



C/2024/3375

30.5.2024

13. JUUNI 2018. AASTA ISTUNGI STENOGRAMM

(C/2024/3375)

EUROOPA PARLAMENT

2018–2019 ISTUNGJÄRK

11.–14. juuni 2018. aasta istungid

STRASBOURG

Sisukord	Lehekülg
1. Osaistungjärgu avamine	4
2. Inimõiguste, demokraatia ja õigusriigi põhimõtete rikkumise juhtumite arutamine (esitatud resolutsiooni ettepanekute tutvustamine) (vt protokoll)	4
3. Parlamendi esimesele lugemisele eelnevad läbirääkimised (heakskiitmine) (artikkel 69c) (vt protokoll)	4
4. Olukord aasta pärast Istanbuli konventsiooni allkirjastamist (arutelu)	4
5. Istungi jätkamine	18
6. Euroopa tulevikku käsitlev arutelu Hollandi peaministri Mark Ruttega (arutelu)	18
7. Istungi jätkamine	49
8. Hääletused	50
8.1. Euroopa Parlamendi koosseis (A8-0207/2018 - Danuta Maria Hübner, Pedro Silva Pereira) (hääletus)	50
8.2. Maksejõuetusmenetluse määruse lisade ajakohastamine (A8-0174/2018 - Tadeusz Zwiefka) (hääletus)	51
8.3. ELi ja Islandi leping välispiire ja viisasid puudutavate täiendavate normide kohta aastateks 2014-2020 (A8-0196/2018 - Anders Primdahl Vistisen) (hääletus)	51
8.4. ELi ja Šveitsi leping välispiire ja viisasid puudutavate täiendavate eeskirjade kohta aastateks 2014-2020 (A8-0195/2018 - Claude Moraes) (hääletus)	51

Sisukord	Lehekülg
8.5. Schengeni infosüsteemiga seotud Schengeni acquis' ülejäänud sätete rakendamine Bulgaaria Vabariigis ja Rumeenias (A8-0192/2018 - Monica Macovei) (hääletus)	51
8.6. Ühtekuuluvuspoliitika ja ringmajandus (A8-0184/2018 - Davor Škrlec) (hääletus)	51
8.7. Täiendava makromajandusliku finantsabi andmine Ukrainale (A8-0183/2018 - Jarosław Wałęsa) (hääletus)	51
8.8. ELi ja Tšiili assotsieerimislepingu ajakohastamise läbirääkimised (A8-0158/2018 - Charles Tannock) (hääletus)	51
8.9. ELi ja NATO suhted (A8-0188/2018 - Ioan Mircea Pașcu) (hääletus)	52
8.10. Küberkaitse (A8-0189/2018 - Urmas Paet) (hääletus)	52
9. Selgitused hääletuse kohta	52
9.1. Ühtekuuluvuspoliitika ja ringmajandus (A8-0184/2018 - Davor Škrlec)	52
9.2. Täiendava makromajandusliku finantsabi andmine Ukrainale (A8-0183/2018 - Jarosław Wałęsa)	55
9.3. ELi ja Tšiili assotsieerimislepingu ajakohastamise läbirääkimised (A8-0158/2018 - Charles Tannock)	57
9.4. ELi ja NATO suhted (A8-0188/2018 - Ioan Mircea Pașcu)	58
9.5. Küberkaitse (A8-0189/2018 - Urmas Paet)	60
10. Hääletuse parandused ja hääletuskavatsused (vt protokoll)	61
11. Istungi jätkamine	61
12. Eelmise istungi protokoll kiitamine (vt protokoll)	61
13. Kohtusüsteemi sõltumatus Poolas (arutelu)	61
14. Humanitaarhädalukorrad Vahemerel ja ELi liikmesriikide solidaarsus (arutelu)	72
15. Parlamendi koosseis (vt protokoll)	96
16. Kutsealasid reguleerivate uute õigusnormide vastuvõtmisele eelnev proportsionaalsuse kontroll (arutelu)	96
17. ELi ja AKV uue partnerluslepingu läbirääkimised (arutelu)	106
18. Romasid käsitlevate riiklike integratsioonistrateegiate ELi raamistiku rakendamine ja järelmeetmed (arutelu)	120

Sisukord	Lehekülg
19. Keeleõppe parandamine ja keeleoskuse vastastikune tunnustamine ELis (arutelu)	129
20. Parlamendi komisjonide koosseis (vt protokoll)	139
21. ELi elevandiluuturu sulgemine salaküttimisega võitlemiseks (arutelu)	139
22. Kultuurile juurdepääsu struktuurilised ja rahalised takistused (arutelu)	144
23. Esitatud dokumendid (vt protokoll)	151
24. Delegeeritud õigusaktid (kodukorra artikli 105 lõige 6) (vt protokoll)	151
25. Rakendusmeetmed (kodukorra artikkel 106) (vt protokoll)	151
26. Järgmise istungi päevakord (vt protokoll)	151
27. Istungi lõpp	151

13. JUUNI 2018. AASTA ISTUNGI STENOGRAMM

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

1. Osaistungjärgu avamine

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 9.00)

2. Inimõiguste, demokraatia ja õigusriigi põhimõtete rikkumise juhtumite arutamine (esitatud resolutsiooni ettepanekute tutvustamine) (vt protokoll)

3. Parlamendi esimesele lugemisele eelnevad läbirääkimised (heakskiitmine) (artikkel 69c) (vt protokoll)

4. Olukord aasta pärast Istanbuli konventsiooni allkirjastamist (arutelu)

Przewodniczący. –Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie pierwszej rocznicy podpisania konwencji stambulskiej: obecna sytuacja (2018/2753(RSP)).

Wcześniej chciałbym zawrzeć z państwem pewne porozumienie, ponieważ o godz. 10.00 musimy zakończyć ten punkt porządku dziennego. Po nim nastąpi strategiczna, tradycyjna debata z udziałem premierów – tym razem jest to premier Holandii, dlatego będę bardzo chciał restrykcyjnie przestrzegać czasu wystąpień. Chciałbym również, mając na uwadze przewagę formuły zgłoszeń z sali, zaproponować, że nie będę udzielał zgody na wystąpienia w trybie niebieskiej kartki, natomiast zostawimy czas na formułę zgłoszeń z sali.

Na wystąpienie Komisji, wystąpienia w imieniu grup politycznych oraz wystąpienia posłów mamy w tej chwili 45 minut – 5 minut na wprowadzenie, a więc zostałoby 10 minut na zgłoszenia z sali, w związku z czym proszę o akceptację takiej formuły dzisiejszej debaty w tym punkcie porządku dziennego. Rozumiem, że jest akceptacja.

Wobec tego proszę bardzo o wystąpienie w imieniu Rady panią minister Monikę Panayotovą.

Monika Panayotova, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, thank you for having this important debate on the agenda today. Indeed this is not the first time I had the opportunity to discuss with you this very important topic. I would like to use the opportunity to reiterate the points which I have made previously. Combating all forms of violence against women and young girls is a core element of the respect for fundamental rights. These crimes have no place in the Union, and the Council is clear on zero tolerance of violence against women.

The Istanbul Convention is a comprehensive framework on violence against women and domestic violence. It constitutes a concrete tool to eradicate all forms of violence against women, protect its victims and prosecute the perpetrators. Finally, it contributes to the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and promotes equality between women and men.

All 28 Member States have already signed this Convention, and 18 of them have already ratified it. The Council has, on several occasions, encouraged those Member States who have not done so yet to ratify the Istanbul Convention.

On 11 May 2017, the Council adopted the decisions on the signing of the Convention on behalf of the European Union. Our Presidency is carrying on the work on the conclusion of this important instrument. This includes reaching agreement on internal rules in the form of a code of conduct for the implementation of the Convention.

According to the EU-wide survey on violence against women conducted by the Fundamental Rights Agency in 2014, one-in-three women, which means 33%, has experienced physical and/or sexual violence since the age of 15. One-in-five women, which means 18%, has experienced stalking; every second woman has been confronted with one or more forms of sexual harassment. Violence against women cannot be seen as a marginal issue that touches only on some women's lives.

Last but not least, gender-based violence also has a significant impact on economies and societies as a whole, for example in terms of health, legal and social services. In 2014, the European Institute for Gender Equality has estimated that the cost of violence against women in the European Union could amount to billions, or to be more precise, EUR 109 billion per year.

As President Tajani strongly affirmed, 'the struggle for the elimination of violence against women is a fight that each and every one of us must take part in. It is our duty to stand up for women by drawing awareness to this injustice.'

The Council has repeatedly expressed its commitment to preventing and eliminating all forms of gender-based violence. We all know that only our joint efforts and a message of unity will help to improve the situation of all women and girls in Europe.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, one year ago, the European Union signed the Istanbul Convention, and since then we have seen women's marches and the '#Me Too' campaign confirm once again that violence against women is a global issue that continues to affect women and girls in every part of the world. We know that this violence is part of an effort to keep women in their place as lesser citizens and this is unacceptable.

The Convention is the first legally binding international instrument with enforceable provisions to prevent and combat violence against women. The Commission's intention is to conclude EU accession as soon as possible. Since the signature, we have been working intensively with the Member States and the Council to reach an agreement on a Code of Conduct that sets out the practical arrangements for implementing the Convention. The Code should accompany the Council's conclusion decision and describe the division of roles between the EU and the Member States in implementing the Convention. We have been discussing legal competence issues, as well as issues such as reporting and sharing information.

Some Member States, regrettably, are still reluctant to support EU accession to the Convention. Let me reiterate again that the EU will accede alongside the Member States and will not replace Member States. Substantial aspects of the Convention, such as those related to substantive criminal law, remain under Member States' exclusive competence.

However, the advantage is that, if the EU becomes a contracting party in its own name, alongside the Member States, certain obligations set out in the Convention will be legally binding for the EU's institutions, bodies and agencies and will therefore protect their staff. For example, the Convention requires that staff are protected through the internal rules of the institutions to prohibit violence and harassment in the workplace and provide for procedures and services to support victims and to sanction offenders.

The Commission is currently in the process of analysing the relevant obligations in the Convention, screening the existing internal rules, regulations and practices of all EU institutions, agencies and bodies, and determining whether there are any gaps in the current system. This is a task which will require the full engagement of all European institutions and bodies, and I warmly welcome the European Parliament's cooperation in this regard.

Unfortunately, achieving EU compliance with these international standards is not enough. Despite the fact that all EU Member States have signed the Convention and that 19 Member States have so far ratified it, we see strong opposition against the Convention in a few countries. A lot has been said about this Convention, some of which is frankly untrue. I would like to be very clear: this Convention is about protecting women against violence. Nothing more, nothing less. One-in-three women in Europe has experienced violence at least once in their life simply because she is a woman, and one-in-three women in Europe has experienced either physical and/or sexual violence. This is unacceptable.

The Istanbul Convention is the first binding and comprehensive international instrument in Europe that addresses violence against women. It is not about imposing new social standards. It is about banning violence. The misconceptions and misleading arguments voiced in the public debates about the Convention need to be confronted. The Commission is working on a communication strategy to rebut fears that the Convention would challenge conventional family or religious norms or introduce an obligation to allow same-sex marriage or a new refugee status for transgender or intersex persons. I would really like to know in which universe social conventions or religious norms would allow for violence against women. Which religion does that?

(Applause)

Gender equality is not a quick fix. We all know that. But unless we take concrete steps and move ahead together on this, we won't achieve the behavioural and cultural shifts that allow change. I say this: I'm a son, I'm a husband, and I'm a father of two girls. I find it completely unacceptable that my mother, my wife or my kids – my girls – would not be better protected against violence. This is a duty shared by men and women. It's not only up to women to make this happen, and this is a duty we should all take very seriously indeed.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, the signature of the EU on the Istanbul Convention was a historic step to strengthen our tools to prevent violence, combat impunity and protect victims. Since then, Estonia, Cyprus, Germany and now Croatia have ratified the Convention, but 10 Member States are missing, including the Presidency. I am asking them: how many women have to be harassed, beaten up and killed? How many girls have to be married away, mutilated or trafficked for prostitution before they ratify and enforce?

All women and girls should feel free and safe in Europe, and no tradition or culture can justify men's violence against women. The EU accession to the Convention strengthens accountability for Member States and external action of the EU in promoting women's rights globally. It is about building a culture of respect for women and girls involving men and boys. The Convention not only provides for sanctions, training, support for victims, but also measures to combat stereotypes and sexism.

So together today, let's call on the Presidency to put the Istanbul Convention on the agenda of the European Council for as long as it takes, and call on all countries – Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Ukraine – to engage with civil society, with religious leaders, across political parties based on facts. Thank you, Vice-President for what you said. Let's also call on the Commission to open a dialogue on the misleading interpretation of gender in the Convention. The Convention is not against family – Mr President, I'm finishing – it is against violence that is against families. As co-rapporteur of the Istanbul Convention, I will remain committed to zero tolerance to any violence against women and girls.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, nous sommes réunis aujourd'hui pour célébrer un anniversaire, celui de la signature par l'Union européenne de la convention d'Istanbul, il y a un an jour pour jour. C'est agréable un anniversaire, on se félicite, on regarde dans le rétroviseur et on constate à quel point les femmes sont désormais mieux protégées, car la convention d'Istanbul est un traité juridiquement contraignant et le meilleur outil qui soit pour prévenir les violences, protéger les victimes et poursuivre en justice les responsables.

Mais cet anniversaire n'est en rien une célébration, car après un an de négociations entre la Commission et le Conseil, aucun progrès notable n'a été réalisé. Vous pouvez estimer que la négociation avance et qu'une partie des États membres est de bonne volonté, je les en remercie sincèrement. Mais nous avons ici besoin de l'unanimité. La Pologne ou la Hongrie – pour ne citer qu'elles – refusent toute avancée sur le dossier.

Ces gouvernements ont tourné le dos à la moitié de leur population, qui risque pourtant de devenir des victimes, niant ainsi notre droit de vivre à l'abri de la violence.

Et quelle force de conviction de la présidence bulgare du Conseil, qui a retiré un projet de loi pour la ratification de son propre pays. Pas étonnant que les négociations au niveau européen s'éternisent.

Le Conseil a déjà restreint la portée de l'adhésion de l'Union à la convention d'Istanbul. Il a choisi de la limiter à quelques domaines précis, alors que ce Parlement appelait à une adhésion la plus large possible. Les arguments juridiques pour justifier ces restrictions regrettables ont d'ailleurs été rejetés par notre Service juridique.

Alors arrêtez-vous là, arrêtez de vous opposer à ce qui peut réellement aider les femmes en Europe, à ce qui peut mettre fin à l'impunité des responsables. L'Union européenne doit ratifier au plus vite cette convention, ainsi que les dix États membres qui ne l'ont pas encore fait au niveau national.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, beste collega's, ik wil vandaag een vurig pleidooi houden voor de ratificatie van het Verdrag van Istanbul. Elk instrument dat vrouwen een beetje meer beschermt tegen geweld, is van groot belang. Ik benadruk dat het hier gaat om de vreselijkste misdaden tegen vrouwen, zoals genitale verminking, gedwongen abortus en gedwongen sterilisatie, kindhuwelijken, verkrachting en eremoord.

Mensen kunnen en mogen religieuze overtuigingen hebben, maar dit mag de bescherming van vrouwen nooit in de weg staan. Ik kan niet begrijpen en aanvaarden dat cultuur, gewoonten, religie, traditie of de zogenaamde 'eer' een excuus kunnen zijn om vrouwen te onderdrukken en te misbruiken.

Ik vraag jullie allen: Wat is er eervol aan geweld tegen vrouwen? En hoe kan het bestrijden van geweld niet in overeenstemming zijn met traditionele waarden? Ik betreur het ontzettend dat het in de EU zo moeilijk blijkt om samen een krachtig signaal te geven tegen geweld. Geweld tegen vrouwen, en bij uitbreiding tegen alle genders, hoort niet thuis in onze Europese samenleving. We slaan onszelf zo graag op de borst voor onze Europese waarden en grondrechten, maar hebben het moeilijk de meest flagrante vorm van discriminatie te veroordelen. Ik vind dit de Europese Unie onwaardig.

Angelika Mlinar, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner. All around the world, in every country, women and girls still struggle to exercise their full human rights.

Violence against women and girls is perhaps the most obvious manifestation of the deep imbalances empowering our societies and the vulnerabilities and limitations that follow them, especially for the most marginalised groups when vulnerabilities are at their peak and protections at their lowest point.

This year marks the first anniversary of the signing by the European Union of the Istanbul Convention, and it is an opportunity for us to reflect on the steps that have been taken so far. But it is also a possibility for a wake-up call. Only robust action can ensure women a life free from violence.

I welcome the steps that have been taken in the negotiations of the Code of Conduct, which lays down the rights and obligations of the EU and the Member States under the Convention. This gives me the opportunity to call on the next EU Council Presidency, Austria – my country – to conclude the Code of Conduct and to find a political agreement with the remaining problematic Member States who keep blocking the ratification by the European Union of the Istanbul Convention.

For those Member States I have a crystal clear message: I urge you to stop spreading outrageous misinformation about the Convention and its content. Gender is not a threat; domestic violence is.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the 13th of June will go down in history. It will go down in history as the day when the European Union truly stood up against violence against women and for the protection of women against violence. And fighting against violence should actually not even be a debate here, because, despite our political differences, shouldn't we all agree that all women in the European Union should be able to live a life free from violence? Still there is opposition to this Convention. There are politicians who are spreading lies in order to block the ratification of this very important Convention, and these politicians only have one pre-condition under which they actually care about violence against women, and that is when the perpetrator is a Muslim, when the perpetrator is a refugee, when the perpetrator is a stranger – when the perpetrator is somebody who they can politically instrumentalise. And I say to you today: stop these disgusting political campaigns. Start doing something for the protection of women against violence, start campaigning for the Istanbul Convention, because this is the real political tool that you should use in order to prevent violence from happening. Stand up for women in Europe: support the Istanbul Convention now!

Malin Björk, *för GUE/NGL-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Könsbaserat våld dödar. Det förminskar livsutrymmet och hotar. Sexualiserat våld, trakasserier, våld i nära relationer, hot på offentliga platser och utrymmen. De som utsätts är kvinnor och flickor men också de med normbrytande könsidentitet eller sexualitet såsom hbtq-personer.

Men jag tror att det ännu viktigare att synliggöra vem som utövar våldet. Det är män. Vi har en slags "toxic masculinity" som i värsta fall genererar våldsutövande män. De goda nyheterna är ju att det inte behöver vara så. Det är en konstruktion av manlighet som inte hör hemma i detta århundrade, och som vi kan ändra på. Det är det som är feminism och genus, det är det handlar om. Och i den bemärkelsen, visst, då välkomnar jag många fler feministiska män som tar avstånd från den typen av manlighet.

Vi som är här i dag, vi som följer arbetet med att ratificera Istanbulkonventionen, vi vet vilket viktigt verktyg det är. Vi vet vilket värdefullt politiskt och juridiskt instrument det är, och vi kommer inte att ge oss, för den här kampen är inte över förrän vi alla är skyddade mot våld mot kvinnor och flickor. Vi kommer inte att ge oss, vi har också mänskliga rättigheter.

Daniela Aiuto, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, già un anno è passato dalla firma della Convenzione di Istanbul da parte dell'Unione europea e siamo oggi qui a ricordarlo. Come in ogni anniversario che si rispetti, facciamo anche un primo bilancio per capire se abbiamo fatto abbastanza rispetto alle aspettative. La risposta è: no, non abbiamo fatto abbastanza.

Certo, lo sappiamo, non è con una firma che le cose possono cambiare. Una firma non ferma né le violenze né le discriminazioni che ogni giorno subiscono le donne in tutta Europa. Quindi facciamo di più, pressiamo i governi degli Stati membri a fare di più, a legiferare nella maniera più efficace e a mettere in campo tutte le forze necessarie perché le violenze contro le donne non si fermano e siamo francamente stanche di aspettare.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, il y a un peu plus d'un an, l'Union européenne signait la convention d'Istanbul. Vous avez réussi au Parlement, à grand renfort de démagogie, à faire accepter ce texte à une grande majorité de nos collègues. Soit.

Alors aujourd'hui, un an après, est venu le temps de faire les comptes. Vous prétendez sauver les femmes et les filles victimes de violences et vous avez mis en avant, lors de l'événement EYE consacré à la jeunesse européenne il y a quelques jours, des femmes défendant le voile islamique, symbole, je l'affirme, de la menace qui pèse réellement sur les femmes européennes aujourd'hui.

Vous prétendez défendre l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes en favorisant ce que vous appelez l'égalité des genres. Pensez-vous réellement qu'imposer l'idéologie du genre, comme vous le faites, à tous et surtout à nos enfants, fera reculer les violences faites aux femmes?

Vous prétendez enfin apporter la lumière de la démocratie européenne à toutes les femmes et les filles d'Europe, et lorsque les gouvernements bulgares, hongrois et polonais, entre autres, refusent souverainement d'adhérer à votre petit livre rouge du genre, ils sont lynchés sur la place publique.

Ils sont surtout conscients que cette convention d'Istanbul ne protégera en rien les femmes européennes des réels dangers qui les menacent aujourd'hui.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Chciałabym na początek przypomnieć, że rząd polski podpisał konwencję w 2012 r. i ratyfikował ją w 2015 r. I wyrażając uznanie dla Anny Marii Corrazzzy Bildt, która prowadzi ten temat w parlamencie z wielką determinacją, chciałabym również przypomnieć, że konwencja powstała w 2011 r. i w ciągu zaledwie kilku lat podpisały ją wszystkie kraje Rady Europy z wyjątkiem Rosji i Azerbejdżanu. Podpisały ją również wszystkie kraje, w tym Unii Europejskiej, i większość z nich ratyfikowała tę konwencję. Ostatnio zrobiła to Chorwacja, której należą się za to wielkie brawa. Konwencja stambulska jest uznana przez ONZ za złoty standard polityki antyprzemocowej. Zawiera rozdział o prewencji, który mówi, że promowanie równości kobiet i mężczyzn to najlepszy sposób zapobiegania przemocy. Konwencja uznaje, że nic nie może przemocy usprawiedliwiać: ani tradycja, ani religia, ani kultura. Wprost niektóre zwyczaje religijne, jak obrzezanie kobiet, uznaje za przemoc i czyn karalny. Ta konwencja to mapa drogowa dla krajowych polityk antyprzemocowych. Wyrażając uznanie dla faktu, że w 2017 r. Unia Europejska jako strona przystąpiła do konwencji, wzywam Komisję Europejską i Radę do rozszerzenia zakresu ratyfikacji unijnej oraz do przygotowania projektu dyrektywy antyprzemocowej, która jako prawo unijne miałaby moc wiążącą.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). –Señor presidente, una de cada tres mujeres en la Unión Europea ha sido víctima de algún tipo de violencia, y, por eso, celebrar hoy este debate, cuando hace un año que la Unión Europea firmó el Convenio de Estambul, creo que es una señal fundamental para trasladar la necesidad de seguir comprometiéndonos y seguir trabajando en la lucha contra la violencia contra las mujeres.

Quiero agradecer el discurso tan comprometido del señor Timmermans al respecto, porque es cierto que necesitamos muchas voces unidas en este sentido. También reconozco que me ha sorprendido escuchar la voz de la Presidencia al respecto de esta cuestión, cuando Bulgaria se encuentra dentro de los países que todavía no han asumido la necesidad de ratificar el Convenio de Estambul.

Es una obligación moral. Es una obligación de todos los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea luchar contra la violencia contra las mujeres, porque necesitamos medidas legislativas que nos comprometan, porque necesitamos poner en marcha todas y cada una de las acciones en los distintos niveles para acabar con la mayor lacra social que tiene en estos momentos el mundo.

Las mujeres están siendo asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres, y eso no merece la impasibilidad de nadie. Por lo tanto, asumamos nuestras obligaciones, asumamos nuestros compromisos y pongamos en marcha una lucha que es necesario comenzar ya desde la unidad de todos los demócratas y desde la unidad de aquellos que consideramos que es necesaria una Europa más igual.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). –Vážený pán predsedaajúci, samozrejme, násilie na ženách nikto schvaľovať nechce, nikto si to neželá, ani to nie je správne. Ale zároveň je treba vidieť, že s týmto dokumentom má množstvo štátov problémy, a myslím si, že je dôležité, že toto je treba rešpektovať.

Výskumy ukazujú, že príčiny násillia voči ženám nie sú také, ako v tomto dokumente stále hovoríte: že muži útočia na ženy, lebo sú ženy. To predsa nie je pravda. Sú to alkohol, hazard, partnerské problémy a mnoho štátov vidí v tomto dokumente aj ideologický problém. Konkrétne v bode C sa uvádza, že chcete predefinovať porozumenie úlohy mužov a žien v spoločnosti. Lenže toto sa nedeje medzinárodným dokumentom. Takisto odstraňovanie tohto násillia sa nedeje reštrikciou a príkazmi, ale výchovou a úctou v rodinách, v školách, voči žene ako takej, k tej schopnosti, ktorú má – prinášať život.

V Turecku bol ratifikovaný dohovor, ale keď tam bol prípad muža, ktorý znásilnil ženu, stačilo zaviesť zákon, že keď sa s ňou ožení, už bude od trestu oslobodený.

Prosím vás, Istanbulský dohovor treba vytvoriť nový. Nový dokument, ktorý bude vyhovovať štátom.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). –Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, me gustaría que este aniversario de la firma del Convenio de Estambul por la Unión Europea fuera motivo de celebración, pero me temo que es motivo de denuncia.

En marzo, señora Panayotova, el Gobierno búlgaro revocó su decisión de presentar el Convenio de Estambul para su ratificación en plena Presidencia europea. El primer ministro eslovaco, Robert Fico, dijo en febrero que se negaba a ratificarlo. Según Viktor Orban, la forma de defender a las mujeres es impedir la inmigración en Hungría.

Diez Estados miembros aún no han ratificado el Convenio y algunos, como Polonia, llevan años amenazando con revertir esa ratificación. Incluso los países que lo han ratificado, como el mío, España, aún no han incorporado adecuadamente las disposiciones en su legislación nacional, de modo que se haga efectivo.

El Convenio de Estambul es la herramienta legal más completa e integrada de que nos hemos dotado para combatir de forma integral la violencia de género contra las niñas, contra las mujeres y también la violencia intrafamiliar, pero hace ya cuatro años que entró en vigor. Yo confío en que la Presidencia austriaca complete el compromiso que el Consejo adoptó hace un año.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ένα χρόνο μετά την υπογραφή της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν έχουμε καταφέρει ακόμα το αυτονόητο: να ισχύουν οι διατάξεις της Σύμβασης σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Και αυτό γιατί η Επιτροπή κάνει τα στραβά μάτια. Ενώ φροντίζει να απειλεί και ακόμα να επιβάλλει πρόστιμα στα κράτη μέλη, όταν παραβιάζουν το κοινοτικό δίκαιο, όπως συμβαίνει σε δημοσιονομικά, εμπορικά, περιβαλλοντικά θέματα, δεν κάνει το ίδιο, όταν πρόκειται για τα δικαιώματα των ανθρώπων, που είναι η βάση και ο πυρήνας της κοινωνίας. Και το χειρότερο: επιτρέπει να ανακυκλώνονται ψευδείς ειδήσεις για το κείμενο της Σύμβασης δαιμονοποιώντας το και στρέφοντας τον κόσμο εναντίον του.

Ερωτώ την Επιτροπή: πρώτον, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για να ισχύει η Σύμβαση που η ίδια υπέγραψε; Δεύτερον, πώς θα αντικρούσει τις ψευδείς ειδήσεις γύρω από τη Σύμβαση;

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). –Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, sehr geehrte Angehörige der anderen über 60 künstlichen Geschlechter! Wir sprechen über „Ein Jahr Istanbul-Konvention“. Alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten verfügen über wirksame nationale Gesetze und Prozeduren, um Gewalt gegen Frauen und Männer zu bekämpfen – sonst wären sie nämlich nicht Mitglied der EU oder des Europarats geworden.

Deswegen ist die Istanbul-Konvention völlig überflüssig. Sie ist ein politisch korrekter Vorwand zur Vertiefung der absurden Gender-Ideologie und sonst nichts. Der Istanbul-Konvention schlägt zu Recht Ablehnung und Misstrauen entgegen. Deswegen denkt der Europarat sogar darüber nach, mit Steuergeldern viele bunte Broschüren zu drucken, um den Gender-Unsinn schönzureden. Die Istanbul-Konvention ist das falsche Instrument in der Hand der falschen Leute.

Fürs Protokoll: Wir stehen ganz klar gegen jede geschlechtsbezogene Gewalt sowohl gegen Frauen als auch gegen Männer. Doch das ist Aufgabe des nationalen Strafrechts, nicht dieser überflüssigen Gender-Konvention.

Herr Kommissar Timmermans, beklagen Sie sich hier doch bitte nicht über Gewalt gegen Frauen im Raum der EU! Sie sind einer der maßgeblichen Akteure, die mit ihrer Politik Gewalt gegen Frauen sogar massiv befördern. Mit Ihrer absurden Migrationspolitik holen Sie Scharen von frauenverachtenden und nicht selten zu massiver Gewalt gegen Frauen bereiten jungen Männern aus fremden Kulturkreisen in den Bereich der EU aktiv herein. Mehr Heuchelei war selten, Herr Kommissar. Das ist mit Naivität nicht zu entschuldigen!

Franz Obermayr (ENF). –Herr Präsident! Einerseits ist es bedauerlich, dass manche Mitgliedstaaten noch nicht die Istanbul-Konvention ratifiziert haben, aber andererseits zeigt es sich immer wieder, dass die Ratifizierung des Vertrages nicht einhergeht mit dem Schutz der Frau. Exemplarisch zu sehen, Herr Kommissar Timmermans, in der Türkei, wo beinahe jede zweite Frau unter häuslicher Gewalt leidet. Im Jahr 2017 wurden gar 409 Frauen in der Türkei unter diesen Umständen ermordet. Sie sind alle verstummte Zeugen eines archaischen Islams, wie der türkische Staatspräsident Erdoğan ihn offensichtlich gerne hätte.

Es wundert daher auch nicht, dass die staatliche türkische Religionsbehörde zu Beginn dieses Jahres vorschlug, die Ehe für Kinder zu erlauben, sobald diese in die Pubertät kämen. Für uns, meine Damen und Herren, ein Weckruf, islamistische Parallelgesellschaften mit ihrem archaischen Frauenbild in unserer Mitte zu verhindern.

Herr Kommissar Timmermans, Sie brauchen offensichtlich Nachhilfeunterricht in Religionswissenschaft, wenn Sie hier heute an dieser Stelle die Frage stellen, welche Religion offensichtlich Gewalt gegen Frauen erlaubt. Gewalt an Frauen zu verurteilen, ist richtig und wichtig. Diese aber präventiv zu bekämpfen, Herr Kommissar, ist in meinen Augen ungleich wichtiger.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). –Mr President, I just want to say very clearly that if you ever have listened to a victim of domestic violence recalling their experience, you would have no doubt of the importance of this issue. And the tragedy is that in our so-called developed world, domestic violence is everywhere. And this is a frightening reality for women and indeed their children.

My country, Ireland, has signed the Istanbul Convention but has not ratified it yet; that needs to be done. I support the call made here in this debate on this very sensitive issue.

It is a shocking sight and a shocking reality. I listened very recently to a woman describe the circumstances of her experience and how difficult it was for her to extract herself from that. This House can only support this initiative absolutely.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la firma da parte dell'Unione europea della Convenzione di Istanbul è stata un passo fondamentale per offrire strumenti giuridici per prevenire le violenze, perseguire gli autori di reati e fornire sostegno alle vittime. A un anno dall'adesione dell'Unione, però, tocca constatare che non tutti gli Stati hanno dato effettiva applicazione alla Convenzione e che, anche laddove le disposizioni hanno trovato attuazione, la violenza è ancora una triste e drammatica realtà per molte donne.

Evidentemente la legislazione da sola, per quanto efficace e completa, non basta. Non basta per risolvere in maniera netta e definitiva i tanti problemi legati alla violenza di genere. Occorre un cambio di passo ancora più efficace, attraverso la previsione di strumenti preventivi di carattere educativo, per diffondere una nuova cultura incentrata sul rispetto delle donne, e occorre l'adozione a livello europeo di una nuova politica integrata contro qualsiasi forma di violenza nei confronti delle donne, che solleciti in tutti i paesi la cosiddetta tolleranza zero, per realizzare finalmente una società realmente paritaria.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχουμε συζητήσει επανειλημμένα για τη Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης και φυσικά είναι σημαντικό το γεγονός ότι έχει υπογραφεί. Τα κρούσματα της βίας κατά των γυναικών είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη και θα πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα, προκειμένου να σταματήσει η βία κατά των γυναικών. Φυσικά υπάρχει και κοινωνική διάσταση σε όλα όσα συμβαίνουν, υπάρχουν διάφορα αίτια, το αλκοόλ, ο τζόγος, αλλά καθημερινά εντείνονται τα φαινόμενα ενδοοικογενειακής βίας λόγω και της οικονομικής κρίσης.

Το βασικό λοιπόν είναι να υλοποιηθεί η Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης. Αλλά για να υλοποιηθεί, πρέπει να κυρωθεί από τα κράτη μέλη. Βλέπουμε ότι ακόμη και η Βουλγαρία, που έχει την Προεδρία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αυτή τη στιγμή, δεν έχει προχωρήσει στην κύρωση. Απαιτείται λοιπόν να κυρωθεί η Σύμβαση, να εφαρμοστεί και να ληφθούν σκληρά μέτρα εναντίον όσων ασκούν βία κατά των γυναικών.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). –Gospodine predsjedavajući, želim povući jednu paralelu. Možda će vam ona izgledati ekstremna, ali ja sam duboko uvjeren da je ona istinita. Oni koji ne žele ratificirati Istanbulsku konvenciju, oni nas žele vratiti u srednji vijek. Oni još uvijek misle da je zemlja ravna ploča, još uvijek misle da bi mnoge žene možda trebale biti na lomači. Želim tako govoriti o tome jer ono o čemu mi ovdje danas govorimo zaista jest nevjerovatno: da u ovoj Europskoj uniji još uvijek imamo zemlje, imamo političare koji su na vlasti, koji ne žele ratificirati Istanbulsku konvenciju. Albanija, Bosna i Hercegovina, Crna Gora, Makedonija i Srbija ratificirale su Istanbulsku konvenciju, a Češka, Slovačka, Mađarska i neke druge zemlje, i neke koje žele povući svoju ratifikaciju, na neki su način vještice Europske unije.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σήμερα συμπληρώνεται ένας χρόνος από την ημέρα υπογραφής της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης. Δυστυχώς όμως το φαινόμενο της βίας κατά των γυναικών συνεχίζει να οξύνεται και εκδηλώνεται σε πολλές μορφές, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ψυχολογικής, σωματικής και σεξουαλικής παρενόχλησης, της αναγκαστικής άμβλωσης, της σωματεμπορίας και των εγκλημάτων τιμής.

Την ίδια στιγμή λόγω των νεοφιλελεύθερων πολιτικών λιτότητας εντείνονται και άλλες μορφές καταπίεσης, όπως η καταπίεση στην εργασία, οι αποκοπές μισθών και επιδομάτων, η κατάργηση κάθε είδους κρατικής πρόνοιας, οι απολύσεις εγκύων και η προσφυγοποίηση, όπου χιλιάδες γυναίκες καλούνται να επιβιώσουν σε αντίξοες συνθήκες και να προστατεύσουν τα παιδιά τους.

Απαιτείται λοιπόν να ληφθούν δραστικά μέτρα και να πραγματοποιηθούν αποφασιστικές ενέργειες, και σε επίπεδο Ένωσης και από κάθε κράτος μέλος. Στην κύρωση και εφαρμογή της Σύμβασης δεν χωρούν επιφυλάξεις, δεν χωρούν εξοικονομήσεις και δεν πρέπει να παρεμβάλλονται εμπόδια. Ως Ομάδα GUE θα συνεχίσουμε να παλεύουμε μέχρι τέλους για μια κοινωνία απαλλαγμένη από τη βία, την εκμετάλλευση, τις ανισότητες.

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). –Señor presidente, en España, gracias al movimiento feminista, no solo tenemos el Gobierno con más mujeres del mundo y de la historia de Europa, sino que la lucha contra la violencia de género es una prioridad social y política. Por eso, celebro que la Unión Europea haya firmado hace un año el Convenio de Estambul. Pero, al mismo tiempo, lamento que el proceso de ratificación siga estancado.

Ante los ataques machistas y homófobos en contra del Convenio, yo pregunto al Consejo y a la Comisión: ¿Qué están haciendo para desbloquear esta situación? ¿Cómo piensan contrarrestar las campañas de desinformación? ¿Hay alguna iniciativa encima de la mesa?

Exigimos que el proceso de ratificación concluya con éxito, pero también les quiero recordar alguna cosa más. Como este Parlamento ha manifestado, el Convenio es un paso necesario, pero no suficiente. Para acabar con la violencia contra la mujer necesitamos una directiva contra la violencia de género. Esto no lo pierdan de vista, por favor.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). –Mr President, it is of great significance that one year ago the Council approved the signature of the Istanbul Convention. But can we really celebrate today in terms of facts and figures?

Violence against women is an extremely serious crime and a serious breach of human rights. Still, it is a persistent issue in the Member States. The numbers are alarming, as every third woman has been a victim of physical or sexual violence in the EU.

In Romania there have been more than 20 000 reported cases in 2017, but we know that the majority of incidents do not even come to the attention of the police. There is still a long way to go until real practices follow ratification acts and the different forms of gender-based violence diminish in our societies.

The Istanbul Convention is not only about numbers but also about changing current attitudes in our households as well as shaping the future behaviour of the next generation. Member States can no longer tolerate abusive behaviour towards women and need to join forces to implement action to combat such violence.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D). –Pažvelkime realybei į akis, tūkstančių moterų ir mergaičių Europos Sąjungos valstybėse patiria smurtą, ir ekonominį, ir psichologinį, ir seksualinį ir fizinį smurtą. Kas trečia, sako statistika. O jeigu pažvelgtume giliau, ko gero tūkstančių moterų net bijo pranešti apie tą patirtą smurtą. Vadinas, realybė yra dar baisesnė, čia, Europos Sąjungoje. Ir todėl mes privalome nedelsiant imtis visų priemonių, kad situacija keistųsi, kad moterys, mergaitės nebūtų skriaudžiamos. Kreipiuosi į pirmininkaujančią Bulgariją, jūs pirmininkaujanti valstybė turite rodyti pavyzdį ir nedelsiant ratifikuoti Stambulo konvenciją. Kreipiuosi, pone Timmermansai, ir į Jus, prašydama, kad Komisija labai rimtai išnagrinėtų galimybę dėl direktyvos smurto pagrindu pateikimo, nes kitaip situacijos mes nepakeisime.

Marek Jurek (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Konwencja stambulska to nie jest konwencja o zwalczaniu przemocy. To jest konwencja o aplikacji ideologii gender. Ona ignoruje kluczowe przyczyny przemocy domowej, przemocy wobec kobiet, takie na przykład jak panseksualizm naszej kultury (o czym wielokrotnie mówiliśmy na przykład w komisji na konkretnych przykładach tego, co się dzieje w internecie) albo kryzys rodziny – bo mamy dane, że zdecydowana większość przemocy wobec dzieci ma miejsce tam, gdzie dziecko nie żyje z obojgiem swoich naturalnych rodziców. Jest rzeczą charakterystyczną, że gdy weźmiemy na przykład przymusowe małżeństwa, to znacznie częściej do nich dochodzi w krajach, które ratyfikowały konwencję stambulską, niż w krajach, które jej nie ratyfikowały. Pan przewodniczący Timmermans zupełnie ignoruje kompetencje Komisji Europejskiej zawarte w art. 17. On mówi o koordynacji, a tymczasem słyszymy tylko ataki na jedną trzecią państw Unii Europejskiej, które tej ideologii podporządkować się nie chcą.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). –Señor presidente, en este aniversario quiero lanzar una reflexión: ningún Estado miembro de la Unión Europea puede negarse a ratificar el Convenio de Estambul, al menos, si cree en los valores que nos unen; al menos si aplica en su territorio los principios de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Es hora de preguntarse si un Estado que no firma este Convenio puede pertenecer a la Unión. Y, desde luego, es hora de plantear que ningún Estado que aspire a integrarse en la Unión pueda hacerlo sin haber firmado previamente este Convenio.

La expresión más dramática de la desigualdad es la violencia de género, y el Convenio de Estambul es el primer instrumento internacional efectivo para combatir de manera efectiva las agresiones machistas, que causan al año más víctimas, muertos y heridos que el terrorismo. Si hubiésemos guardado un minuto de silencio en este Pleno por cada víctima de la violencia machista registrada en la última década, tendríamos que haber estado callados cinco días completos, un silencio estruendoso que debería avergonzar a todos los que, a base de mentiras, buscan excusas para no enfrentar el problema de estereotipos y dominación en que se basan las agresiones sexistas.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). –Senhor Presidente, a evidência e a dimensão da violência contra as mulheres provavelmente nunca terá tido tanta projeção mediática e visibilidade. Somam-se variados instrumentos estratégicos de combate à violência, de que a Convenção de Istambul será, porventura, o de maior alcance.

Apesar disso, a tendência de agravamento da violência sobre as mulheres não parece mostrar sinais de ser invertida. Não por acaso: as políticas de austeridade, de desinvestimento económico e social, de ataque a direitos – promovidas com o beneplácito da União Europeia – e o consequente aumento das desigualdades, da pobreza, da exploração laboral, outras expressões de violência humana, foram acompanhados de maiores níveis de violência sobre as mulheres.

Será, porventura, a maior evidência de que é impossível dissociar violência do modelo socioeconómico e das opções políticas que o definem, e que não bastam diplomas, recomendações, leis, para alterar a realidade. Exigem-se outras políticas.

A talhe de foice, não se pode, como alguns pretendem agora em Portugal, ignorar outras ignóbeis formas de violência, como a prostituição, procurando legitimá-la a pretexto de falsas liberdades de escolha ou conceptualizações de trabalho, que rejeitamos.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). –Senhor Presidente, que importante é esta ferramenta contra a violência contra as mulheres, contra a violência patriarcal e machista. Bem-vindo ao primeiro instrumento jurídico internacional que cobre todas as formas de violência contra todas as mulheres de todas as idades em tempo de guerra e de paz.

Cerca de nove milhões de mulheres na Europa foram violadas antes de completarem os quinze anos. É um número chocante. Igualmente alarmante é o facto de poucos países na Europa tratarem este crime com a devida seriedade. Nós, mulheres, queremos voltar para casa sem olhar para trás, queremos ser respeitadas no lar, no trabalho, na vida, queremos que as nossas filhas vivam sem medo e que existam meios económicos, porque a violência económica também existe. Por isso, tolerância zero relativamente à violência, tolerância zero relativamente aos Estados-Membros que não ratificaram a Convenção de Istambul e tolerância zero relativamente às deputadas e deputados machistas desta câmara que, infelizmente, há muitos.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). –Pane předsedající, z vyjádření pana komisaře, ale i mnohých z vás vyplývá, že pokud nepřijmeme úmluvu o prevenci a boji proti násilí na ženách a domácímu násilí, Istanbulskou úmluvu, pak nemáme nástroj, nemáme právní základ pro to, abychom bojovali proti násilí na ženách. Ale já se chci důrazně ohradit proti této nepravdě. Protože my tady přece máme Evropskou úmluvu o lidských právech, která jasně bojuje proti mučení, nelidskému zacházení, chrání důstojnost lidského života a respekt rodinného i soukromého života. Občané se mě ptají: „Co se stane, když nepřijmeme Istanbulskou úmluvu?“ A já jim říkám: „V České republice nic nového Istanbulská úmluva nepřináší.“ Česká republika má zákon proti domácímu násilí od roku 2006.

Dámy a pánové, já chápu, že v některých státech je to možná důležité, a já respektuji váš názor, ale prosím respektujte i subsidiaritu a rozhodování ostatních členských států.

Maria Grapini (S&D). –Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, cred că – măcar cei de aici care am rămas, nu colegii care au plecat – suntem de acord că semnarea Convenției de la Istanbul a fost un prim pas. Ratificarea în alte state, de o parte dintre statele membre, a fost al doilea pas. Dar este foarte important dacă ținem cont de ce scrie în această Convenție de la Istanbul.

Trebuie să facem prevenție și mă miră că un coleg de aici spune că depinde de țară. Violența nu depinde de naționalitate, nu depinde de nimic. Violența este violență și trebuie să o combatem cu toate măsurile: prevenția – prin educație, pedepsele – trebuie să fie o pedeapsă aspră pentru cei care îndrăznesc să mai violeze femei, tinere, copile, pentru cazurile de căsătorii forțate. Avem foarte multe forme hidoase ale violenței și cred foarte tare că trebuie să fim uniți în acest demers și mă bucur că ieri, înainte de a aniversa semnarea Convenției, am avut un raport din proprie inițiativă pe educație. Cred că trebuie să corelăm educația și să cuprindem în educație și combaterea violenței.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, allow me to reflect very briefly on the nature of violence against women. Violence against women, sexual violence against women, is about power, it's not about sex. Violence against women is an instrument of submission of women, and those who belittle violence against women believe in a society where women are under submission.

What I find mind-boggling, of the extreme right, is that they would attack the Istanbul Convention and, at the same time, say that we should be doing more in attacking violence against women in the Islamic community. If you are serious about that, then the Istanbul Convention will give you additional instruments to do that.

I believe that if you oppose the Istanbul Convention with such force, it is based on an ideology that says that submission of women is part of our traditional values, and I refute that vision of our society. The Istanbul Convention, at the end of the day, is about equality between men and women. It is about making it clear that using violence, simply because you are stronger and because you can, to create the submission of women is unacceptable in a European society based on our common values, which demand equality of men and women.

Monika Panayotova, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, I have to justify that I am here today in the capacity of the Presidency of the Council representing all EU Member States, therefore I am not in a position to enter into details about the current situation in Bulgaria. Nevertheless, I would like to underline that it is beyond any doubt that Bulgarian society is firmly opposed to any form of violence against women, as they had the opportunity to underline during the plenary debate on the stalking crimes on 2nd May. The fact that the Convention law was included as a priority in the programme of our Presidency is a clear demonstration that the Bulgarian Government is convinced of its importance.

The process of ratification of the Convention by the Member States requires respect of the procedures according to the specific national public debates and constitutional arrangements. We are currently still waiting for clarifications from the Constitutional Court concerning certain aspects of the Convention in relation to the Bulgarian Constitution, and I am convinced that this will contribute to a better-informed public debate on the topic. We will assess the situation in the light of the Court's ruling once it is available.

As the Presidency, I would like to underline that we are fulfilling our duties and investing our utmost efforts to achieve progress, and we will continue to work in closer cooperation with our Austrian colleagues to finalise the discussions on the code of conduct towards conclusion by the European Union.

I would like to conclude by stressing that we share the view that violence against women and young girls and the protection of its victims is an issue of common concern that touches upon the core values of the European Union. It needs to be addressed with a high level of commitment, both by the European Institutions and bodies and also by our Member States.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), por escrito. – Una de cada tres mujeres ha sufrido algún tipo de agresión física y/o sexual en la UE. Hace un año que la UE firmó el Convenio de Estambul. Aunque todos los Estados miembros lo han firmado, no podemos permitir que todavía haya once Estados miembros que no lo han ratificado. El Convenio de Estambul es el tratado internacional de mayor alcance para abordar la violencia contra las mujeres como una grave violación de los derechos humanos. Constituye el primer instrumento que hace jurídicamente vinculante la prevención y lucha contra la violencia de género y establece una tolerancia cero hacia la violencia contra las mujeres. Sorprende escuchar la voz de la Presidencia en esta cuestión, cuando Bulgaria se encuentra entre los países que todavía no han asumido la necesidad de ratificar el Convenio de Estambul. Es una obligación de todos los Estados miembros luchar contra la violencia de género, porque necesitamos medidas legislativas que nos comprometan, debemos poner en marcha todas las acciones en los distintos niveles para acabar con la mayor lacra social que tiene en estos momentos el mundo. Las mujeres están siendo asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres, y eso no merece la impasibilidad de nadie.

Nessa Childers (S&D), in writing. – 13 June marks one year from the signing of the Istanbul Convention by the EU. It is sad for me to say that my own country, Ireland, has yet to ratify this Convention. In Ireland today, some 15% of women have experienced abusive behaviour from a partner at some point, according to national statistics, while two out of five people know someone who has experienced domestic violence. Today, Parliament is sending a very strong political message on its commitment to end violence against women and girls, and I urge the Minister to sign the Istanbul Convention, and ensure its immediate ratification and implementation once this decision is made.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), в писмена форма. – Година след подписването на Истанбулската конвенция смело можем да заявим, че тя е политически акт, който е абсолютно ненужен. Аз подкрепям борбата с насилието над жени, но съм твърдо против използването на този предлог за прокарване на идеи за узаконяване на гей-бракове, навлизане на идеята за понятие „социален пол“ и най-вече съм против разглеждането на пола като социална роля. България е една от страните, които не ратифицира Истанбулската конвенция и смятам, че това е правилно решение. Този ненужен документ не спомага за борбата с домашното насилие, напротив измества фокуса и пречи за налагането на ефективна политика за борба с домашното насилие и подкрепа за семействата.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), por escrito. – Una de cada tres mujeres ha sufrido algún tipo de agresión física y/o sexual en la UE. Hace un año que la UE firmó el Convenio de Estambul. Aunque todos los Estados miembros lo han firmado, no podemos permitir que todavía haya once Estados miembros que no lo han ratificado. El Convenio de Estambul es el tratado internacional de mayor alcance para abordar la violencia contra las mujeres como una grave violación de los derechos humanos. Constituye el primer instrumento que hace jurídicamente vinculante la prevención y lucha contra la violencia de género y establece una tolerancia cero hacia la violencia contra las mujeres. Sorprende escuchar la voz de la Presidencia en esta cuestión, cuando Bulgaria se encuentra entre los países que todavía no han asumido la necesidad de ratificar el Convenio de Estambul. Es una obligación de todos los Estados miembros luchar contra la violencia de género, porque necesitamos medidas legislativas que nos comprometan, debemos poner en marcha todas las acciones en los distintos niveles para acabar con la mayor lacra social que tiene en estos momentos el mundo. Las mujeres están siendo asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres, y eso no merece la impasibilidad de nadie.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – Una de cada tres mujeres ha sufrido algún tipo de agresión física y/o sexual en la UE. Hace un año que la UE firmó el Convenio de Estambul. Aunque todos los Estados miembros lo han firmado, no podemos permitir que todavía haya once Estados miembros que no lo han ratificado. El Convenio de Estambul es el tratado internacional de mayor alcance para abordar la violencia contra las mujeres como una grave violación de los derechos humanos. Constituye el primer instrumento que hace jurídicamente vinculante la prevención y lucha contra la violencia de género y establece una tolerancia cero hacia la violencia contra las mujeres. Sorprende escuchar la voz de la Presidencia en esta cuestión, cuando Bulgaria se encuentra entre los países que todavía no han asumido la necesidad de ratificar el Convenio de Estambul. Es una obligación de todos los Estados miembros luchar contra la violencia de género, porque necesitamos medidas legislativas que nos comprometan, debemos poner en marcha todas las acciones en los distintos niveles para acabar con la mayor lacra social que tiene en estos momentos el mundo. Las mujeres están siendo asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres, y eso no merece la impasibilidad de nadie.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Una de cada tres mujeres ha sufrido algún tipo de agresión física y/o sexual en la UE. Hace un año que la UE firmó el Convenio de Estambul. Aunque todos los Estados miembros lo han firmado, no podemos permitir que todavía haya once Estados miembros que no lo han ratificado. El Convenio de Estambul es el tratado internacional de mayor alcance para abordar la violencia contra las mujeres como una grave violación de los derechos humanos. Constituye el primer instrumento que hace jurídicamente vinculante la prevención y lucha contra la violencia de género y establece una tolerancia cero hacia la violencia contra las mujeres. Sorprende escuchar la voz de la Presidencia en esta cuestión, cuando Bulgaria se encuentra entre los países que todavía no han asumido la necesidad de ratificar el Convenio de Estambul. Es una obligación de todos los Estados miembros luchar contra la violencia de género, porque necesitamos medidas legislativas que nos comprometan, debemos poner en marcha todas las acciones en los distintos niveles para acabar con la mayor lacra social que tiene en estos momentos el mundo. Las mujeres están siendo asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres, y eso no merece la impasibilidad de nadie.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D), *γραφτώς*. – Δυστυχώς υπάρχουν διάφορες εσφαλμένες αντιλήψεις και παρανοήσεις σχετικά με τη συγκεκριμένη Σύμβαση. Για αυτό, ξεκαθαρίζουμε ότι η Σύμβαση δεν εναντιώνεται στους ρόλους των φύλων ούτε καταπολεμά την οικογένεια και τις αξίες της. Η Σύμβαση καταπολεμά τη βία, και ιδιαίτερα τη βία εναντίον των γυναικών λόγω φυλετικής ανισότητας. Επιπλέον, η Σύμβαση καταπολεμά την αθέατη, συνήθως, αλλά ωμή ενδοοικογενειακή βία, τη «σιωπηλή» καταπίεση και ψυχολογική βία, όπου τα θύματα δεν έχουν επιλογές διαφυγής, αλλά υποτάσσονται λόγω της αδυναμίας τους στον ισχυρό θύτη. Στην Κύπρο έχουν γίνει σημαντικά βήματα για το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο και υπάρχει αυξημένη ευαισθησία για το θέμα με σκοπό την πρόληψη και καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών και της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας. Ωστόσο, πάσχουμε ακόμη στον έγκαιρο εντοπισμό των θυμάτων, ειδικά παιδιών, ηλικιωμένων και αναπήρων. Σε όποιον επιχειρεί να συγκαλύψει την οικογενειακή βία κατά των γυναικών με θρησκευτικό μανδύα ή με δήθεν παραδοσιακή συμπεριφορά, καταλήγω ως εξής: οποιαδήποτε κοινωνική συμπεριφορά ή θρησκεία συγκαλύπτει ή ευνοεί τέτοια βαναυσότητα δεν έχει χώρο στον σύγχρονο πολιτισμένο κόσμο. Στηρίζουμε λοιπόν την Σύμβαση, επειδή στηρίζουμε τον άνθρωπο και απεχθανόμαστε τη βία οποιασδήποτε μορφής.

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan*. – Neosporno je da EU, baš kao i svaka država članica oštro osuđuje svaku vrstu nasilja te na njega primjenjuje nultu stopu tolerancije. Svaka država članica ima zakonsku regulativu i povezane mehanizme za borbu protiv nasilja nad ženama i obiteljskog nasilja. Država članica je ta koja donosi mjere i mehanizme koji sprječavaju nasilje, ona je ta koja promptno reagira u slučajevima nasilja jer kada se nasilje događa, nema vremena za čekanje, nema vremena za europske nadzorne mehanizme.

Mnoge države članice već imaju uspostavljene sustave borbe protiv nasilja. Među njima je i Hrvatska koja već ima sve mehanizme koje predviđa Istanbulska konvencija za borbu protiv nasilja ugrađene u svoje zakonodavstvo. Ključ rješavanja problema nasilja bilo koje vrste jest u prevenciji. Hrvatska je 13. travnja 2018. ratificirala Istanbulsku konvenciju, no građani Republike Hrvatske nedavno su prikupili 377.635 potpisa za referendum o deratifikaciji Konvencije. To nisu potpisi za nasilje, to su potpisi protiv ideologije koja se želi nametnuti pod krinkom borbe protiv nasilja.

Kada uzmemo u obzir da deset država članica nije ratificiralo Konvenciju, moramo se zapitati zašto i pokazati razumijevanje, a ne nametati našim građanima što ne žele te državama članicama određivati kako će postupati u područjima u kojima one imaju isključivu nadležnost.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Vuosi sitten EU allekirjoitti Istanbulin sopimuksen naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan ja perheväkivallan ehkäisemiseksi ja torjumiseksi. Tämä oli tärkeä askel. Työn täytyy jatkua sopimuksen toteuttamiseksi. Jäsenmaiden, jotka eivät vielä ole sopimusta ratifioineet, tulee tehdä se mahdollisimman pian. Sopimuksen täytäntöönpanoon jäsenmaissa on panostettava yhteistyössä eri hallinnonalojen kanssa. Muun muassa uhrien tukipalveluita ja turvakotipaikkoja on lisättävä, jotta palveluita riittää kaikille niitä tarvitseville. Uhrien suojelemista on vahvistettava. Tämä alkaa siitä, että uhrit kokevat voivansa turvallisesti kertoa kohtaamastaan väkivallasta. Tähän vaikuttaa ammattihenkilöstön laadukas koulutus ja osaaminen väkivallan uhreja kohdatessaan.

Evelyn Regner (S&D), schriftlich. – Wir begehen heute den ersten Jahrestag der Unterzeichnung des Übereinkommens des Europarats zur Verhütung und Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen und häuslicher Gewalt. Nach wie vor haben zehn Mitgliedstaaten, darunter auch Bulgarien, das gerade noch den Ratsvorsitz innehat, die Konvention noch nicht ratifiziert. Es ist eine moralische Pflicht, mehr als Willensbekundungen für den Schutz von Frauen abzugeben. Auch bei allen Fortschritten, die wir in den letzten Jahrzehnten erzielt haben, gibt es nicht nur in Polen und Ungarn gefährliche Tendenzen eines frauenfeindlichen *backlash*. Das eigene Haus ist für viel zu viele Frauen immer noch die größte Bedrohung. In Österreich hat jede fünfte Frau einmal im Leben körperliche oder sexuelle Gewalt erfahren, in der EU sogar jede dritte Frau. Wir haben mit der Istanbul-Konvention einen ersten Schritt zum stärkeren Schutz der Frauen gemacht, nun müssen wir aber weitergehen und dafür kämpfen, dass der rechtliche Schutz von Frauen gegen Gewalt endlich verbindliche Wirkung in der EU hat. Da erwarte ich mir ein entschiedenes Vorgehen des österreichischen Ratsvorsitzes.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), írásban. – Ma egy éve, hogy a nőkkel szembeni erőszak elleni nemzetközi fellépésben áttörést jelentő Isztambuli Egyezményt aláírásával látták el az Európai Unió képviselői, annak pedig kilenc hónapja, hogy az Európai Parlamentben nagy többséggel üdvözlöttük az Egyezményt és határozatban sürgettük az EU-t és tagállamait a mielőbbi ratifikálásra. Azóta is ez a Parlament az egyetlen az uniós intézmények közül, amelyik emlékeztetett rá: minden államhatalom, kormányzat nyilvánvaló és egyik legfontosabb politikai és emberi kötelessége a gyengék, a védtelenek óvása, biztonságuk garantálása.

Most, az első év eredménytelenségére, a tovább romló statisztikákra visszatekintve kénytelenek vagyunk figyelmeztetéseinket megismételni. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy néhány, a ratifikálást makacsul megtagadó, vagy az egyezmény hatáskörét szűkíteni próbáló EU tagállami kormány blokkoló magatartását a Bizottság és a Tanács eltűri, sőt kiszolgálja azzal, hogy végtelen intézményi jogi egyeztetésekkel legitimálja a nyilvánvaló obstrukciót. Józan ésszel érthetetlennek tűnik az Egyezmény ellenzése mögött meghúzódó kormányzati, politikai érdek, de saját országom, az Orbán-kormány esetében látható, hogy ez is tükrözi a hatalmon lévő párt vezetőinek világlátását, ami politikai programmá emelte a nők lenézését, társadalmi elnyomását.

Az EU-ban még létező ilyen személetmód és politika veszélyei miatt is fontos, hogy az EP megerősítse a tagállamok és az európai intézmények felé: nőkkel szembeni erőszak esetében nincs helye toleranciának!

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A tendência de agravamento da violência sobre as mulheres não parece mostrar sinais de ser invertida. Não por acaso, as políticas de austeridade, de desinvestimento económico e social, de ataque a direitos, promovidas com o beneplácito da UE, e o consequente aumento das desigualdades, da pobreza, da exploração laboral, outras expressões de violência humana, foram acompanhados de maiores níveis de violência sobre as mulheres.

Será, porventura, a maior evidência de que é impossível dissociar violência do modelo socioeconómico e das opções políticas que o definem. E que não bastam diplomas, recomendações, leis para alterar a realidade. Exigem-se outras políticas! A talhe de foice, não se pode, como alguns pretendem em Portugal, ignorar outras ignóbeis formas de violência, como a prostituição, procurando legitimá-la a pretexto de falsas liberdades de escolha ou conceptualizações de trabalho que rejeitamos.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE), γραπτώς. – Η Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης, που δεν έχει κυρωθεί ακόμα από όλα τα κράτη μέλη, ακολουθεί συνολική και στοχευμένη προσέγγιση για την αντιμετώπιση της έμφυλης βίας. Η προσχώρηση της ΕΕ στη Σύμβαση εξασφαλίζει τη σύνδεση μεταξύ εθνικού και ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου και ενισχύει τον ρόλο της Ένωσης στα διεθνή φόρα. Παρά ταύτα, τα κράτη μέλη δεν απαλλάσσονται από την υποχρέωση να ενσωματώσουν τη Σύμβαση στην εθνική τους νομοθεσία. Παρά την πρόοδο που έχει συντελεστεί, ο δρόμος για την εξάλειψη των έμφυλων διακρίσεων είναι μακρύς. Τα στοιχεία είναι σαφή: το 1/3 του συνόλου των γυναικών στην Ευρώπη έχουν υποστεί σωματική ή σεξουαλική βία τουλάχιστον μια φορά στην ενήλικη ζωή τους, το 20% έχει υποστεί παρενόχληση μέσω διαδικτύου, μία στις είκοσι γυναίκες έχει πέσει θύμα βιασμού και ποσοστό μεγαλύτερο από το 1/10 έχει υποστεί σεξουαλική βία με χρήση σωματικής βίας. Βασικοί παράγοντες που ευνοούν την εκδήλωση κρουσμάτων βίας κατά των γυναικών είναι ο φόβος του κοινωνικού διασυρμού και το έλλειμμα παιδείας. Η αποτελεσματική αντιμετώπιση όλων των μορφών έμφυλης βίας απαιτεί συντονισμένες δράσεις πρόληψης, ενημέρωσης και

ευαισθητοποίησης αλλά και ενθάρρυνση των θυμάτων να καταγγέλλουν κάθε πράξη βίας, μακριά από φόβο, ντροπή, κοινωνικά στερεότυπα και οικονομική ή συναισθηματική εξάρτηση από τους θύτες.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono o godz. 9.58.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

5. Istungi jätkamine

(La seduta è ripresa alle 10.05)

6. Euroopa tulevikku käsitlev arutelu Hollandi peaministri Mark Ruttega (arutelu)

Presidente. –L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione con il Primo ministro dei Paesi Bassi Mark Rutte sul futuro dell'Europa (2018/2728(RSP)).

Ho il piacere di salutare il Primo ministro del Regno di Olanda, il signor Rutte. Lo ringrazio per aver accettato il nostro invito ad un dibattito con i deputati europei sul futuro dell'Europa.

A noi interessa conoscere le proposte del governo del Regno di Olanda. A noi interessa coinvolgere nel Parlamento, che è il cuore della democrazia europea, tutti i Primi ministri della nostra Unione, per avere un confronto sereno, franco e costruttivo sull'avvenire dell'Europa.

Quindi sono veramente lieto che il Primo ministro olandese abbia accettato il nostro invito e gli do immediatamente la parola.

Mark Rutte,*Prime Minister of the Netherlands.* – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, President Tajani, for your kind introduction, and thank you, the Members of the European Parliament, for giving me this opportunity to contribute to this series of debates with members of the European Council on the future of Europe. It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here.

Winston Churchill once said: 'Politics is the ability to foretell what is going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month and next year. And to have the ability afterwards to explain why it didn't happen.' Churchill was right, we can't predict the future. Unexpected events will always occur. But as politicians, it's our job to lead and to chart a course. It's our job to set goals and make choices that help achieve those goals. And looking at Europe and the world today, it's clear: the European Union needs to make choices. Choices about its course and its role in the years to come.

I must say, my personal views on the importance of the EU have evolved over the years. Yes, there is a transactional, 'bread and butter' element. Member States all benefit from the Single Market, the monetary union and the free movement of people. But it's just as important that the EU ensures security, stability and the rule of law. The mere fact that we work together, that we are embedded in this Union, makes us stronger, safer and more effective.

More and more, I've come to view the EU in this light. It's something we in the Netherlands felt in the aftermath of the downing of flight MH17 in 2014, and yet again after the decision to hold Russia accountable for its part in it.

The EU united behind us, jointly calling for Russia to accept responsibility and cooperate with efforts to establish the truth and achieve justice and accountability. We are grateful for the support and unity shown by this Union.

Russia has continued in its denial; its baseless criticism of the investigation and its obstruction of the truth are a stark reminder of how much we depend on all parties uniting to achieve justice for the victims and their loved ones, and of the importance of upholding an international, rules-based system aimed at fostering peace and justice.

So today, I stand before you with a real sense of urgency. Because recent developments make it very clear that we cannot take our way of life, our way of doing business, or our way of conducting international relations for granted. The multilateral order is being challenged in a way that we haven't seen in decades, and the geopolitical balance of power is shifting. This global dimension of Europe's future is the first thing I'd like to highlight today. Because if we want to be able to act, if we want to determine our own future, Europe must stand united. Now, more than ever.

We must deal with the fact that Russia has chosen to distance itself from its neighbours in the West. We must deal with the ongoing conflict in Syria, and the arc of instability around Europe. With countries like China and India, which are stepping up their presence on the world stage, projecting greater self-confidence and a clear agenda. And with all the challenges and opportunities this brings for the EU, as the world's biggest trading bloc and as a leading force for peace, stability and development.

Even the relationship with our most important ally is no longer self-evident. The USA has unilaterally pulled out of the Paris Climate Agreement and the Iran nuclear deal. It has imposed import duties on steel and aluminium, triggering a debate we thought was obsolete. But of course, we remain friends and allies. I personally have always been a strong believer in the transatlantic bond. We need to keep working as closely as possible with the USA. But we must also deal with the fact that the rules-based multilateral system is under severe pressure.

Since 1945, that system has greatly benefited Europe as a whole and the world around us. Indeed, the EU is the most successful example in world history of how multilateralism and the willingness to compromise can bring about unprecedented security, stability and prosperity. The EU is the ultimate example of the power of international cooperation and free trade. We know from experience that progress requires give and take. We know the value of seeking common ground, shared interests and sensible compromise.

So let us broadcast a strong message to the world: that Europe's belief in the power of multilateral cooperation and free trade is as firm as ever, and that the EU Member States stand united in this, however much pressure we face.

I like to compare it to the wagon trains in those John Wayne westerns that I watched as a boy. The settlers made a conscious decision to jointly undertake the difficult journey westwards. Before setting off, they agreed to stick to certain rules. Rules on conduct, speed of progress and care of the sick. And when evening fell, or danger threatened, the settlers circled their wagons. Their unity gave them strength, stability and security. It's the same with the EU. Unity is the bedrock of our strength. Unity defines our ability to act.

Sadly, Brexit will leave a big hole in our circle. The only positive effect is that it has made the other 27 Member States even more aware of the importance of unity and working together.

As a founding member, the Netherlands is committed to ensuring that our circle stays strong; that the EU remains successful and effective, that it continues to improve the lives of hundreds of millions of people. For the Netherlands, EU membership is self-evident. Because the Single Market has brought greater prosperity for more people than the founders of the EU could ever have imagined. Thanks to our shared values, most Europeans and more Europeans than ever before, enjoy legal certainty and protection.

But I must be frank. I firmly believe that a truly strong and unified Europe must embody that famous quote by Goethe: *'In der Beschränkung zeigt sich der Meister.'* 'Mastery is revealed in constraint.' Or, to put it another way, 'less is more.' More and more Europe isn't the answer to the many problems that people face in their daily lives. For some, 'ever closer union' is still a goal in itself. Not for me. 'Unity' and 'ever closer union' are not the same. You don't achieve unity by simply doing more in more areas. You achieve it by doing things really well in a few important areas.

So I believe we should be working towards a more perfect Union, which safeguards our way of life and delivers practical results. The EU needs to under-promise and over-deliver. Because focusing on our core tasks will promote the Union's effectiveness, strength and identity. And it will boost unity.

I believe that the future of Europe should essentially be about the original promise of Europe: the promise of sovereign Member States working together to help each other achieve greater prosperity, security and stability. But we can only deliver on this promise if a deal is a deal, and if the difficult compromises we have to make apply to everyone, and in full. Europe isn't a menu you can pick and choose from. That is – and always has been – the basic promise and the basic premise of our unity.

So let me be very clear: the debate about the future of the European Union should not be about more or less Europe. It should be about where the EU can add value. Where can cooperation achieve more than the Member States can achieve in isolation? Where does it make sense for sovereign Member States to make a positive and conscious choice to work together?

Originally, it was the Single Market and international trade policy. Then came EMU and the euro. Then, more recently, we added the common migration policy, joint control of our external borders and our collective security. Of course, there's climate policy – by definition a cross-border issue. These are the areas where the EU needs to focus, because here Europe can achieve more than the sum of its parts. The challenge is to ensure that we do confine ourselves to these areas. And that we actually deliver on them. A Europe that adds value, sticks to its core tasks and achieves visible results can count on public support. That is why, once again, we need to under-promise and over-deliver.

So for me, the debate on the EU's future starts with the questions: Is the EU still doing the right things? What new priorities are emerging? Where does the EU need to do things better, or differently? When it comes to new priorities, climate policy and climate policy is a case in point. The current EU target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 40 % by 2030 predates the Paris Climate Agreement. But it isn't enough. Not if we're to play our part in keeping global warming below two degrees. Let alone aim at one-and-a-half degrees, as we agreed in Paris.

So for a Paris-compatible EU target, we need to raise the bar. I am proposing a 55 % reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030.

(Applause)

Not only to meet our obligations, but also because a competitive and forward-looking Europe is, by definition, a sustainable Europe. Can it be done? Absolutely! As long as we, the Member States, Commission and European Parliament, all make it our goal.

That's what I'm asking you today. Together with countries like France, the Netherlands wants to lead the way on this new climate ambition, and to work with you to achieve it. Exactly as we've done before.

I still have a very clear memory, dating from the Dutch Presidency in 2016, of how we tackled the refugee crisis in record time through a big, concerted effort. As co-legislator on border control measures, you played a major role. Let us show once again, in this other, more insidious crisis, that Europe can take responsibility, and that together we can achieve a great deal.

And this brings me to what we need to do better. It's an important question, because the EU has a tendency to make new agreements before existing agreements have been fully implemented. We all know the ultimate example: the Single Market. There is so much more we can achieve in the field of services and the Digital Single Market. According to this Parliament's estimate of the cost of non-Europe, we're missing out on over a trillion euros a year. So, with respect to the EU's original promise and its future: this is what it's all about.

Here, too, I have something to ask of you, especially the representatives of the larger Member States that are at this moment in no hurry to open up the market for services. I hope you won't hold it against me, as Prime Minister of a country with a smaller domestic market and a long history of international trade, for mentioning the elephant in the room. We need to team up to unleash the full potential of the Single Market. Because we can't pass up an extra trillion euros a year.

(Applause)

Another area where we could do better is the eurozone. We've come a long way, and the EU has shown that it can take action when it has to. But we are not sufficiently prepared for another crisis. The basic promise of the euro was that it would bring us all greater prosperity – not a redistribution of prosperity. That together we would achieve greater affluence. The pleas now being made to establish a transfer union fly in the face of this promise. Yes, I know that a currency union needs stabilisation mechanisms at times of crisis. But if the 19 eurozone countries were to put their own budgets and national debts in order, this would probably be stabilisation enough. That, too, is simply an existing agreement under the Stability and Growth Pact. A deal is a deal.

Of course, if – after putting its house in order – a country suffers a financial crisis and there's genuinely no alternative, we should help each other, as good neighbours. We created the ESM, our collective safety net, precisely for that purpose. But we need to do things in that order.

Let's not forget, we already have hundreds of billions of euros available in the EU budget to support structural reforms at national level. I strongly believe that we should use these resources, these existing resources, to fulfil the original promise of the euro, a higher level of convergence and competitiveness for all. Let's use the tools we already have in place. Let's make sure that the Commission and the Eurogroup work together to achieve this goal.

And yes, of course we must do better on migration. We must be prepared to tackle the next migration crisis. We must resist the unchecked influx of migrants and work harder on return. We really must take steps now to make the European asylum system fair and effective. If we fail to take these measures – collectively – we risk losing the advantages that Schengen has brought us. I applaud the work done by the Bulgarian Presidency on migration, and by the way, I congratulate Boyko Borisov on his birthday today!

Mr President, Members of the European Parliament, the debate about the future of Europe, about old and new priorities, is also at the heart of the debate on the next multi-annual budget. To the Netherlands, it is only logical that the budget should shrink after Brexit. And within that smaller budget, it is only logical that wealthy states should pay more – but not disproportionately so. The Netherlands is willing to pay its share, but countries with a comparable level of prosperity must make a comparable net contribution per capita. Member States' financial contributions need to be proportionate and reasonable: that's how we see it.

But figures aside, the Netherlands sees the next budget above all as a chance to show that the EU is serious about reform, by re-assigning funds to tomorrow's priorities. We can't solve today's problems with yesterday's solutions. We can't face the twenty-first century with a budget that reflects the realities of decades ago.

At present, agriculture and structural funds swallow up 70 % of the budget. Spending less in these areas will make room for new priorities. We also need to reform the very substance of these policy areas, to make them fit for the future. That, too, is only logical; and it's necessary. We must show the people of Europe that we practise what we preach. Because, as the old Dutch saying goes: trust arrives on foot and leaves on horseback.

In many countries, the EU's democratic legitimacy, as well as public trust and support, are under pressure. For the future of Europe, perhaps our most important task is to regain that trust one step at a time.

Of course, the democratic legitimacy of the EU has various dimensions. There's the formal, institutional dimension. And that centres on the fine balance between the members of national parliaments and you. I'm not giving away any secrets when I say that the Netherlands attaches great importance to the role of national parliaments. Because that is where we must address the question of what Member States can do better themselves, and what should be a matter for the EU as a whole. In other words, how taxpayers' money should be spent.

Here, in the European Parliament, proposals for European laws and rules are discussed, amended and adopted. Here, implementation is monitored. And here, plans and proposals by the Council and the Commission for the future of the EU are weighed and discussed. In this way, national parliaments and the European Parliament together provide the EU's democratic legitimacy.

But there's also a less institutional dimension. Because legitimacy and realism are extensions of each other. So the EU needs to listen to what the citizens of the Member States want from it. And especially, what they don't want. And it has to act on that.

I believe that delivering on the EU's basic promise is crucial if support for the EU and unity are to be preserved. Yes of course, there can be no democratic legitimacy without the rule of law. Let me be crystal clear on that point: ours is a union of laws and values. Membership of the EU is not a statement of intent. It means opting unconditionally for freedom of the press, an independent judiciary, legal certainty and all those other democratic achievements that bind us together as a community of values.

(Applause)

It's literally part of the deal. When you're in, you're in all the way.

This is a pressing issue for this Parliament too, I'm happy to say. Those who say that the rule of law is a purely national matter are wrong. The people of Europe can flourish only if the rule of law applies in all Member States.

(Applause)

Our citizens need to trust each other's legal systems. And businesses need to know that their investments are safe, and that any disputes will be resolved by an independent judiciary. That's why it's vital that countries do what they agreed when they signed up as members of the EU, and that the Commission monitors this rigorously and independently.

Ladies and gentlemen, friends, one of the founding fathers of the European Union was Johan Beyen, a post-war Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs. In his memoirs, published in 1968, he refers to the story of the giraffe that Julius Caesar brought back to Rome from one of his campaigns. It's said that the Romans weren't sure what to call this strange animal.

Eventually they settled on 'camelopard', because it had a neck like a camel and spots like a leopard. Beyen wrote: 'Europe is like a giraffe: an animal difficult to define, but easy to recognise.' And fifty years on, that's still a good description. Because Europe's wealth lies in the diversity of its Member States and the regions, the histories, and all the different languages and cultures. That can't be summed up in a few words.

At the same time, Europe is easy to recognise as a community of values and as a united partnership. It's a circle of covered wagons that gives strength and protection, and that's my core message. We don't have to agree on everything – and we probably won't today – in order to recognise the value of unity in a fast-changing world. That unity, ladies and gentlemen, is the future of Europe: our future.

(Sustained applause)

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Rutte. The first reaction is positive. I think that a standing ovation is a good message from the European Parliament.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, I want to start by thanking Prime Minister Rutte for praising former Dutch Foreign Ministers. That's always a good thing to do.

Listening to Prime Minister Rutte, I was thinking about one of the most important contributions the Dutch nation has made to Europe, as it now stands. I have to take you back to 1581 when, after a long struggle with the Spanish King, the Dutch Parliament (if you could call it at the time the States General) declared that, since the King did not perform his duty vis-à-vis the Dutch population, he had in fact left the throne – vacated the throne. This 'Act of Verlatinghe' is the first document in European history where it said that sovereignty is in the hands of the people, and for them to give to the rulers.

I think this has later also been the inspiration for the Declaration of Independence in the United States and for the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in France, and therefore it constitutes, I believe, an essential element of today's Europe and our values.

I wanted to take you back briefly to the Dutch Republic because the Dutch Republic, once it had obtained its independence and freedom, flourished incredibly to become a world power. And the elements of that were openness; entrepreneurial attitudes; audacity (to try and sail all over the world), but also respect for diversity; curiosity about what is different; openness to other religions and other beliefs; putting an end to persecution of people who had different beliefs. It's interesting, if you follow Dutch history, that in those times when we were open towards what is different, we did well. And in those times when we became introspective, we became afraid of what is different, we set our backs to the outside world, we declined and we became irrelevant in world politics.

I think this applies to Europe today, and I really, on behalf of the European Commission, want to thank the Prime Minister for the sense of urgency he has expressed today before this Parliament.

This sense of urgency should be guiding what we do right now, because the unthinkable has become possible. Who would have said five years ago that the European Union can break up and disintegrate? Nobody. It was gratuitous to attack the European Union and its institutions, because they were unbreakable anyway. And now we've seen, as a consequence of the fourth industrial revolution, as a consequence of all these crises we've had, that the European Union is not unbreakable – which means that it's valuable. Something that is breakable and fragile can be extremely valuable, and that is the European Union. So this is the time for people who believe in the European Union to stand up and come together and show unity, and this is precisely what the Prime Minister has advocated today. And I warmly welcome that.

What is creating this brittle element in our Union? I believe, to sum it up, it is, arguably, moral hazard. The Union functions because Member States trust each other that they will do what we agreed collectively. This trust has been eroded over the last ten years: between north and south, east and west, within the west, within the east. If we do not confront the issue of moral hazard, if we do not take that away, if we do not take that out of our Union, how could we ask our Member States and our people to share their destinies? I can only share a destiny with someone I trust and can rely on when I'm in trouble. If that is not the case, I will withdraw, because it is too risky for me. I believe that is where it starts, and that's my own very urgent call upon the Prime Minister, as a Member of the European Council.

If I look back over the last couple of years, what is the issue that has brought the European Union to the brink? It's the issue of migration. The issue of migration has played a key role in all of our Member States, wherever we are, and only if we, as a European Union, can convince our citizens that we do have an answer to this – not denying migration, not pretending you can solve it by building fences and building walls, not pretending that you can solve it by just letting everybody in – if you understand that we need a comprehensive approach on the migration issue and that only at European level will this comprehensive approach be valuable and work – if we cannot convince our Member States and our citizens of that, then we will be in the same situation as the Dutch citizens were in 1581. You have vacated your seat because you are not capable to deliver to the citizens what they demand as your sovereign, namely security and management of a migration issue that will be with us for generations. And I would call on the Prime Minister to use everything he can during the upcoming European Council to try and help the Bulgarian Presidency bring the issue forward.

I feel strongly supported by what President Tajani said yesterday when he called upon the European Council to see what Parliament has done in this line of work, to see what Parliament and Commission have proposed together. I think this is a good basis for a solution of this problem. We cannot leave our Member States alone with the issue. This is something Europe needs to solve. That is being big on big things.

One of the challenges that is new to us, which comes from the outside, is the fact that, for the first time since 1945, we now have a President of the United States who apparently believes that a disunited Europe is more in the interest of the United States than a united Europe. This is completely new and a paradigm shift. Again, this calls for Europe to be united, and I, these days, remember very well John F. Kennedy going to Berlin and at Berlin's worst hour, saying to people in Berlin: 'I am one of you, I am one of you and I will make sure that you will continue to live in liberty'. That's an American President I am inspired by. Also by Ronald Reagan, going to Berlin again and saying to Mr Gorbachev: 'tear down that wall'. That is an American President I'm inspired by, and he helped the great European liberators Wojtyła and Wałęsa to do what was necessary to bring freedom to the whole of Europe. That is an American President one can be inspired by.

(Applause)

I would echo what the Prime Minister said: the foundations of our relations with the United States on the basis of our values are extremely strong and cannot be destroyed by one president and one administration. The more unity Europe has on the basis of international rules, on the basis of our values, the more chance we will have to help the Americans return to that same path. Because we are linked – our destinies are linked – with the Americans' because we share so many values.

In conclusion, I would also like to echo what the Prime Minister said on the nature of our unity. After 1945, our unity was built on a tripod of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights. This tripod is indispensable if we want to maintain and strengthen our Union. You cannot use democracy against the rule of law, nor can you use the rule of law against democracy, nor can you use those against respect for human rights. This is, by the way, how it worked in times of dictatorship in Eastern Europe: when we would criticise democracy, they would say: 'but our constitution describes it'. So they used their so-called rule of law (which was in fact rule by law) as justification for not having democracy. But you cannot do it the other way round either. You cannot say: 'because I've got a majority, I can do with the rule of law whatever I like. I am the rule of law!'

(Applause)

If that is your position, you return to the rule by law, which is at fundamental odds with the nature of our Union.

I want warmly to thank the Prime Minister for now saying very clearly, on behalf of the Dutch Government, that, yes, the instruments of the Union are important: our common market (and we need to perfect it – a lot to do); our common currency (which is not perfect yet – a lot still to do); finding a budget for the European Union (which is not perfect yet; we made a proposal; I think it does comply with some of the criteria set out by the Prime Minister, but that's all up for debate – we'll get there). But all these things have no importance and no value if they are not founded on the basic values that brought Europeans together after such a long period of strife and dictatorship. Our freedom is founded on our values, not on our markets, not on our currency, but on the values we share.

(Applause)

Presidente. –Ora procedo alla chiusura del sistema per la registrazione elettronica delle richieste per il «catch-the-eye».

Leaders of Groups, please, it is important to respect your speaking time now, because one minute more for you is one minute less for your Group.

(Applause)

Manfred Weber, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I wish to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. It is good to have him here.

After the G7 weekend – or should I call it the G6 weekend – I want to focus on External Affairs in my contribution today. Some would probably say that after Donald Trump, in three or seven years' time, the old system of partnership with America will come back, but I don't think so. I think we are at a historical moment, at a crossroads, and I think we have to decide in which direction we want to go as the European Union, as you also said in your contribution. The alternatives are clear: national egoism – that the European Union is a community of those who are dreamers of the past, of the empires of our history or whether we are a real global power as Europeans. The positive thing is that the decision is in our hands; we decide about our future.

The need is obvious. You mentioned MH17. I want to underline that you have the full support of my group and I think of the whole House, that we have to find the persons responsible and that Russia has to contribute to an independent investigation. But having this concrete point in mind, Prime Minister, the key question is: how do we come to conclusions in external affairs in the European Union because today, foreign affairs policy is – frankly speaking – horse-trading in the European Union. A continent of 27 Member States with 500 million people can be blocked by only one country in this European Union and we are obviously weak in this regard. We have a friendship group of China inside the Council, we have a friendship group of Russia inside the Council, a friendship group of Iran in the European Council. You can buy countries at the moment to get influence in this European Union and you can block everything.

(Applause)

That is why you have to answer one concrete question. The Commission will come up with a proposal to use the Lisbon Treaty and change the unanimous decision-making process on external affairs, to switch to majority decision-making. If we don't do so, we will be weak. If we do so, we will be strong. We need your answer on this concrete question.

Another aspect is our priorities for our external affairs activities. I think the Middle East is key; the EU is the biggest donor but with the least impact in the region. Can we use our humanitarian power to create peace in Syria, yes or no? And on Africa, which is probably the biggest priority for all of us, we have to take an open market approach. Trade is key for creating development in Africa and a Marshall Plan is needed. There I want to reflect on the MFF discussion. You spoke about the MFF, and first let me underline that I do not think it is fair when you talk about the proportional burden-sharing in the European Union, because the mechanism of financing the European Union is clearly linked to GDP: so 1% is 1%, 1.1% is 1.1% and 1.3% – which is the idea of the European Parliament – is 1.3%. So it is proportional in every way, so don't tell the people that this is not proportional what we are doing here; the key question is whether we are ready to finance the strength of the European Union when we make new investments in the defence fund, when we make new investments on a Marshall Plan for Africa and when we want to have strong border control, with additional Frontex officers, then we have to finance this and you have to finance this.

I want to add, on the subject of external affairs, also some general ideas. We need a clear understanding about what is our role as Europeans in this global development. Today's world – and Frans mentioned this – is dominated by 'America first'; egoism against partnership. Our history was the same, the history of Europe: national egoism against partnership. Then we had a game-changer; we had the creation of the European Union as a game-changer – a way, a mechanism, to find solutions in a civilised way.

Having this in mind, dear friends, I think the European Union is probably a model for today's world – being less than a nation and more than an international organisation, and a key to solving problems and avoiding conflicts, today's European Union is probably the alternative to the Donald Trump approach.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we have this in mind, I think we also have to talk about the hard power of the European Union. We are talking about the military activities of our continent. We have done a lot with PESCO now in creating a headquarters. Please allow me on this aspect only to pick out one detail, because, Prime Minister, you talked about respecting agreements on a European level, so I want to ask you about the implementation of the PNR Agreement because this is also an important security aspect but it is not fully implemented in the Netherlands.

Coming back to military activities, I want to ask you what you think about creating common initiatives in this field. My group believes that in drones and in cyberwar, in new security challenges, we should from the beginning start with EU forces, with EU activities. In the long term, we have to work for a European army, but in the short term I think it would be much more cost efficient if we could do this together from the start.

Finally, if you allow, I want to say that the headline for our External Affairs Policy should be what Europe is all about. The European Union is a force for peace, is a power of peace. In Iran we showed that sanctions worked and the treaty works. It is better to have an agreement than to send troops. The same in North Korea. And even in Ukraine we told our friends that weapons will not create more peace. So Europe is a continent which stands on a global level for peace. That is a great image for the future.

Udo Bullmann, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, a warm welcome to the Prime Minister from the Social Democrats in the House as well. We listened to your speech and I have to admit I like the general idea of talking about urgencies. I like the general idea of talking about leadership, and if I got it right – and I am one of those you will find on the site, I also liked your metaphors, go west, because this is very familiar to this House: we are permanently detecting new ‘territoires’, new areas of our work, we are building Europe each and any day from scratch, in a new mode towards a new direction – and if I got it right, you were also talking about John Wayne’s spirit, which I like as well.

But what do you think about the organisers of a trek to the west where the organisers say to the farmers: ‘well, the “territoire” in front of you is dangerous, you will have bad weather, there is a multiplication on criminal gangs which you have to face, and to make you more efficient I provide you with less water, less food and less horses, and at the end of the day that makes you quicker, and you will with less resources get to the other side in a better way’. What do you think at the end of the day, how many of these farmers would have then ended up in California, and what do you think John Wayne would have said to the organisers, once the organisers would have tried to get him on board as a possible scout?

So I have questions to this narrative, and I don’t think that this narrative is in itself convincing. So please explain your position on the European budget, because this is my metaphor on that.

I would also join forces with you and hope that we can have a joint initiative in making clear to Mr Tusk that Dublin reform and that the situation of the refugees in the Mediterranean has to be the top priority at the next summit – the top priority. And I would like to echo the interest of the European Parliament that nothing is postponed any more.

My question is: can you support this position in the best interests of those people who are in danger of drowning in the Mediterranean, in the best interests of the dignity of the European Union and, to make it very concrete – talking to the experts in the house, for instance to my colleague, Liberal colleague in ’t Veld this morning – also in the concrete legislation? This moment we are discussing, the Coreper is discussing the Reception Directive – close to a compromise. The only potential deal-breaker I hear is the Council insisting on a by-principle detention of children. What would John Wayne have said to this question that you by principle have to organise the detention of children, to have a reception culture for foreigners and for migrants and for refugees? You could take the lead (talking about leadership immediately), ask one of your guys, of your colleagues, to phone up your ministers and your civil servants in the Coreper and clarify on that, so that we perhaps get a solution already today.

(Applause)

Again, talking about a joint spirit (John Wayne again, forgive me today but it was so close to my heart): what would he have said to the leaders of a country where he had to pay taxes for the coffee he buys, but those who sell the coffee do not need to pay taxes? It would have been potentially a dangerous conversation with him, because what would have been his position on tax havens and the defence of tax havens like you see in the Netherlands?

(Applause)

So it’s an interesting question.

Mein Schlusswort auf Deutsch. Man sagt ja zu Recht, dass wir uns gar nicht so unähnlich sind – was wir beide nicht so gerne hören, weder die Niederländer noch die Deutschen. Wir haben euch immer bewundert für die vielen Dinge, die Frans Timmermans aufgezählt hat. Wir geben es kaum zu: sogar beim Fußball, Fußball total. Es ist ja kaum einzugestehen, dass wir euch eigentlich sogar dabei gelegentlich bewundern.

Aber was ihr machen müsst – und das ist mein Appell als regionaler Nachbar –, Herr Premierminister: Bringen Sie die Niederländer, bringen Sie Ihren Staat, bringen Sie Ihre Gesellschaft in die erste Linie der Reform der Europäischen Union! Wir brauchen die Niederlande als einen Reformfaktor, einen aktiven Faktor, um die Zukunft Europas zu bauen gegen die Populisten, gegen diejenigen, die Europa kaputt machen wollen. Sind Sie in der ersten Linie, lassen Sie uns Klartext reden! Das entspricht beider Mentalitäten. Keine Ausreden mehr: Wir müssen es gemeinsam anpacken.

Peter van Dalen, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Heel hartelijk welkom, meneer Rutte. We kunnen hier gewoon Nederlands spreken hoor. We hebben uitstekende tolken. Die hebben het nu wel een beetje moeilijk, maar betere tolken vind je niet.

In de Europese Unie is het Verenigd Koninkrijk altijd opgetreden als constructieve oppositie, als tegenmacht tegen de te vaak overheersende as Duitsland-Frankrijk.

In Berlijn heerst echter een oud trauma: men wil nimmer meer opnieuw dominant worden. Dus uiteindelijk bepaalt binnen die Duits-Franse as Parijs wat er gaat gebeuren. Dat betekent, zeker nu met Macron, nog meer Europa.

Door de exit van het Verenigd Koninkrijk valt in de Europese Unie het land weg dat op een nuchtere en constructieve manier tegenwicht bood.

Hoog tijd dus voor Europa 2.0: enter Mark Rutte! Als een van de langstzittende Europese regeringsleiders is hij dé aangewezen persoon om dat tegenwicht te organiseren. Ook het moment is van groot belang. We zijn op weg naar 2019: Europese verkiezingen, een nieuwe Commissie, onderhandelingen over de meerjarenbegroting, en natuurlijk de brexit. Europese politici als Macron, Juncker en Verhofstadt staan te trappelen om door te pakken. Dus nú is het moment voor Mark Rutte om tegenwicht te bieden, de scepter van de Engelsen over te nemen en die tegenmacht te organiseren.

Ruttes toespraak in Berlijn dit voorjaar vormt een hele goede basis voor dat tegenwicht. Dat geldt ook voor de samenwerking binnen de eurozone, waarbij hij met een aantal noordelijke landen en Oostenrijk probeert die eurozone op een nuchtere manier op te bouwen.

Geen Verenigde Staten van Europa dus, maar een nuchtere benadering. Een bescheiden en vooral dienstbaar Europa dat afspraken nakomt en verbindt. Dus ook een bescheiden begroting, geen eurozone die transferunie wordt, en een Europese Unie die Italië en Griekenland helpt met het migrantenvraagstuk.

Het is nú tijd voor zo'n Europese Unie. Mark Rutte moet aan de bak. Gebeurt dat niet, dan zal de kloof tussen de burger en Brussel, die nu al groot is, onhoudbaar worden.

Guy Verhofstadt, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Mijnheer de minister-president, beste Mark. Welkom in het Europees Parlement.

I have to tell you – I agree with you. The new world order needs a new Europe and it's completely useless and unproductive to continue a discussion now, 20 years on, about less and more and more and less. What we need is not more or less – it's new, it's something else, it's something different to the Europe we got in the past. I liked the word you used: a "more perfect" Union, because a more perfect Union is a sentence in the American constitution, and in the American constitution, they are not talking about a bigger union or a smaller union – they're talking about a more efficient union, a more united union, a more perfect union. It's good to look to the past of the Netherlands, as Frans Timmermans has done, to see where we have to go because the Netherlands in my opinion, were robbed a little bit *avant la lettre*. There were seven independent provinces who worked together and beat the Spanish Armada, with a little bit of help from the Brits, but we have forgotten that, naturally, for the moment. The bad weather also helped them a lot. Afterwards, in 1602, Mark, what did you do? What the Netherlands did was unite the fleets, in one fleet, in one confederation, in one nation, establishing the Dutch Golden Age. That is the example that you have given to Europe, and what we have to do is to copy that by creating a European golden age in a certain way, a European golden age in a time where we are surrounded, I should say, by a circle of evil, and by that, I mean Putin. I mean Erdogan. I also mean, on a bad day – and that's nearly every day – Mr Trump for the moment, for example, on trade matters.

We need a Europe that is also in solidarity with you, Mark, and with the Dutch people and the Dutch victims of MH17, and I ask the Commission, President Juncker and President Tusk to examine in what way in the international court case in The Hague we can be in full solidarity with the Dutch in that court case – because the Russians continuing to deny their responsibility is a scandal, and Europe has to be behind the Netherlands and far more outspoken on that issue.

(Applause)

But as we all know, Putin gets away with everything: the shooting down of flight MH17, the cyber-attacks against Baltic states, murders in the streets of London, killing of political opponents in Moscow, the illegal occupation of Ukraine and some regions in other Soviet republics. I think it's time to wake up, particularly at a time when we have an American president who is more comfortable with autocrats than with his old Western democratic allies. That's a wake-up call. That's the inconvenient truth. The inconvenient truth is that if there were to be an attack by somebody on European soil tomorrow, we could not be sure that the Americans would help us. We need to take responsibility, we need to build up our own European defence community, and I agreed with Manfred Weber when he said we need to get rid of the unanimity rule in all these matters as soon as possible. It doesn't make any sense to continue like that. Our problem is not only that we maybe have a different point of view on this issue. We have another problem, and it is that we have inside the European Union, inside the European family, a fifth column in our ranks. Let's be honest – I call them the cheerleaders of Putin: Farage, Le Pen, Wilders and others. Their friends are sitting here and they are, in fact, doing only one thing: they take the money from the Kremlin, they take the intelligence of the Kremlin, like Mr Arron Banks, the friend of Mr Farage, who colluded and even contributed, with the help of the Russians, to creating Brexit. These people work together, in fact, with Mr Orban, but Mr Weber said nothing about Mr Orban today. I'm a little bit disappointed. It's time that we stop this cooperation with people like Orban, Kaczyński and Salvini who are working with all these nationalists and populists.

(Applause)

I'm pleased that you talked about a Europe of values at the end of your speech and your introduction, as Macron did, as Bettel did, as Charles Michel did.

In fact, we as liberals can never accept the illiberal plot of these people, and we and you have to be at the forefront to fight against them. Thank you.

(Applause)

President. –Thank you very much, Mr Verhofstadt. I want to thank you for this.

Ska Keller, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, I would like to thank Prime Minister Rutte for coming to join this debate and also for bringing in a sense of urgency; I very much appreciate that. Thank you also for your very clear words on the rule of law, on the bad situation that we see in several countries in the European Union. My question directly on that would be what exactly are you – what exactly are the Netherlands – going to do in Council to support the Article 7 procedure on Poland but also, when it goes beyond Poland, what exactly are you going to do?

I really appreciated your words as well about how unity works and how we all depend on each other because I think this is really true. We do depend on each other. If we work together well then we can all benefit from that, but if we work apart, then we will all lose out. You mentioned climate change as the obvious example of that, and I very much agree with that and I can only applaud the proposal you made on further reducing CO₂ emissions to 55% in the European Union. This is a really good way forward because climate change is a threat to humanity and we need to act. We need to get our act together and we have to move first because if we don't, no one else will do so.

But of course in order to achieve that, you will also have to talk with your colleagues and your neighbours. You will have to make sure you get a majority in Council because we in Parliament are not actually the problem – the others are the problem! – and the problem is the Council, so please go ahead, put some pressure on your colleagues to make sure that we get to that aim.

Talking about dependency, I would also like to mention the fact that we are very much dependent on each other in economic terms. The economy is, I understand, a very central point in how you view the European Union, and even how you view the world. You have said that everyone needs to put their house in order. I think that's not the first time you have said that you; you have said that repeatedly. But putting your house in order doesn't work if you say everyone puts their house in order and everyone does their thing and then all will be well. This is because we have a common market, we have a current common currency, we are all interlinked and our economies are interlinked, so if one wants to export, someone else needs to import. This is how it works. We are all interdependent on that, and if everyone has to save and save and save, then who's going to drive demand?

You've been very critical again here today of others not getting their budget in order, but I would say one of the reasons other countries are not managing to put their budget in order is because of you – it's your government and previous Dutch Governments which, by being a tax haven, through a long history of blocking and frustrating and delaying European action against tax avoidance.

(Applause from certain quarters)

With that you are taking away other countries' income. Tax dodging by companies leads to costs of EUR 15 to 17 billion a year in the European Union. That's money missing from our taxpayers. You have just agreed in the Netherlands – to please, apparently, multinationals like Unilever and Shell – to give a tax break to companies that will cost the Dutch taxpayers 1.6 billion a year. Out of the 20 largest companies in Portugal, 19 used Dutch letterboxes to avoid paying taxes in the midst of the economic crisis. So while Portugal was attacked for not saving enough, while in Portugal there were severe austerity measures, it was actually your country that helped companies avoid pay the taxes that would have helped Portugal.

(Applause)

So how do you expect Portugal to get its house in order, and why do you not cooperate with your colleagues in the Council instead of competing with them? Less tax competition would actually be more in this case!

Promoting the single market might sound very pro-European in the context that we are all getting used to, but just sticking to free trade, deregulation, liberalisation, that is the recipe for a status quo. We need to get to a social union – we should not forget that the European Union is not just a market, it is a place where people live, work, experience inequalities, have social insecurities – and that's where we need to get. We need to get to a social union because if we're not having more social union, if we're not having more solidarity in the European Union, then we're not getting anywhere. The European Union should be more social, should have more solidarity or it will have difficulties being.

(Loud applause)

Dennis de Jong, namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie. – Dank u wel, Voorzitter, en een hartelijk welkom ook van Links Europa, mijn eigen fractie, aan de minister-president van Nederland, de heer Rutte. Zoals Peter van Dalen al zei: je kunt hier prima Nederlands praten. Dat komt doordat we hele goede tolken hebben. Die hebben het niet een beetje maar harts-tikke moeilijk omdat hun arbeidsvoorwaarden verder worden uitgekleeft en ze niet eens het recht op staken krijgen. Onze fractie is daar solidair mee en ik hoop dat steeds meer fracties zich uitspreken voor de rechten van de tolken.

Want dit staat wel voor iets breders. Als zelfs in dit Parlement – dat toch het huis van de democratie in Europa zou moeten zijn – de arbeidsvoorwaarden en arbeidsrechten van mensen niet meer worden nageleefd, als concurrentie en marktdenken het enige is wat telt, dan kom ik uit bij Mark Rutte. Want in uw toespraak in Berlijn en in uw toespraak hier staat eveneens de markt centraal. Zelfs als het gaat om veiligheid en de rechtsstaat, wil u in de eerste plaats bedrijven ruimte geven.

Ik denk dat dat de foute ingang is. Kijken we maar eens waar de markt goed voor is geweest: in Nederland beschikt 10 % van de bevolking over twee derde van het inkomen. De overige 90 % moet de rest verdelen. Op wereldvlak bezit 1 % de helft van het vermogen. De overige 99 % moet de rest verdelen. Dat is wat de markt doet, in Nederland, in Europa en in de hele wereld. Daarover moeten we het hebben. Wat doet u voor die 90 %? Ook de Groenen zeiden het al. Waar is de sociale kant? Hoe zit het met eerlijkheid?

Belastingen spelen daarin een rol. We zien dat kinderen op dit moment minder kansen hebben dan hun ouders hadden, dat het toekomstbeeld voor mensen minder goed is. Dat zijn de dingen die we moeten aanpakken. Gelijk loon voor gelijk werk, zei u in Berlijn. U hebt dat nu niet herhaald, maar dat is een reëel probleem. We hebben weliswaar stappen vooruitgezet met gedetacheerden, maar nog steeds gelden voor hen de sociale premies en pensioenen van het land van herkomst. Dus er is niet echt gelijk loon voor gelijk werk. Deze week en bij de vorige Straatsburgzitting stonden hier vrachtwagen- en buschauffeurs voor de deur. Internationaal wegtransport heeft geen gelijk loon voor gelijk werk. Wat doet u voor die 90 %? Wat doet u voor hen?

En dan de culturele kant van de zaak. We hebben niks tegen ondernemingsgeest. Dat is goed. Maar waar we wel wat tegen hebben, is het tegen elkaar uitspelen van mensen. Wat doen we om mensen te verbinden? Gaan we naar een samenleving (zij het dan een rechtsstaat) waar iedereen tegen elkaar wordt opgezet? Of komen we bij een samenleving die verbindt? Gaan we verder dan het marktdenken?

Er wordt hier regelmatig verwezen naar Trump. Maar waar heeft die zijn populariteit aan te danken? Die heeft hij te danken aan de staalarbeiders in Detroit, die zich alleen gelaten voelen en vinden dat ze het slachtoffer van de globalisering zijn. Daar heeft ook de Commissie op gewezen. Als je dat niet aanpakt, dan krijg je het tegenovergestelde van wat waarschijnlijk ook u wil. Dan krijg je mensen die tegen elkaar opkomen. Dan krijg je onveiligheid. En daar komen we niet verder mee.

Nog één opmerking over die 1 %. U zit bij die één procent. Dat zijn ook de grote investeerders. Dat zijn de grote multinationals. Ik zou u willen aanraden eens te kijken naar Investigate Europe. Dat is een ngo die in beeld gebracht heeft wat BlackRock als investeringsmaatschappij voorstelt. BlackRock beheert 6,3 biljoen US-dollar. Op dit moment zet BlackRock de aanval in op de collectieve pensioenen in Europa. We moeten allemaal individuele pensioenen hebben. Daar kan BlackRock lekker op verdienen. Daarom wil het ook een pan-Europees pensioenproduct dat je per persoon onderschrijft. Dat gaat de verkeerde kant op. Ik wil een solidair Europa. En ik wil graag uw visie op een solidair Europa horen.

Ik doe één voorstel: als we die markt nou eens reguleren? Laten we aan het Europees verdrag een sociaal en groen protocol hechten. De vakbeweging heeft dat jaren geleden al voorgesteld voor het sociale aspect. Aangezien u nu Groen Rechts bent, wil u waarschijnlijk wel instemmen met de aanhechting van een groen protocol. Laten we dus alles toetsen op solidariteit en duurzaamheid en de markt beteugelen. Zou dat niet leiden tot een Europa dat echt verbindt, dat echt stabiel is en waarmee we voorkomen dat we hier straks ook met een Trump zitten?

Gerard Batten, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, Mr Rutte, you spoke about listening to the people, but in Holland, of course, in 2005 you had a referendum on the constitution. That was ignored. We got the Lisbon Treaty, which was the Constitution in another form, in 2016. The Dutch voted against the Ukrainian Association Agreement, and that has been ignored. The EU rule is to pay and obey, so if you can change that, then good luck to you.

Now, Europe can have a great and prosperous future, but not if the European Union is planning it. The European Union is responsible for many of the problems that beset Europe, and your solution is always the same: to have more power. The European Union was always about creating an undemocratic state – a ‘united states of Europe’ – and it has always been about deconstructing nation states and transferring political power to Brussels. That would be bad enough in itself, but you have actually made a complete mess of governing the Member States.

There are two areas in which this is obvious to the ordinary citizen: the economy and security. The creation of the euro was a political project, not an economic project, and was an entirely predictable disaster and has brought about financial austerity and unemployment. The dead hand of European bureaucracy impedes business and makes it increasingly harder for small businesses to operate, to create new jobs and to grow prosperities. Your policies have blighted the lives of millions of people.

Meanwhile, our security is endangered because of the results of mass immigration. Under Mrs Merkel’s leadership you have brought in millions of people from Africa, the Middle East and beyond, and you intend to bring in millions more. You have turned many parts of Europe into foreign countries. You use the emotional blackmail argument of talking about helping defenceless refugee families, and yet the reality is that the vast majority of these migrants are young men from Islamic countries. This is not immigration, this is invasion.

(Shouted comments from the floor)

Traditionally, Europe resisted Islamic invasion. Heroic struggles in the Siege of Malta, at the Gates of Vienna, have now been replaced by abject surrender. Islam offers two options: submit or resist.

(Interjection from the floor: 'Rubbish')

You have decided to surrender and submit on behalf of your citizens. But some states are resisting. Rebellion is now stirring in Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Austria and elsewhere. The tide is turning against the EU, and best of all, we have Brexit: a modern Peasants' Revolt against their out-of-touch overlords. When Britain leaves the European Union, we can point the way for a Europe of independent democratic nation states. Most people want a Europe of genuine trade, friendship and cooperation. They do not want rule from Brussels.

(Mixed reactions from the floor)

Presidente. –Ricordo al pubblico presente in quest'Aula che non è consentito a coloro che assistono al dibattito applaudire o dissentire nei confronti degli oratori.

Marcel de Graaff, on behalf of the ENF Group. – Mr President, I welcome Mr Rutte to this Parliament. I guess we will see him quite often in the future when he has accepted the position of Mr Tusk as President of the European Council.

When we discuss the future of the EU, we most certainly must address the situation of the rule of law in the Member States. The majority of this Parliament has serious concerns about the rule of law in Hungary, Poland, Malta and Slovakia. Therefore it has started the monitoring group on the rule of law. Your party is a member of the ALDE Group, and a colleague of yours in this Parliament, Ms in't Veld, presides over this monitoring group.

I advise this monitoring group to take the Netherlands as a reference case. In the Netherlands, the prosecution doesn't have the obligation to follow up on any reported offence. It is at the discretion of the Prosecutor's Office whether to take action. Therefore, millions of citizens in the Netherlands see prosecution as a political tool. This was recently confirmed in a report by WODC, a scientific institution that advises the Dutch Government. The report stated that over the last decade there has been no prosecution of extreme-left violence.

I will give you another example. Last month, a group of rejected asylum seekers looking for a place to stay broke into a house near Amsterdam, claimed the property as theirs and tried to chase away the inhabitants. Although this attempt failed, the state prosecution didn't want to take legal action, and they allowed this behaviour. To me it's absolutely clear that applying the law to one group and letting another off the hook creates legal inequality. It breaks the rule of law. These are the Netherlands of Mr Rutte and Ms in't Veld of today.

I have some serious advice for Mr Rutte with regard to his European ambitions. If you want an EU where the rule of law applies, start at home. And I quote: 'get your house in order', and have the prosecution take action against illegal activities in general, not just against so-called populists.

A second issue I would like to address is illegal migration. The EU is in a complete deadlock on how to deal with illegal migrants. The EU has no solutions. It doesn't close its borders; it doesn't expel rejected asylum seekers; it doesn't fight Islamisation and radicalisation. So I urge Mr Rutte to distance himself from Ms Merkel's 'refugees welcome' policies and endorse the Visegrad approach.

He could start by making it a criminal offence to help illegal migrants, rejecting asylum to migrants who enter via safe third countries, and making asylum seekers who go on holiday in their home country lose their right to stay. When you are President of the European Council, recommend the whole package that we proposed yesterday to the Member States.

(Applause)

Diane James (NI). –Mr President, good morning, Prime Minister, and thank you for coming to the Chamber and for taking questions. I've got three for you, sir.

The first one concerns trade. You've made the point that the Dutch economy depends on trade with the United Kingdom as a result of the Rotterdam effect. I do appreciate the point you made about the Single Market and why, therefore, you would want the United Kingdom to remain part of that, but you've also effectively admitted the issue of punitive tariffs post-Brexit making no economic sense for your own country. Can we ask, therefore, that you champion not only support for a free-trade deal for the United Kingdom post-Brexit, but that you also champion free trade change within the remaining European Union Member States?

My second question: you raise the issue of rule of law and electoral process. You, I hope, will be aware of billionaire George Soros, a fifth columnist, to use a phrase used this morning, interfering in a democratic referendum result on Brexit in the United Kingdom. Can I ask, how would you deal with that sort of political interference and how will you try and influence European Union policy to stop that degree of national affront to democracy and affront to national democratic process?

Mark Rutte,*Prime Minister of the Netherlands.* – Mr President, I'll continue in English if that is okay, but of course with all respect for the interpreters. First of all, to the First Vice-President of the European Commission, thank you very much for your gracious remarks, dear Frans. You made this point regarding moral hazard. That was exactly right, since there is a lack of trust which crept into the European Union over the last ten years because of moral hazard. I was very happy that you made this point and we have to work on that.

You also made a point regarding migration, and other speakers in this first round also made a point on migration. It is also crucial to come to an agreement at European Council level. We are very much pushing to make that happen at the European Council at the end of this month. But it is not easy, since, at the moment, there are still a lot of debates going on between the North and the South, as well as with the countries in the East. Regarding this whole notion of solidarity, of burden sharing, and of making sure that everyone is involved and that we find an acceptable compromise, I'm not very optimistic at the moment that we will reach conclusions at the end of June. We need your help there, and the European Parliament can push for this. Mr Bullmann also made this point in response to you on this issue.

On the situation with the United States, this was also a point made by Mr Weber, Guy Verhofstadt and others. I was always raised with the absolute conviction that the transatlantic bonds between Europe and the United States – anchored not only in a joint security imperative, in the fact that we share values across the Atlantic Ocean, and that we share the same type of history – make it crucial that together we keep working on the transatlantic bonds. It is not easy, but I cannot foresee us resolving any major crisis in the world without the United States. For our defence, it is crucial to keep the dialogue with the United States going, even if within that family relationship we have some serious quarrels at the moment.

And, yes, Frans, you can count on the Netherlands where rule of law is concerned. I know that you personally, within the Commission, are working very hard on this.

Ms Keller you made a point about Article 7. Let me assure you that the Netherlands and my government are squarely behind Frans Timmermans and the entire European Commission on this issue. There can be no doubt, and I am happy that I know that the whole Commission is behind it.

Mr Weber, on the issue of the Multiannual Financial Framework: yes, I agree that we have new priorities which we need to address. But at the same time – and this is also a point I would like to make to Mr Bullmann – we have to acknowledge that 70 % of the European budget at the moment is spent on the priorities of yesterday. Why not think about what we can do in terms of making savings there to free money up for new priorities?

Mr Bullmann, you made this analogy again with John Wayne. However, when John Wayne and his people were back in those days when that story played out, when the United States was working on pushing its frontiers westwards, there was no government to help them. There was no central system. It was the farmers themselves, making sure that, by putting their wagons in a circle, they could create safety.

Luckily, at the moment we have governments and we have collective security. Absolutely, we need to work with our members, but considering this budget and what you need to do, we cannot just discuss new money; we also have to look at where we can find the money. I am simply against the 1.3 %. If you really want to make the parties at the extremes much bigger than they are today, keep on pushing for 1.3 %. It's the best recipe.

On PNR, I completely agree with Mr Weber. The legislation to implement PNR has been submitted to our Parliament and is being discussed in our House. We have already set up our national organisation and notified the Commission. It is not yet through Parliament, but we are working on that. At the moment, I believe that 14 countries have implemented this legislation. Half still have to come, and we are in the second half and working on that.

On the military side, military mobility is one of the things the Netherlands is pushing at the moment within NATO and within the EU. We are very much behind the initiatives President Macron is making to get a more effective basis to organise defence within the European Union. At the same time, I would argue that we should not now push for new symbols like a European Army. These are symbols. We have to make sure that we get things done in practice and that we get, in that sense, a satisfactory result for our citizens. I am not in favour of these symbols like the European army. I am very much in favour of working in the next five to ten years on practical things like, for example, military mobility. I know that I can count on your Group on this important priority.

On the issue of taxation, we acknowledge the importance of combating tax avoidance, both for the Netherlands and at the EU level. Taxation is an important issue in this House, but particularly in the parliaments of the Member States. Taxation is a key element of the political systems in our democracies, and in the Treaty they are therefore part – and I believe rightly so – of the Member States' competencies. We are working at this moment on letterboxes and how to make sure that we take the necessary next steps in that regard. I was very happy to see that Commissioner Moscovici was very appreciative of the Dutch initiative in that regard. This is also in reaction to Ms Keller and Mr Bullmann.

It was Mr Peter van Dalen and Mr Udo Bullmann raising the issue of reform, and whether the Netherlands are pushing reform within the EU. Yes we are. We are pushing for radical reform. Yes, we are working on new alliances within the EU. The fact that the UK is leaving means that we in the Netherlands, which is the fifth-largest economy in the European Union, have to work on how we are going to organise our relationships with other countries.

Of course, our relationships with Germany and France will always be crucial. When I listened to President Emmanuel Macron's speech in the Sorbonne last September, I agreed with most of the points he made there. We have agreed to work together on issues like migration, the G5 Sahel, external borders, and in particular on climate change and pushing for this 55 % CO₂ emissions target.

At the same time, we are working with other countries to find a balance within the EU to make sure – with the UK leaving and therefore the power balance shifting – that we in the Netherlands also try to work on new alliances. Yes, indeed we are working closely together not only with the Baltic States and the Scandinavian countries, but also with Austria, Ireland, and Spain, as well as with Portugal on other issues; it can be bilateral, it can be multilateral. Within the EU, that helps to achieve sensible decision-making.

Therefore, it is much more nuanced, in response to Mr van Dalen, than saying it is a counterbalance to France and Germany. The moments they agree on a policy are very scarce. Sometimes it is good that they can agree on issues, because they are the two biggest Member States, but there is no automaticity that when they agree, things are pushed forward, and it is not an automaticity that they agree. In many cases, as we all know, they very much disagree, and that also helps the debate in those areas.

Ms Keller, you also have to do something. Yes, I have to work; I agree. The Dutch Government, together with France, has to work on this support for the 55%. But please don't leave it to me. You have this big House here. We had the applause, so please help. We have to do this collectively. That's exactly the plea I was making in my speech. I need the European Parliament, because without your pressure – including in your Member States – to push for that emissions target, we will never get there.

Mr de Jong, of course we disagree on many issues, not on the Dutch language, but on many other issues. But still, I would argue that you were bashing the free market. Thanks to the free market, hundreds of millions of people in the last ten to fifteen years have been lifted out of poverty worldwide. Thanks to the free market, let's not forget that.

(Applause)

On one thing we fully agree. I did not mention it in my speech, but the same pay for the same work in the same type of circumstances is at the core of the belief of the Dutch Government, and we will push for that. I know that collectively we are working to make that happen, including in the transportation sector.

Mr Batten, you addressed Brexit. I would like to remind you that the Governor of the Bank of England has calculated that the cost of the United Kingdom leaving the European Union is already GBP 900 per average British family. That is the cost that British families are already paying, and that will rise.

(Mixed heckling and applause from the floor)

Maybe not for you personally, but this is happening at the moment. What I found in the Netherlands is that this fact, as well as the fact that it is hurting our collective security, is the best argument why the others need to work more closely together. So in that sense, thank you for that, but I am still very sombre and pessimistic about the fact that you are leaving the European Union.

Finally, Ms James, on Brexit: let me assure you that the Dutch Government is squarely behind Michel Barnier and what he is doing as our negotiator in this process. Can you help to make sure that we get more clarity from the British side as soon as possible, particularly on the issue of the Irish border? I believe that it is crucial to move and push that subject, which is important for all of us, forward.

(Applause)

Procedura «catch the eye»

Esther de Lange (PPE). –Dank u wel, voorzitter. Meneer de minister-president, u hebt gezegd: de EU moet minder beloven en meer waarmaken. Daar ben ik het mee eens. Maar laten we het concreet maken. Een groot aantal voorstellen van dit Parlement zijn door de Commissie behandeld maar zitten nog vast in de Raad. Ik wil even terugkomen op het gebied van migratie. U zei: het is moeilijk, ik ben niet optimistisch. Maar denkt u eens een stukje mee. Angela Merkel heeft gesproken over flexibele solidariteit als oplossing voor dit probleem. Je moet toch komen tot een migratiebeleid met alle landen, dat begint in de landen van herkomst, dat een sterkere grensbescherming inhoudt en dat een land niet alleen laat op het moment dat er vele vluchtelingen komen. In mijn kantoor hangt een spreuk in het Fries, toch onze andere landstaal. Ik zal u het Fries besparen, maar in het Nederlands komt die hierop neer: als het niet kan zoals het moet, dan moet het maar zoals het kan. Ik denk dat dat nu speelt in de discussie over migratie. Angela Merkel noemt dat flexibele solidariteit. Denkt u eens mee. Hoe zou die eruit kunnen zien?

Ik wil nog twee andere punten aanstippen. Wat nationale parlementen betreft, ben ik het eens met uw pleidooi. We kunnen hele ingewikkelde constructies gaan verzinnen om die meer te betrekken. Maar laten we eens beginnen met de documenten in de Raad, die vaak onnodig als geheim bestempeld worden, waardoor nationale parlementen hun werk niet kunnen doen en wij ook minder. Dit parlement is open en transparant. Helpt u ons mee om ook de Raad open en transparant te maken.

Ten slotte kom ik bij mijn laatste pleidooi. U sprak terecht over een eerlijke interne markt, of over het vervolmaken van de interne markt, ook op digitaal gebied. Hoe zorgen we dat we die digitale interne markt ook eerlijk maken? En ja, daar hoort misschien ook een discussie over digitale belasting bij. Dank u wel.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). –Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Dank u, minister-president, dat u hier bent. Ik heb geluisterd naar een toespraak die volgens sommigen die van een bekeerling was. Maar mag ik u vragen u ook nog op een ander punt te bekeren? Want als we onderwerpen noemen waar het 'beter' of 'meer' kan, dan verwacht ik dat op dat lijstje ook sociaal Europa staat.

U was erbij op de top in Göteborg. U was erbij toen aan de burgers van Europa beloofd werd dat Europa ook in sociaal opzicht AAA zou worden. Ik ben blij dat u steunt dat chauffeurs onder 'gelijk loon voor gelijk werk' moeten komen te vallen. Maar mag ik u, als aanvoerder van de 'zeven zuinige dwergen', ook zien als aanvoerder van de Sociale Alliantie onder de regeringsleiders? En mag ik uw steun voor voorstellen als een Europese arbeidsautoriteit en een evenwicht tussen werk en privéleven?

Amjad Bashir (ECR). –Mr President, I would like to thank the Prime Minister very much for addressing us today. I have a couple of quick questions. The first is about the migration crisis. Would you agree with me that, in order to address the migration problem, we need to get to the root causes, and that is the failed states – many of which we've interfered in – like Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya? Would you not say that we need to trade with these nations so that they can find themselves in a better place to help their citizens to remain where they are?

The second question is on human rights and the fact that economic power is going to the East, to China and India. These countries believe that economic development will, in the end, see that human rights are respected. Would you not agree, at a time when, in Myanmar, millions of people have had to seek refuge in neighbouring countries where ethnic cleansing and genocide is taking place, that we in Europe have to say that this is unacceptable and that human rights values have to be respected?

Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE). –Voorzitter, het is een eer hier te spreken nadat de heer Rutte zijn pleidooi heeft gehouden. Als wij willen luisteren naar de geschiedenis, kijk ik niet alleen naar de 'Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Provinciën', waarbij de provinciën hun soevereiniteit gingen delen. Een ander voorbeeld is het Verenigd Koninkrijk der Nederlanden van 1815-1830, waar wij in het noorden te weinig respect opbrachten voor onze landgenoten in het zuiden, zowel op religieus gebied als ook op ander gebied. Daardoor is dat project gefaald.

Kijken we nu naar de Europese Unie, dan moeten wij in het westen respect hebben voor onze collega's in het oosten en het zuiden en omgekeerd. In dit halfrond moeten wij van links tot rechts zonder boegeroep met elkaar debatteren. De parlementaire dimensie die de premier heeft genoemd, namelijk het Europees Parlement en de samenwerking met de nationale parlementen, is vitaal. Want zonder parlementaire dimensie is er geen draagvlak. Zonder draagvlak en met bestuurlijke arrogantie bouw je geen Europa. Dus we moeten samen voortgaan.

Presidente. –La parola all'on. Turmes. Lo saluto perché credo sia il suo ultimo intervento in quest'Aula, avendo assunto responsabilità di governo nel suo paese, e gli formulo i migliori auguri a nome di tutti quanti noi di buon lavoro in Lussemburgo.

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). –Mr President, thank you very much. Yes, I am leaving for the Luxembourgish Government. When Guy Verhofstadt says that we need a new golden age, I think he is right, but I think the golden age for a lot of Europeans was before Margaret Thatcher and neoliberalism. It was also before ten years of – I think for a lot of Europeans – brutal austerity politics. It was surely also before this kind of tax competition.

So when I go back to Luxembourg next week, Mr Rutte, I think I have the same job to do in my government as you. I do not think we can leave taxation policy in unanimity. We need at least to take energy and environment taxation out of unanimity, as well as corporate taxation and probably also taxation for the very wealthy, because otherwise we are undermining solidarity in Europe.

Colleagues, if you want to give me a big gift, we can build on your 55% climate. Today and next week we will be finalising, hopefully, the efficiency legislation, the renewables legislation and the energy and climate framework legislation. So what should be the target for 2030? 33, 33, 55: isn't that a good rhetoric? So that's where we have to get today and then, in addition, we need a vision. Society needs a vision, and this vision is net zero in 2050, and that is, hopefully, also where you can help me next week when we close it. Thanks a lot for these almost two decades of working together.

(Applause)

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL). –Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Minister-president, vanmorgen zei u "minder beloven en meer waarmaken". Vervolgens zegt u dat de uitstoot van broeikasgassen niet met 30 % maar met 55 % zou moeten worden teruggedrongen.

Ik denk dat dat heel goed is. Alle lof en hulde daarvoor. Maar onze afhankelijkheid van aardgas zorgt niet alleen voor wekelijks aardbevingen in Groningen. Ze brengt ook de doelstellingen van het klimaatakkoord geen stap dichterbij.

Tegelijkertijd haalt Nederland veel van de ontwikkelingsdoelen van de Verenigde Naties niet. We hebben te veel armoede en te weinig hernieuwbare energie. Slechts een klein aandeel van de landbouw is biologisch. En de uitstoot van broeikasgassen is veel hoger dan die van onze Europese collega's.

Uw kabinet doet bitter weinig om dat aan te pakken. Onlangs drukte u er bij de Commissie nog een mestderogatie door. Voorzitter, onze bio-industrie brengt biologische en andere boeren in de verdrukking, houdt dierenleed en ernstige milieuvervuiling in stand en is funest voor het klimaat.

Graag hoor ik van de premier hoe hij ervoor gaat zorgen dat Nederland niet het vieste jongetje van de Europese klas blijft.

President. – We need to respect speaking time because more time means fewer Members of Parliament can speak.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie Primo ministro per essere qui. Lei viene dal nord Europa e io vengo dal sud Europa e dalle nostre parti si dice che «il sazio non capisce il digiuno». Oggi siamo qui a chiederle, ancora una volta, quale futuro per questa Unione europea.

Ma quale futuro ci può essere se permettiamo ancora una volta di importare olio tunisino senza dazi nel nostro territorio, facendo concorrenza sleale alle nostre imprese olivicole? Quale futuro ci può essere se importiamo il grano canadese trattato con il glifosato che, oltre a essere cancerogeno, distrugge anche le nostre piccole e medie imprese che producono il grano duro che serve per la pasta?

E quale futuro ci può essere se avete avuto il coraggio di lasciare sola l'Italia per dieci anni, di fronte alla crisi migratoria? Adesso avete il coraggio di chiudere le vostre frontiere e avete ancora il coraggio di dire che l'Italia e il governo italiano è xenofobo.

E lei, collega João Rodrigues che è qui davanti a me, come si permette di offendere il governo italiano e 17 milioni di cittadini italiani che l'hanno votato? Allora, se questa è l'Unione che voi volete, non c'è nessun futuro per questa Unione.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, οι ηγέτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως δηλώνουν σε κάθε ευκαιρία πως ένας από τους σημαντικότερους στόχους της είναι η συναδέλφωση των λαών και η εγκατάλειψη κάθε εχθρότητας που οδήγησε στο παρελθόν σε συγκρούσεις. Επιπλέον, μιας και το αντικείμενο της συζήτησης είναι το μέλλον της Ευρώπης, ένα σημαντικό τμήμα αυτού του μέλλοντος είναι και η περίφημη διεύρυνση με την ένταξη των χωρών των Δυτικών Βαλκανίων.

Δυστυχώς όμως ακόμη και μετά από όλα όσα έχουν συμβεί τα τελευταία χρόνια στην Ευρώπη, αδυνατούν να κατανοήσουν οι ηγέτες της Γερμανίας και των δορυφόρων της πως, εκμεταλλευόμενοι την ύπαρξη μιας αριστερής προδοτικής κυβερνήσεως στην Ελλάδα και προσπαθώντας να επιβάλουν μια λύση στο θέμα της ονομασίας των Σκοπίων, όχι απλά δεν προωθούν τη διεύρυνση, αλλά δημιουργούν εύλογα στη συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των Ελλήνων το συναίσθημα πως η Ευρώπη υιοθετεί ξεκάθαρα ανθελληνικές θέσεις για να εξυπηρετήσει τα συμφέροντά της.

Είμαι βέβαιος πως η συμφωνία για την ονομασία των Σκοπίων θα καταρρεύσει μαζί με την κατάρρευση της κυβέρνησης του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, καθώς δεν εκφράζει πλέον τη βούληση της πλειοψηφίας του ελληνικού λαού. Τα Σκόπια δεν θα ενταχθούν στην Ένωση! Πρέπει πλέον να αναλογιστούμε όλοι οι Έλληνες εάν θέλουμε να συνεχίσουμε να ανήκουμε σε έναν εχθρικό για την πατρίδα μας Οργανισμό.

Elmar Brok (PPE). –Herr Präsident! Herr Ministerpräsident, ich bedanke mich sehr für Ihre Rede, die deutlich gemacht hat, dass Sie eine realistische, seriöse, aber auch zukunftsgerichtete Europapolitik betreiben wollen. Und ich glaube, dass das in guten Strukturen ist und dass es weitblickend ist, auch aufgrund der internationalen Situation, in der wir jetzt stehen. Aber dafür müssen Sie der Europäischen Union auch die notwendigen Instrumente geben. Ihre Haltung in den Haushaltsfragen steht im Widerspruch zu den richtigen politischen Zielen, die Sie zum Ausdruck gebracht haben. Ich bitte Sie, diesen Widerspruch aufzulösen.

Wenn wir gegenwärtig auch die Migrationsfrage diskutieren, wenn wir endlich einen wirkungsvollen Außengrenzschutz durchführen wollen, dann muss dafür das Geld zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Man kann nicht sagen: „Europa muss die Frage lösen“, und anschließend gibt man nicht das Geld dafür, anschließend gibt man nicht die Entscheidungsmechanismen dafür. Auf diese Art und Weise ist Europa in den Augen der Öffentlichkeit wieder schuld daran, dass es nicht vorangeht. Aber in Wirklichkeit haben die Nationalstaaten durch die Verweigerung der Instrumente eine Lösung unmöglich gemacht. Ich bitte um Ihre Stellungnahme dazu.

Salvatore Cicu (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che il populismo cresca nel momento in cui l'Unione europea non riesce a dare risposte concrete ai temi appunto dell'immigrazione, ai temi del lavoro, ai temi della disuguaglianza e della povertà. Credo che la posizione del governo italiano, che deve essere rispettata, è una sfida. È una sfida proprio alla concretezza e all'efficacia della risposta. Quindi io credo che non bisogna più tergiversare rispetto agli egoismi e ai pregiudizi, alla necessità cioè che la posizione del Parlamento europeo nel prossimo Consiglio venga assunta come una posizione da condividere, perché noi non possiamo più aspettare.

Oggi sono arrivati altri mille migranti nel porto di Catania e l'Italia sta facendo la sua parte rispetto a questa situazione, però non è più tollerabile che i paesi del Sud vengano lasciati soli. Allora, occorre una redistribuzione, occorrono regole precise, occorre che ciascuno faccia la sua parte, perché se l'Europa vuole esistere, credo che questo sia il momento di dimostrarlo.

Paul Tang (S&D). –Dank u wel, Voorzitter, en welkom aan de minister-president. De vraag is inderdaad: aan wie laten we de toekomst over? Aan Donald Trump, Vladimir Poetin, de techgiganten Google en Facebook, of oliemaatschappijen als Shell? Nee, zonder Europa geen toekomst van waarden. Europa zal de rug moeten rechte. Ik ben blij met de urgentie waarmee de minister-president hier vandaag heeft gestaan. Mijn complimenten daarvoor.

Maar er is wel werk aan de winkel. Waarom neemt het Nederlandse kabinet niet het voortouw bij het veranderen van de euro en lijkt het niks te willen veranderen? Wat is uw handtekening waard als u zegt dat de sociale pijler niet eens in uw boekenkast terechtkomt? En waarom wil het Nederlandse kabinet de winstbelasting niet hervormen? Want u kunt niet als het Zeeuwse meisje klagen over de Europese begroting en tegelijkertijd Nederland als een belastingpiraat laten optreden en winstbelasting stelen van andere landen. Meer dan 14 miljard euro kost Nederland de andere Europese lidstaten. Wees dus niet John Wayne die zichzelf in de voet schiet. Wees ook een partner. Er is werk aan de winkel voor het Nederlandse kabinet.

Charles Tannock (ECR). –Mr President, Prime Minister Rutte, you have made a strong case for the role of the EU in external security and foreign policy matters, and you rightly cited Russian expansionism as an example where we work better together in preventing it. But to me, Brexit is a destructive and selfish act, but at least Prime Minister May has requested that the UK and the EU have a very special and deep partnership in terms of external security and defence matters post-Brexit.

But as a third country, the UK's role, for instance with PESCO or over Justice and Home Affairs matters, will be very limited. Recently, for instance, the Commission refused to allow the UK to participate in the Galileo project. So how do you envisage keeping the UK, a P5 member and a nuclear power with serious armed forces, fully plugged in and actively engaged with the EU security and defence structures post-Brexit?

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). –Voorzitter. Welkom, meneer Rutte! Het is een genoegen u hier in het hart van de Europese democratie warme woorden te horen spreken over Europa. In de wereld van Trump, Kim Jong-un, brexit en vluchtelingenstromen, Facebook en klimaatverandering biedt Europa ons bescherming.

U sprak bevlogen over de eenheid van Europa, maar tegelijkertijd ook over de Europese Unie als minimale technocratische samenwerking. Daar zit licht tussen, meneer Rutte. Natiestaten waren het antwoord op de uitdagingen van de 19e eeuw. Europese eenwording is het antwoord op de realiteit van de 21e eeuw. Want Europa heeft nu geen boekhouders nodig, maar leiderschap. Leiders die zich durven uitspreken voor een krachtig politiek Europa.

Bent u die leider, meneer Rutte? Maakt u, samen met Macron en Merkel, het pro-Europese, progressieve midden sterker? Ik ben in elk geval verheugd dat u inmiddels het idee van een eurozonebegroting omarmt. Meebuigen met populisme heeft het midden uitgehold. Maar een zwak Europa kunnen we ons niet permitteren. In 2019 vinden Europese verkiezingen plaats. D66 staat voor een sterk en solidair Europa. Meneer Rutte, vinden wij u aan onze zijde?

Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE). –Mr President, Prime Minister, I agree with your sentiments that the European Union has to be a more perfect union. What does it mean, more perfect? From my point of view, it means we need a more common political interest all over the European Union in being stronger. We have to be more responsible, more ecological, more social, more effective, and we need a common asylum system in order to be better in all these questions of refugees and migrants. There we can do better. That would be a more – and better – perfect union.

And with that, I come to the MFF. I was very disappointed when I read in the newspaper that you, Prime Minister, said: oh, we have Brexit, the UK will be leaving; we will be a smaller union, so we will have a smaller budget. No, that is not true, because we have bigger challenges; we want to be more responsible; we want to perform well on the global stage. Therefore, we have to answer the question: where does the money come from? It must come, to a large extent, from new own resources and, in particular, environmental taxes and a digital tax. Be ready to make the new tech giants pay to the national and the European budget. That would be a wonderful solution and European citizens would profit from that.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). –Herr talman! Välkommen hit, premiärminister Rutte. Det är nu väldigt många medborgare runt om i Europa som ser hur EU har blivit allt mer maktfullkomligt och allt mindre kapabelt att lösa stora problem, och alla vi som påpekar detta faktum stämplas som populisterna och möts med många andra tillmälen enbart för att vi påpekar detta faktum.

Den enda lösningen man har från EU:s sida är ju ständigt ökande budgetar och avgifter. Nederländerna betalar redan, precis som Sverige, mycket mer än man får tillbaka och har gjort så i många år. Nu föreslår Angela Merkel att alla nettobetalar ska betala ännu mer. Hur ska Nederländerna med sina 26 ledamöter mot Tysklands 96 ledamöter kunna stoppa det här? Ert folk kommer att få betala detta bland annat genom höjd pensionsålder i framtiden. Är det här vad det nederländska folket önskar, för det är deras talan ni för som premiärminister här i dag.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). –Κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, ως γνωστόν η Τουρκία προωθεί κατά εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες τους παράνομους μετανάστες στα ελληνικά νησιά. Παράλληλα, απειλεί την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ότι, αν δεν ικανοποιήσει τις παράλογες απαιτήσεις της, θα πλημμυρίσει την Ευρώπη με παράνομους μετανάστες. Πρόσφατα κατήγγειλε τη συμφωνία με την Ελλάδα για επαναφορά όσων λαθρομεταναστών δεν πληρούν τις προϋποθέσεις για χορήγηση ασύλου.

Συμφωνείτε ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να σκληρύνει τη στάση της απέναντι στην Τουρκία, να διακόψει άμεσα τη χρηματοδότηση, καθώς επίσης και τις συζητήσεις για την ένταξη της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Δεύτερον, επειδή σωστά επισημάνατε ότι με το ευρώ έγινε απλώς ανακατανομή πλούτου, συμφωνείτε ότι, στα πλαίσια αυτά και για επίδειξη αλληλεγγύης, πρέπει να μειωθεί και να ελαφρυνθεί το χρέος της Ελλάδος, την οποία κατέστρεψε οικονομικά και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για να διασωθεί το ευρώ; Και τέλος, θεωρείτε ότι, αν εγκαταλείψουμε την αρχή της ομοφωνίας, θα εξυπηρετήσουμε την ανάγκη για ύπαρξη μιας Ευρώπης κυρίαρχων λαών;

Angelika Niebler (PPE). –Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident, Herr Ministerpräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Sie sagten – und ich komme darauf gleich zu sprechen –: „less is more“ und „a deal is a deal“. Ich möchte mich für diese klaren Aussagen bei Ihnen, Herr Ministerpräsident, ganz, ganz herzlich bedanken. Ich unterstütze Sie vollumfänglich, möchte aber zum schlanken Europa nochmal nachfragen: In welchen Bereichen soll sich denn künftig die Europäische Union zurückziehen? Haben Sie da konkrete Vorschläge? Sie fragten ja zu Recht auch in unsere Runde: *Is the EU still doing the right thing?* Wenn ich Sie zurückfrage: Was ist denn Ihre Antwort darauf? Machen wir wirklich die richtigen Dinge, oder was würden Sie denn anders machen? Das wäre meine Frage.

Und natürlich erlaube ich mir auch, mit Blick auf die Debatten zum europäischen Haushalt diese Frage an Sie zurückzugeben. Ich möchte meinen Kollegen Elmar Brok nochmals ganz nachdrücklich unterstützen. Wir müssen über die Aufgaben diskutieren, die Europa hat. Aber die Aufgaben, für die wir in der Europäischen Union zuständig sind, müssen dann auch ordentlich finanziert werden. Nur dann können wir liefern, nur dann können wir das leisten, was wir den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern auch versprochen haben. Und da glaube ich, dass wir bei den vielen neuen Herausforderungen um eine moderate Erhöhung des europäischen Haushalts einfach nicht herumkommen werden. Also bitte: kein apodiktisches „Nein“, sondern ein bisschen mehr Flexibilität in dem Bereich.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). –Mr President, I will refer to two of the Prime Minister's key words: unity and trust. I remember that we have to pay attention. If the gap between what we preach and what we practise is only getting larger then we are offering support to populism, Euroscepticism and even anti-euro cronyism. This is why I have two questions for you. What is your view on the future of the Schengen System and what role do you see for Romania and Bulgaria, knowing that your country systematically – and without any legal basis in the Treaties – opposed the integration of my country into Schengen? The second question is: what is your vision of the future of the eurozone, considering that a moment ago you referred to President Juncker's State of Union speech with some, should I say, offensive connotations? If you have a vision, you should go to the doctor. What is your vision of the future of the eurozone and how can the eurozone be enlarged to integrate new Member States?

Othmar Karas (PPE). –Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte zuerst einmal dem Vizepräsidenten Timmermans für seine Antwortrede danken. Ich kann jeden einzelnen Satz unterstreichen, und er hat sich auch unterschieden von Ihnen, Herr Ministerpräsident, weil es keinen einzigen Widerspruch in den Formulierungen gegeben hat.

Daher muss ich nachfragen. Sie sprechen von der Einheit. Und ich frage Sie daher: Sind Sie bereit, die Einstimmigkeit zu reduzieren, damit die Europäische Union handlungsfähiger wird? Sind Sie für verstärkte Eigenmittel im europäischen Budget und für Eigenmittel zur Schaffung eines Euro-Budgets im EU-Haushalt? Sind Sie für gemeinsame Asylstandards? Sind Sie für eine gemeinsame Migrationspolitik? Sind Sie für den Europäischen Währungsfonds? Sind Sie für einen Sanktionsmechanismus bei Verletzungen des europäischen und internationalen Rechts und der europäischen Werte?

Und Sie sprechen von den Spannungen zwischen nationalen Parlamenten und Europäischem Parlament. Die haben wir nur dann, wenn wir keine klaren Zuständigkeiten haben. Die haben wir nur dann, wenn die Einstimmigkeit und der Intergouvernementalismus vorherrschen. Treten Sie dafür ein, dass das Europäische Parlament in allen Fragen die demokratische Legitimierung und Kontrolle vornimmt, wo auf europäischer Ebene entschieden wird!

Emilian Pavel (S&D). –Domnule preşedinte, domnule prim-ministru, aici în spatele dumneavoastră, dacă vă uitaţi... Sunt şi eu membru al Parlamentului European din România şi vreau să apreciez câteva cuvinte pe care le-aţi rostit. Da, Europa trebuie să ia anumite decizii. Da, toţi trebuie să beneficiem de libera mişcare. Da, trebuie să ne ocupăm de anumite urgenţe. Trebuie să fim uniţi, aţi vorbit de unitate. Aţi vorbit de competitivitate europeană, domnule prim-ministru, foarte frumos. Dar, haideţi, domnule prim-ministru, să folosim acest cuvânt pe care l-aţi folosit, sau această expresie, *team up*.

I will just express it: team up, team up and respect the laws, Prime Minister. Respect the laws and the requests that were made here in Parliament and in the Council, and bring Romania and Bulgaria into Schengen. Don't mix up corruption, because your ambassador had a meal for the New Year with a penal person from Romania who was convicted in the first instance. So please respect the law, Prime Minister.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). –Mr President, Prime Minister, you mentioned – and rightfully so – that with Brexit, Europe would be faced with a big hole, but you also talked about the things that Prime Minister Churchill said, that unexpected things can happen. Brexit will not only have a tremendous negative impact on Britain, but also on the European Union. We talked recently to the heads of the Port of Rotterdam, who confirmed that.

I would therefore like to ask you to take the initiative, because I have not met one person to the right of me in this Parliament, and to your left, who does not regret Brexit. Take the initiative and make Britain another offer for more autonomy in immigration, so as to avoid Brexit at the last minute. Without Britain, Europe will never be complete and will never be credible.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). –Voorzitter, mijnheer Rutte, wij kennen elkaar goed, dus ik spreek u gewoon bij uw voornaam aan: Mark.

Heb ik het goed gehoord dat u net hebt gezegd dat landbouw- en structuurfondsen in Nederland tot de verleden tijd behoren? Dan kijk ik nu naar Frans Timmermans. Die heeft net gezegd dat de economische groei in Nederland dankzij Europa heel groot was en dat er een bedrag van 85 miljard euro mee gemoeid was als het gaat over export.

Wat de vermindering voor de landbouw betreft, weten we tot nu toe helemaal niet om welke cijfers het gaat. Gaat het om 15 procent of 30 procent? Daarnaast impliceert het klimaatakkoord een verhoging. Daarin moet heel Europa meedoen. Als dat niet gebeurt, dan zetten we uiteindelijk in heel Nederland de agrarische sector in de uitverkoop want dan hebben we te maken met een nog hogere kostprijs. In Nederland hebben we op milieugebied altijd gedaan wat Europa ons vroeg. Andere landen hebben dat niet gedaan. Ik wil er dus op aandringen om alles in Europa met elkaar gelijk te doen, want het gaat om de toekomst van onze gezinsbedrijven en onze verwerkende industrie. Het gaat om onze transportbedrijven en een leefbaar platteland, en uiteindelijk ook om artikel 2 van het klimaatakkoord. Daarbij moet voedselzekerheid niet alleen in Nederland, maar ook in Europa bovenaan staan. Ik hoop dat u daar met Carola Schouten hard aan meewerkt.

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D). –Arvoisa puhemies, pääministeri Rutte korosti aivan oikein Euroopan unionin legitimeettii ja samalla kansallisten parlamenttien asemaa. Se on aivan oikein. Jäi kuitenkin sellainen vaikutelma, että Te olette varaa-massa Euroopan parlamentille ja unionille pienen roolin, jonkinlaisen mini-Euroopan, kun mainitsitte, että ehkä ilmas-tonmuutoksessa olisi roolia yhteisille eurooppalaisille asioille. Mutta eikö ole aika vaikea erottaa tänä päivänä toisistaan eurooppalaista ja kansallista politiikkaa? Täällä moni meppi on jo painostanut Teitä veronkierron ja veroparatiisien sulkemiseen. Osittain Te vastasittekin jo siihen. Haluaisin kuitenkin vielä kysyä, että eikö tämä digivallankumous erityi-sesti edellytä, että verotuksessa voidaan tehdä uusia eurooppalaisia ja jopa maailmanlaajuisia ratkaisuja.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). –Mr President, Prime Minister Rutte, thank you for your speech on a united and stable Europe. Indeed, we are all facing global challenges, and as you say, we need to have a European Union which delivers an added value where the national sovereign state cannot be effective enough. Such areas are common migration policy, a fair and effective European asylum system, protection of the external borders but also preserving and extending the free Schengen area.

Thank you very much for the birthday wishes to Prime Minister Borisov, and congratulations to the Bulgarian Presidency. I am not asking you for a present for Prime Minister Borisov's birthday, but for fair treatment of all countries which fulfil all the criteria which are needed for the Schengen area. The same goes for ERM II – the exchange mecha-nism for the eurozone. I hope that you act only on behalf of the Netherlands and not some other Prime Ministers hiding behind your back. But when will the Netherlands give up this opposition and let Bulgaria and Romania join the Schengen area, at least as regards their international airports?

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). –Herr Präsident, Herr Ministerpräsident! Wenn im Bierzelt Populisten schreien: „Keinen Euro-cent mehr nach Europa!“, dann ist das das Eine. Wenn aber ein seriöser Politiker – und als solchen schätze ich Sie ein – hier in diesem Haus behauptet, wir verlangen nur mehr und mehr und mehr statt uns inhaltlich mit der Zukunft Europas auseinanderzusetzen, dann empfinde ich das bis zu einem gewissen Grad als Affront.

Denn wir haben nicht einfach mehr und mehr gefordert. Wir haben ganz konkret eingefordert, dass das, worauf wir uns in der Vergangenheit schon verständigt und wozu wir uns verpflichtet haben, eingehalten wird, dass die Leistungen, die wir für dieses Europa schon zugesagt haben – sei es im Bereich der Kohäsionsfonds, sei es im Bereich der Landwirtschaft –, erbracht werden können.

Und wir haben uns gemeinsam mit der Kommission und dem Rat darauf verständigt, neue Aufgaben, die wir als gemeinsame Aufgaben definiert haben, zu übernehmen. Diese Aufgaben brauchen eine budgetäre Ausstattung. Und ich ersuche Sie: Bierzelt ist Bierzelt, aber das Parlament und die Zukunft Europas sind etwas, womit wir uns seriös ausei-nersetzen wollen. Wir brauchen nicht generell mehr Europa – wir brauchen ein besseres, ein sozialeres, ein gerech-teres Europa.

Sander Loones (ECR). –Voorzitter. Interessante toespraak, meneer Rutte. Wat jammer dat u ze niet minstens deels in het Nederlands hebt gegeven. Maar goed, dat kunt u goedmaken op het wereldkampioenschap voetbal. Oh nee, daaraan neemt u niet deel.

Serieuzer nu. Ik vind het altijd jammer wanneer Nederland niet kan meespelen. Dat maakt de competitie internationaal en Europees minder boeiend. Ik heb graag dat jullie wél op het veld staan. Als ik een aantal collega's hier in het Europees Parlement hoor, krijg ik trouwens de indruk dat zij liever een Europese ploeg zouden zien in plaats van die competitie tussen de verschillende lidstaten. Dat is niet mijn visie.

Over Europa nu. Die competitie moet er ook op Europees niveau zijn. En daarover gaat mijn vraag aan u. Hoe gaan wij die competitie organiseren? Laten we eerlijk zijn. We zien dat Frankrijk en Duitsland opnieuw het laken naar zich toe proberen te trekken, in een tegenreactie op de Visegrad- en de 'Club Med'-landen. Hoe gaan wij onze stem luider laten klinken? Dat is mijn vraag aan Nederland, Denemarken, Ierland en Finland, die kleinere landen uit Noord-Europa. Hoe zullen wij onze boodschap sterker brengen?

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). –Mr President, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his realistic speech. Prime Minister, you spoke about the rule of law and said that this should apply to every state. Would you also agree that international law is part of the rule of law principle? If so, there are grave breaches of international law taking place, like the ones in Crimea and Georgia. If a Member State proposes to leave such grave breaches of international law unpunished and, for instance, to abolish sanctions, would you agree that such a state is working against the rule of law and thereby against the values of the European Union?

Richard Corbett (S&D). –Mr President, the Prime Minister quoted Winston Churchill in his speech, but the British Prime Minister he reminded me of the most when he spoke was, sadly, David Cameron. Like him, you, Prime Minister, railed against the treaty provision on ever-closer union without quoting the full sentence, which refers to closer union respecting the principle of subsidiarity: in other words, as decentralised as possible and only centralised where necessary. Like him, you spoke of a European Union that only acts on the big things and not the little things. But the biggest thing this union does is the single European market, where the devil is in the detail, hence all the detailed legislation that Ministers who like to attack Brussels subsequently rail against and denounce as interference.

You spoke of Europe inflicting legislation on Member States and doing too much, as if Member States were blissfully unaware of what was happening, yet no legislation is agreed without the approval of the Council of Ministers, composed of national ministers accountable to national parliaments. It's time that national politicians ceased to rail against Brussels as if it was something alien and started explaining it to citizens. Otherwise you might have the same thing happening in your country.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro Primo ministro, io sono un po' preoccupata perché penso che siamo qui a parlare del futuro dell'Europa, ma questa Europa non avrà futuro se noi non diamo risposta a quello di cui ha parlato con passione Timmermans. Io l'ho molto apprezzato, sia oggi che ieri, perché ho trovato in lui veramente un appello accorato, un appello accorato a dare una risposta a risolvere questa crisi che è una cosa seria. La crisi dell'emigrazione che l'Europa sta affrontando farà saltare l'Europa, se voi non vi rendete conto in Consiglio che quella è la priorità. Non ci sarà il futuro dell'Europa, se non lo fate.

Abbiamo bisogno di tornare ai fondamentali, caro Ministro. Lei ha citato un padre dell'Europa, io vorrei citarne un altro: De Gasperi. Sono andata a rivedermi un suo discorso. Lui diceva, già nel 1954, che noi abbiamo bisogno di un'architettura europea che sappia dominare dalla base alla cima, dove inglobiamo tutti i pensieri, e non, come dice tante volte Verhofstadt: tu sei buono, tu sei cattivo, tu sei incluso, tu sei fuori dalla porta, no! E guardi che allora la situazione non era semplice. Eravamo dopo la guerra, c'erano ancora tanti affascinati dal totalitarismo bolscevico. Oggi noi dobbiamo riprendere quella Europa per costruire una casa comune, dove i cittadini vogliano entrare, dal basso verso l'alto. Dall'alto verso il basso non funziona.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). –Señor presidente, señor primer ministro, yo aprecio, como muchos colegas, una enorme contradicción en su discurso, porque compartimos ese escenario geopolítico y geoeconómico preocupante sobre Europa. Hay una enorme cantidad de retos en materia defensiva, en materia de Agenda Digital, en materia migratoria.

Todo el mundo pone sobre la mesa enormes retos; usted también, pero usted dice que tiene que reducirse el presupuesto de la Unión Europea. Usted dice que, al irse el Reino Unido, tenemos que reducir el presupuesto y no tenemos dar ni un euro más desde los Estados que pueden hacerlo. Esto es una contradicción absoluta.

En mi opinión, usted tiene que respondernos si cree que es creíble, que es verosímil, que es posible afrontar el reto del futuro de Europa con todos estos grandes desafíos sin presupuesto y sin una mayor aportación económica. Y mi pregunta concreta es: ¿Cree usted en los recursos propios de la Unión Europea? ¿Usted cree posible que la Unión Europea establezca recursos propios para financiar el futuro de la Unión?

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). –Herr Präsident! Herr Ministerpräsident und Herr Vizepräsident, Sie haben beide das Prinzip des *rule of law* angesprochen. Man kann auch sagen, wenn es das *rule of law* nicht gibt, dann gibt es auf lange Zeit auch kein Europa.

Aber schauen wir uns doch einmal die Euro-Zone an. Frau Christine Lagarde hat gesagt, wir mussten die Verträge brechen, um den Euro zu retten. Und alles, was ich in der Euro-Zone sehe, ist nicht rechtsstaatlich. Die Frage ist ja immer: Was müssen wir tun, um die Euro-Zone zusammenzuhalten – auch gegen das Gesetz? Und jetzt wissen wir, wie fragil diese Institution ist, weil sie falsch konstruiert worden ist.

Und wir sagen jetzt nicht, wir müssen die falsche Konstruktion beseitigen, sondern wir führen jetzt Fonds ein. Wir führen Fonds ein, wenn Leute gegen Gesetze verstoßen haben, damit sie in Zukunft nicht mehr gegen Gesetze verstoßen. Ich kann nur sagen: Wer diese Euro-Zone so weiterentwickelt, wird dauernd, Herr Timmermans, *moral hazard* haben. Was soll ich mich anstrengen im eigenen Lande, wenn andere meine Fehler zudeckeln und mich dafür noch belohnen?

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). –Minister-president, goedemiddag. Ik zit hier helemaal achteraan in de engelenbak van dit Parlement, recht voor u. Ja, u ziet me wel.

We hebben hier gisteren een debat gevoerd over de toekomst van de economische en monetaire Unie. En de consensus was eigenlijk best groot. De EMU was en is nog steeds een historisch project, maar is nog verre van afgewerkt. Dat wisten we, maar toch hebben we jaren aan een stuk de andere kant op gekeken, eigenlijk tot en met de financiële crisis van 2008. Herstelwerken aan die EMU zijn nu echt wel nodig. Maar de meningen daarover lopen nog erg uiteen.

Ik wil kort terugkeren naar de oprichting van de EMU. Vele economen en academici waren het er al bij aanvang over eens dat een monetaire Unie niet kan werken zonder een budgettaire capaciteit. Er is ook geen enkele andere monetaire Unie ter wereld zonder zo'n budgettaire en politieke link eraan gekoppeld. Toch zijn we met die wankel constructie gestart. Politieke belangen kregen de bovenhand, economische wetmatigheden moesten het onderspit delven.

Daarom deze vraag: Wat is er volgens u fout gelopen bij de creatie van de EMU? Indien u in 1989 zelf in het Delors-Comité gezeten zou hebben om de blauwdruk voor de EMU uit te tekenen, hoe zou u het dan aangepakt hebben om ervoor te zorgen dat we vandaag verder zouden staan?

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). –Mr President, (*inaudible as the microphone is not switched on*) ... a more united Europe in the current world, but unity should be based on all Member States getting a sense of benefit from belonging to the European Union. And something is unbalanced now, because some Member States get a benefit from having a geographically-central position in Europe, combined with good exchange rates regarding the euro launch, plus using tax rates which are low to attract more resources. This creates unbalanced conditions in which to invest and to create jobs. So we need to rebalance the situation, and the minimum we need to do is to have a European budget keeping a strong commitment with cohesion and to equip our monetary zone with a fiscal capacity. I really agree that we can no longer continue with the situation of a monetary zone – the only one in the world – that does not have a fiscal capacity. These are decisions for the next European Council, so we count on you also to move in this direction.

Daniel Buda (PPE). –Domnule preşedinte, domnule prim-ministru, două sunt problemele pe care doresc să vi le supun atenţiei, şi anume: ţara dumneavoastră s-a opus permanent în Consiliu intrării României şi Bulgariei în spaţiul Schengen, deşi indeplineam toate condiţiile tehnice, fiind furnizori de securitate şi stabilitate în regiune. Aş dori să vă întreb în mod clar: care este poziţia dumneavoastră astăzi faţă de intrarea României şi Bulgariei în spaţiul Schengen, deoarece situaţia actuală mi se pare profund inacceptabilă şi incorectă faţă de poporul român.

A doua problemă este cea legată de bugetul Uniunii Europene. Olanda astăzi se opune creșterii contribuției naționale la bugetul Uniunii Europene până la un nivel la care să se permită finanțarea adecvată a politicii de coeziune, a politicii agricole comune, dar și să se facă față unor provocări cum ar fi migrația sau securitatea frontierelor. În acest context, vă întreb, domnule prim-ministru, cum credeți că putem face o Uniune Europeană puternică fără resursele financiare necesare în acest sens?

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). –Herr Präsident! Sehr geehrter Ministerpräsident, vielen Dank, dass Sie heute hier sind. Sie sprachen in Ihrer Rede von Solidarität und davon, das Leben in der Europäischen Union zu verbessern. Ich muss Sie fragen: Ist es solidarisch, dass 40 % der Konzerngewinne in Steueroasen versickern? Oder ist es solidarisch, dass wir das Geld in die Hand nehmen und innerhalb Europas für bessere Lebensbedingungen für Menschen sorgen? Ist es solidarisch, dass wir mehr Geld in ERASMUS investieren? Ist es solidarisch, dass wir mehr Geld in ein Interrail-Ticket investieren? Und ist es solidarisch, dass wir die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Europa beenden und nicht Konzerne in Steueroasen unterbringen?

Das ist meine Definition von Solidarität. Und deswegen meine klare Frage: Glauben Sie, dass es notwendig ist, Unternehmen in den Ländern überall in Europa gerecht zu besteuern, um den Europäerinnen und Europäern zu helfen?

Brian Hayes (PPE). –Mr President, I would like to welcome Prime Minister Rutte to the

European Parliament.

Prime Minister, I think if you were to answer all our questions, you'd be here for the next week, so can I give you just one reflection, as an Irish colleague? You said earlier that you need the support of the European Parliament. Can I say to you that the European Parliament and the pro-European forces in the European Parliament need the support of the European Council to get more of Europe working? There is a majority in this House for an ambitious European project. We come from the centre right and the centre left, from the centre ground, and we represent the majority of European citizens who are ambitious and want the European project to succeed across the 500 million citizens. That's the message I want you to bring back to the European Council: that, if you want our support, we look for your support as well.

On the EU budget, can I ask you this? Let's be ambitious for a change. Let's do something differently for a change. Let's agree the EU budget before next year. That would send out a strong message that we are serious about reform, serious about new contributions and serious about making sure that Europe works.

Eugen Freund (S&D). –Mr President, Mr Prime Minister – here. It's good to have you back in the Parliament, and I am referring to this, in particular, because I remember you were here in January of 2016, and at this point you said: 'we have two months more in order to settle the resettlement issue'. And now it's been, I think, 29 months since you said this, and we still haven't a solution for that problem.

So I ask you: why did you fail, and what kind of hopes do you have for the next presidency, which will also have to tackle that issue?

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). –Domnule președinte, domnule prim-ministru, în calitate de membru al Consiliului European v-ați declarat un adversar al integrării României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen, în condițiile în care România deja acționează *de facto*, apărând peste 2 000 de kilometri de frontieră europeană estică. Opoziția dumneavoastră a consolidat și alimentat un discurs al unor eurosceptici în România, care leagă această decizie de anumite politici economice protecționiste și de întârzierea intrării în concurență a portului Constanța din România cu alte porturi din Uniunea Europeană. În sesiunea plenară precedentă, Parlamentul European a reiterat apelul ca România și Bulgaria să fie integrate imediat în spațiul Schengen și – cum bine ați menționat dând exemplul Imperiului Roman – marile imperii se destramă dacă nu reușesc să își securizeze granițele. La două săptămâni după decizia Parlamentului European, aș vrea să vă întreb: ce poziție aveți legat de intrarea României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen?

Ana Gomes (S&D). –*(inaudible as the microphone is not switched on)* ...the EU ensures security and the rule of law when Member States, including the one that you lead, function as laundromats to kleptocrats, oligarchs, the corrupt and criminals from around the world.

According to Europol, your country accounts for one fourth of actions reported as suspected instances of money laundering, mostly related to drug-trafficking.

Senhor Presidente, a Holanda é o principal paraíso fiscal para os evasores do meu país, Portugal. A sua desculpa de que a fiscalidade é matéria de soberania nacional não serve para dar cobertura ao papel holandês na corrida para o fundo na fiscalidade na União Europeia, que põe em causa a solidariedade, o mercado único, regras de concorrência, justiça, boa governação e a segurança de nós todos.

Qual é a sua posição sobre o CCCTB?

Why delay the VAT reform, and why delay an EU tax on digital platforms, financial transactions and polluting industries? Why obstruct these ways to increase the EU's own resources and favour economic convergence and political cohesion in the eurozone and in the European Union?

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). –Poštovani premijeru Rutte, dobrodošli i hvala Vam na doprinosu ovoj važnoj raspravi.

Kao i Vi, Uniju vidim kao zajednicu suverenih država koje međusobno surađuju u pitanjima na koja europska razina može dati bolje odgovore od nacionalne razine. No i Vi i ja znamo da je supsidijarnost princip kojega EU institucije prečesto zaborave.

Drago mi je da ste jedan od rijetkih lidera koji su jasno i glasno izrekli da ne trebamo više Europe. Trebamo bolju Europu koja će imati povjerenja u države članice, a intervenirati samo u ona područja u kojima može ponuditi dodatnu vrijednost.

Koja su to područja mora biti plod konsenzusa. Rekli ste da Unija nije meni s kojega svatko može uzeti samo ono što mu odgovara. Slažem se, uz dodatak da bismo pravila koja vrijede jednako za sve ipak trebali prihvatiti jednoglasno, a ne da ona bilo kome budu nametnuta.

Ova Unija mora biti utemeljena na dobroj vjeri inače nema budućnosti.

And by the way, John Wayne did what the scriptwriters told him to do, and so far the scriptwriters for the EU are not doing such a good job.

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). –Mr President, I would like to say to the Prime Minister that in my country there is still a lot of sympathy for his beautiful tulip country. But don't forget, Prime Minister, that these tulip flowers come from East Europe. We share the same values in our history and we ask you to share the same values in the European Union, to respect the Treaty of Schengen acquis and to respect all the Treaties, because for us the rule of law means respect for the Treaties of the European Union, including the Lisbon Treaty.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). –Minister-president Rutte, dank u wel. Ja, weer even in het Nederlands mag ook weer. Allereerst wil ik u complimenteren, want na vele jaren erkent u dat Europa meer is dan markt en munt. Volgens mij is dat al 20 jaar lang de slogan van GroenLinks. Maar dat maakt niet uit. Het is hartstikke goed dat die stap is gezet, dus gefeliciteerd. Ook op klimaatgebied zet u hele goede stappen. Ik kan u melden dat het Europees Parlement Nederland steunt om de uitstoot met 55 procent te verminderen. Dus wij staan al achter u. Nu nog wat meer landen in de Raad meekrijgen. Dat is nog een klus.

Maar wat we missen in het debat en in uw verhaal is de volgende stap in uw liefde voor Europa, namelijk een sociaal Europa. Waar is het verhaal van sociaal Europa? Zoals u weet, hebben we een interne markt en een Europa met één markt van werknemers gecreëerd, maar op belastinggebied zijn we nog nationale eilandjes waar de landen van kunnen profiteren.

Ik heb een hele simpele vraag: gaat u het initiatief steunen om binnen Europa een minimumtarief voor vennootschapsbelasting te krijgen om die nivellering naar beneden tegen te gaan?

Jiří Payne (EFDD). –Pane předsedající, pane premiére, EU nefunguje. Svět evropských institucí a rétorika, která všechno přelakovává na růžovo, to není svět, ve kterém žijí lidé. To je svět nekonečně se měnících regulací, stále přísnějších a brutálně bezohledných a přitom zbytečných. To je svět zákazů, příkazů, povinností a pokut. Svět, ve kterém neplatí zavedené tradice ani názvosloví. Pomazánkové máslo už je jen pomazánkové, žárovka nesmí mít žár a vysavače nevysávají.

Namísto demokracie máme demokratický deficit, namísto volného obchodu máme jednotný trh. Volný pohyb kapitálu je sice bezvadná věc, ale drtivá většina Evropanů žádný kapitál nemá.

Nevraživost vůči Velké Británii, která se rozhodla využít svého legitimního práva, je vidět na každém kroku. A migrace ukázala, že EU nezvládá svou vlastní existenci a své selhání chce řešit solidaritou členských států.

To je svět, ve kterém občané nemají vůbec žádný vliv na to, co se děje, a to musíme změnit. Musíme vytvořit alternativu, schůdnou cestu, která napraví evropský kontinent, plán, jak založit spolupráci na lepších základech.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). –Señor presidente, gracias, primer ministro, por estar hoy con nosotros. Como este es un debate sobre el futuro de Europa, voy a referirme a los jóvenes. Todos conocemos la ventaja del programa Erasmus, pero yo creo que también es necesario que los jóvenes estudien en profundidad los antecedentes, objetivos y funcionamiento de las instituciones de la Unión Europea, ese «camelopardo» tan difícil de definir al que usted se refería hace un minuto.

Por ello, celebro que recientemente el Consejo aprobara la recomendación de la Comisión sobre la promoción de la educación en temas europeos en las escuelas europeas. Esta asignatura europea me parece muy conveniente, y espero que los Estados miembros pronto la implementen.

En segundo lugar, quisiera subrayar un grave problema que afecta hoy a toda Europa: la baja tasa de natalidad y, por consiguiente, un futuro con menos jóvenes. Me gustaría, o me habría gustado, que en el marco financiero plurianual este declive demográfico que afecta ya a toda Europa hubiera estado más presente a la hora de repartir fondos entre las regiones. En su país la tasa de natalidad ya es baja, está en 1,66 por mujer, aunque todavía es superior a la de otros países. Me gustaría conocer su valoración de estos hechos.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Primo ministro, lei ci ha detto che l'Europa deve essere di meno nelle cose inutili – e io posso essere d'accordo che dobbiamo ridurre l'invasività di certe norme di dettaglio – però contemporaneamente ha chiaramente detto che serve un'Unione europea forte in politica estera, difesa, sicurezza e nelle politiche economiche e quindi nella difesa della zona euro.

Allora, non crede che su queste questioni sia necessaria una vera cessione di sovranità, e quindi più Europa? In secondo luogo, non crede che serva un bilancio adeguato? Lei certamente ha ragione quando dice che l'azzardo morale è sbagliato, ma vorrei vedere cosa farebbe lei se si trovasse con il 30, 40 o 50 % di giovani disoccupati o di disoccupati, se sceglierebbe prima di tutto l'austerità o se sceglierebbe invece di rispondere alle domande dei suoi cittadini.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). –Mr President, I would like to address the Prime Minister. Prime Minister, first I want to join the call from my colleagues for the Council to find a solution to the migration issue next week. Second, you said we need to regain the trust of citizens. Yes. Last week, Chancellor Angela Merkel and Prime Minister Kurz took a clear stand: the work of the European Parliament should be in one location. Don't you think that, as EU leaders engage in talks on key reforms and on the budget, the time has come to put the issue of the single seat on the European Council agenda? Are you willing to take a stand and to open a constructive dialogue with your colleagues and with us for a roadmap for treaty change; for a more effective, a less costly, a climate-friendly European Parliament close to citizens? You said, Prime Minister: 'Let's show the people that we practise what we preach'. Are you going to do it?

(Applause)

Răzvan Popa (S&D). –Domnule prim-ministru, România merită Schengen. Am ascultat cu atenție discursul dumneavoastră, iar în spiritul a ceea ce ați spus, mai ales despre solidaritate, vă cer să sprijiniți intrarea României și a Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen. Fac acest apel, deoarece pentru cetățenii români este de neînțeles opoziția Olandei față de intrarea României în Schengen. Există în țara mea un curent de opinie potrivit căruia Olanda se opune aderării României la spațiul Schengen pentru ca portul Constanța să nu devină un competitor direct al portului Rotterdam. Pentru că România a îndeplinit toate criteriile de aderare – și nu o spun numai eu, o spune și Comisia, o știe și Parlamentul European –, iar dacă ar fi alte motive, cu siguranță și alte state s-ar fi opus intrării României în spațiul Schengen. De

aceea, în concluzie, domnule prim-ministru, vă cer să sprijiniți intrarea României în spațiul Schengen, precum și a Bulgariei.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). –Mr President, dear Prime Minister, let me tell you very frankly: I was delighted to listen to the first part of your speech. You were in the line of the best Dutch tradition of Huig de Groot, pleading for a geopolitical global role for the European Union. But then you have to explain to us how this is compatible – this giant external European Union – with an internal dwarf European Union. Because you don't care about MFF, about eurozone reform. You plead for more subsidiarity, so how do you make compatible a very, very weak internal European Union with a giant in the global landscape? This is not sustainable. This is a major contradiction, Mr Rutte. And let me put a final question: do you really believe that one per cent of the budget, one per cent of GDP, is the fast track – the big way – for the big government of the European institutions? One per cent, Mr Rutte? Please, be reasonable. I would say, like Mr Verhofstadt: come on, Mr Rutte.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). –Mr President, Prime Minister Rutte, we got your message: focus on added value and what the European Union can do best by acting together. That is the case with external borders, migration and refugees. So, you take the floor in the next European Summit and state three principles. Number one: the situation of the Aquarius is not only immoral, it's against humanitarian law and European law. It's about time that the Council fingers point not at those who act like the new government in Spain but at those who do not act.

Number two: the question cannot be externalised and the answer cannot be simply repressive. It has to be holistic and preventive. And number three: it's got to be political. No country can be left alone; not Malta, or Spain, or Italy can be left alone. The question is political. You quoted Winston Churchill by saying that politics is about foretelling the future and explaining eventually why it didn't happen. But the best Churchill quote is that politics is first and foremost about action, and no action at all is the worst failure for the European Union.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Mark Rutte, Prime Minister of the Netherlands. – Mr President, I am so happy that the whole Parliament has now come together to listen to my final reply. Thank you all for participating in this debate. I believe it is an excellent opportunity to discuss the big issues of the European Union and how we can work together.

There were so many questions, I cannot answer all of them but I have tried to bring them back to basically four key issues. The first of them, of course, is the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). Ms Schreijer-Pierik, I am of course in favour of the common agricultural policy. It has to stay, but it also has to modernise and the whole budget has to modernise. We, as politicians, have to make choices in scarcity. We have to make choices about what we are going to spend our money on.

I am absolutely convinced that we cannot just say there are new tasks which have to be funded and, at the same time, we cannot find savings in the existing budget. That is the plea I am making here. That is exactly what all the Member States have to do. I believe that simply saying we have to go to 1.3% again will only fuel the extremists who are saying that Europe is not making the necessary choices.

Secondly, on migration: here today I reach out my hand to Italy because I know that they have to deal with an extremely difficult situation. But I also eagerly await the Italian Government's national measures because they have to do a lot in order to manage the inflow of illegal migrants better, and then they know that we stand ready to show solidarity and, as the European Union, to work collectively to address this issue, which no doubt will be with us for years to come.

Ms de Lange rightly alluded to the Common European Asylum System, and we need, as part of that, to take out the root causes of migration. This is also my answer to Mr Bashir on this issue: better guarding of our borders and working on better return mechanisms for rejected asylum seekers. Again, I hope that I will be successful, with my colleagues at the European Council in June, in taking the necessary decisions although, looking at where the debate is now, it is not an absolute given that we will be successful on this.

Many of you alluded to or discussed Schengen and the accession of Bulgaria and Romania. Let me be very clear on this: I welcome the fact that both Bulgaria and Romania have the aspiration fully to join the Schengen acquis. We acknowledge the work which has been done in Bulgaria and Romania on this issue, but we also know the work is not yet finished. Romania and Bulgaria need to meet several conditions that stem from joining the EU, as defined in the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, one of the benchmarks of which concerns corruption – and, here too, a deal is a deal. We cannot have countries entering the Schengen area if they do not fulfil all the criteria.

Another issue is that of which tasks the European Union should be working on. For example, one of the tasks raised by the S&D Group is the issue of a social Europe. I believe that social affairs have to stay at a national level, but when social affairs have a cross-border impact then Europe also needs to get involved. Therefore, for example, this issue of making sure that people get paid the same amount of money in the same circumstances for the same type of work is an issue where Europe has a role to play, as it does in the area of transportation.

I know that one of the speakers was the chair of the biggest Dutch union and I am absolutely convinced that, in those days, she would have fully agreed with what I have just stated. As I said in my speech, the European Union has to concentrate on its core tasks: those being, of course, the internal market, economic and monetary union (EMU), external borders, the issue of migration and, yes, the big issue of climate change.

Finally, regarding the eurozone and EMU: as you know, a particular subject on the agenda for the European Council meeting at the end of June is the banking union. I believe that we need to take the necessary next steps on the banking union. But let me also go back to what was the basic promise of the euro, namely that it was not a redistribution of wealth but that our cooperation makes the cake bigger for everyone. That was the basis of EMU.

I believe that EMU can deliver on this only if all the Member States get their house in order, which means aiming for sound and sustainable budgets and competitive economies through the implementation of structural reforms. When you do this, you will have not one big European mechanism to absorb macroeconomic shocks, but rather mechanisms at national level – 19 shock-absorption funds – and then you will not need additional stabilisation funds at European level.

We also have to remain focused – and this is crucial – on structural reforms. They are essential for competitive and shock-resistant economies, and here, as I said in my speech, already at the moment in the MMF, we are spending hundreds of billions of euros within the eurozone on cohesion funds, on a common agricultural policy and on structural funds. My plea would be that the eurozone countries, together with the Commission, would give much clearer guidance on how to make better use of that already existing money in order to ensure that it fuels and supports structural changes in our national economies, because that would mean we were making better use of the existing money.

The idea of the Commission proposals is to put some extra money in for the eurozone, but here I would say that we already have hundreds of billions of euros on the table and we can make better use of them. So, in terms of EMU reform, the main issue on the agenda at the end of June will be the banking union but also we will no doubt discuss some wider themes, and this will be part of my input to that debate.

Thank you again for hosting me and giving me this opportunity. I thank the whole Parliament for this wonderful initiative and I will tell all my colleagues – six have already been here, I was number seven – that they should all come because it is useful, it is invigorating and it is also great fun. So thank you.

(Applause)

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Rutte, for the timing.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Maria Grapini (S&D), *în scris*. – Sper, domnule prim-ministru, că nici dumneavoastră, nici Consiliul nu vă concentrați pe ultima parte a citatului! V-am ascultat cu atenție și am fost de acord cu o parte din afirmații, dar v-ați contrazis în multe puncte! Ați spus că doriți o Europă mai bună, dar nu doriți să susțineți un buget mai mare pentru coeziune. Ați spus că statele trebuie să lucreze între ele, că înțelegeți valoarea compromisurilor și a intereselor partajate, dar, în același timp, susțineți paradisurile fiscale în țara dumneavoastră și nu susțineți interesele pentru toți cetățenii europeni! Un exemplu elocvent este opoziția sistematică a intrării României și Bulgariei în Schengen, deși de șapte ani îndeplinesc toate condițiile tehnice! Ați spus că UE trebuie să țină seama de poziția parlamentelor naționale, dar în Consiliu țineți cont discreționar de acest lucru, deși spuneți că UE trebuie să-și asculte cetățenii! Toți cetățenii, domnule prim-ministru! Atunci, ascultați și milioanele de români și bulgari, dar și pe cetățenii din alte țări care cer admiterea României și Bulgariei în Schengen! Ați vorbit de unitate, dar adăugați și solidaritate! Ce Uniune poate fi aceea care ignoră coeziunea socială?

András Gyürk (PPE), *írásban*. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr, tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Ez már a sokadik alkalom, amikor összeülünk, hogy az Unió egyik miniszterelnökével közösen megvitassuk Európa jövőjét. Általában szép és nemes elvekről vitatkozunk, de egyre inkább az a benyomásom, hogy folyamatosan szakadunk el a valóságtól. Felülről próbáljuk megmondani az európai polgároknak, hogy milyen is lesz a jövőjük és, hogy mi a fontos az életükben. Úgy gondolom, hogy ez éppen ellentétes a megbízatásunkkal. Mi azért ülünk itt, hogy képviseljük az embereket és nem pedig azért, hogy irányítsuk a gondolkodásukat.

Az Eurobarometer idén áprilisban végzet egy Unió szintű felmérést, amiben többek között azt is megkérdezték, hogy mik azok a témák, amik a legfontosabbak az Unió jövőjét tekintve, miről kéne a közelgő Európai Parlamenti választási kampánynak szólnia. A felmérésben világosan látszik, hogy a három legfontosabb téma, a migráció, a terrorizmus és a munkanélküliség. Úgy gondolom, hogy ezeket a témákat messze nem kezeljük a súlyuknak megfelelően, illetve amikor mégis beszélünk róluk, akkor a legritkábban nyújtunk valós megoldást. Nehezen tudom elképzelni, hogy azok az európai polgárok, akik végigkövetik ezt a vitát, elégedetten dőlnének hátra a székekben, mert megint egy kicsivel nagyobb biztonságban érzik a jövőjüket. Kérem Önöket, hogy beszéljünk valósan és konstruktívan ezekről a témákról, hiszen erről szól a demokrácia.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – V časoch ťažkých otázok a veľkých výziev nám holandský predseda vlády Marko Rutte pripomína dôležitosť Európskeho projektu a prečo sa oplatí zaň bojovať. EÚ je jeden z najúspešnejších projektov našej novodobej histórie, kde spleť odlišných národov, kultúr a jazykov sa snaží hľadať kompromisy a spoločne dosiahnuť ciele, ktoré by sme ako jednotlivci nevedeli uskutočniť. Samozrejme, naša Únia si prechádza náročným obdobím, či už je to odchod Británie, ťažká ekonomická situácia alebo komplexná utečenecká kríza, odpoveď ale určite nie je ľahostajnosť alebo uzavretosť. Súhlasím s Markom Ruttem, že musíme dôslednejšie hľadať, kde EÚ môže napomôcť k zlepšeniu našich životov, a takisto plne oceniť tú hodnotu jednoty v tomto rýchlo meniacom sa svete.

Romana Tomc (PPE), *pisno*. – Prav vsi predsedniki vlad so do zdaj v svojih govorih v Evropskem parlamentu poudarjali pomembnost sodelovanja in zaupanja. Na žalost pa tega sodelovanja in enotnosti ni čutiti.

Ko gre za ključna vprašanja naše prihodnosti, nekateri še vedno vztrajajo pri svojih idejah, čeprav se je pokazalo, da so za ostale nesprejemljive.

Danes smo slišali, da ni potrebe po sprejemanju novih sporazumov, če se niti stari ne izvajajo. Prav je, da gledamo v prihodnost, vendar je v tem trenutku bolj pomembno, da se poenotimo o rešitvah izzivov sedanosti. Varnostna situacija, migrantska kriza, stanje v gospodarstvu, staranje prebivalstva, neenotna in neučinkovita zunanja politika, Brexit so teme, kjer bi morali najti skupni jezik in ukrepati takoj.

Odgovori na ta vprašanja bodo v veliki meri vplivali tudi na to, kakšna bo naša prihodnost. Ne želim si, da bi izgubili zaupanje v demokracijo, vladavino prava in človekove pravice. Prav tako pa si ne želim, da bi izgubili svojo identiteto.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Kiitos puheestanne, pääministeri Rutte. Hienoa, että nostitte esiin Euroopan unionin yhtenäisyyden kansainvälisissä suhteissa ja vapaakaupan tärkeyden. Nämä molemmat ovat maalleni Suomelle ja minulle tärkeitä. Yhtenäistä Eurooppaa tarvitaan tässä maailmanajassa enemmän kuin pitkään aikaan. Euroopan tulevia toimia globaalina johtajana ja ottaa sille kuuluva painoarvo kansainvälisillä kentillä. Euroopan on edistettävä ja puolustettava yhteisiä arvoja: oikeusvaltioperiaatteen toteutumista, demokraattisia arvoja, kansanvaltaa, tasa-arvoa. EU:n toimittava rauhan ja vakauden eteen. Myös kauppapolitiikassa EU:lla on mahdollista ottaa johtajuus käsiinsä. Kun Yhdysvallat on vetäytymässä ja Kiina puolestaan vahvistamassa otettaan, on ehdottoman tärkeää, että Eurooppa maail-

man suurimpana kauppa-alueena näyttää suuntaa maailmankaupassa ja on aktiivinen kauppasopimusten laatimisessa.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD), skriftlig. – Europas framtid avgörs idag. Europa med sina olika kulturer och nationalstater är det vi européer kallar vårt hem, vi har inget annat hem. Om detta hem raderas eller förändras till oigenkännlighet genom att andra kulturella sedvänjor får ta över vart ska då vi, våra barn och barnbarn ta vägen? EU lanserades som en lösning för att stärka Europa genom fred, handel och samarbete. Detta har nu istället utvecklats till ett maskineri som bland annat försöker förmå medlemsländerna att ta emot enorma mängder illegala migranter, framförallt ekonomiska migranter, ofta från världens mest dysfunktionella och våldsamma stater och kulturer. Detta skeende omvandlar i grunden många av Europas länder i sådan rask takt att vi har förlorat kontrollen. Det finns inget utrymme, tid eller incitament för assimilering av dessa grupper och snart inget utrymme för de inhemska europeiska kulturerna. EU måste nu stoppa all migration förutom en begränsad andel kvotflyktingar, samt stoppa all expansion av EU. Detta är vad en majoritet av européerna vill och vad som krävs som ett första steg om vi skall fortsätta att förvalta det gemensamma europeiska kulturarvet samt de specifika nationella europeiska kulturerna och ge välmående, säkra samt demokratiska stater i arv till våra barn och barnbarn.

(The sitting was suspended for a short time)

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

7. Istungi jätkamine

Πρόεδρος. – Θα ήθελα, πριν περάσω σε μερικά διαδικαστικά θέματα, να σας ανακοινώσω ότι πριν από λίγες ώρες ανακοινώθηκε από τους πρωθυπουργούς Αλέξη Τσίπρα και Zoran Zaev στην Αθήνα και στα Σκόπια μια συμφωνία σημαντική όχι μόνο για τις δύο γειτονικές χώρες, αλλά και για ολόκληρη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Ήδη ο Πρόεδρος του Συμβουλίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης κ. Tusk, η Επιτροπή καθώς και ο ΟΗΕ έχουν χαίρεισαι θερμά τη συμφωνία χαρακτηρίζοντάς την «ιστορική» και ως «μεγάλη νίκη της διπλωματίας».

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, εμείς, σταθερά επιδιώξαμε όλα αυτά τα χρόνια μια τέτοια συμφωνία αμοιβαία αποδεκτή και από τις δύο χώρες. Το πιστοποιούν τα δεκάδες ψηφίσματα που έχουμε εγκρίνει με πολύ μεγάλη πλειοψηφία και συναίνεση όλων των πολιτικών ομάδων. Πρόκειται για μια σημαντική, θετική εξέλιξη, για την οποία εμείς στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο εργαζόμαστε εδώ και χρόνια και νομίζω ότι εκφράζω το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο χαίρετιζοντας αυτή τη συμφωνία και εκφράζοντας την ικανοποίησή μας.

Gabriele Zimmer, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich beziehe mich auf Artikel 158 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung des Europäischen Parlaments, in dem es heißt: „Alle Mitglieder haben das Recht, im Parlament die Amtssprache ihrer Wahl zu sprechen. Die Ausführungen in einer der Amtssprachen werden simultan in alle anderen Amtssprachen sowie in jede weitere Sprache, die das Präsidium für erforderlich erachtet, verdolmetscht.“

Um dieses Grundrecht der Abgeordneten zu gewährleisten, um Dienstleistungen in höchster Qualität anbieten zu können, müssen die Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetscher angemessene Arbeitsbedingungen vorfinden. Das Europäische Parlament muss dafür sorgen, dass diese Dienste an der europäischen Demokratie zu guten Bedingungen stattfinden, Beruf und Privatleben gut miteinander zu vereinbaren sind und körperliche und geistige Gesundheit der Bediensteten nicht aufs Spiel gesetzt werden.

Als Linksfraktion der GUE/NGL stehen wir deshalb hinter den Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetschern, die sich gegen die Verschlechterung ihrer Arbeitsbedingungen zur Wehr setzen. Egal, wie schwierig Verhandlungen sind: Am Ende muss es ein Ergebnis geben, das von beiden Seiten getragen werden kann.

(Beifall)

Πρόεδρος. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σημειώνω την παρέμβασή σας, όπως και το χειροκρότημα που τη συνόδευσε. Το θέμα αυτό το έχουμε συζητήσει στο Προεδρείο του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Θα το ξανασυζητήσουμε επιδιώκοντας μια συναινετική λύση.

Patricia Lalonde (ALDE). –Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je voudrais attirer votre attention sur l'assaut qui vient d'être lancé par la coalition dirigée par l'Arabie saoudite à Hodeïda, le principal port du Yémen. Ce port est la principale source d'acheminement de l'aide humanitaire. Nous risquons d'assister à une catastrophe humanitaire sans précédent et ceci sans témoin, puisque les personnels des Nations unies et des principales ONG ont été priés de partir.

L'Europe devrait faire jouer la diplomatie et appuyer les efforts de Martin Griffiths, l'envoyé spécial des Nations unies, pour parvenir à une solution négociée.

David Campbell Bannerman (ECR). –Mr President, under Rule 11(3), I wanted to point out we've had two unelected Commissioners come to this Parliament and insult elected Members of this Parliament, calling them 'extreme'. Under Rule 11(3), you are meant to show mutual respect and not be defamatory. This is a disgrace. We are the elected; they are the unelected. They should show us some respect.

(Applause and cheering from certain quarters)

Μανώλης Κεφαλογιάννης (PPE). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να κάνω μια δήλωση όσον αφορά την επίλυση του θέματος των Σκοπίων. Ποιος δεν θέλει την επίλυση ενός προβλήματος που εκκρεμεί για τριάντα χρόνια; Ασφαλώς και όλοι το επιθυμούμε. Αυτό όμως που πρέπει να γνωρίζει το Κοινοβούλιο είναι ότι πρόκειται για ένα μνημόνιο συνεργασίας, χωρίς καμία κυβερνητική απόφαση από καμία χώρα και ουσιαστικά αναφέρεται σε «μακεδονικό έθνος» και «μακεδονική γλώσσα», κάτι το οποίο πρέπει να διευκρινιστεί και δεν μπορεί να γίνει αποδεκτό από κανένα. Δεν θα λύσουμε το πρόβλημα των Σκοπίων για να δημιουργήσουμε πρόβλημα και διχασμό στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα.

Πρόεδρος. – Αρκετοί συνάδελφοι στην αίθουσα σημειώνουν, όπως και προηγούμενα, ότι το θέμα δεν είναι επί της διαδικασίας.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, βρίσκομαι σε αυτή την αίθουσα τέσσερα ολόκληρα χρόνια και με πολύ μεγάλη υπομονή ακούω όλους τους συναδέλφους όταν ζητάνε τον λόγο. Σας παρακαλώ πολύ να με ακούσετε για τριάντα δευτερόλεπτα μόνο, γιατί για εσάς μπορεί να μην είναι θέμα σοβαρό, για εμάς τους Έλληνες όμως είναι κυρίαρχης σημασίας. Θα πω μόνο δύο λέξεις.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ξεχάσατε να πείτε στην ανακοίνωσή σας για ένα τόσο σοβαρό θέμα που αφορά την ελληνική κοινωνία, τον ελληνικό λαό, ότι η συμφωνία που επετεύχθη, όπως αναφέρατε, είναι κατά παράβαση κάθε κανόνα δημοκρατίας, ακριβώς γιατί το Ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο δεν ενημερώθηκε ούτε και κανένας φορέας τον οποίον θα έπρεπε να ενημερώσετε σοβαρά.

8. Hääletused

Πρόεδρος –Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η Ώρα των ψηφοφοριών.

(Για τα αποτελέσματα και άλλες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις ψηφοφορίες: Βλέπε Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά).

8.1. Euroopa Parlamendi koosseis (A8-0207/2018 - Danuta Maria Hübner, Pedro Silva Pereira) (hääletus)

— Μετά από την ψηφοφορία:

Danuta Maria Hübner, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleagues for their patience. I would just like to thank you for this vote. I think we have just taken one more very important step toward the European elections of 2019. I also believe that we have found a good solution for the composition of the future Parliament that is fair and objective and also respects European law. It has also been agreed by unanimity by the European Council. This decision, I would like to remind you, comes on top of our earlier decisions on setting the dates for the European elections, amending the Regulation on the financing of European parties and also outlining Parliament's position on the Spitzenkandidaten process. I also hope that during our next plenary session, we will finalise our reform of European electoral law, also adopted by unanimity by the Council.

So now the challenge for all of us is to spare no efforts to increase citizens' participation in the elections to the European Parliament and strengthen the ownership of Europe.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). –Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, como correlator não vos tomarei muito tempo, mas quero também assinalar este momento em que o Parlamento toma uma decisão final sobre a sua futura composição.

Quero agradecer a colaboração de todos e, sobretudo, o apoio expressivo ao nosso relatório, porque não é todos os dias em que numa questão sensível é possível formar um consenso tão alargado neste Parlamento e também no Conselho.

E temos boas razões para estarmos satisfeitos: uma representação mais justa dos Estados neste Parlamento, cumprindo o Tratado de Lisboa, um parlamento mais pequeno com 705 lugares e com espaço para futuros alargamentos, e também a garantia de que nenhum Estado perde lugares.

Este é um bom dia para a democracia europeia e para o projeto europeu.

8.2. Maksejõuetusmenetluse määruse lisade ajakohastamine (A8-0174/2018 - Tadeusz Zwiefka) (hääletus)

8.3. ELi ja Islandi leping välispiire ja viisasid puudutavate täiendavate normide kohta aastateks 2014-2020 (A8-0196/2018 - Anders Primdahl Vistisen) (hääletus)

8.4. ELi ja Šveitsi leping välispiire ja viisasid puudutavate täiendavate eeskirjade kohta aastateks 2014-2020 (A8-0195/2018 - Claude Moraes) (hääletus)

8.5. Schengeni infosüsteemiga seotud Schengeni acquis' ülejäänud sätete rakendamine Bulgaaria Vabariigis ja Rumeenias (A8-0192/2018 - Monica Macovei) (hääletus)

8.6. Ühtekuuluvuspoliitika ja ringmajandus (A8-0184/2018 - Davor Škrlec) (hääletus)

8.7. Täiendava makromajandusliku finantsabi andmine Ukrainale (A8-0183/2018 - Jarosław Wałęsa) (hääletus)

— Μετά από την ψηφοφορία επί της αιτιολογικής σκέψης 18:

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). –Mr President, I have an oral amendment: 'the Finance Minister for Ukraine was dismissed on 7 June; the Finance Minister had objected to government payments on the grounds of corruption'.

(Η προφορική τροπολογία δεν κρατείται)

8.8. ELi ja Tšiili assotsieerimislepingu ajakohastamise läbirääkimised (A8-0158/2018 - Charles Tannock) (hääletus)

8.9. ELi ja NATO suhted (A8-0188/2018 - Ioan Mircea Pașcu) (hääletus)

8.10. Küberkaitse (A8-0189/2018 - Urmas Paet) (hääletus)

Πρόεδρος. - Η Ώρα των ψηφοφοριών έληξε.

9. Selgitused hääletuse kohta

Πρόεδρος. –Προχωρούμε τώρα στις αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου. Παρακαλώ όλους να είναι αυστηρά συνεπείς στο 1 λεπτό που διατίθεται σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 183 του Κανονισμού.

9.1. Ühtekuuluvuspoliitika ja ringmajandus (A8-0184/2018 - Davor Škrlec)

Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). –Señor presidente, una verdadera economía circular requiere un cambio sistémico, por lo que deberíamos preguntarnos si es posible una economía circular verdadera dentro de esta política comercial de la Unión Europea y de los tratados de libre comercio. Nosotros creemos que no, porque una economía que cierre los ciclos tiene que estructurarse alrededor, precisamente, de los circuitos cortos, y esta economía debe ser también diversa, ni hiperespecializada ni productivista.

Las economías solidarias, feministas o ecologistas tienen propuestas y prácticas de gran utilidad para este cambio sistémico hacia la economía circular, pero implican también cambios políticos. No hay economía circular sin reparto de la riqueza, sin democratización real.

Hablar de economía circular es hablar de soberanía energética y alimentaria, de equidad social y de la salud de las personas; es hablar de municipalismo transformador; de recuperar los aprendizajes del mundo rural, en el que nada se desperdiciaba; es volver a conectar campo y ciudad; es hablar de consumo de proximidad. Es, en definitiva, hablar de construir entre todas una Europa mucho más habitable.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). –Vprašanje krožnega gospodarstva in pa kohezijske politike je izjemno pomembno, zlasti seveda zato, ker ga je potrebno inkorporirati v pravzaprav celoten cikel tako imenovane kohezijske politike, ki pa mora biti ciljno usmerjena in en od teh pomembnih ciljev tudi krožnega gospodarstva mora biti usmerjen tudi v varovanje okolja, tudi zdravja in pa področja prehrane.

In tu pridemo do enega perečih problemov naše prihodnosti in to je ravnanje z odpadki, ravnanje s plastiko, ki predstavlja eden največjih izzivov, tudi za krožno gospodarstvo in če se tega lotimo z vso resnostjo in tudi z razpoložljivimi viri, ki jih imamo, lahko plastiko kot nevaren vir znižamo zelo močno in to pomeni tudi boljšo prihodnost za hrano, za zdravje in tudi okolje.

Zato je pomembno seveda tudi krožno gospodarstvo in tudi kohezijsko politiko razumeti skozi konkretne cilje.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). –Elnök Úr! A jelentést szavazatommal támogattam, és gratulálok a jelentéstevőnek és mindazon kollégáknak, akik részt vettek ebben az igen fontos munkában. Mi, szocialisták elköteleztünk magunkat a fenntartható és gazdaságos, körkörös gazdasággal kapcsolatban, és ezt Monika Smolková sikeresen képviselte a dosszié kapcsán is. Örülök annak, hogy a kohéziós politika felől is megközelítjük a körforgásos gazdaság kérdését, hisz a pénzügyi ciklus szempontjából egy új politikai prioritásról beszélünk.

A kohézió nem csak a városok és a régiók térségi különbségeit kell hogy csökkentse, nem elfelejtendő, hogy a vidéki térségek markáns részét képezik a kohéziós politikának, így a vidéki települések is. A régiós politikák alatt ismerjük az okos városokat, de az új okos falvak kezdeményezés is igen sok teendőt adnak ennek a politikának a vidékfejlesztési politika mellett.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Polityka spójności jest jednym z najciekawszych i najcenniejszych instrumentów finansowych, jakie posiadamy. Bardzo się cieszę, że został on obroniony. Przede wszystkim dlatego, że jego głównym odbiorcą są samorządy.

Natomiast w tej kwestii, w której dziś głosowaliśmy, muszę powiedzieć, że nie jestem optymistą. Wydaje mi się, że nie nadążamy w żadnym elemencie za masową produkcją rozmaitych opakowań i widać to zwłaszcza w dużych miastach. Wydaje mi się, że ten instrument powinien być opatrzony dodatkowymi elementami, dzięki którym rzeczywiście będziemy mogli poradzić sobie z przyrastającą ilością śmieci. Widać to nie tylko w dużych miastach, ale przede wszystkim na składowiskach odpadów, gdzie selekcja śmieci wypada, krótko mówiąc, nie najciekawiej.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Ja przy tym głosowaniu wstrzymałam się od głosu, ponieważ niektóre zapisy sprawozdania budzą moje wątpliwości. Polski rząd jest zdania, że powinniśmy promować sprawiedliwy dostęp do rynku. Nie możemy więc zgodzić się z przyznaniem przewagi energii odnawialnej w postaci priorytetowej wysyłki. Oznaczałoby to, że nastąpi to kosztem energii produkowanej z węgla, gazu lub kogeneracji, która niestety w Parlamencie Europejskim wciąż jest niedoceniana. Uważam, że jest to sprzeczne z podejściem rynkowym i bezpieczeństwem dostaw naszej sieci. Wyczerpywanie się zasobów, wzrost ich cen i rosnąca zależność od dostawców z krajów trzecich stanowi poważne zagrożenie dla dalszego rozwoju Unii Europejskiej. Wprawdzie popieram transformację w kierunku modelu gospodarki o obiegu zamkniętym, ale uważam, że powinniśmy te działania podejmować bardzo rozważnie, tak by nie zakłóciły bezpieczeństwa energetycznego.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Przegłosowane sprawozdanie o gospodarce o obiegu zamkniętym w ramach polityki spójności, mimo wygłaszanych w trakcie wczorajszej debaty peanów, budzi wiele kontrowersji. Dotyczy recyklingu i to o szerszym niż dotychczas zasięgu. Po pierwsze, jego cele łączą się ze wsparciem finansowym ze środków w ramach polityki spójności, na którą obecnie Komisja Europejska przecież drastycznie zmniejsza środki. Skąd więc wezmą się pieniądze? W sprawozdaniu przewiduje się zwiększenie kosztów produktów bazowych, czyli naturalnych, aby pokryć koszty produktów z recyklingu. W jednym z najważniejszych zapisów zawartych w sprawozdaniu stwierdzono wprost, że projekt ten przynosi większe korzyści regionom bardziej rozwiniętym. Ja pochodzę z Lubelszczyzny, która nie należy do tej kategorii regionów, dlatego nie mogłem poprzeć tego sprawozdania.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). –Jeg tror, at alle grundlæggende synes, der er noget positivt over genbrug og genanvendelse. Det er godt for miljøet, det er godt for sundheden, ja det er godt for den måde, vi indretter vores samfund på. Men som vi kan høre på flere af de talere, der har debatteret her i dag, så går der umiddelbart nemt socialisme i det. Lige pludselig handler det ikke længere om miljø og sundhed og forbrugerbeskyttelse. Så handler det i stedet om, at man skal fordele værdierne i mellem folk. Det handler om at skabe et nyt skattesystem, en ny måde at indrette vores økonomi demokratisk på, som man kalder det. Det har man eksperimenteret med i Østeuropa igennem tiderne. Derfor må jeg sige, at jeg er meget forundret over, at man ikke kan holde sig på sporet og blot sige: Lad os gøre noget godt for miljøet, lad os gøre noget godt for folkesundheden. Al den snak om, at EU skal til at opkræve skatter fra nogle steder og nogle lande og distribuere til andre steder og andre lande og så videre – det er ikke nogen uden for dette hus, der ønsker! Derfor stemmer jeg selvfølgelig nej til denne betænkning.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). –Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu. Považuji ji za velmi kvalitní, protože na rozdíl od některých jiných zpráv obsahuje celou řadu konkrétních opatření, která mohou pomoci v boji za ochranu životního prostředí a v boji za obnovu zdrojů, které využíváme.

Otázka plastů je dnes obrovským ekologickým problémem a je zjevné, že žádná země sama tento problém není schopna vyřešit. Je to přesně podle mého názoru kompetence, kterou má řešit EU, a EU v této oblasti recyklace plastů, oběhového hospodářství má být světovým lídrem.

Jsem proto rád, že tato zpráva prošla, a i do budoucna bychom měli vést velkou debatu o tom, co udělat pro ochranu životního prostředí a jak řešit odpady, plastové odpady, které jsou podle mne dnes obrovskou ekologickou zátěží.

Seán Kelly (PPE). –A Uachtaráin, fáiltím roimh an tuarascáil seo, agus dar ndóigh vótálas ar a son mar tá a lán moltaí an-mhaith ann a dhéanfaidh maitheas dúinn amach anseo.

Mr President, the proposals themselves help to build the foundations of a separate economy at regional and at local level, with an investment potential of EUR 5.5 billion. This policy creates great potential for new forms of employment where it is needed most.

It is important that waste is dealt with at local level. This is for the best insights which are available to local challenges and opportunities while creating local value and sustainable jobs – and indeed, we have plenty of waste to be utilising. As a rapporteur for the Plastics Directive in the Committee on Fisheries, I think our proposal will help to reduce the amount of waste plastics over the years and, indeed, eliminate them. Indeed, also as rapporteur for the Renewable Energy Directive, I think again our proposals to increase sustainable and local energy production will help in this aim.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). –Mr President, I don't know if you're familiar with Orwell's concept of Duckspeak, which he introduces in 1984. He defines it as being able to 'make articulate speech issue from the larynx without involving the higher brain centres at all'. We've heard an awful lot of that in the debate about the circular economy. One after another the hackneyed phrases have been coming out, without thought or consideration: 'protecting the environment', 'social justice', 'building a better Europe' – as though anyone is against building a better Europe or as though anyone is against the environment!

What does this actually mean when we translate it into policy? Politicians have every right to cost externalities. They have every right to regulate final outcomes. If we think that there is environmental damage caused by waste or by pollution, it is absolutely our role to say 'this is the minimum level, now over to you to see how to meet it'. But that isn't what this debate is about. It's all about shovelling public money around as an exercise in a kind of massive collective virtue-signalling to show that we're nicer than the other guy. It's not the economy that circular, it's our ridiculous debates in this Chamber!

John Howarth (S&D). –Mr President, I welcome the report and I welcome the inclusion of the circular economy in cohesion policy post 2020. I was also interested in the debate and the reference by the Commissioner, Mr King, to the need to support the transition of communities reliant on linear economies and extractive economies to the new circumstances of a circular economy. I support that need for transition, but a need for transition requires money. It's a shame that specific budget lines concerning transition funding have not as yet been included in the post-2020 MFF. I, along with my colleagues, will continue pressing for that, because if you want a model of how not to do transition from one economy to another, it exists in the way the United Kingdom got out of producing coal.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). –Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořil tento návrh zprávy, protože pokládám za velmi důležité, aby i kohezní politika reagovala na aktuální výzvy doby. Mimo jiné je to problém oběhového hospodářství a vracení surovin do oběhu.

Tato zpráva naplnila má očekávání i z toho důvodu, že se zabývá konkrétními projekty, které jsou důležité pro předcházení vzniku odpadů, jejich recyklaci, zvyšování energetické účinnosti, snižování spotřeby, opravdu vracení surovin do oběhu tak, aby nebyly jen jednorázově využity.

Jsem velmi rád, že na tato témata reaguje i konkrétní zpráva, která vyzývá města, obce zemědělce v případě bioodpadu ke spolupráci. To si myslím, že je velmi významné, a pro mne je také důležité, že se tímto ukazuje, že kohezní politika není nějaká Popelka, ale je dominantní politikou EU a má návaznost na další inovace a technologie, se kterými přicházíme.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). –Senhor Presidente, votei a favor desta moção por considerar que há uma urgência evidente em promover a economia circular como uma das principais medidas no combate às alterações climáticas.

Acresce que o desperdício de uns pode e deve ser aproveitado como matéria-prima de outros. Há imensos exemplos deste aproveitamento. Neste espírito, entendo que temos de dar incentivos claros aos Estados-Membros e aos poderes regionais e locais para o investimento na bioeconomia e na diminuição dos resíduos através de soluções amigas do ambiente.

Eu penso que este deve ser o percurso que os cidadãos europeus e os Estados-Membros devem trilhar, em uníssono, para o bem-estar, enfim, para termos um planeta mais sustentável e deixarmos aos nossos filhos um mundo melhor do que aquele que nos foi legado.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). –Panie Przewodniczący! W sprawozdaniu ubolewa się nad marnowaniem żywności. 183 kilogramy żywności na osobę rocznie to jest oczywiście godne ubolewania, natomiast chciałem przypomnieć Parlamentowi jego własne regulacje, na przykład nakaz wyładowywania wszystkich złowionych ryb, łącznie z niewymiarowymi, które potem się utylizuje i zabija po prostu, niszczenie upraw, które wynika z kwot narzuconych przez Unię Europejską na produkcję żywności, i ogromną nadprodukcję papieru, która wynika z nadprodukcji regulacji przez ten parlament. Sam ten parlament generuje tyle makulatury co niejedno miasto w Polsce, a produkcja przez niego nadmiernej ilości prawa prowadzi do tego, że wielu innych ludzi również marnuje czas, papier, środki i prąd na to, żeby się z tym zapoznać. Dlatego miarą szczerości byłoby wycofanie się z tych regulacji, a póki co nakazywanie czegoś innym, gdy nie robi się tego samemu... (Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

9.2. Täiendava makromajandusliku finantsabi andmine Ukrainale (A8-0183/2018 - Jarosław Wałęsa)

Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). –Mr President, I visited Kiev and Maidan in 2014 when the revolution was going on. I remember these people in the audience who were standing in front of the stage longing for peace, stability, democracy and the EU. They were longing to decide their own future by themselves and not have it imposed by some bigger players in the region.

Four years later we have to say: yes, we have delivered a bit. The agreement between the EU and Ukraine is in force. We have the mutual assistance, we have the reform that shows considerable progress in the country, and we have the Ukrainian citizens who have been granted visas for short visits to the EU. Some things might be better, of course. We have to help Ukraine get rid of the occupants in eastern Ukraine, in the Crimea. But these agreements and the cooperation have made us both stronger, and I believe that this new macro-assistance in Ukraine will be a further step on that path.

Monica Macovei (ECR). –Domnule președinte, în Ucraina, legea pentru înființarea tribunalului anticorupție a fost adoptată. Acest succes se datorează atitudinii ferme a Băncii Mondiale, a Fondului Monetar Internațional și a Uniunii Europene, care au refuzat să aloce fonduri până la adoptarea acestei legi privind tribunalul anticorupție. De asemenea, trebuie să menționăm eforturile societății civile și ale politicienilor responsabili din Ucraina.

Da, vedem că funcționează condiționalitatea. Prin urmare, Uniunea nu mai trebuie să dea bani până când nu vede rezultate. Astăzi am dat undă verde pentru ca încă un miliard de euro să fie transferați la Kiev. Cer politicienilor de acolo să îi folosească în mod responsabil pentru reforme, pentru oameni și împotriva corupției.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). –Senhor Presidente, nós estamos a falar do quarto programa de assistência à Ucrânia e está bem clara a dimensão da catástrofe que a União Europeia e a NATO provocaram a este país. Por razões geoestratégicas a União Europeia resolveu patrocinar um golpe de estado ilegal que destruiu laços históricos, comerciais e económicos entre a Ucrânia e a Rússia, desorganizando completamente aquela economia e criando uma situação de total dependência face à dita ajuda externa.

Mas pior, esta aventura diplomática prejudicou objetivamente setores importantíssimos da nossa agricultura que ainda hoje estão a pagar a fatura do embargo russo. Nós somos sensíveis à questão da corrupção, mas isto não apaga os atropelos aos direitos democráticos que acontecem todos os dias na Ucrânia e, em particular, a intenção do Governo de ilegalizar o Partido Comunista da Ucrânia.

Nós queremos que a paz e a democracia voltem àquele país, mas isto implica acabar com a ingerência externa e deixar que seja o povo da Ucrânia a decidir do seu futuro.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Zabieram dziś głos przede wszystkim ze względu na nie najwyższą jakość wczorajszej debaty. Z jednej strony pojawiły się naiwne przekonania, że rozwiązania legislacyjne, które podjęto na Ukrainie, rozwiążą problem korupcji. Z drugiej strony były takie oczekiwania, by warunki postawione przez Unię Europejską były tak ściśle pilnowane, pod takim reżimem, aby Ukraina *de facto* środków finansowych i pomocy nie otrzymała.

Odrzucam te skrajności. Trzeba w tej materii wykazać się po pierwsze konsekwencją, po drugie zainteresowaniem, a po trzecie gotowością do udzielania pomocy w warunkach rzeczywiście realnych. Ukraina jest za dużym, za ważnym państwem, aby lekceważyć zadania, jakie jej stawiamy jako Unia Europejska, ale róbmy to z uwzględnieniem warunków, w jakich te zadania są na Ukrainie, a nie we Francji czy w Niemczech, realizowane.

Krótko mówiąc, domagam się przede wszystkim konsekwencji, daleko idącego zainteresowania, pewnej rzetelności, ale też realizmu w stosowaniu określonych instrumentów, przede wszystkim politycznych.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). –Elnök Úr! A jelentést szavazatommal támogattam, és gratulálok a jelentéstevőnek, illetve mindazon kollégáknak, akik részt vettek ebben az igen fontos munkában. Egyetértek az Ukrajnának folyósított makrofinansciális segély további folyósításával, elsősorban azért, mert ez kulcsfontosságú eszköze a háborús nyomás alatt álló, változatlanul gyenge lábakon álló ukrán gazdaság stabilizálásához. Ugyanakkor folyamatosan figyelemmel kell lennünk arra is, hogy az uniós segítség valóban ösztönözzé az ukrán reformfolyamatot, és az ukrán fél maradéktalanul teljesítse ezzel kapcsolatos vállalásait.

Az Európai Unió ukrán parlamenti társulási bizottságának alelnökeként a helyszínről is jól ismerem a korrupció elleni harc ellentmondásait és a reformok lassúsága kapcsán felmerülő számos problémát, és méltányolom az erről itt, az Európai Parlamentben is megfogalmazott aggályokat. Mindemellett a három uniós intézmény közös nyilatkozata az ukrán féllel szemben a kondicionalitás érvényesítéséről és szigorú ellenőrzéséről, valamint az ukrán partnereink folytatódó reformerőfeszítései – így legutóbb a Verhovna Rada régóta várt határozata a magas szintű korrupcióval foglalkozó törvényszék létrehozásáról – megítélésem szerint kellő garanciát nyújtanak az EU által nyújtott makrofinansciális segélyek hatékony és szabályszerű felhasználására.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Opowiadam się za udzielaniem dalszej pomocy makrofinansowej Ukrainie. W związku z kryzysem wywołanym rosyjską agresją na Wschodzie oraz aneksją Krymu taka pomoc jest Ukrainie bardzo potrzebna. Unia Europejska powinna pomagać Ukrainie w przezwyciężaniu słabości gospodarczych oraz zachęcać do jak najszybszego wprowadzenia niezbędnych reform. Popieram rozwiązanie polegające na tym, że nie jest to pomoc bezwarunkowa, a Ukraina musi podjąć konkretne działania w celu otrzymania kolejnej puli pieniędzy. Wsparcie finansowe musi być ukierunkowane i przynosić wymierne efekty. Mam nadzieję, że dzięki temu mechanizmowi zostaną wdrożone uzgodnione wcześniej z Unią Europejską warunki, takie jak reforma zarządzania finansami publicznymi, ograniczenie korupcji czy zniesienie na przykład zakazu eksportu drewna.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατά τη χθεσινή συζήτηση για τη μακροοικονομική χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή στην Ουκρανία, ο κύριος Dombrovskis αναφέρθηκε στο διήθεν «success story» της ουκρανικής οικονομίας. Αυτό που παρέλειψε να αναφέρει είναι ότι η διεθνής κοινότητα, το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προχώρησαν σε αναδιάρθρωση του δημοσίου χρέους της Ουκρανίας. Έτσι είχαμε κούρεμα 20% και αποπληρωμή του υπολοίπου χρέους με ρήτρα ανάπτυξης. Δηλαδή η διεθνής κοινότητα ουσιαστικά δέχθηκε το μοντέλο του 1953 για τη διαγραφή του δημοσίου χρέους της τότε Δυτικής Γερμανίας.

Το ερώτημα είναι: γιατί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο αρνούνται την αναδιάρθρωση του δημοσίου χρέους στην Ελλάδα; Γιατί αρνούνται το κούρεμα του επονειδιστού χρέους το οποίο υπάρχει για την Ελλάδα; Γιατί, αντί για αυτό, επιβάλλουν τέταρτο μνημόνιο με περικοπές των συντάξεων, με υποθήκευση της δημόσιας περιουσίας; Αυτό το ερώτημα πρέπει να μας απαντήσει ο κύριος Dombrovskis.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). –Jeg tror de fleste – sådan har jeg det i hvert fald – har meget vanskeligt ved at gennemskue, hvad det egentlig er, der sker og foregår i Ukraine. Derfor har jeg også valgt og afstå – jeg stemte blankt om denne betænkning. På den ene side er det selvfølgelig rigtig fint, hvis vi kan bidrage til økonomisk stabilisering og strukturreformer, der kan modernisere økonomien, og så videre. På den anden side kan jeg ikke lade være med og sidde tilbage med det spørgsmål: Virker det egentlig? Jeg synes, vi har talt om Ukraine i utrolig lang tid, at vi har brugt ufattelige summer, og det er meget svært at spore, om der egentlig er value for money. Derfor er jeg også glad for, at der er kommet en såkaldt solnedgangsklausul ind i denne betænkning, så man simpelthen insisterer på at få efterprøvet programmerne – om skatteydernes penge bliver brugt på en ordentlig måde, eller om de er spildt. Det er et skridt i den rigtige retning, men stadigvæk ikke nok til at overbevise mig.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). –Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořil toto usnesení. Rozumím kolegům, kteří tu hovoří o tom, že peníze na Ukrajině nejsou vždy využívány efektivně. Rozumím tomu, že korupce je velký problém Ukrajiny. Na druhou stranu jsem přesvědčen, že my musíme geopoliticky Ukrajinu podpořit, tak aby alespoň nějaký funkční režim v této zemi fungoval, protože je to naše geopolitická potřeba, náš zájem vůči Rusku.

Na druhou stranu je třeba, aby peníze, které poskytneme do budoucna, byly mnohem lépe kontrolovány a opravdu byly využívány na podporu rozvoje ukrajinské společnosti, ukrajinského státu. Aby se ty peníze neztratily v kapsách oligarchů.

Takže je geopolitický zájem na podpoře této země, ale na druhou stranu měli bychom najít mechanismy, jak lépe kontrolovat peníze, které půjčujeme.

Monika Smolková (S&D). –Vážení pán předsedající, podporila som uznesenie, aby sme poskytli ďalšiu makrofinančnú pomoc Ukrajine, pretože ako Slovenka, ktorá žije v blízkosti Ukrajiny, si myslím, že obyvatelia Ukrajiny si zaslúžia našu pomoc pri budovaní spravodlivejšej, stabilnejšej a prosperujúcej krajiny.

Ale musím vysloviť aj veľké znepokojenie nad tým, že Komisia pozastavila financovanie modernizačného projektu pre spriechodnenie hraníc s Maďarskom, Rumunskom a Slovenskom v dôsledku veľkého časového sklzu výstavby modernizácie hraničných priechodov bez možnosti iných riešení.

Ak sme umožnili obyvateľom Ukrajiny cestovať do krajín EÚ bez víz s časovým obmedzením, potom musíme nájsť riešenia, ako zabezpečiť, aby hraničné priechody spĺňali aspoň základné normy, pretože dnes sú podmienky na ukrajinsko-slovenskom priechode alarmujúce. Domnievam sa, že práve Komisia má možnosti kontrolovať a usmerniť ukrajinské orgány, aby finančné prostriedky, ktoré dostávajú od Európskej únie, využívali efektívne a v prospech svojich obyvateľov.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). –Senhor Presidente, votei favoravelmente este relatório porque entendo que, além de impulsionar a estabilização econômica e superiores necessidades de financiamento neste biênio, esta assistência macrofinanceira constitui um poderoso incentivo para que a administração ucraniana reforce a sua estrutura institucional de combate ao problema endêmico da corrupção dentro do quadro das recomendações da Comissão de Veneza e, principalmente, porque esta aprovação nesta casa consolida as relações como parceiro estratégico no quadro da parceria oriental e reforça o nosso apoio à sua trajetória europeia num momento crítico, político, de especial fragilidade e quando se tenta relançar o processo da paz.

Entendo ainda que, face às sucessivas e permanentes agressões territoriais à soberania ucraniana por parte da Rússia, esta assistência macrofinanceira servirá ainda como sinal claro de que a União Europeia não aceita este tipo de ingerências e de agressões e que apoia o povo na totalidade, o povo ucraniano.

9.3. ELi ja Tšiili assotsieerimislepingu ajakohastamise läbirääkimised (A8-0158/2018 - Charles Tannock)

Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie, o którym mówimy, na posiedzeniu komisji AFET przeszło stosunkiem głosów 45 do 0. Trudno się dziwić. Chile to jest, powiedziałabym, „kawał dobrej Europy” w Ameryce Południowej. To jest także bardzo ważne państwo członkowskie Unii Narodów Południowoamerykańskich oraz Wspólnoty Państw Ameryki Łacińskiej i Karaibów. Unię Europejską i Chile wiążą nie tylko historia i tradycja, ale również silne więzy społeczne i gospodarcze. Mamy także własne interesy i wspólne cele. Dlatego bardzo ważne jest dokonanie i realizacja projektu zmodernizowania układu o współpracy między Unią Europejską i Chile. Właściwie staje się to oczywistością, co widzimy po głosowaniu w komisji. Dlatego głosowałem za tym sprawozdaniem.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). –Må jeg ikke starte med – til protokollen – at spørge, hvorfor vi skal sidde og kigge på flag fra et territorium, der ligger i Mellemøsten? Der sidder ikke engang nogen medlemmer bag pultene. Kunne de ikke blive fjernet? Jeg troede ikke man på den måde måtte komme med visuelle markeringer her i salen.

Når det så er sagt, så i forhold til frihandel: Denne betænkning er bestemt et skridt i den rigtige retning. I de kommende 10-15 år vil 95 % af verdens vækst ske uden for EU. Derfor er det fuldstændig afgørende, at vi får lavet samhandelsaftaler, både med de vækstende økonomier i Mercosur, men sandelig også med USA og Asien og andre steder på kloden. Vi kan ikke – selvom man nogen gange tror det, når man hører taler her fra mødesalen – bare isolere os i den lille kerne af lande, som nu en gang er EU. Væksten og vejen frem kommer i fremtiden til at ske mange andre steder, end i EU. Derfor er det her et lille skridt i den rigtige retning.

9.4. ELi ja NATO suhted (A8-0188/2018 - Ioan Mircea Paşcu)

Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). –Herr talman! Världen har de senaste åren onekligen blivit mycket osäkrare, oroligare och oförutsägbare. Den ryska aktiviteten i Östersjön ökar, aggressioner mot Georgien och östra Ukraina, Krim, har skett, aggressiva handlingar har noterats mot Moldavien och Armenien och tonläget mot oss i Norden har förändrats totalt.

Förra året sa president Putin att ett svenskt Nato-medlemskap skulle utgöra ett hot mot Ryssland. Vi svenskar förväntas alltså bete oss och välja vår framtid utifrån vad något annat land tycker om det, hur det påverkar något annat land. Det är helt otroligt, det är faktiskt helt otroligt. Utifrån det kan inte de som opponerar sig mot svenskt Nato-medlemskap längre hävda alliansfrihet. Det är omöjligt att vara alliansfritt när Ryssland beter sig som det gör. Vår oroliga värld kräver att vi söker oss till Nato och kräver att vi skaffar oss all säkerhet, som ingen annan garanterar. Vi bör inte ha några illusioner, för illusioner i säkerhetspolitiken betalas väldigt dyrt.

Monica Macovei (ECR). –Domnule preşedinte, un punct esenţial al summitului NATO de luna viitoare este apărarea contra atacurilor cibernetice, care sunt tot mai frecvente. Evenimentele recente arată că atacurile cibernetice fac parte din războiul hibrid, iar NATO trebuie să răspundă eficient şi rapid. În plus, trebuie să fim pregătiţi pentru situaţiile de criză. Infrastructura de transport, drumurile, podurile, căile ferate trebuie modernizate în toate statele membre. Iar barierele birocratice trebuie eliminate, pentru ca fluxul transportului de personal şi echipamente să meargă, nu să fie oprit de birocraţie. Trebuie să colaborăm definitiv şi foarte clar cu NATO în toate aceste aspecte care privesc apărarea noastră.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). –Elnök Úr! Támogatom e fontos jelentés stratégiai megközelítését, mert ez nemcsak átfogó képet ad és őszinte szembenézést szorgalmaz az Európa előtt álló, minőségi és mennyiségi szempontból is rendkívüli biztonsági kihívásokra, hanem az ennek való megfelelés útját is jelzi az Európai Unió számára. A már a közeljövőben egységes döntést és EU-akciót igénylő változások sorából kiemelnek háromat: a hibrid jellegű biztonsági kockázatok, ezen belül a kiberhadviselés megjelenése, ami sürgetővé teszi az EU–NATO szinergiák kihasználását.

Kettő: a brexit nyomán az EU-tagok NATO-n belüli súlyának csökkenése, ami a következő években az Európai Unió stratégiai autonómiájának erősítése mellett a NATO-val való párbeszéd és együttműködés rugalmasabbá és hatékonyabbá tételével kompenzálendő. A folytatódó putyini orosz expanziós politika az a harmadik, ami az Unió közvetlen határán, Ukrajnából és másutt is rendszeresen teszteli a szövetség erejét, miközben minden eszközzel az EU megosztására törekszik, és ebben sajnos némely tagállam vezetőiben partnerre talál. A markánsabb, valóban közös EU...

(Az elnök megvonta a szót).

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Pakt Północnoatlantycki jest gwarantem obrony i bezpieczeństwa nie tylko dla Europy, ale i innych krajów świata. Zdecydowana większość krajów Unii to członkowie NATO. Formułując w sprawozdaniu ambitne cele dotyczące relacji Unii z NATO, nie pomija się wielokrotnie powtarzanego apelu prezydenta Donalda Trumpa, dotyczącego obowiązku przeznaczania 2% PKB na obronność. Wiele krajów Unii się z tego wywiązuje, jak na przykład Polska, ale w tyle pozostają kraje takie jak na przykład Niemcy. Co do tego sprawozdania nasza grupa EKR wyrażała wątpliwości, które nie do końca zostały rozwiane. Jednakże zdecydowaliśmy się głosować za, mocno podkreślając, że NATO jest fundamentem europejskiej obrony i nie należy dublować jego roli.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Debatujemy nie tylko na bardzo ważny temat, ale także w ważnym momencie. Już niedługo, 11 i 12 lipca, odbędzie się kolejny szczyt NATO w Brukseli – pierwszy po szczycie, który miał miejsce dwa lata temu w Polsce, w Warszawie. Minęły tylko dwa lata, a świat się bardzo pod względem bezpieczeństwa zmienił i to zmienił się na gorsze. Dlatego trzeba brać to pod uwagę.

Zagrożenia, które czyhały na pokój w Europie i na świecie, bardzo radykalnie się zmieniają. Mamy teraz do czynienia z działaniami, z zagrożeniami, które nazywamy zagrożeniami hybrydowymi. Mamy do czynienia z niekonwencjonalnymi zagrożeniami. To wszystko powoduje, że powinniśmy się zastanowić, po pierwsze, nad przyszłością NATO, a po drugie – nad przyszłością bezpieczeństwa Europy, Unii Europejskiej. Pamiętajmy, że sześć państw Unii Europejskiej nie należy do NATO, a siedem państw NATO nie należy do Unii Europejskiej. Nastąpiła kompletna zmiana sytuacji politycznej w Stanach Zjednoczonych i w Turcji. To musi wpływać na nasze stanowisko w tej sprawie.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). –Monsieur le Président, j'étais partisan de l'OTAN quand 6 000 chars soviétiques campaient à une nuit de route de nos frontières, quand l'Union soviétique tenait sous la poigne démoniaque du communisme la moitié de l'Europe que les Américains lui avait livrée à Yalta, qu'elle était une puissance menaçante, que le communisme continuait sa progression impitoyable par la subversion ou par la conquête armée en Asie, en Amérique latine.

Mais aujourd'hui, qu'en est-il? Le communisme s'est effondré, l'Union soviétique s'est retirée de l'Europe orientale, d'anciens pays qui faisaient partie de l'Empire tsariste, elle a rendu sa liberté aux Baltes, aux pays du Caucase – même s'il subsiste un problème en Abkhazie –, à la Biélorussie, à l'Ukraine – même s'il subsiste un problème en Crimée.

L'OTAN ne se justifie plus, il est l'instrument de notre soumission stratégique et politique aux États-Unis...

(le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). –Monsieur le Président, êtes-vous aveugle, n'avez-vous pas vu ce qui vient de se jouer au G7? N'avez-vous pas vu le mépris affiché par Donald Trump pour tous ses alliés européens, y compris pour son proche voisin, le Canada? N'avez-vous pas perçu l'isolement des États-Unis? N'avez-vous pas compris que c'est une occasion unique, historique, pour l'Europe d'exister?

Quand Justin Trudeau, dans une réaction de dignité, dit non à Donald Trump, vous, vous nous proposez, dans votre rapport, de continuer à jouer les servants dans l'OTAN et à continuer de dangereuses politiques de tension avec la Russie. C'est désespérant, et c'est pourquoi j'ai voté contre ce rapport; au fond, ceux qui veulent l'Europe de la paix, c'est nous, quand vous, vous voulez l'Europe de la guerre à travers l'OTAN.

Stefano Maullu (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa relazione ripropone un cliché completamente vecchio e sbagliato. Un cliché che vede un atteggiamento revanscista da parte dell'Unione europea nei confronti della Federazione russa. Un atteggiamento che si scontra con quello che è il nuovo ordine mondiale, che fa a pugni in faccia con ciò che gli Stati Uniti stanno proponendo nei confronti dell'Europa, un atteggiamento contraddittorio e aggressivo dal punto di vista commerciale. Soprattutto io credo che non tenga conto dei nuovi equilibri mondiali, non tiene conto nello specifico di ciò che si muove nel Pacifico e di questa specie di isolazionismo che noi rischiamo di avere.

Credo che usare la NATO come schema per riproporre questo atteggiamento russofobico contro la Federazione russa non sia negli interessi dell'Europa, non sia negli interessi che rappresentiamo dei nostri cittadini, non sia neanche nell'interesse di una dimensione strategica che noi dobbiamo avere. Soprattutto io credo che non si possa continuare a non tener conto di ciò che accade nel resto del mondo, in una competizione sempre più ampia, sempre più globale. Ecco perché questa relazione non ha avuto il mio voto.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι σχέσεις Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης–NATO είναι σημαντικές, όπως επίσης και η μελλοντική διεύρυνση των δύο αυτών οργανισμών. Η χθεσινή κατάπυκτη και επαίσχυντη συμφωνία Τσίπρα- Zaev για το Σκοπιανό ανοίγει τον δρόμο στο μόρφωμα των Σκοπίων για ένταξη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και στο NATO. Πρόκειται για μια συμφωνία που ξεπουλά το όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας και της ιστορίας μας, γιατί η Μακεδονία είναι μία και ελληνική.

Δεν υφίσταται καμία δήθεν «Βόρεια Μακεδονία», δήθεν «μακεδονική γλώσσα» και δήθεν «μακεδονική υπηκοότητα». Η συμφωνία Τσίπρα- Zaev βλέπει το ελληνικό εθνικό συμφέρον, αποτελεί μια απαράδεκτη εθνική υποχώρηση στις ανιστόρητες και αλυτρωτικές απαιτήσεις των Σκοπίων. Γιατί η επιτομή του Σκοπιανού αλυτρωτισμού βρίσκεται στο όνομα «Μακεδονία». Ζητάμε δημοψήφισμα για το Σκοπιανό εδώ και τώρα, για να μιλήσει επιτέλους ο ελληνικός λαός που δεν ανέχεται την ταπείνωση! Το ποτάμι των συλλαλητηρίων δεν γυρίζει πίσω! Καμία υποχώρηση στο Σκοπιανό!

John Howarth (S&D). –Mr President, I believe support for today's report is important, and my party has always stood firmly behind the collective defence of Europe. And at this time, which is a dangerous time in our history, I believe that it's important that European nations step up to the plate and contribute that 2% that is essential to our future defence in the face of isolationism in the United States.

We can't have it both ways. We can't on the one hand suggest that we should be relying on the United States and on the other hand suggest that we shouldn't step up to the plate and contribute to our own defence. It is indeed a dangerous collection of forces that we face, and I find it remarkable that we have a very, very strange form of patriotism going on when people are prepared to sit behind the flag of their country and seek to demolish the structures that have defended their country over the last 70 years.

9.5. Küberkaitse (A8-0189/2018 - Urmas Paet)

Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

Monica Macovei (ECR). –Domnule președinte, amenințările cibernetice variază de la atacuri motivate politic și finanțate de state precum Federația Rusă până la forme de terorism. Moscova folosește miliarde de dolari pentru a plăti miile de experți care lansează atacuri asupra sistemelor informatice din statele membre și de peste ocean. Grupările teroriste folosesc spațiul cibernetic, care este o modalitate ieftină și accesibilă pentru recrutări și pentru radicalizare. În spațiul virtual, domeniul militar nu poate fi clar separat de cel civil, iar cei care vor să ne atace profită de ezitățile noastre.

Sunt soluții. Sper ca NATO, la următorul summit de luna viitoare, să găsească și mai multe. Dar noi este clar că avem nevoie ca bazele de date europene și cele internaționale să fie interoperabile, să comunice între ele și să avem o platformă coordonată, pentru ca informațiile să fie transmise și analizate rapid și eficient.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Historycznie jesteśmy przyzwyczajeni do tego, że to ląd, morze, powietrze, od niedawna kosmos są teatrami działań wojennych. W ostatnich latach do tego katalogu na pewno dołączyła cyberprzestrzeń. Sprawa więc bardzo ważna. Pokazują to dowody, które mamy z wielu krajów, i nie tylko dotyczące konfliktów, ale także działań politycznych, także tych, które dotyczą spraw ważnych dla demokracji, jak wybory. Dlatego Europejska Unia Obrony musi bardzo poważnie traktować kwestię cyberprzestrzeni i obrony w tym zakresie, na tej przestrzeni. Do tego Europejska Agencja Obrony czy Agencja Unii Europejskiej do spraw Bezpieczeństwa Sieci i Informacji muszą przygotować określone projekty na rzecz bezpieczeństwa przyszłości Unii Europejskiej, Europy, a więc także świata, dlatego byłem za tym sprawozdaniem.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). –Panie Przewodniczący! Opowiadam się za wzmocnieniem cyberobrony w Unii Europejskiej i za współpracą Unii Europejskiej z NATO. Przypadki cyberataków na infrastrukturę krytyczną, cyberspiegostwo, kampanie dezinformacyjne są absolutnie realnym zagrożeniem. Państwa członkowskie powinny współpracować ze sobą w zakresie cyberbezpieczeństwa zarówno wewnątrz Unii, jak i z NATO. Położenie wyraźnego akcentu na poprawę tejże współpracy między Unią Europejską a NATO w zakresie cybernetycznym, a w szczególności na precyzyjne określenie priorytetów w zakresie komunikacji strategicznej, środków orientacji sytuacyjnej, wymiany informacji niejawnych, powstrzymanie nielegalnej imigracji, usuwania przeszkód utrudniających szybkie i sprawne przemieszczanie personelu wojskowego i zasobów wojskowych w Unii jest bardzo dobrym kierunkiem. Uważam, że wszyscy powinniśmy podejmować działania, żeby wdrażać te rozwiązania.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). –Pane předsedající, já podporuji tuto zprávu, protože téma kyber útoků je v zásadě téma nové. Naše obranné složky dosud na takovéto útoky nebyly připraveny a my musíme s tímto problémem pracovat. Zvláště ze strany Ruska, již to zde zmiňovali někteří moji kolegové, lze do budoucna čekat, že kyber útoky spíše budou narůstat než klesat, a pokud EU na to nebude připravená, pak nás tyto útoky citelně mohou zasáhnout.

Já jsem přesvědčen a již to tu také bylo řečeno, že je nutné v této věci spolupracovat s NATO, pro NATO musí být kyber útoky jednou z klíčových priorit a my bychom v tomto směru měli maximálně s NATO jako naším partnerem koordinovat. NATO by mělo předložit konkrétní plán a konkrétní způsoby, jak na kyber útoky reagovat.

John Howarth (S&D). –Mr President, I am happy to support the report – this very timely report that we have today. During the debate I heard a really rather remarkably daft remark, and it was that nation states have to be given the means and equipment to defend their cyberspace – their cyberspace – something which by definition has no borders. And if we have something that by definition has no borders but is the public space, it is incumbent on cooperation and the economies of scale that we have through the European Union to contribute to that defence.

It's worth remembering that most military analysts regard a massive cyber-attack as the likely prelude to warfare, and it is in fact alternative warfare. Those who seek to exclude the United Kingdom from future security arrangements will in future be seen as what they are – Putin's useful idiots.

10. Hääletuse parandused ja hääletuskavatsused (vt protokoll)

(Η συνεδρίαση διακόπτεται στις 14.06)

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

11. Istungi jätkamine

(Se abre la sesión a las 15.00 horas)

12. Eelmise istungi protokoll kiinnitamine (vt protokoll)

13. Kohtusüsteemi sõltumatus Poolas (arutelu)

El presidente. –El primer punto del orden del día es el debate a partir de las declaraciones del Consejo y de la Comisión sobre la independencia del poder judicial en Polonia (2018/2761(RSP)).

Permítanme que informe a sus señorías, antes de nada, de que no se aplicará a este debate ni el procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye») ni el de la «tarjeta azul».

Monika Panayotova, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, it is not the first time the Council has been asked to intervene in this House on the situation in Poland. This shows again that the protection and promotion of rule of law – including its core element, the independence of the judiciary – is a constant endeavour. It requires unwavering attention and efforts across different policy areas.

Common values, such as human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and human rights, are the cornerstone of the European Union. Each Member State must therefore respect, protect and promote them. The Bulgarian Presidency, and indeed all of us, agree that the protection of the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights in our Union cannot be taken for granted.

The Commission triggered, on 20 December 2017, the procedure foreseen by Article 7(1) of the Treaty on European Union. This procedure is designed to assess if there is a clear risk of serious breach by Poland of the values referred to in Article 2 of the Treaty.

The Council is regularly updated on the outcome of the dialogue between Poland and the European Commission. The dialogue is ongoing, and the final assessment has not yet been presented. The issue is on the agenda of the upcoming General Affairs Council meeting on 26 June. At this stage, I cannot prejudge and draw conclusions as regards the next step.

The Presidency has acted, and will continue to act, as an honest broker considering all circumstances and positions.

Let me conclude by saying that the issues raised in the debate go to the heart of our commitment to this Union. We therefore trust that all sides will act responsibly and constructively to reach an outcome that leaves no doubt about our core values.

Frans Timmermans, *(First Vice-President of the Commission)*. – Mr President, I will have to ask your indulgence because I cannot deliver my message in five minutes, because I want to give Parliament exactly the same information that I have given to Council. So might it take a bit longer, and I do apologise for that.

The last time we discussed the issue was on 12 February, and I thank the Parliament for the wide support for the Commission's actions expressed in the resolution adopted on 1 March. Let me now give you an update on the current situation and developments which took place during the last months.

First, a number of exchanges between the Commission and the Polish authorities took place at different levels. In particular, I travelled to Warsaw on 9 April, where I met the Polish authorities and members of the judiciary. On 3 May, I met with Foreign Minister Czaputowicz in Brussels. This meeting was followed by further technical exchanges on the new amendments by the Polish Parliament. On 16 May, President Juncker met with Prime Minister Morawiecki at the informal Leader's meeting in Sofia.

Now what about the concrete measures taken by the Polish authorities? Three laws were adopted in April amending the law on the Supreme Court, the law on ordinary courts organisation and the law on the National Council for the Judiciary. A fourth law was adopted by the same on 10 May. I welcome the change of the law, which provides now for a uniform retirement age for female and male judges, now fixed at 65. Also, the amendment on the assistant judges goes in the right direction. I also welcome the fact that there has been a willingness on the side of the Polish authorities to amend the laws on a number of other issues.

However, I regret to inform you that, overall, and despite all of these legislative changes, key concerns which the Commission identified in the Reasoned Proposal remain unaddressed. I can summarise the situation as follows. First, despite the new amendments, the discretionary power given to the authorities in charge of deciding on the prolongation of the judicial mandates of Supreme Court judges and of ordinary court judges remains a key concern from the point of view of upholding the principles of the separation of powers and judicial independence. The current judges still have no right to serve their full term as originally established. Judges affected by the lowered retirement age cannot simply notify their intention to continue to adjudicate, together with a health certificate, and continue to work.

The President of the Republic has wide discretion to decide on the prolongation of Supreme Court judges' mandates. There are no specific criteria and there is no judicial review of his decision. Whilst the transfer of the power to decide on the prolongation of ordinary courts judges to the National Council for the Judiciary is a step in the right direction, this is undermined by the politicisation of the National Council for the judiciary. In addition, there is a very wide discretion, and again – sadly – no judicial review.

Second, the risk of creating irreparable damage fully remains. On 3 July, 27 out of 72 Supreme Court judges will face the risk of being forced to retire. As you may know, the current Supreme Court judges were asked to declare their intention to remain in the court by 4 May. 13 judges reacted in one way or another to the new prolongation regime. Some judges submitted a formal declaration requesting prolongation of their mandate, whilst other judges made a general statement that they are fit and ready to continue to occupy their posts without making a formal declaration requesting prolongation, due to the unconstitutionality of such a procedure and its humiliating character. In its opinion, the Supreme Court explicitly stated that the lack of declarations of the other 14 judges cannot be identified with the lack of their will to further adjudicate.

The situation of the First President of the Supreme Court is also very worrying. She is affected by the new lowered retirement age, and her mandate of a six-year term of office would be prematurely terminated two years early, despite the fact that it is the Polish Constitution itself which sets the period of her term of office. A forced retirement of these Supreme Court judges would constitute an irreversible violation of the rule of law. The Commission is at present examining this issue.

Third, the reforms brought forward have only served to underline the crucial role of the new National Council for the Judiciary, yet there has been no corresponding increase in the judicial influence over the election regime of the judges' members of the Council, so it still does not comply with European standards. Also, no remedy is foreseen to address the premature termination of the mandates of the former judges' members established in the Constitution. The politicisation of this body that has occurred undermines its role as an effective safeguard of judicial independence.

Fourth, I would like to recall that the new legislation offers no solution for those judges who have already been concretely affected by the reform measures contested by the Commission. I am referring to the Court Presidents dismissed by the Minister of Justice. I am referring to ordinary court judges already forced to retire by the lowering of the retirement age, including female judges subject to the provisions that are in violation of EU anti-discrimination law – and by the way, now they have announced they will change that: no misunderstanding on that. I am also referring to judges' members of the former National Council for the Judiciary whose constitutional mandate was prematurely terminated.

Fifth, recent changes do not eliminate the broadness of the criteria governing extraordinary appeal. They remain almost the same. In particular, they still refer to social justice, albeit in a different wording. The Venice Commission explicitly criticised such references. Also, the 20-year reach of the extraordinary appeal has not been eliminated, which means that the extraordinary appeal could result in the repeal of final judgments dating back to October 1997. A new condition was introduced, which aims at avoiding the extraordinary appeal resulting in the repeal of judgments infringing international obligations. This condition lacks real impact, as such repeal is nevertheless possible if justified by principles or rights established in the Polish Constitution. This could even justify, for example, the repeal of final judgments by Polish courts applying EU law as interpreted by the case law of the Court of Justice of the EU.

Sixth, also other key issues underlined in the recent proposal and the fourth rule-of-law recommendation have not been addressed. As to the disciplinary regime, new provisions render it in practice highly possible for current Supreme Court judges to participate from the start as judges in the Disciplinary Chamber. The three Constitutional Tribunal judgments of 2016 remained to be published as such, without any additional qualifications about their legality from the legislative or executive powers. They have been published now, but with a disclaimer that they are, and I quote: 'findings delivered in breach of law'. No legislative changes were made to address the concerns expressed in the recent proposal in order to restore the independence and legitimacy of the Constitutional Tribunal.

Sadly, the Commission can only conclude that the four new laws adopted in April and May are not by themselves sufficient to remove the existing concerns and are not sufficient to eliminate the clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law. The measures the Polish authorities have continued to implement over the past six months have already created damage and are continuing to do so. After the Constitutional Tribunal and the National Council for the Judiciary, it is now the Polish Supreme Court which is at risk of coming under political control.

Last week, the Commission therefore asked the Council to organise a formal hearing of Poland in the context of the Article 7(1) TEU procedure. Finding a solution urgently is a matter of common interest for all Member States and all EU institutions. It is the Commission's sincere hope that Poland will now urgently address the key concerns identified by us. In particular, it is indispensable that urgent action be taken by the Polish Government to address the situation of the Supreme Court judges before 3 July, because that is when the decisions about the retirements become final. I will travel to Moscow on Monday to continue the dialogue with the Polish Government in an attempt to find solutions for the issues I've just outlined.

(Interjection from the floor, off mic: 'You said Moscow' and other comments off mic, to which Timmermans reacts by saying: 'That is an incredible mistake – that has never happened to me before. I do apologise. Sir, if you knew anything of my personal history, you would not have made that remark.')

As I said, I will travel to Warsaw on Monday to talk to the Polish government.

You know the Commission is the guardian of the Treaties. That is our role. But we do this in a cooperative sphere. I continue to believe that it is through dialogue that we need to solve these problems. But I also continue to believe that dialogue needs to lead to concrete results so that we can remove the threat to the rule of law and restore the independence of the judiciary.

Janusz Lewandowski, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziś Parlament Europejski, stając w obronie niezawisłego sądownictwa i konstytucji, staje po stronie polskich obywateli, a mój głos niech będzie przestrożą co do losu Polek i Polaków, jeżeli demontaż państwa prawa zostanie doprowadzony do końca. Bo chodzi o instytucje, które są gwarancją wolności, które chronią przed nadużyciami władzy, i jeśli ich brakuje, jest się bezbronnym wobec maszyny państwa. Wiedzą o tym Polki, których dane personalne były spisywane przez policjanta tylko dlatego, że zadały niewygodne pytania któremuś z ministrów. Wie o tym młody człowiek, który nieszczęśliwie pojawił się na trasie kolumny samochodów rządowych, a teraz jest obwiniany o katastrofę rządowej limuzyny. Dowie się o tym każdy, kto wejdzie w spór sądowy z sąsiadem, jeżeli ten sąsiad będzie należał do rządzącej partii. Wiemy także, jakim nieszczęściem może być ingerencja polityczna w system sądownictwa. Przypadek Tomasza Komendy. Ówczesny minister sprawiedliwości, dziś na pomnikach, z góry uznał go za winnego, za zbrodniarza. Szybki proces. Dożywocie. Po osiemnastu latach w więzieniu okazało się, że jest zupełnie niewinną osobą. Na szczęście jest na wolności. Ochrona niezawisłych sądów to jest ochrona zwykłego człowieka. Ale jest coś więcej, bo to także wiarygodność polskiego systemu sądownictwa w europejskiej przestrzeni prawnej, również na wspólnym rynku, gdzie trzeba mieć pewność inwestowania i pozyskiwania inwestycji. A prawda jest znana. Jest zawarta w dokumentach Komisji Weneckiej, Komitetu Praw Człowieka ONZ, we wszystkich ciałach i ekspertyzach, które zachodnia demokracja powołała do tego, żeby stwierdzić stan praworządności w danym kraju. Niestety Trybunał Konstytucyjny jest fasadą niezdolną do oceny konstytucyjności ustaw. Niestety w sądach jest coraz więcej prezesów spolegliwych, a coraz mniej niezawisłych. Niestety Krajowa Rada Sądownictwa powstała z klucza partyjnego. Ale jest ostatni bastion – Sąd Najwyższy. Tylko też już się chwieje, bo rzeczywiście już 3 i 4 lipca może być wymienione 40% składu tego sądu w wyniku wymuszonego przejścia na emeryturę. A jest to organ, który ocenia ważność wyborów, więc jest to egzystencjalny problem polskiej demokracji. Stąd dramatyczne apele o skierowanie skargi do Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości lub chociażby zawieszenie tej ustawy, co pozwoliło na przykład ocalić przed dewastacją jedyną w Europie Puszcę Białowieską. Rozmawiamy o tym w stulecie polskiej niepodległości. Wtedy, po niezwykłym zwycięstwie, które zatrzymało bolszewicką nawałnicę na przedmieściach Warszawy (nazywamy to „cudem nad Wisłą”, rok 1920), marszałek Piłsudski, zwracając się do polskiej młodzieży, powiedział: „My Wam wywalczyliśmy niepodległość ojczyzny, a Wy będziecie w niej żyć, pracować i rządzić. Zapamiętajcie. Jeżeli zwrócić się na Wschód, to minimum o jeden wiek cofniecie się z kulturą i ekonomią. Jeżeli zwrócić się na Zachód, minimum o jeden wiek szybciej Polska będzie się rozwijać”. Więc pozostawił nam w testamencie definicję zdrady polskiej racji stanu. Zdradza polską rację stanu, tak jak kiedyś Targowica, ten, kto chce znowu Polskę cofać na Wschód, kto chce osłabiać więzi z Zachodem, kto chce osłabiać Unię Europejską. Mówienie prawdy nie może być zdradą. Ja się spodziewam fali hejtu, co tylko potwierdzi, że wypowiadam niewygodne prawdy. Obrona konstytucji jest obowiązkiem. Polska potrzebuje dzisiaj patriotyzmu konstytucyjnego, dlatego stając dzisiaj w obronie konstytucji, w obronie niezawisłości sądów, wstajemy i upominamy się o prawa Polek i Polaków.

(Poruszenie na sali)

El presidente. – Señor Lewandowski, perdone que le interrumpa, pero como hay quienes se empeñan esta tarde en interrumpirle... ya les advierto seriamente: respeten los turnos de palabra. No interrumpan.

Janusz Lewandowski, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Stając dzisiaj w obronie sądownictwa i konstytucji, upominamy się o prawa Polek i Polaków, i ich dobrą przyszłość w Unii Europejskiej.

Josef Weidenholzer, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, what I will say is also directed at the people of Poland. Let me be clear. Our political Group appreciates the substantial contribution of the Polish people to restoring democracy in the east of Europe. We see the enormous progress the country has made since. We are also aware that not all aspirations have been met and that many people feel left behind. We understand that some people are angry. We have to be concerned. And if we don't deliver, more and more people will turn their backs against democracy.

The current discussion on and in Poland is about the state of democracy. It is worrying to see the signs from your country. Democracy, which your nation was so admirably fighting for, is in danger. All of us have the right to insist that a Member State is adherent to its constitution. We have to know that our partners are predictable. In Poland, the Constitution is at stake. We are concerned about the independence of the judiciary – a key element of every democracy. We share this concern with relevant authorities such as the Human Rights Committee or the Venice Commission, renowned scholars and friends of Poland around the world.

Our Group was satisfied that the Commission has activated Article 7, and in March, Parliament explicitly welcomed this decision and urged the Council to take swift action. They acknowledged that this action put the Polish government in negotiation mode. But the results are poor and more or less cosmetic.

The recommendations of the Commission have not been fulfilled. The Polish government continued its so-called reform of the judiciary. Almost 40 per cent of the judges will be forced into early retirement, and procedural rules are fundamentally changed. In less than three weeks there could be no independent judiciary in Poland any more. If the measures enter into force as planned, a large number of sitting judges of the Supreme Court will see their tenure unconstitutionally extinguished, including the First President of the Court. In combination with an increase in the number of seats, this means that the government-controlled National Council of the Judiciary will be in a position to appoint a majority of the judges. This could mean the end of checks and balances in your country. We must not accept this. It is against the Polish Constitution and against the Treaties, and it is against the people of Poland, who gave their approval in referendums for this.

The situation is serious and urgent and we are obliged to act now – and not later, when democracy could be already severely damaged. This is not the moment for short-sighted political manoeuvres. After all the experiences with the Council (sorry), we must not expect that the summit at the end of June will deliver any clear results. Therefore, we appeal to the Members of the Commission to fully stand behind its Vice-President Timmermans. The Commission has to take strong action before July. It must refer this case to the Court of Justice. To make it clear, dear colleagues: if we give up Poland, we give up Europe.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie wiceprzewodniczący Komisji! Chciałem zacząć od czegoś innego, ale może zacznę od polemiki z moim kolegą Januszem Lewandowskim. Otóż, to nie jest tak, jak pan mówi – to nie są niewygodne prawdy i też nikt nie będzie pana za te niewygodne prawdy prześladował. Nad hejtem niestety nie panujemy, hejt się zdarza, spotyka każdego z nas. To nie są niewygodne prawdy. Pan, po prostu, z faktów wyolbrzymionych i pojedynczych buduje pewną narrację, która nie ma nic wspólnego z tym krajem, w którym obaj żyjemy.

Co do pana Weidenholzera – jedną rzecz chciałem powiedzieć. Ostatnio odwiedziłem pański piękny kraj i mogę powiedzieć tylko jedno: mogę pana zapewnić, że praworządność w Polsce, podział władzy i to wszystko, o czym mówimy, nie są gorsze niż w pana kraju. Tak że – chociaż doceniam pana troskę – zapewniam pana, że pod tym względem Polska nie różni się bardzo od Austrii.

Natomiast teraz zwracam się do pana przewodniczącego. Otóż w swoich wystąpieniach pod koniec tamtego roku (ja sam przysłuchiwałem się panu w komisji LIBE) wielokrotnie pan ubolewał, że rząd Polski odmawia dialogu z Komisją Europejską, sugerując brak dobrej woli i arogancję po polskiej stronie. Nie była to, moim zdaniem, sprawiedliwa ocena. Ale, jak wszyscy wiemy, rząd polski, po swej rekonstrukcji i zmianie premiera, od początku roku podjął kolejną próbę intensywnego dialogu, dążąc do porozumienia z Komisją i zakończenia tej, naszym zdaniem, nieszczęsnej i niepotrzebnej procedury sprawdzania praworządności w Polsce.

Ale nie tylko – i pan przewodniczący o tym mówił – ponieważ rząd polski wyszedł naprzeciwko wielu postulatów Komisji, nawet jeśli uważał je za niezbyt zasadne, np. były takie postulaty dotyczące różnicy wieku między kobietami i mężczyznami. Parlament polski dokonał w ostatnich czasach znaczących zmian i korekt w przyjętych regulacjach, między innymi osłabiając możliwość wpływu ministra sprawiedliwości na organizację sądów, wzmacniając rolę Krajowej Rady Sądownictwa oraz prezydenta, a nie ministra, publikując zaległe, mające jednak tylko archiwalne znaczenie, werdykty Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, zmieniając przepisy dotyczące asesorów, nakładając dodatkowe warunki na możliwość wniesienia skargi nadzwyczajnej, wyrównując, tak jak chciała Komisja, wiek przechodzenia na emeryturę sędziów obu płci itd. Moglibyśmy pana przemówienie skonstruować zupełnie inaczej, żeby pan mówił o tych osiągniętych kompromisach, a nie o różnicach. Polska zrobiła zatem bardzo wiele, by osiągnąć porozumienie i by uwzględnić zastrzeżenia Komisji.

Niestety, do porozumienia potrzeba dobrej woli i chęci zrozumienia z obu stron. Z przykrością należy stwierdzić, że reprezentowana przez pana Komisja nie chce tej dobrej woli i zrozumienia wykazać.

Sądzi pan zapewne, że kontaktując się z niektórymi środowiskami prawniczymi i opozycją w Polsce, ma w swych działaniach poparcie także polskiego społeczeństwa. Zdaje się, że pan Weidenholzer też tak sądzi, że przemawia w imieniu Polski, a nie tylko w imieniu skrajnie zideologizowanych sił w Polsce i poza nią, np. w tym parlamencie, co słychać w wypowiedziach. Nic bardziej błędnego. Wszystkie dane wskazują na to, że reformy podjęte przez Prawo i Sprawiedliwość mają ogromne poparcie społeczne. W sierpniu 2007 roku w badaniach 81 % Polaków powiedziało, że popiera reformę sądownictwa. Tak że proszę nie powoływać się tutaj na polskie społeczeństwo, na Polaków, jak państwo tu krytykują. Można krytykować szczegóły, ale nie można odrzucać konieczności reform. Polacy wiedzą, że nie chodzi bowiem o naruszenie praworządności, lecz o jej przywrócenie, wiedzą, jak dotąd działały sądy, jaka była ich sprawność oraz jaka była jakość i niezależność ich wyroków.

A teraz zacytuję nie-Polaka. Günter Verheugen, kiedyś komisarz Unii do spraw rozszerzenia, powiedział niedawno w wywiadzie dla jednego z polskich portali: „W moim przekonaniu Komisja Europejska nie ma odpowiednich kompetencji, by zajmować się tą sprawą. (...) Oczywiście, że ma do tego narzędzia i może się nimi posługiwać. Uważam jednak”, przepraszam, panie przewodniczący, to jest zdanie pana Verheugena, „że robi to nieudolnie. Komisarze nie wiedzą, co zrobić. Nie mają też pojęcia, co się stanie”, i to też powinniśmy brać pod uwagę: konsekwencje naszych działań. „Mam”, mówi Verheugen, „dla wszystkich stron sporu jedną prostą radę – załagodźcie ten spór (...) Nie jestem ekspertem w tych sprawach”, mówi dalej, „ale wiem to nie tylko ja”, polscy koledzy oczywiście tego nie wiedzieli, „że polski system sprawiedliwości wymaga reformy, bo nie odpowiada współczesnym standardom. Pytanie jest inne – czy opieramy się na podwójnych standardach, czy na tych samych regułach? W Europie”, mówi Verheugen, „panują podwójne standardy, bo polski rząd nie jest z tych tzw. głównego nurtu”. Koniec cytatu.

A na zakończenie dodał, bardzo charakterystycznie: „Europa żyje w epoce hipokryzji”. Bardzo trafnie, moim zdaniem. Rzeczywiście jest tajemnicą poliszynela to, że jest wiele krajów w Unii, które zasługiwałyby znacznie bardziej, panie przewodniczący, na pańską troskę i uwagę. Mogę panu kiedyś prywatnie o tym opowiedzieć, które by to były kraje. Rozwiązania przyjęte w Polsce są stosowane w innych krajach, jak pan wie. A jeżeli chodzi o wpływ polityczny na sędziów czy trójpodział władzy, to zachęcam kolegów z Parlamentu Europejskiego, by uważniej spojrzeli na swoje kraje, np. kolegów z Niemiec, widzę, że są tutaj obecni, prosiłbym o zwrócenie na to uwagi. Wtedy może i hipokryzji będzie trochę mniej. Trochę mniej hipokryzji na tej sali i trochę mniej hipokryzji w tej debacie.

Inny wybitny europejski polityk, przewodniczący Bundestagu Wolfgang Schäuble, powiedział niedawno: „Obserwując niektóre dyskusje między Brukselą a takimi krajami jak Polska czy Węgry, ale także Czechy i Słowacja, chciałbym poradzić: nie sprawiajmy wrażenia aroganckich. Rozumiem, że kraje Europy Wschodniej mogą czasami mieć wrażenie, że ich argumenty się nie liczą”.

Teraz konkludując: my ze swej strony uczyniliśmy wszystko, co możliwe, by zakończyć ten szkodliwy dla Unii spór. A teraz Polacy w swej znakomitej większości uważają, że czas naszych ustępstw się skończył. Z całym spokojem i stanowczością czekamy więc na ruch Komisji i Rady Europejskiej, gotowi oczywiście nadal informować i tłumaczyć nasze stanowisko.

Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, let me make three general remarks before I go into the issue of the complaint before the European Court of Justice.

First of all – and this has been said here before – we have no fight with the Polish people, because they are Europeans like us. We are all one, and we are just standing up for the principles that we have all signed up to. The interesting thing is that you just said that the eastern countries may have a view. Countries don't have a view. In a democracy, within a country there is pluralism, something that you have difficulty recognising.

My second general remark is that my group fully supports Commissioner Timmermans' efforts to redress the situation in Poland and bring it back into the fold.

My third general remark: you were all shouting when Commissioner Timmermans by accident or by mistake referred to Moscow rather than Warsaw. But isn't there a degree of hypocrisy there? Aren't you also working very closely, for example, with Mr Steve Bannon? This is all on the internet. It's all public knowledge. Mr Steve Bannon is clearly out to undermine the European Union and is also working with Mr Orban, who is one of the biggest supporters of Mr Putin. So this is all one big network. You all have the same agenda. So stop the hypocrisy because this is not about, let's say, the retirement age of judges. What this is about is your party creating an authoritarian regime in Poland, and the Polish people deserve better than that.

(Applause)

Maybe you could have the decency to hear me out just for once. It would be nice. The Treaties allow the Commission to bring a complaint against the reform law before the European Court of Justice – it has already been raised – and we would really urge the Commission to do that soon, before the deadline of 3 July. You have the power and the means to act, and you have the support of the majority of this House.

This is urgent. The new law on the Supreme Court will enter into force on 3 July, in less than three weeks' time. Everybody has already mentioned what the consequences will be. We have to avoid that, because otherwise we get what we saw in Hungary: the situation may have been redressed by Luxembourg, but by then a lot of judges had already been dismissed, and they never came back. That means that, in the end, there is still undue political influence on the judiciary.

Since there are only a few weeks left, we would also urge the Commission to ask the Court of Justice for an interim measure to suspend the law until the case is resolved. So time is almost up, and we would ask the Commission to act now. We would therefore join all the people in Poland – NGOs, political parties, civil society – who have been calling for the Commission to take this step before the European Court of Justice.

Why is this important? I am going to quote the President of the European Court of Justice, who in a speech said, 'Judicial independence is the bedrock of our democracies, be it at national or European level. I would go as far as to say that judicial independence is part of both our common heritage and of our very identity as Europeans'. The effective protection of EU rights requires that the competent national court is isolated from any political pressure, and if it's not, it means that the whole European judicial fabric no longer works and that there are big holes in there.

We have already seen the Celmer case, in which an Irish judge refused to extradite a Polish citizen and did not respond to a European arrest warrant, but this will go further. We are talking about more and more connection, for example, of databases; we are talking about e-evidence; and we are talking about the European evidence warrant. All those instruments will not work – not just in Poland, but in the whole European Union – because, if you remove one part of the chain, then the whole chain will fall. So this is essential.

But I would still like to urge the Commission not to focus only on the judiciary, but also to look at the rights of women and freedom of the media. I am also very concerned about the attempts of the government to exert control over the media. The integrity and independence of the advertising and measurement markets are crucial in this context.

Poland has actually dropped from number 18 to number 58 in the world press index out of 180 countries. That should tell you something. So, all in all – and to finally also respond to your accusation that we are applying double standards, that may or may not be the case – I think it is an argument, Commissioner Timmermans, to quickly come forward with this general mechanism for the rule of law that applies equally in all the Member States so that we can easily rebut the accusation that was just made.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'Union européenne est d'abord et avant tout une union de valeurs, une communauté de valeurs centrée sur l'égalité dignité de chaque personne humaine.

Pour protéger au mieux ces valeurs, nous avons fait le choix d'un régime politique, la démocratie. Une démocratie aujourd'hui remise en cause au cœur même de l'Union. Car la démocratie ne se résume pas au suffrage universel. Encore faut-il que le système électoral permette une représentation juste de la société dans toute sa diversité. Encore faut-il que les citoyennes et les citoyens puissent être librement informés par une presse indépendante. Encore faut-il que tienne le rempart de la séparation des pouvoirs contre tous les abus.

C'est précisément sur ce front que le gouvernement polonais issu des élections de 2015 défie ouvertement nos valeurs communes. Il a pris le contrôle politique du pouvoir judiciaire et s'attaque aujourd'hui à la Cour suprême, la dernière qui restait indépendante.

Nous saluons l'action entreprise par la Commission, qui n'a pas hésité à déclencher la procédure de protection de l'état de droit à l'encontre de la Pologne. Mais nous devons reconnaître qu'à ce jour, les résultats sont maigres et que l'essentiel des mesures incriminées restent en place.

Le gouvernement polonais sait aussi qu'il peut compter sur ses alliés au Conseil, en particulier la Hongrie de M. Orbán. Et Madame Panayotova, la timidité absolue de la Bulgarie pose question: est-ce qu'elle relève de l'embarras ou d'une tacite complicité?

Toujours est-il que le temps presse. Si rien n'est fait, le 3 juillet prochain, une bonne partie des juges de la Cour suprême seront limogés, ouvrant la voie à la désignation par le gouvernement d'une majorité de juges à sa main.

Avec nos amis polonais, Monsieur Timmermans, nous vous avons écrit pour vous demander d'utiliser tous les moyens en votre possession pour empêcher ce fait accompli.

Au nom de toutes les Polonaises et de tous les Polonais attachés à nos valeurs communes, au nom de tous les démocrates, je vous réitère cet appel aujourd'hui: saisissez en urgence la Cour de justice de l'Union.

Au-delà du cas polonais, le pouvoir judiciaire est menacé dans son essence dans plusieurs États de l'Union. Il n'y a pas qu'en Pologne qu'il est l'objet de tentatives de soumission à l'exécutif, et une justice soumise ouvre la voie à tous les abus de pouvoir.

Ailleurs, des coupes budgétaires, brutales ou larvées, paralysent l'appareil judiciaire dans sa mission première, rendre la justice. Est-il encore question de justice lorsque des années s'écoulent entre un crime ou un délit et sa sanction? Est-il encore question de justice lorsque des citoyens ne se tournent plus vers la justice pour des raisons financières?

Enfin, au nom de la lutte antiterroriste, Monsieur Timmermans, il est devenu courant de mettre le pouvoir judiciaire hors-jeu. Alors qu'aucun attentat n'a jamais été commis parce qu'un juge n'aurait pas délivré à temps un mandat, là encore, la porte est ouverte à tous les abus.

Je vous invite, Monsieur le Président, à exercer votre mission de gardien des traités et de nos valeurs fondamentales sans faiblesse ni favoritisme.

Aucun gouvernement – et j'insiste là-dessus – aucun gouvernement n'est a priori suspect – je termine Monsieur le Président –, mais aucun ne peut être a priori épargné par votre surveillance. Ce qui se joue ici est un élément fondamental de nos démocraties et, vous le dites vous-même, la démocratie n'est jamais un acquis irréversible.

Barbara Spinelli, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Parlamento ha approvato a marzo la decisione della Commissione di attivare l'articolo 7, paragrafo 1. Circolano ora voci insistenti secondo cui parte della Commissione, attenta a inquietudini nel Consiglio, sarebbe pronta a sospendere la decisione. Le stesse voci adombrano l'ipotesi di un passaggio del PiS al PPE, una mossa che garantirebbe a Varsavia l'ombrello di cui gode l'Ungheria.

Al Vicepresidente Timmermans, che ringrazio per la sua costanza, domanderei un chiarimento sulle intenzioni della Commissione, specie riguardo ai tempi d'azione. Il rischio, in caso di congelamento, è che l'Unione appaia disarmata di fronte a degenerazioni del *Rule of Law* al suo interno. In tal caso, meglio non attivare affatto l'articolo 7, piuttosto che ammettere così apertamente un'eventuale incapacità di agire.

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, w imieniu grupy EFDD. – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się z dzisiejszej kolejnej debaty o Polsce. Obnaża ona obłudę, hipokryzję, wielokrotnie już dzisiaj wspomnianą, i zakłamanie. Słyszę, że tu gardzi się polską suwerennością i nie szanuje się polskiego państwa i Polaków. Według badań opinii publicznej połowa Polaków źle oceniała działania wymiaru sprawiedliwości. To były czasy, gdy sędziowie na usługach państwa Tuska tropili internautów krytykujących ówczesną władzę. Wtedy, Panie Timmermans, milczał Pan, gdy Polską rządził prounijny układ pod dyktando Brukseli, który przewodnią rolę sowieckiej Rosji zamienił na przewodnią rolę Unii Europejskiej. Martwicie się o demokrację i praworządność, a to w tej izbie bezprawnie ukarano posła, który realizował swoje prawo do wolności wypowiedzi. Możecie się z panem posłem Korwin-Mikkem nie zgadzać, ale okazało się, że to Wy nie respektujecie prawa do wolności wypowiedzi. To w Wielkiej Brytanii uwięziono prawicowego dziennikarza Tommy'ego Robinsona, który relacjonował rozprawy sądowe w sprawie masowych gwałtów, jakich dopuścili się imigranci. Nie będę przedłużał mego przemówienia cytowaniem przykładów. Są one dostatecznie znane wszystkim, co się sprawą Polski w jakikolwiek sposób zajmowali, ale z chwilą kiedy po tylokrotnych debatach nad Polską słyszę żądania, by pozbyła się swej suwerenności, to muszę sobie postawić pytanie, o co właściwie chodzi. Czy o demokrację i praworządność, która w Polsce nie jest zagrożona? Czy o sprawy prestiżowe? Czy też o pozbawienie Polski resztek wolności, której Polska pozbawić się nie da?

Michał Marusik, w imieniu grupy ENF. – Panie Przewodniczący! Ta debata, jak kilka poprzednich podobnych, bardzo niewiele mówi o stanie spraw w Polsce. Natomiast bardzo wymownie i wiele mówi o stanie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Unii Europejskiej. Unia nadal koncentruje się na odbieraniu państwom narodowym kolejnych atrybutów suwerenności. Polacy, zresztą jak wszystkie inne narody, nie muszą wcale mieć najlepszych rządów i najlepszych sądów. Chciałbym, żeby tak było, ale tak być nie musi. Muszą natomiast mieć gwarancję, że nikt im z zewnątrz nie będzie narzucał czegoś, co w demokratycznym głosowaniu odrzucili.

Jak dalece nierówne, jak dalece niesprawiedliwe jest traktowanie Polski pokazał niedawno przypadek krytykowania polskiego Trybunału Konstytucyjnego. Padło tu bardzo wiele krytyk. A przecież przez całe lata nikt nie podniósł, na przykład, sprawy funkcjonowania Trybunału Konstytucyjnego w Wielkiej Brytanii. A tam w ogóle nie ma Trybunału Konstytucyjnego i Wielka Brytania może funkcjonować wedle własnych upodobań, a Polakom się tego prawa nie przyznaje! Co więcej, Wielka Brytania nie ma w ogóle konstytucji i jakoś Unii Europejskiej to nie przeszkadza, i pozwala się Brytyjczykom funkcjonować według własnych upodobań. A Polakom się tego prawa nie przyznaje!

Polacy chcą mieć prawo decydowania o funkcjonowaniu własnej ojczyzny bez ingerencji z zewnątrz. I tego prawa własnego narodu bronię. Krytykowanie Polski w ten sposób, że wspiera się jedne partie przeciwko innym, jest niedopuszczalną i skandaliczną ingerencją w wewnętrzne sprawy Polski. Dlatego też Unia coraz częściej jest postrzegana jako „Unia Antyeuropejska”. Trzeba z tego wyciągnąć wnioski, bo to jest naprawdę nieszczęście. To jest droga w bardzo złym kierunku.

El presidente. – Permítanme decirles que ha habido dos peticiones de palabra, una recientemente, una «tarjeta azul», y, por otra parte, una solicitud de «catch the eye», pero, al principio del debate, habíamos dicho que en este momento no se va a aplicar ni el procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra ni tampoco el de la «tarjeta azul». Lo digo para que sus señorías conozcan las razones por las cuales no se concede la palabra. Esto no conlleva debate alguno.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, on a point of order: it is not a debate, sir, if people aren't allowed to respond or speak. It's a declaration. It's a speaking to camera. And the problem, sir, is if the...

(Interruption shouted from the floor)

Madam, you don't believe in democracy because you're a socialist, madam. Socialists do not, by definition, believe in democracy.

(The President cut off the speaker)

El presidente. – Señoría, siéntese, no, no tiene usted la palabra porque, además, no tiene la razón. Esta es una decisión que toma el Parlamento en su momento y usted no la va a quebrar, como podrá comprender. No va, ni mucho menos a imponer su minoría sobre las decisiones de la mayoría. Se acabó el debate. Continuamos.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). –Panie Przewodniczący! Oczywiście, że Pan ma rację. Nie ma tu żadnej debaty, tylko seria wcześniej przygotowanych odczytów. Ale tu nie ma się co dziwić. Rządząca Unią Europejską lewica ma długą tradycję dyscyplinowania niepokornych narodów. Jak tylko wybory w jakimś kraju jej się nie podobają, jak tylko wyniki demokratycznych wyborów jej się nie podobają, to zawsze próbuje kopnąć w stolik i je podważyć. Po prostu przegraliście w Polsce wybory i pogódźcie się z tym. Przestańcie się w końcu mazać, bo to, co tutaj robicie, jest żałosne.

Ale oczywiście nie tak się umawialiśmy przecież, prawda? Nie o taką demokrację walczyliśmy tutaj, żeby wygrywali nie ci, co mieli wygrać, tak? Więc umowa jest taka, że za każdym razem, kiedy jakieś państwo odchyli się od wyznaczonego z góry kursu, to pozostałe będą nim trzęsły, aż na ten kurs wróci. Bo ci, którzy teraz domagają się interwencji w Polsce, też się boją, że u siebie przegrają wybory, i oczekują, że wtedy wdzięczni koledzy z Platformy u nich będą destabilizować sytuację tak długo, aż wrócą do władzy. To jest układ wzajemnej adoracji, który w tej chwili wyżywa się na naszym kraju. Ja nie jestem zwolennikiem ani jednej partii, ani drugiej. Uważam, że to jeden kit dla nas, czy rządzi PiS, czy rządzi Platforma, ale nie pozwalam na taką ingerencję w sprawy mojego kraju.

Frans Timmermans,*(first Vice-President of the Commission).* – Mr President, part of democracy is letting other people speak when they have the floor.

The Polish people decided to join the European Union. The Polish Government signed the Treaty on European Union, it was ratified by the Polish Parliament, elected by the Polish people, and that Treaty comes with rights and obligations.

(Applause)

One of the obligations in the Treaty on European Union, described in Article 2, is to respect the values of the European Union and fundamental rights. One of these elements is the rule of law, and the rule of law cannot exist if you do not have a separation of powers and an independent judiciary.

(Applause)

This is not an obligation that has been thrust from the outside on the Polish people and Polish nation. This is an obligation that the Polish nation went into with their eyes open after a popular vote – I think there was a referendum, if I'm not mistaken – and this obligation was taken upon the shoulders of the Polish people and Government and they execute that obligation. The fact of the matter is that the Commission is the guardian of the Treaties, and if we believe that there is a problem with Member States executing their obligations, we have to speak up. The world championships will start tomorrow – you cannot play a game of football without a referee to make sure that the rules are applied. If the referee is ignored or doesn't apply the rules, you can no longer play football – the game will not happen – and that is the same with the European Union. We are a rule of law— and treaty-based organisation and we demand respect for the rule of law by all members of that organisation. That is not imposing – that is doing what was agreed and what was voted for, etc.

(Applause)

In that context, the European Commission absolutely does not dispute the right of the Polish Government to reform the judiciary, and there might be very good arguments to reform the judiciary if it is slow, for instance, or if it is not delivering the results people expect from it. But in reforming the judiciary, you still need to respect the independence of the judiciary. If you believe that through putting the judiciary under political control, you can make it a better judiciary, you are wrong and you are violating your own obligations under the EU Treaties, and that is the core element of our discussion with the Polish Government.

Let me be clear: we do not dispute the right of the Polish Government to reform its judiciary, but in doing so, it should not infringe upon the independence of the courts, upon the independence of the judiciary. I put before you today our very concrete concerns. I've been very specific – that is why it took me some time, and that is probably also why I made that mistake. But when we do this, we do this in good faith. We want to have this dialogue – that is why I am travelling on Monday to Warsaw. That is, in my opinion, very important because I hope we can find a solution. It is true what you have said, sir, that with the new prime minister, a new era started – because this prime minister is willing to at least talk to us and discuss with us and look for ways out. But where I do not agree with you, sir – this is not horse trading. We are not talking about 'you give a bit here' and then 'you give a bit there' – we're talking about the independence of the judiciary and the rule of law, and the Commission is just trying to maintain standards and wants to help Poland avoid a systemic risk to the rule of law. That is our duty, I am bound to that duty, I will do my utmost, and – frankly – I have been trying for two and half years. You can't fault the Commission for not trying to find a way out through dialogue. I've listened very carefully to Parliament today, I've taken careful note of your remarks, I will also inform the Prime Minister when I see him on Monday of your remarks, and I hope we can then find a solution together, but if we cannot find a solution, the Commission will have to stand firm on these issues.

Once again, it is not an imposition from the outside – it's just holding a Member State to the agreement they entered into in freedom and ratified in freedom in their Parliament. *Pacta sunt servanda* – this applies to all of us.

(Applause)

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me assure you once again that the Presidency and the Council as a whole attach great importance to upholding the rule of law and the separation of powers. They are at the heart of our principles and values. We believe that the dialogue should continue and we very much hope for a positive outcome.

As I mentioned during my intervention, the issue will be on the agenda of the General Affairs Council on 26 June. I am not in a position to state more at this stage, because I speak as Presidency of the Council and therefore in the name of all its Member States. The Council will continue to follow this debate closely, and personally I can assure you that I paid particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate.

El presidente. –Se cierra el debate.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR), *na piśmie*. – W dzisiejszych wypowiedziach parlamentarnych (Lewandowski, Verhofstadt) padały oskarżenia o rzekome związki Prawa i Sprawiedliwości z kremlowską Rosją. To kuriozalne. W pierwszym przypadku mamy do czynienia z byłym komisarzem UE, który aktywnie zaangażował się w 2011 r. w kampanię bliskiego mu obozu władzy w Polsce, w wielu aspektach blisko związanego z polityką Kremla. W pierwszych dniach rządów Platformy Obywatelskiej w 2007 r. nastąpił zwrot w polityce wobec Rosji, zniesienie uzasadnionego polskiego weta wobec umowy UE-Rosja, zawarcie niekorzystnej umowy z Gazpromem, dalsze pogłębienie relacji po katastrofie smoleńskiej prowadzące do zawarcia międzypaństwowej umowy z FSB, a także wizyta polskiej Państwowej Komisji Wyborczej w Moskwie w maju 2013 r. na konsultacje z rosyjską komisją wyborczą.

G. Verhofstadt ma swoją osobną historię współpracy z Kremlm, do której w pełni odniosę się w innym czasie. Chcę jednak stwierdzić wyraźnie, odpowiadając obydwu Panom: Moje poglądy na działania Kremla są znane, nie meandrują, jak w przypadku obydwu Panów. Jestem ujęta na czarnej liście Putina. Jestem współpracownicą obrażanego przez Lewandowskiego śp. prezydenta Lecha Kaczyńskiego i prezesa Jarosława Kaczyńskiego, w którego rządzie byłam ministrem. Nie życzę sobie obrażania ze strony osób, które powinny milczeć, wstydząc się swojego stosunku do Rosji z przeszłości. W tym kontekście anons Timmermansa o wyjeździe do Moskwy brzmi szczególnie ironicznie.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), írásban. – Az Európai Bizottság és az Unió demokratikus kormányzatai számára világossá kellett válnon: az „orbáni minta” fertőző. Ez nemcsak a hatalom visszaélészerű használatában, és az antidemokratikus reformokban mutatkozik meg, hanem a kommunikáció szintjén is. Lengyelországban a populista Jog és Igazságosság Párt hatalomra kerülésekor jogi adminisztratív eszközökkel vette át a hatalmat az Alkotmánybíróság fölött. Meglépték ezt alkotmányozó többség híján is. Ez volt a kulcs további reformjaik sikerére. Majd elkezdtek szisztematikusan átvenni a hatalmat a médiában. 2017-ben pedig bírák nyugdíjazásával és egyéb jogi eszközökkel elkezdték az igazságszolgáltatás feletti hatalmat átvenni. Ne felejtjük el, hogy Magyarországon pont ilyen módszerekkel távolították el Baka Andrást a Legfelső Bíróság éléről, minden következmény nélkül.

Az első uniós hetes cikkely szerinti eljárás megindítása kicsit megtorpantotta a lengyel kormányt, de alapvetően nem tántorította el őket: Orbán mintáját követve kommunikációs trükkökkel és néhány álmódosítással próbálják az időt húzni. Ez azonban mind szemfényvesztés. Mialatt az EU a módosításokat emésztgeti és tárgyal a kormánnyal, addig egy sor új bírót választanak meg és rúgnak ki. Az Európai Bizottságnak, és a demokratikusan működő kormányoknak rá kell ébredniük, hogy a jogállamiság fokozatos csorbítási kísérletei és a tétlenség együtt halálos kombináció a demokratikus értékekre, s a Bizottságnak mielőbb Bírósághoz kell fordulnia és kérnie a lengyel intézkedések felfüggesztését, mielőtt jövőhatékony dolog történik.

Kati Piri (S&D), schriftelijk. – Ondanks het besluit van de Europese Commissie om artikel 7 in werking te laten treden tegen Polen, is de situatie met betrekking tot de rechtsstaat nog altijd zeer zorgwekkend. Als het namelijk aan de Poolse regering ligt, gaat in juli een wet van kracht waardoor tientallen rechters van het hoogerechtshof zomaar vervangen kunnen worden. Er is daarom niet veel tijd meer om te praten. De Europese Commissie en de Europese regeringen moeten nu daadkracht tonen om te voorkomen dat dergelijke ondemocratische maatregelen genomen worden door een lidstaat van de EU.

De Europese Commissie moet er geen politiek steekspel van maken, maar moet het bij de feiten laten en juridisch ingrijpen door middel van inbreukprocedures voor het Europees Hof van Justitie. Hoe dan ook, alle middelen moeten worden ingezet om het massaontslag aan het Pools hoogerechtshof te stoppen, aangezien het zeer moeilijk zal zijn om deze maatregel terug te draaien in de toekomst.

De justitiële systemen in Europa zijn zozeer met elkaar verbonden dat één zwakke schakel het hele systeem kan doen wankelen. Daarom is het niet alleen in het belang van de Polen dat deze maatregelen worden tegengehouden, maar van alle Europeanen die moeten kunnen vertrouwen op een eerlijk justitieapparaat.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

14. Humanitaarhădaolukorrad Vahemerel ja ELi liikmesriikide solidaarsus (arutelu)

Presidente. –L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulle emergenze umanitarie nel Mediterraneo e la solidarietà all'interno dell'Unione europea (2018/2768(RSP)).

Onorevoli colleghi, questo dibattito capita in un momento particolarmente complicato. L'emergenza immigrazione richiede una reazione immediata da parte dell'Unione europea. Il problema non può essere risolto a livello nazionale, né può essere risolto da polemiche tra Stati membri. Polemiche, contrasti e confronti rischiano soltanto di allontanare la soluzione del problema.

Se noi guardiamo a ciò che accadrà nei prossimi anni, non possiamo non decidere in tempi rapidissimi il da farsi. Nel 2050 ci saranno due miliardi e mezzo di africani. Se non interverremo sul cambio climatico, contro il terrorismo, contro la povertà, contro la siccità, contro la carestia e contro la povertà in favore della pace, avremo migrazioni bibliche. Non ci saranno migliaia di persone che si sposteranno dall'Africa, ci saranno milioni di persone che si sposteranno dall'Africa. E noi continuiamo a perdere tempo, gli Stati membri continuano a discutere fra di loro senza trovare una soluzione.

Il Parlamento europeo, che rappresenta mezzo miliardo di cittadini europei, ha approvato una riforma delle regole di Dublino che può essere un'ottima base di confronto tra gli Stati membri, perché noi non abbiamo adottato una scelta debole, ma abbiamo coniugato fermezza e solidarietà. Quindi è una scelta positiva. Siamo disposti a compromessi e a trovare accordi, ma il prossimo Consiglio europeo non potrà rimanere senza decisioni, perché ne va dell'intero assetto dell'Unione europea. Qui non è in ballo il problema «immigrazione sì, immigrazione no, che tipo di immigrazione», è in ballo la sopravvivenza dell'intera Unione europea.

Dobbiamo essere molto chiari: gli Stati da soli non riescono a risolvere il problema. Quindi serve una strategia a breve, a medio e a lungo termine. Io credo che a breve sia quello di bloccare i flussi migratori, a medio dare vita ad uno Stato libico che possa essere un interlocutore dell'Europa e, a lungo termine, una strategia che dovrà essere parte importante anche del prossimo bilancio pluriennale dell'Unione europea per più investimenti nel continente africano.

Il Parlamento europeo non rinuncerà a giocare un ruolo da protagonista. Abbiamo lavorato intensamente – io ringrazio tutti i gruppi politici –, ci sono delle proposte concrete e pretendiamo che queste proposte siano esaminate dagli Stati membri.

Lunedì della prossima settimana saremo a Vienna per incontrare la prossima Presidenza austriaca. È mia intenzione far valere con il Primo ministro Kurz le posizioni del Parlamento europeo e ribadire questa posizione di fronte al Consiglio quando prenderò la parola. È mia intenzione andare in Niger per portare un messaggio positivo in quella parte di Africa sulle intenzioni dell'Europa. Se mi sarà autorizzato, andrò anche in Libia per dare seguito alla missione che c'è stata del Parlamento europeo e al documento approvato dal Parlamento europeo. Nessuno può dire che questo Parlamento non sia stato all'avanguardia nel tentativo di risolvere il problema dell'immigrazione, ma non possiamo rinunciare a risolvere il problema.

Ecco perché io chiedo fermamente alla Commissione e al Consiglio di agire. Le polemiche fra Stati – chi è più duro, chi è più responsabile – non servono a nulla. Sono soltanto piccole beghe che non contribuiscono a risolvere un problema storico, che crea grande allarme sociale e che rischia veramente di provocare effetti nefasti sull'intera Unione europea.

Ecco perché, signor Commissario, signora rappresentante del Consiglio, vi chiedo di prendere con grande serietà la richiesta che parte da questo Parlamento. Noi non intendiamo rimanere in silenzio, non intendiamo fare il ruolo del passacarte, intendiamo essere protagonisti nella soluzione di un problema storico per l'Unione europea.

Ora ascoltiamo le parole, a nome del Consiglio, della signora Monika Panayotova.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, over the past few days we have watched with great concern the developments in the central Mediterranean Sea and yesterday I heard your concerns on the situation. From a humanitarian point of view, it is extremely disconcerting to see the same scene repeated again and again in which hundreds of persons risk their lives in flimsy rubber boats setting out from the Libyan shores.

For many years Italy has received all migrants, regardless of where they were rescued, whether on the high seas or in the search-and-rescue zone of any neighbouring state. We should recognise the significant contribution by Italy, but Italy was not left alone. The EU has assisted Italy in terms of setting up the Frontex Joint Operation Triton, now Operation Themis, as well as Operation Sophia and a long list of measures to address the flow of migrants coming through North Africa. I refer here notably to the Malta Declaration of 3 February 2017, the implementation of which is ongoing and which was supplemented by the Commission Action Plan of 4 July last year.

Italy has been very active in implementation on the ground, whilst Member States have contributed with funding for projects under the EU Trust Fund for Africa and by seconding experts to the EU agencies engaged in the maritime operational 'hotspots' and other migration-related activities in Italy.

Our intensive efforts are reflected in the number of arrivals, which has decreased significantly. By 8 June this year the number of arrivals in Italy had gone down by 77% compared to the same period last year. However, the number of fatalities has not decreased to the same extent. This fact is a stark reminder of the desperation of migrants and the lack of opportunities they face in their countries of origin. Our strategy aims to address the root causes of migration by providing economic and social opportunities in the countries of transit and origin. I believe this is the right strategy.

Apart from existing instruments to that effect – namely the European Union Trust Fund, the Partnership Framework, the Valletta Action Plan and EU Member States' development assistance – more facilities have been developed such as the recently launched European Fund for Sustainable Development, which supports investment in Africa and in neighbourhood countries. The implementation of the European Investment Bank Economic Resilience Initiative is also very welcome.

In the short to medium term, we should continue and intensify all the measures we have already undertaken in Libya and neighbouring countries. I can name some here but there is a whole range of initiatives: equipment and capacity building to enhance border management; the establishment of platforms to combat human smuggling networks; and support for international organisations to improve the horrific conditions in detention centres in Libya and promote voluntary return.

We should also keep sustained pressure on the Libyan authorities and partners in the African Union to take a stance against the criminal activities that thrive in Libya and in the region, human smuggling and human trafficking of which migrants are so often victims. Our cooperation with the UN and the African Union has been very fruitful. Voluntary return of migrants from Libya was accelerated because of political engagement by African leaders and efficient ground-work by UN organisations.

We need more of this kind of engagement from the region itself. The European Union cannot and should not do this alone. The fate of migrants in the Mediterranean Sea, even though we are fully engaged at our level, is not solely an EU responsibility.

Coming back to the actual situation in the Mediterranean Sea, I believe that the different positions expressed by some Member States will need to be addressed in the Council. We need to find a solution that matches our common European values. We in the Council, in collaboration with all our partners, in particular Italy and the Commission, are pursuing this objective with vigilance.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Membro della Commissione*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli deputati, volevo prima di tutto segnalare che sono d'accordo con Lei. Voglio anche ringraziare Lei e anche i gruppi politici di questo Parlamento per il loro sostegno. Il lavoro di questo Parlamento è importante per finire la riforma di Dublino in modo giusto ed efficiente per tutti gli Stati membri.

La Commissione e il Parlamento lavorano insieme mano nella mano come sempre.

— Mr President, the events of the last few days concerning the Aquarius boat remind us of the gravity of the migratory challenge in the central Mediterranean and of its humanitarian implications.

We cannot turn our eyes away from what is happening, even after three years of progress in managing flows. We cannot afford to become complacent. What matters most is that people in a desperate situation were saved and helped. That is what counts – ultimately and always. I want to be clear on that. I will not enter into any blame game today. Everybody needs to take up their responsibilities and play their role in solidarity. In the case of the Aquarius boat, I welcome that a solution was found and I commend the decision of the Government of Spain. I would also like to commend Italy and many other Member States that are upholding our values and taking up their share of European responsibility for many years now. Just remember where we were three years ago and where we are today.

We should not lose sight of the efforts these Member States have made in the past and continue to make. Indeed, while the Aquarius will disembark in Spain, more than 900 people were embarked this morning in Catania, Italy. So Italy is continuing to take up its responsibilities. Our central objective is – and I think we all agree on this – to avoid people fleeing from poverty, persecution or violence in the first place, putting their lives at risk by embarking on perilous journeys. It puts people's lives at risk. It creates tensions within our societies, as shown by the strong reactions on social media.

To this end, our action is much more effective if it starts before they embark on these journeys on the other side of the Mediterranean. On this we have already achieved results, and we have to continue strengthening our cooperation with countries of origin and transit in order to address root causes of migration and avoid people falling into the hands of smugglers' networks.

Let me give you a few examples. Thanks to our good cooperation with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), we have helped more than 25 000 migrants to leave Libya and voluntarily return to their countries of origin, and we have supported the evacuation of 1 474 migrants in need of international protection from Libya to other countries, including Niger, in view of their resettlement as refugees. Resettlement should be the normal way to Europe for those who need protection.

Finally, we continue to train the staff of the Libyan coast guard in order to enhance its capacity to carry out search-and-rescue operations at sea, which has so far resulted in 16 000 migrants rescued. We are strengthening our monitoring after training in order to ensure full respect of human rights. We also financially support Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia so that they can better control their borders and fight smugglers' networks. Protecting the external borders is essential on both sides of the Mediterranean. Protecting our European external borders is and will remain among our top priorities. We have made significant progress since the establishment of the European Borders and Coast Guard, but we need to continue. We proposed yesterday to almost triple funding for migration and border management to EUR 34.9 billion for the period between 2021 and 2027, compared with EUR 13 billion in the previous period. This comprehensive approach delivers results.

The peak of arrivals over the past few days should not overshadow the progress that we have achieved in significantly reducing the migratory pressures in Italy. This year, arrivals to Italy have dropped by 78% compared with last year. So far, 13 000 have arrived this year, compared with 90 000 last year. But when migrants engage in dangerous, perilous journeys in the Mediterranean, our humanitarian imperative to help people in distress should come first.

To truly prevent that situations such as what happened with the Aquarius, we cannot be satisfied with ad hoc solidarity. We need a comprehensive approach and rules to ensure that the responsibility of assisting migrants does not fall on the shoulders of just a few Member States. The Commission has used – and will continue to facilitate – an open and frank dialogue and it will continue to find durable solutions based on solidarity and responsibility. Migration is definitely not a challenge for one or a handful of Member States, but for the European Union as a whole and all its Member States.

Our migration policy can only succeed if we work together in a spirit of solidarity and sincere cooperation and, most importantly, with trust. It will not succeed if each country proceeds with unilateral and uncoordinated initiatives or feels authorised to only look at its own national situation and interests. We are therefore looking forward to continuing to work closely with Italy and the new Italian Government so that we can continue to manage migration flows on the central Mediterranean route. But as I said before, this is not just an Italian issue – we expect all the Member States to join forces in sharing the solidarity and responsibility and addressing this truly common challenge. This is the essence of all our efforts, whether it is saving lives in the Mediterranean or better protecting our shared external borders or coming to an agreement on any formal common European asylum system as part of the comprehensive approach on managing migration better.

Only united will we stand. It is very important for us to understand that it is part of the legacy of this Parliament and of this Commission for the years to come because migration will be with us for many, many decades ahead. We have to be better prepared, more united and resolved to provide solutions, always having as a priority how to save lives and protect those who are in genuine need of protection.

(Applause)

Roberta Metsola, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, it is difficult not to be angry when we find ourselves in another summer, facing a situation that we warned would come. It is difficult not to be angry when we know that we can introduce laws on plastics and on litter, we can end roaming, we can even reform agriculture, but when it comes to migration, prime ministers remain stuck.

Our message to the Council must be clear: leave no space for more raised fists and banging on tables, no more victorious hashtags, no more children born on the high seas, no more lives used to prop up the wannabe strongmen of Europe. Things must change. Now, in the immediate term, we must reform our Dublin system to one that balances responsibility with solidarity. We need to ensure that our borders are secure and our coast guards have all the resources they need. We must break – as has just been said – traffickers' models. We must draw distinctions between those in need of protection and those seeking work. Those who need protection must be given it, but equally, those who do not must be returned quickly.

On migration and borders, the budget has been tripled. This is welcome, but in the medium term, we need to think outside the box and look seriously into having EU-run disembarkation locations in safe third countries, with EU standards, where anyone saved from the dark sea can be disembarked immediately, rescued, vetted, processed in full recognition of their rights – by EASO, for example – and either returned or resettled. We have the money to do it and we must find the will to do it. In the longer term, we must move from aid for Africa to investment which creates jobs and creates hope and allows for education and entrepreneurship to flourish.

Let's create a Union where Italy, Malta, Spain and Greece do not feel left alone to manage this; a system where desperate people in need of protection have a real chance, where children grow up to a future without fear. That is the Europe I want to see and that is the world I want my children to find.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, usted recordará bien que antes de que el señor Salvini utilizara el sufrimiento humano para ganar algunos votos, el Gobierno del señor Renzi ya pidió socorro por la gestión de la migración. Italia pidió ayuda y nadie le dio ayuda a Italia. Esa es la verdad.

Grecia está recibiendo un gran número de migrantes. España está recibiendo un gran número de migrantes. Y los Estados miembros no pueden abandonar a Italia, a España, a Malta y a Grecia en la gestión de la migración, que debe ser común. Y debe serlo, primero, porque no se puede dejar a la gente sufrir de esta manera y porque, además, dejarles sufrir solamente alimenta la peor gasolina, incendia el populismo, la xenofobia y el racismo. Y porque la solución es europea y lo sabemos. Todo el tiempo que el Consejo está perdiendo, lo estamos perdiendo todos, todos los que aquí nos sentamos con una cierta dosis de responsabilidad.

La acción del Gobierno español, que es una acción inteligente, solidaria, humana y, por cierto, legal, no como la del señor Salvini. Esa acción tiene que servir de revulsivo para que el Consejo reaccione. ¡Reaccionen ustedes! Se lo ha dicho el presidente, se lo han dicho mis colegas. Aprueben de una vez por todas, como mínimo, el paquete de Dublín, escuchen a este Parlamento, resuelvan una situación que solamente está dando beneficios a aquellos que están en contra del proyecto europeo.

Estamos dejando sufrir a la gente. No estamos resolviendo el problema de la migración y estamos alimentando a los antieuropeos, xenófobos y racistas. Ese es el resultado, luego algo ustedes tienen que mover.

Raffaele Fitto, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho ascoltato con molta attenzione la relazione della rappresentante del Consiglio e del Commissario e devo dire che il mio convincimento è aumentato rispetto a tre punti fondamentali che sono evidenziati dopo gli episodi di queste ore.

Il primo è il tema della grande incapacità di affrontare in via definitiva e strutturale questo problema. Abbiamo ascoltato un elenco di tante misure, abbiamo anche ascoltato la moltiplicazione delle risorse, ma non abbiamo ascoltato e continuiamo a non ascoltare una sola parola rispetto alla volontà di ridistribuire la grande massa di flusso migratorio che arriva in pochi paesi.

Questo è il nodo di fronte al quale noi ci troviamo e fino a quando i paesi europei non entrano nell'ottica di idee che su questo terreno si deve affrontare e dare una risposta chiara, il rischio è quello collegato alla grande ipocrisia, la polemica di queste ore, che sinceramente è imbarazzante. Ascoltare da paesi che hanno schierato ai propri confini i soldati per evitare che potessero entrare donne e bambini una polemica nei confronti di altri paesi è sinceramente inopportuno e totalmente sbagliato.

Questo ci porta alla terza considerazione, che è un paradosso. Ascolto tanti discorsi contro i partiti antisistema in quest'Aula e non ci si rende conto che le istituzioni europee hanno avuto e stanno avendo la capacità di creare le condizioni per far crescere dei partiti antisistema in tutti i paesi, pur avendo loro delle posizioni di totale contrapposizione. Infatti, cresce chi chiede e ha un atteggiamento duro nei confronti degli immigrati, per poter avere la solidarietà della redistribuzione, e cresce chi, paradossalmente, contemporaneamente chiude i propri confini, avendo lo stesso analogo atteggiamento.

Io penso che l'Europa oggi si trovi di fronte ad un rischio evidente. Non è più in discussione l'opportunità di questo o di quello Stato, è in discussione la possibilità che l'Europa abbia un futuro. E la partita dell'immigrazione vale molto di più delle partite economiche, sociali ed istituzionali. Io mi auguro che ci si renda conto di questa enorme gravità.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, quiero darle las gracias por sus palabras, porque son enteramente lo que yo pienso también y lo que significa sentido común y conocimiento de la situación.

La tragedia del Aquarius no es un problema italiano ni una crítica francesa ni una solución española: es un problema integral de la Unión Europea. Tampoco es una solución falsa la que se ha establecido con Libia, y yo quisiera que pensáramos en algo: nuestra relación con el fantasmagórico Gobierno de Fayed al-Sarrach da como consecuencia que todos los inmigrantes que salen de Libia salen de las costas dominadas por Fayed al-Sarrach.

Creta está mucho más cerca de Libia que Pantelleria. No sale nadie del territorio del Gobierno de Tobruk, dirigido por Jalifa Haftar. Vale la pena que pensemos y salgamos de la idealidad a la realidad. Es preciso establecer una solución africana con las autoridades locales, nacionales, tribales, religiosas africanas, porque lo que ocurre en el Mediterráneo tampoco es un problema de rescate, es el último eslabón de una tragedia que empieza en África.

Y, en consecuencia, si no somos capaces de establecer una solución en origen —en origen— en África, lo único que haremos es una tarea humanitaria, yo diría para alivio de nuestras conciencias —de nuestras conciencias estéticas— cuando estemos comiendo y nos encontremos, a la hora del almuerzo, con algunos muertos en las playas de Grecia o en las aguas del Mediterráneo occidental o central. Y eso, sencillamente, me parece una aproximación filantrópica, más bien yo diría estética, pero no profunda, que es la que necesitamos.

Hace falta colaboración en África, hace falta acción integral en África y hace falta una responsabilidad verdadera europea.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, rien, rien ne peut justifier qu'un pays ferme ses ports à un navire chargé d'humains en détresse. M. Salvini s'est servi de vies humaines pour se livrer à un chantage politique et, accessoirement, à de la gesticulation électorale. Ceci est inqualifiable.

Pourtant, nous comprenons et nous partageons la colère des citoyennes et citoyens d'Italie, de Malte, de Grèce, ces pays de première ligne de l'accueil des migrants, trop souvent livrés à eux-mêmes par les autres États membres.

De l'Italie de Salvini à l'Autriche de Kurz, en passant par la Belgique de De Wever, la France de Macron, la Hongrie d'Orbán ou la Pologne de Kaczyński, l'Europe forteresse semble devenue l'alpha et l'oméga d'une majorité de dirigeants européens.

Sous couvert de fermeté et d'humanité, il s'agit pour eux de refouler et de contenir à distance, quitte à payer des dictateurs ou des bandes armées pour transformer leur pays en prison à ciel ouvert.

Mais regardons la réalité en face, le défi des migrations – vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire – ne disparaîtra pas. Entre les guerres et les persécutions, la faim, le changement climatique et l'exploitation économique, les causes qui poussent des êtres humains sur le chemin de l'exil demeurent brûlantes.

Si les chefs d'États et de gouvernement – qui se gaussent souvent d'être des *leaders* – s'arc-boutent sur des réponses à la fois coûteuses, inhumaines et vouées à l'échec, le Parlement européen a pris une autre direction, et comme vous Monsieur le Président, je suis fier d'appartenir à une assemblée qui a su trouver une large majorité pour mettre fin au système inique de Dublin et le remplacer par une approche collective, responsable et solidaire.

Or, les responsables politiques qui siègent ici sont issus des mêmes pays et appartiennent aux mêmes partis que les chefs d'État et de gouvernement et leurs ministres. Alors dites-moi pourquoi ce qui est possible pour nous, ici, leur est impossible derrière les portes fermées du Conseil?

Si M. Salvini cherche vraiment la solidarité des Européens, il sait ce qu'il lui reste à faire: soutenir au sein du Conseil la position du Parlement.

Une chose est sûre, c'est qu'en déshumanisant les migrants pour justifier l'Europe forteresse, ce sont nos valeurs fondamentales que nous foulons aux pieds. Personne, personne ne demande à l'Union européenne d'accueillir les 65 millions de personnes déplacées à l'intérieur ou hors de leur pays! Mais l'Europe est très loin aujourd'hui de prendre sa juste part dans l'accueil.

Nous pouvons, nous devons faire plus, et mieux. C'est une question de justice, de solidarité et de responsabilité. C'est plus encore une question d'éthique et d'humanité.

Barbara Spinelli, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dal 2012 l'Italia è stata condannata tre volte dalla Corte di Strasburgo per respingimenti collettivi attuati da governi pro-establishment. Ricordiamocelo, evocando l'iniqua chiusura dei suoi porti ad Aquarius.

In Italia si discute delle colpe di Malta. È comprensibile, ma Malta, purtroppo non aderisce alle riforme delle Convenzioni SAR e SOLAS sui salvataggi in mare e considera di non avere gli obblighi di firmatari come l'Italia.

Ancora, Macron accusa Roma di cinismo, ma cinicamente chiude i confini con l'Italia. Nel criticare Roma teniamo conto di queste cose. Soprattutto teniamo conto della paralisi negoziale su Dublino IV. Il sonno della solidarietà genera mostri quasi ovunque nell'Unione.

Per questo appoggio la proposta di Verhofstadt: un ricorso del Parlamento, ai sensi dell'articolo 265, per inazione del Consiglio. Per questo approvo il no del governo italiano alle proposte della Presidenza bulgara su Dublino IV.

Laura Ferrara, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Italia non è mai venuta meno al suo dovere di salvare le vite in mare. Anche oggi è stata accolta a Catania una barca della Guardia Costiera italiana che ha messo in salvo più di 900 persone che sono state salvate nel Mediterraneo. A partire dal 2014 sono stati circa 640 000 gli sbarchi che sono avvenuti in Italia.

La vicenda Aquarius ha messo a nudo quanto stiamo denunciando da diverso tempo, possiamo dire da anni. L'Italia è lasciata sola non soltanto nella gestione dell'immigrazione una volta che i migranti arrivano sul suolo italiano, che è anche suolo europeo, ma anche nelle operazioni di ricerca e salvataggio.

Mi rivolgo alla rappresentante del Consiglio europeo, che dice che l'Unione europea ha dato sostegno all'Italia con l'operazione Triton. Parliamo proprio dell'operazione Triton, che prevedeva che l'Italia fosse l'unico paese ospitante di tutti gli sbarchi. Allora voi capite bene che, se parliamo di Dublino, che ancora oggi impone il principio in base al quale la responsabilità resta in capo ai paesi di primo arrivo, se facciamo ancora un passo indietro e vediamo le operazioni di ricerca e salvataggio che devono essere effettuate con sbarchi solo in Italia, allora poniamoci un interrogativo, che finora non ho ascoltato da parte di nessuno: perché chi ha diritto alla protezione internazionale, perché chi fugge da guerre e persecuzioni, perché chi è costretto ad abbandonare il proprio paese di origine deve arrivare in Italia o in Europa in maniera illegale?

La più grande contraddizione e la più grande ipocrisia che regna nell'Unione europea è il fatto di voler, da un lato, contrastare l'immigrazione irregolare e, dall'altro, non offrire un'alternativa legale. Il fatto che chi è costretto a lasciare il proprio paese per guerre e persecuzioni deve pagare i trafficanti e deve pagare gli scafisti.

Allora, se veramente vogliamo parlare di riforma del sistema comune europeo di asilo, se veramente vogliamo parlare di cooperazione, se veramente vogliamo rispettare quanto previsto dai trattati e dall'articolo 80 sul trattato del funzionamento dell'Unione europea, allora cominciamo a parlare di un vero diritto d'asilo europeo, cominciamo a parlare di vie legali di accesso all'Unione europea, cominciamo a dare la possibilità a chi fugge da guerre e persecuzioni di arrivare in via legale e sicura, senza essere costretti a imbarcarsi e attraversare il Mediterraneo in condizioni disumane, senza essere costretti a passare necessariamente dall'Italia come paese di transito. Allora in questo caso avremmo una solidarietà concreta e non a parole.

Mara Bizzotto, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sull'immigrazione avete fregato l'Italia per tanti anni ed è colpa vostra e dei governi Letta, Renzi e Gentiloni se l'Italia è diventata il campo profughi d'Europa. Negli ultimi cinque anni sono sbarcati in Italia 700 000 immigrati e l'80 % sono immigrati clandestini. Cosa ha fatto l'Europa per aiutare l'Italia? Niente! Cosa hanno fatto Malta, la Spagna e la Francia? Zero! Anzi, la Francia ha scatenato la guerra in Libia per il petrolio e ha lasciato all'Italia ondate di immigrati.

Il Presidente Macron e i bullettini francesi, che oggi accusano il ministro Salvini e gli italiani di essere responsabili e vomitevoli, si devono vergognare e chiedere scusa. Noi non accettiamo lezioni da nessuno, tanto meno dalla Francia di Macron che nel 2018 ha respinto 10 000 immigrati alla frontiera con l'Italia. La pazienza degli italiani è finita, finita! Il Ministro Salvini e il nuovo governo fermeranno il business dell'immigrazione clandestina. Noi chiuderemo i porti e difenderemo gli interessi degli italiani, non quelli di qualche petroliere francese o di qualche miliardario che finanzia le navi ONG per portare i clandestini in Italia.

L'Europa ha due possibilità davanti a sé: dare una mano all'Italia e difendere le frontiere esterne o continuare con la solita politica ipocrita di Macron e di questo Parlamento europeo e di questa Commissione. Il tempo è quasi finito. Se l'Europa esiste davvero, batta un colpo ora, immediatamente, altrimenti taccia per sempre.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η «βαρβαρότητα» των απελπισμένων προσφύγων και μεταναστών να αναζητούν λιμάνι αποτελεί υλοποίηση της πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και μέγιστη απόδειξη της υποκρισίας της. Αποτέλεσμα της σταθερότητας, που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση κλίνει σε όλες τις πτώσεις, των δήθεν χειρουργικών πολέμων και επεμβάσεων της, αυτής και των συμμαχών της, αποτελούν αυτές οι κραυγές. Οι αρνήσεις ελλειμενισμού είναι συνέπεια της πολιτικής της συγκέντρωσης στην πρώτη χώρα υποδοχής, του «κανονισμού του Δουβλίνου», του εγκλωβισμού χιλιάδων σε άδλιες συνθήκες στα ελληνικά νησιά λόγω της απαράδεκτης συμφωνίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – Τουρκίας. Αυτή η πολιτική θρέφει και αναπαράγει τα αντιδραστικά κυβερνητικά μέτρα, τους άδλιους ανταγωνισμούς των ποσοτώσεων από τις αστικές κυβερνήσεις, το εθνικιστικό ρατσιστικό δηλητήριο.

Σε σύγκρουση με την πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κυβερνήσεων απαιτούμε ανθρώπινους χώρους υποδοχής και φιλοξενίας, απεγκλωβισμό από τα ελληνικά νησιά και τις άλλες πύλες εισόδου, για να ταξιδέψουν οι πρόσφυγες στις χώρες τελικού προορισμού τους. Να δυναμώσει η πάλη των λαών ενάντια στους ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους και στον καπιταλισμό που τους γεννά, μαζί με την εκμετάλλευση και την προσφυγιά!

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, antes de mais queria começar por dizer que em qualquer circunstância é inaceitável que nós tenhamos tragédias no Mar Mediterrâneo ou noutra região de acesso à Europa. E portanto a União Europeia tem de estar preparada, no seu todo, para resgatar os náufragos e para ajudar aqueles que estão em situação de necessidade, absolutamente necessário.

Depois, segundo ponto. Critico claramente a forma como o ministro Salvini se tem referido a este assunto, mas ninguém me verá condenar a Itália, porque não há dúvida de que a União Europeia tem responsabilidades ao ter abandonado a Grécia, a Itália, Malta, em menor medida Chipre, a Espanha, que são países que estão na frente da crise humanitária e que têm estado muito sós, quer do ponto de vista logístico, quer do ponto de vista financeiro, a enfrentar este problema.

E depois claro, temos as soluções de médio e longo prazo e, nas soluções de médio e longo prazo, temos, em primeiro lugar, a guarda costeira que devia ser bastante reforçada, a ajuda humanitária que poderia ser bastante reforçada e temos naturalmente que ter uma visão estratégica para África, e aqui eu devo dizer – e queria que fosse este no fundo o meu principal apelo para o médio prazo –, a Chanceler Merkel propôs ainda na semana passada um Plano Marshall para África que possa criar desenvolvimento na Bacia do Mediterrâneo e na África subsariana para os próximos 20 ou 30 anos.

Vamos levar esse plano para a frente.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» (n.º 8 do artigo 162.º)).

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

David Coburn (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – I have always voted for President Tajani. He is a humane and decent fellow and a lot of what he said made sense. What worries me is that, if we don't keep people out of Europe in general, we look weak. What will then happen is that more and more people will take the risk of dying crossing the Mediterranean to reach the rich European Union and – probably more so – the United Kingdom. People are queuing up in Calais to come across to England. They are not queuing up ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – My dear colleague, I was totally convinced that you were one of the best supporters – the main supporters – of global Britain, a Britain open to receive people from all across the globe. No Europeans, but for people from the other continents the doors are open: that is global Britain. So I'm very surprised by your question.

Claude Moraes (S&D). – Mr President, recently I was in Libya with one Spanish colleague and one Italian colleague. I am very proud of the Members here today who are not running away from the problem, but are facing the problem.

The Commissioner said one thing which I think we should all keep at the forefront of our minds – and something which was said to me in Libya – which is that the number of sea arrivals in Italy is the lowest since 2013, but that migration will not stop. It is a simple equation. You can run away from the problem all you want – some of the arrivals will go down and they are going down, not up – and people will make a political football of migrants and people will play a game between Member States. But remember: migration will not stop.

At the forefront of our minds, we must retain the understanding that, here in this Chamber, we must show leadership. That requires us, in this window of opportunity, to go for Dublin IV, for all of those asylum files, and then to implement them and make them happen. This is not some sort of dream: it is the obvious imperative for this Chamber.

I would say this, colleagues: if we do not have Dublin, we cannot have this game playing in the Mediterranean and people dying in Niger and Libya, as we in our committee saw. We have a responsibility. Migrants cannot not become the footballs of the Mediterranean. Dublin IV has to work. We must pursue humanity and we must pursue the management of migration. If we do not do this, then what is actually the future of the European Union?

(Applause)

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, esta semana hemos visto cómo el nuevo Gobierno xenófobo de Italia, saltándose la ley internacional, cerraba sus puertos al buque Aquarius y a sus 629 pasajeros salvados del mar. Y, hemos visto cómo el nuevo Gobierno de España se ofrecía a acogerlos. Es un noble gesto, sin duda, pero todos sabemos que con gestos no solucionaremos el problema de fondo.

El peso de la crisis migratoria y de refugiados recae sobre los países del Sur. Necesitamos una política europea justa y generosa con los refugiados, eficaz en sus mecanismos y equitativa entre los países, que demuestre que la Unión respeta los valores sobre los que se funda.

Esta Cámara tiene que presionar al Consejo para que deje de bloquear la reforma del Reglamento de Dublín. Presionarlo con todos los medios legales a su alcance. Y digo con todos, todos, incluidos los que están previstos en los Tratados, porque están en juego miles de vidas y está en juego el honor de Europa.

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

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD), domanda «cartellino blu». – Io credo che all'articolo 165 del regolamento, primo paragrafo, ci sia scritto che non si può offendere in quest'Aula, non si può offendere il governo italiano con le parole come «xenofobo» che ha usato la nostra collega. Quindi io la prego di agire immediatamente nel rispetto dell'articolo 165, primo paragrafo, del regolamento.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – No tengo ninguna intención de ir contra el Reglamento. Lo que estoy calificando son las acciones del Gobierno de Italia. Es lo que quiero decir. Es un Gobierno que se ha manifestado en boca de su presidente, y el ministro del Interior se ha manifestado con claras expresiones xenófobas. Eso es lo que he querido decir, en ningún caso quiero romper el Reglamento de la Cámara.

Marco Affronte (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questa discussione si sentono parole come «invasione», mentre i numeri ci dicono che in atto non c'è alcuna invasione, o come «business dei migranti», formula che poi chi la usa dovrebbe anche spiegare cosa significhi.

Intanto la proposta del Parlamento per riformare Dublino è lì, è molto ambiziosa, ma come al solito a bloccarla è l'egoismo degli Stati membri. È qui che c'è in gioco il concetto di Europa, che oggi è completamente tradito. Siamo nell'Europa degli egoismi dove se ognuno pensa per sé, sulle tasse, sul lavoro, sull'immigrazione e sulla politica estera, l'Europa stessa smette di esistere.

Serve un cambiamento, che però non si fa con altre prove di forza, sommando egoismo ad egoismo, come chi oggi canta vittoria dicendo che fare la voce grossa serve come un bulletto di quartiere. Ma quale vittoria? Ogni Stato dell'Europa di oggi ha perso e straperso se continuerà a farlo ogni giorno e se continuerà ad affrontare il tema dei migranti come un male necessario da ripartire in tutto il suo corpo. Non è un'emergenza, ma è un mondo che cambia e continuerà a cambiare.

Se invece vogliamo essere protagonisti di questo processo irreversibile, se vogliamo guidarlo e non finire schiacciati, allora dobbiamo cambiare anche noi. Serve una rivoluzione culturale – e spero che queste parole ricordino qualcosa ai miei amici del Movimento 5 Stelle –, dobbiamo cambiare le regole che non sono scolpite nella roccia, ma dobbiamo cambiare anche e soprattutto le idee.

President. – I will still return for a second to Mr Pedicini and his reference to Rule 165. I would say that I did not find the disruption to the session which is stipulated in the rule that you referred to.

Having said that, colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, I know that this is a difficult topic and a sensitive one. It can be heated, but I think that we should refrain from unnecessary strong language. That is a general comment without reference to anyone that has so far spoken, but the Chair would appreciate it if we would keep in the margins of solid European Parliament culture.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in primo luogo vorrei ringraziare le donne, gli uomini, i sindaci, a partire dal sindaco di Napoli, che sono scesi in piazza davanti ai porti per gridare: «porti aperti!». Vorrei ringraziarli perché mi hanno fatto vergognare un po' meno di essere italiana e di essere europea.

Chiedo ai colleghi del Movimento 5 Stelle, con molti dei quali ho tante volte lavorato insieme in questo Parlamento europeo: come lo definite se non xenofobo chi parla di «paccia» a proposito dei rifugiati che vengono in Italia? Come lo definite chi grida vittoria a proposito di una nave con 600 persone a bordo, che è costretta ad arrivare fino in Spagna? Come lo definite? Altro che regolamento del Parlamento europeo! Vorrei dire che Salvini è un'icona, è un'icona del razzismo che cresce in questa Unione europea. Ma noi non dimentichiamo la Libia e la Turchia, con cui l'Unione europea ha un accordo. Non dimentichiamo Bardonecchia e Ventimiglia, a cui Macron evidentemente non presta molta attenzione. Non dimentichiamo Ceuta...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratrice)

President. – Ms Forenza, you ran out of time. I would appreciate it if you would show respect both to the Chair and to your colleagues – once again, I think that this is difficult and sensitive and I can understand that there might also be domestic political aspects referred to, but I would really appreciate it if we could stay in the margins of a debate which is respectful for this House.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la prima domanda che voglio rivolgere ai colleghi eurodeputati presenti in quest'Aula è: quante volte in questi anni abbiamo discusso esattamente della stessa cosa? Non me ne voglia il Commissario Avramopoulos, ma il suo discorso sembra esattamente riciclato sulle stesse parole dette tre-quattro anni fa, e non è cambiato assolutamente nulla. Anzi, oggi c'è la novità che, alle stesse cose che si dicono sempre, si aggiunge il *trend topic* del momento che è dire «governo italiano populista, governo italiano xenofobo», come qualcuno ha detto in maniera davvero irrispettosa.

Però cosa ha fatto il governo italiano? Il governo italiano ha fatto molto meno di quello che fanno tutti gli altri governi nell'Unione europea e non mi risulta che il governo francese, il governo di Macron europeista, sia stato additato da voi stessi come un governo nazista, xenofobo, per quello che ha fatto a Bardonecchia con blitz nel territorio italiano, dove c'erano donne incinta e bambini. Non mi risulta che sia stato considerato xenofobo Macron per avere chiuso i suoi porti o per quello che fa a Ventimiglia. E non mi risulta che il governo spagnolo, che faceva respingimenti a caldo, che non è quello che ha fatto l'Italia, sia stato additato come fascista, nazista, xenofobo, contrario ai diritti umani e genocida!

Non è successo, e allora incominciamo ad adottare lo stesso metro e la stessa misura. Quello che è successo in questi anni è che l'Italia è stata lasciata sola da tutti gli altri Stati dell'Unione europea. È stata lasciata sola ad affrontare un fenomeno epocale, un fenomeno globale di un continente che si sposta. Era logico che prima o poi qualcuno, che magari non fa business sulla pelle dei migranti avrebbe dovuto dire: basta non si può continuare avanti così! E allora cerchiamo di essere seri e pretendiamo da parte di tutti gli Stati europei di prendersi le loro responsabilità, a partire dalla Francia, che è stata la prima a causare quello che è successo in Libia...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

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

Andreas Schwab (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Corrao, Sie haben ja gesagt, dass Italien von allen anderen Ländern der Europäischen Union alleingelassen wurde. Ist es richtig, dass Deutschland deutlich mehr Flüchtlinge aufgenommen hat als Italien? Und ist es richtig, dass Deutschland monatlich 50 Flüchtlinge außerhalb des Kontingents speziell aus Italien aufnimmt, um Ihnen zu helfen?

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Caro collega Schwab, mi sa che facciamo un po' di confusione terminologica, perché quelli che tu chiami «migranti» in realtà si chiamano «rifugiati» e sono coloro che hanno già ottenuto lo status di protezione internazionale.

Quelli che arrivano in Italia sono migranti che, per via di Dublino, rimangono in Italia. Allora io dico: va bene la redistribuzione, facciamo che le navi delle ONG che fanno un lavoro straordinario di salvare vita, che battono bandiera tedesca, al posto di portare nei porti siciliani, che è la mia regione, e lasciarli lì dove rimangono bloccati per anni, in attesa di sapere quale sarà il loro destino, li portano in Germania e poi lo decidete voi se hanno diritto all'asilo o no. Va bene?

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). –Monsieur le Président, Matteo Salvini a eu raison de refouler l'Aquarius: l'Italie ne peut plus continuer à recevoir des bateaux de migrants illégaux. La submersion migratoire doit cesser. Ce refoulement a valeur d'avertissement. L'Union européenne doit arrêter d'être la fosseyeuse de l'identité des peuples d'Europe.

Le commissaire Avramopoulos a déclaré le 8 juin 2015 que son objectif était d'accueillir 50 millions de migrants à l'horizon 2060. Les peuples européens s'y opposent. Il est temps de lutter contre les réseaux de passeurs et contre les ONG qui sont objectivement leurs complices.

La solution ne consiste pas à instaurer des quotas obligatoires de relocalisation de migrants, comme le projet Dublin IV voudrait le faire. La solution consiste à passer des accords avec les pays de départ pour les persuader de retenir ou de récupérer les migrants qui tentent d'en partir.

C'est l'avenir de la civilisation européenne qui est en jeu. L'Afrique va doubler sa population: elle comptera 2,5 milliards d'habitants en 2050. Si nous ne faisons pas preuve de fermeté maintenant, notre modèle de société disparaîtra sous les coups de boutoir de l'immigration, du communautarisme et de l'Islam radical. Bravo Matteo Salvini pour être la vigie de l'avenir de l'Union européenne!

President. – I was looking at the timetable. We are behind schedule. We also have an extensive list for the catch-the-eye procedure, so from now on I am not in a position to bring in any blue card requests. I do appreciate your understanding.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν θα καταχραστώ τον χρόνο σας. Θέλω να διαμαρτυρηθώ και θα αποχωρήσω εις ένδειξη διαμαρτυρίας για την προδοτική στάση της Ένωσης και της κυβέρνησης Τσίπρα στην παραχώρηση του ονόματος της πατρίδος μου Μακεδονίας στα Σκόπια.

David Casa (PPE). –Din it-traġedja li għandna fil-Mediterran Sur President qiegħda, iktar ma jgħaddi ż-żmien, iktar thalli l-pajjiżi tal-Unjoni Ewropea mifrudin. Sfortunatament, anke alleati kbar, bħal ma kienu, u għandhom jibqgħu, Malta u l-Italja. Jien niddejjaq nisma xi deputati, mill-Italja, pajjiż li jien tant inhobb, jgħidu affarijiet illi flok iressquna lejn xulxin biex naghmlu l-battalja tagħna fl-Unjoni Ewropea, iva kontra min mhux qiegħed jagħti dan il-kontribut biex insolvu darba għal dejjem din il-problema.

Mhuwiex sew, għandkom raġun, illi xi pajjiżi fl-Unjoni Ewropea ma għamlu assolutament xejn biex jgħinu lill-Italja, b'mod partikolari, naturalment lil Malta illi ilna issa s-snin kbar niffaccjaw wiċċna ma' din il-problema. Għandna diversi soluzzjonijiet, jien ngħid lill-Membri tal-Kunsill, għandna r-Regolament ta' Dublin illi rridu naraw kif jitranga. Ma jistax ikun illi nhallu r-regolamenti kif inhuma llum. Għandna bżonn li l-Istati Membri kollha jaqsmu din ir-responsabbiltà. Għandna bżonn li jkun hemm ċentri ta' applikazzjoni f'pajjiżi sikuri fl-Afrika qabel dawn jiddeċiedu li jithallew jitolqu biex jiġu fl-Ewropa. Imma ejja nahdmu din il-battalja flimkien għaliex jekk ma naghmlux hekk ha jerġa' jkollna d-dizastri illi kellna sfortunatament fil-passat.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, due osservazioni veloci. Io vorrei dire al Presidente Macron che se noi oggi abbiamo un governo che a lui non piace per nulla, e che peraltro non piace neanche a me, e vorrei dire agli altri membri del Consiglio che se abbiamo questo governo qua, forse è anche per le politiche che molti Stati hanno fatto contro l'Italia, non aiutando il nostro paese negli anni passati. Ricordo al Presidente Macron che tre mesi fa io lo invitai a venire a Bardonecchia e Ventimiglia a vedere qual era la situazione che si è creata e che ancora oggi vige.

Mentre ai colleghi del Movimento 5 Stelle vorrei chiedere: dove siete finiti? Dov'è finita la vostra umanità? Raccogliete i soldi per le ONG e oggi lasciate che le navi delle ONG stiano in mezzo al mare perché avete abdicato alle politiche fasciste del Ministro Salvini! E infine vorrei chiedere al Ministro Salvini: perché non è qua? Perché non è qua a prendere la proposta del Parlamento europeo sulla riforma del trattato di Dublino e a portarla in Consiglio? Questo dovrebbe fare il nostro paese, come ha fatto negli anni passati!

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). –Señor presidente, ningún Estado miembro está para dar lecciones a ningún otro, después de la catástrofe masiva que es esta crisis de refugiados. Ninguno. Pero hay cosas que hay que decir: un país de la Unión Europea no puede vulnerar el Derecho internacional. Y lo que ha hecho el Gobierno italiano es vulnerar el Derecho internacional y el Derecho marítimo. Y sí, las declaraciones del señor Salvini son xenofobia. Yo no sé si alguien nos va a sancionar por decir la verdad, pero esta es la verdad.

Dicho lo cual, ¿por qué está Salvini en el poder? Porque, evidentemente —y yo estoy de acuerdo—, se ha dejado a Italia sola; porque ha sido la política de la Unión Europea la que ha fomentado este tipo de personajes. Y no toda Italia es Salvini. Claro que lo sabemos. Yo estoy orgulloso del alcalde De Magistris, en Nápoles, que ha levantado la voz estos días, diciendo: «Nápoles sí os quiere acoger». Y, por lo tanto, sabemos que no toda Italia es Salvini, claro que sí.

Y sabemos que ha habido muchos gobiernos que han sido insolidarios. El Gobierno español anterior lo ha sido muchísimo, de los que más, y por eso estamos muy contentos de que el actual Gobierno español haya tomado una medida totalmente correcta y solidaria que celebramos, porque, durante muchos años en España, las ciudades también han estado solas reclamando esta cuestión.

Barcelona, en tres años: 11 000 refugiados atendidos, ante la indiferencia completa del Gobierno español. Por lo tanto, también sabemos en España lo que es tener un gobierno totalmente indiferente y contrario a las políticas de acogida.

Pero la pregunta que hay que hacer aquí es: ¿Hay que condenar las cosas que hace el Gobierno italiano, contraviniendo el Derecho internacional? Desde luego. Pero van venir más Aquarius. Y cuando vengan más, ¿qué haremos? ¿Vamos a seguir así? Por lo tanto, es muy importante decirle al Consejo Europeo a finales de junio, que desbloquee la reforma de Dublín, que ponga en marcha vías seguras de entrada, que termine con el blindaje de las fronteras y, sobre todo, que ponga en marcha una política de salvamento en el Mediterráneo.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). –Señor presidente, 629 personas que huyen de la miseria y las guerras, a las que contribuye la Unión Europea, llegarán al puerto de Valencia por razones humanitarias. Pero aquí no termina todo. Reflexionemos.

¿Cómo es posible que desde hace tantos años que llevan muriendo miles de personas en el Mediterráneo no hayamos avanzado en materia de asilo? ¿Hasta cuándo se va a consentir la deplorable actuación del Consejo? ¿Cómo es posible que la Unión Europea consienta las violaciones constantes de la legislación internacional? ¿Alguien cree que estas personas serán las últimas que vivirán este calvario?

Los flujos migratorios son y seguirán siendo una constante en nuestro mundo global. Si permitimos que se vulnere impunemente el Derecho internacional, si nuestra política es cerrar las fronteras, abrir CIES, la Unión Europea quedará nuevamente deslegitimada y abrirá la puerta para que la xenofobia y el fascismo —sí, fascismo— siga extendiéndose. La historia, desde luego, no nos va a perdonar.

Raymond Finch (EFDD). –Mr President, there has been an awful lot of gum-flapping both in this Chamber and other places about humanitarianism and solidarity. As far as I can see, the only humanitarianism and solidarity shown has been from the Italian Government. The policies of Angela Merkel and the EU are the issues that have precipitated this crisis, first by the unfair EU trade policies that are impoverishing Africa, and then by the ridiculous measures and windbag virtue-signalling that are failing to secure the borders of our respective nation states.

Let us address the root causes of this problem. People are undertaking this hazardous journey and putting themselves in the hands of people-smuggling gangsters because of the policies I have mentioned that are both treating Africa as a dumping ground for European producers and refusing to allow true fair trade, to allow African nations to build working economies.

If you were about to see a friend put his hand in the fire, what would you do: stop him, or take him to the hospital after he had burned it? The NGOs that are working in partnership with the people-smuggling gangsters are enabling them to carry on this cruel and dangerous trade.

Britain stopped the slave trade in the world by stopping the people who transported the slaves. The world must now follow that example. Let us stop the people smugglers rather than making them richer. Have fair trading agreements with Africa and interdict the smugglers before they send all of those poor people off to die in the Mediterranean: that is solidarity, that is humanitarianism. Anything else is inviting tragedy and death.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). –Elnök úr! Az elmúlt években migránsok milliósámmra érkeztek Európába, és a Földközi-tengeren átkelőik közül tízezres nagyságrendben haltak meg. Van-e ebben a tragédiában felelőssége az Európai Parlamentnek? Van, mert hamis illúziókat keltett. Ez a parlament fogadta el a többségével azt a jelentést, amelyben úgy beszél a migrációról, mint egy pozitív folyamatról, amit támogatni kell.

Azt deklarálta ennek a parlamentnek a többsége, hogy nem lehet különbséget tenni az üldöztetés elől menekülők és a jobb élet reményében ide jövő gazdasági menekültek között. Ez nem más, mint egy meghívólevél, a megoldás pedig nem a kötelező kvóta szerinti elosztás. Egyre több ország utasítja el, látja a példákat, nem akarják, hogy a saját országukban is párhuzamos társadalom épüljön ki. A megoldás: a gyökérénél, Afrikában kezelni a migrációt, erre fordítani energiát, és mivel ez nem egy rövid folyamat, addig pedig a határoknak mind a szárazföldön, mind a tengeren valódi határokként kell működni.

Alessandra Mussolini (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, basta ad insultare l'Italia, sia dentro quest'Aula che fuori, l'Italia che salva e ha salvato centinaia di migliaia di migranti! Peccato che non c'è Tajani. Bisogna chiedere scusa a quest'Italia e sì, bisogna difendere il nostro governo italiano. Io qui sono italiana e difendo questo governo, anche se non ne faccio parte.

Il governo ha chiuso i porti. Certo, è facile parlare da quei banchi di solidarietà dell'Europa con i porti degli altri, perché non si aprono i porti anche di fronte a donne, anche di fronte a bambini, come è stato fatto da parte della Francia, da parte della Spagna.

Allora, abbiamo un regolamento di Dublino – io avevo un intervento che ho eliminato, non lo voglio più fare – ma parliamo di un momento precedente, parliamo anche della creazione di *hotspot* nei paesi di transito, in Libia, in Tunisia, parliamo del coordinamento che ci deve essere a livello europeo degli sbarchi, e dare all'Europa, cosa che ancora non ha, una esatta valutazione degli strumenti per vedere se un paese è o no in forte pressione.

Questo si deve fare, perché Dublino, se vogliamo, già cade in un momento successivo. Quindi non facciamo degli insulti a paesi che si sono fatti carico del lavoro sporco dell'Europa! Sciacquatevi la bocca quando parlate dell'Italia.

President. – I can only second that. If we would refrain from any insults, indeed – not just in this Chamber.

Elly Schlein (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la decisione del governo italiano sull'Aquarius è gravissima e viola il diritto internazionale del mare.

Salvini, chi fa il forte coi deboli e il debole coi forti è vigliacco. La battaglia per la solidarietà europea non si fa sulla pelle delle persone in mare, ma qui ai tavoli dove si cambiano le norme sbagliate come Dublino, come noi abbiamo fatto in questo Parlamento, ottenendo un voto storico dei due terzi, che cancella il criterio del primo paese di accesso e stabilisce il ricollocamento obbligatorio e la vera solidarietà europea. Dov'era la Lega che non vi abbiamo visto per 22 riunioni di negoziato? Vada al Consiglio, almeno ora che è al governo, a chiedere al suo amico Orban di fare la propria parte sull'accoglienza.

E voi governi europei non credetevi assolti. Le ONG che salvano le vite in mare stanno solo sopperendo alla vergognosa mancanza di una missione umanitaria europea di ricerca e soccorso in mare, degna di un'Europa civile. L'unico modo di mettere fine alle morti è aprire vie legali e sicure di accesso a tutti i paesi europei, altrimenti Italia e Grecia continueranno ad essere gli unici punti di accesso a un intero continente su rotte pericolosissime.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). –Monsieur le Président, oui, le chantage du gouvernement italien est inhumain et profondément choquant en plus d'être illégal.

Mais le gouvernement italien n'est pas arrivé au pouvoir par effraction. Le monstre Salvini n'est pas là par effraction. C'est l'absence de solidarité de l'Union européenne dans l'accueil des 700 000 réfugiés! C'est la lâcheté des dirigeants européens! Ce sont les égoïsmes nationaux qui ont nourri la bête! C'est la lâcheté des dirigeants européens quand ils délèguent nos obligations en matière d'accueil au dictateur Erdoğan! C'est la lâcheté des dirigeants européens aux mains pleines de sang quand ils livrent les réfugiés aux bandes armées libyennes en fermant les yeux sur les viols, sur les meurtres, sur les violences! C'est le cynisme et l'irresponsabilité du président Macron quand il maintient une frontière de fer contre les réfugiés à la frontière italienne!

Alors le Parlement européen a montré l'exemple: cassons Dublin, accueillons collectivement les réfugiés et que les dirigeants européens sortent la tête du sable pour nous écouter!

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). –Señor presidente, lo primero es aplaudir el gesto de las ciudades del cambio y del Gobierno español. Pero si no hacemos nada, el bloqueo ilegal por parte del ultraderechista ministro de Interior italiano al Aquarius se puede convertir en una norma, en una forma de actuar que vulnera el Derecho internacional y de paso criminalice a las ONG. No seamos hipócritas. El caso del Aquarius demuestra que es imprescindible abrir rutas legales y seguras de entrada a Europa, y eso pasa también por eliminar las vallas con concertinas e impedir las devoluciones en caliente. Hay que darles la vuelta a las políticas xenófobas de la Europa fortaleza, instaurando nuevas políticas basadas en la justicia, la solidaridad y la cooperación, que conformen una nueva política migratoria común; una política que frene el ascenso de la extrema derecha de los Salvini y de los Le Pen, que rompa la trampa que pretende obligarnos a elegir entre neoliberalismo y xenofobia. No podemos sustituir los derechos...

(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).

Sophie Montel (EFDD). –Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je vous entends depuis tout à l'heure condamner les uns après les autres la décision souveraine de l'Italie de ne pas accueillir 629 migrants. Cette décision ne serait donc pas humaine; l'humanité, selon vous, consisterait à encourager les ONG qui jouent au taxi pour migrants dans la Méditerranée pour le plus grand bonheur des passeurs, qui en ont fait un business et transforment la Méditerranée en cimetière.

L'année dernière, un policier italien infiltré au sein d'une ONG sur le bateau Juventa avait révélé les liens dégoûtants qui lient certaines ONG et les passeurs. Quand va-t-on enfin s'intéresser aux acteurs de ce business sordide?

Votre condamnation de l'Italie est indécente, car enfin qui êtes-vous pour donner des leçons de morale à un pays et à un peuple qui depuis 2013 ont subi l'arrivée de 700 000 clandestins? Dans un pays dont l'économie stagne depuis l'adoption de l'euro, où le chômage est endémique, comment ne pas réaliser le fardeau que représentent ces migrants économiques?

Avec l'arrivée de ces clandestins aux mœurs et aux modes de vie parfois si différents des nôtres, comment ne pas compatir avec les Italiens qui ont éprouvé tant de difficultés? Matteo Salvini et le gouvernement italien ont raison de dire «Stop», quoi qu'en pensent et quoi qu'en disent M. Macron et ses amis. Cette situation ne peut pas être durable.

Grâce à Schengen, les clandestins accueillis en Espagne pourront franchir les Pyrénées comme avant ils franchissaient les Alpes, et ils pourront choisir de s'installer où cela leur profite le plus une fois fait leur *benchmarking* des conditions d'asile en Europe.

Il est plus que temps que chaque pays retrouve sa souveraineté, que l'Espagne accueille tous les migrants du monde si elle le souhaite, mais que la France... *(le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)*

Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE). –Señor presidente, estoy orgullosa de que España ayer y hoy siga salvando vidas. Como andaluza, conozco bien la tragedia de los inmigrantes que ponen en riesgo sus vidas para llegar a nuestras costas. Solo en 2017 nuestra Armada, nuestra Guardia Civil y Salvamento Marítimo rescataron en el mar a miles de inmigrantes.

Que los refugiados del Aquarius lleguen a buen puerto sanos y salvos es siempre un alivio. Pero una medida puntual no es la única solución que esperan los ciudadanos, quienes saben que, sin una estrategia de futuro, eso es pan para hoy y hambre para mañana. Y los inmigrantes quedarán de nuevo a merced de los traficantes.

La responsabilidad es de Europa: ni España ni ningún país debe asumir este reto en solitario. Por eso exijo a la Comisión y al Consejo que aprueben urgentemente el nuevo Reglamento de Dublín, con reglas claras, pero, sobre todo, que se cumplan.

Las fronteras de Italia, Grecia y España son las de toda Europa, y hay que obligar a los países que no quieren hacerlo a que miren al sur. Porque otro fracaso en política migratoria hundiría en el Mediterráneo el proyecto europeo y daría alas a los populistas. En este drama humano nadie puede cantar victoria. Sería mezquino utilizar a los inmigrantes para alcanzar logros políticos a corto plazo.

Dejemos los signos de victoria para cuando logremos que el barco de la política migratoria, hoy encallado, vuelva a navegar. Y trabajemos con menos focos, más efectividad, por una Europa más libre y más segura y por relanzar el ...

(el presidente retira la palabra a la oradora).

Miriam Dalli (S&D). –Mr President, I just heard the Council saying that they are concerned to see the same scene over and over again of flimsy dinghies with people on board. So, with all due respect, Ms Panayotova, what are you waiting for? Because it is up to the governments in the Council to come together and act on this issue collectively, not letting certain members get away scot free – as they can do, as if nothing had happened.

And I would like to refer to something else that was mentioned in this Chamber. Some mentioned Malta, as though Malta was doing nothing. Malta has always respected and adhered to its obligations. Malta's resources are fully dedicated to saving lives at sea and Malta has the second highest number of refugees per capita, second only to Sweden.

With all due respect, by pointing fingers at one Member State or another we are not going to solve this issue because we are in this together, and only if we act as one can we truly make a difference and solve the problem. So let this Parliament come together and stand up – stand up to the Council – because we have the solution for a centralised system and if the Council doesn't want to hear that, then something needs to be done ASAP.

President. – For those of you who were not present when I made the announcement, we are well behind schedule and we have an extensive list for the catch-the-eye procedure, so a few minutes ago I said that I am not in a position to accept any blue cards.

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, desde esta Cámara quiero agradecer, primero, a todas las ciudades de refugio en España que están acogiendo a personas migrantes y refugiadas, especialmente a Valencia y a su alcalde, Joan Ribó, que va a acoger el Aquarius. Por supuesto, Valencia, Barcelona, Madrid, País Vasco, Navarra nos están dando un ejemplo desde hace años. También celebro la decisión del Gobierno español de acoger el Aquarius.

Frente a la extrema derecha, es el despertar de la Europa solidaria. Pero, señorías, señor comisario, Consejo, necesitamos mucho más.

Todos los Estados, empezando por Italia, tienen que cumplir con sus obligaciones europeas, con el Derecho europeo, con el Derecho internacional. Al mismo tiempo, ningún Estado puede hacer frente solo a la gestión migratoria. Las fronteras españolas, italianas o griegas son fronteras europeas. De forma coordinada con los Estados miembros, la Unión debe hacerse cargo de los rescates con más fondos y más competencias y, sobre todo, aprobar ya una reforma justa de Reglamento de Dublín.

Y espero del Gobierno español que siga por el buen camino. Le pido que retire las devoluciones en caliente y las cuchillas en Ceuta y Melilla. La solidaridad con los refugiados y entre países europeos es fundamental para salvar vidas y para devolver la dignidad a nuestro continente.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Senhora Ministra, uma vez mais, o Mediterrâneo foi notícia. Jogou-se a vida de quase setecentas pessoas, das quais cento e vinte e três crianças sozinhas, onze bebés e sete grávidas. É um péssimo sinal quando vemos responsáveis políticos reagir com indiferença e até hostilidade.

Durante horas a fio assistimos a um triste inferno porque, uma vez mais, não fomos Europa, e muito menos União. Fomos 28 territórios, cada qual a olhar para o seu umbigo. Todos saímos derrotados. E porque se trata de vidas, devemos sentir-nos envergonhados.

A ferida ficou exposta novamente: o Sistema Comum Europeu de Asilo não funciona. Mas sejamos claros, reformar este sistema, reformar Dublin, é um apelo para que todos os Estados-Membros cumpram com a sua justa parte, para que exista verdadeira solidariedade europeia. Não significa portas abertas, mas também não pode significar apenas mais dinheiro do orçamento comunitário.

O Parlamento fez a sua parte: aceitámos fortalecer as nossas fronteiras e ainda ontem fechámos um acordo com o Conselho para reformar o Sistema de Informação de Schengen e aumentar a segurança. Mas apresentámos também a nossa posição para reformar o sistema de asilo. Estamos prontos para codecidir, mas os Estados-Membros tudo fazem para protelar.

Ontem um primeiro-ministro, lamentavelmente, ousou falar da força de vontade e de como esta teria regressado a Itália. Estaríamos todos muito melhor se a força de vontade tivesse regressado ao Conselho e a todos os Estados-Membros e pudéssemos finalmente reformar o sistema de asilo na Europa.

A solidariedade é o berço da Europa, mas está afundada no Mediterrâneo. Haja coragem de a resgatar.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). –Señor presidente, señores del Consejo, señores de la Comisión, ¿no son capaces ustedes de percibir la exasperación de este Parlamento Europeo, expresada en todas las lenguas de la Unión con este debate —y van cientos—, que desnuda la inoperancia y el fracaso de Europa ante las migraciones? El Gobierno de España ha adoptado una decisión humanitaria en relación con el Aquarius y es un símbolo que marca la diferencia, un símbolo del cambio político, pero también de cuánto puede la voluntad política cambiar las cosas.

Y voluntad en lo que se espera del Consejo, de la próxima Cumbre Europea sobre Migraciones, para decir, en primer lugar, que no tienen cabida en Europa los gobiernos de los Estados miembros que incumplan el Derecho internacional humanitario y el Derecho europeo cerrando las puertas a los desesperados como el caso del Aquarius.

En segundo lugar, que no existe ninguna solución que pueda basarse en la externalización y en la pura represión del problema; que hay que adoptar una política —como ha demandado este Parlamento Europeo— holística, comprensiva y preventiva, incrementando la ayuda humanitaria y el compromiso con los desesperados. Pero, en tercer lugar, hay que cambiar la legislación europea, desbloquear Dublín y esto les ... *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). –Señor presidente, este no es un debate sobre Italia o sobre este o aquel Estado. Este es un debate sobre la respuesta europea al drama humanitario que se vive en el Mediterráneo. Pero el problema es que no hay una respuesta europea. El problema es que los Estados siguen sin reconocer que, para afrontar el reto de la gestión migratoria de los refugiados, hay que compartir responsabilidades, hay que actuar de manera solidaria, hay que avanzar en la reforma del sistema de Dublín y no afrontar esta situación de manera egoísta o cada uno por su cuenta.

No nos engañemos, señorías, el Aquarius es solo un síntoma de una realidad tan dura como inaceptable. El Mediterráneo es la frontera más desigual y más mortífera del mundo. Podemos entrenar a los guardacostas. Quizás tendremos un mar menos mortífero, pero no menos desigual, y esta es la causa por la cual seguiremos teniendo Aquarius.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questi giorni siamo stati testimoni della spregiudicatezza dei signori Salvini e Di Maio, che con le loro alleanze improbabili, ahimè sulla pelle dei più deboli, a discapito dei diritti umani, fanno credere all'Europa di poter fermare gli sbarchi chiudendo i porti.

Le regole si cambiano ai tavoli negoziali e non nei *social network*. In Europa, e lo chiedo a tutti gli Stati membri, si lavora per cercare alleanze costruttive per un'equa ripartizione delle responsabilità. Questo Parlamento lo ha fatto, modificando Dublino, eliminando il criterio del paese di primo ingresso e scegliendo il ricollocamento obbligatorio. Chi arriva in Italia, arriva in Europa.

Il sistema di ricerca e salvataggio resta la nostra priorità, fiore all'occhiello dell'Italia grazie allo straordinario lavoro della Marina Militare, della Guardia Costiera e delle ONG, sempre più spesso capri espiatori di politiche fallimentari europee e nazionali. A SOS Mediterranée, Medecins sans frontières, Sea Watch, Proactiva, Sea Eye, Mission Lifeline dico grazie per questa prova di grande umanità. Solidarietà a tutte le vittime del Mediterraneo.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stefano Maullu (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che l'Aquarius abbia avuto il merito di rompere il velo dell'ipocrisia dietro a questo vero e grande problema epocale dell'immigrazione. Ha rotto il velo di una politica che non funziona, una politica europea che ha abbandonato l'Italia e l'ha lasciata da sola rispetto a questi flussi demografici, e ha reso ancora più evidente la politica neocolonialista fatta dalla Francia, che ha avuto l'ardire di definire in maniera improponibile il nostro paese, una politica fatta in Africa sulle baionette della Legione straniera, una politica di cui subiamo gli effetti ancora oggi per la disastrosa azione contro il governo libico dell'epoca.

Un'azione che continua ancora oggi, con il Presidente della Repubblica francese che, in barba a tutto e in barba soprattutto alla politica estera europea, continua a fare incontri con al-Sarraj e con il generale Haftar quasi come se fosse un ministro degli Esteri dell'Unione europea. Questo stiamo pagando: una dannosa politica europea fatta sulla pelle dei migranti, dando sei miliardi a un dittatore come Erdogan e non facendo lo stesso per un grande piano per il Mediterraneo.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η χώρα μου η Ελλάδα έχει επιδείξει αλληλεγγύη και υπευθυνότητα στη διαχείριση του μεταναστευτικού παρά τα οικονομικά προβλήματα. Βρισκόμαστε όμως ενώπιον μιας νέας ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης: κυκλώματα παράνομης διακίνησης με τζιρους δισεκατομμυρίων, που καταγγέλλονται και για συνεργασία με ΜΚΟ, συνεχίζουν την εγκληματική δράση τους στη Μεσόγειο.

Η ομαλή λειτουργία του χώρου Σένγκεν δεν έχει αποκατασταθεί, ενώ η αναθεώρηση του «κανονισμού του Δουβλίνου» προσκρούει στην άρνηση συγκεκριμένων κρατών μελών να συνεργαστούν. Ξέρουμε ότι οι χώρες εδώ και καιρό, η μία μετά την άλλη, κλείνουν τα σύνορά τους. Πού θα πάνε τόσοι άνθρωποι; Συνάδελφοι, δεν είμαστε εδώ για να κατηγορεί ο ένας τον άλλον. Όμως σε λιγότερο από ένα χρόνο έχουμε εκλογές. Αν δεν αποδείξουμε αλληλεγγύη στην πράξη και συνεκτική ευρωπαϊκή μεταναστευτική πολιτική, δεν θα μπορέσουμε να υπερασπιστούμε τις αξίες μας, τις ευρωπαϊκές αξίες. Δεν έχουμε μόνο όλοι ίσα δικαιώματα, αλλά κυρίως ίσες υποχρεώσεις.

Marijana Petir (PPE). –Gospodine predsjedavajući, migracije predstavljaju izazov za Europsku uniju, no problem je trebalo rješavati na mjestu njegova nastanka, a ne u Europi. Bilo je nužno napraviti razliku između ratnih i ekonomskih migranata i pružiti pomoć onima koji spašavaju goli život. Tragično je da u potrazi za boljim životom ljudi na Mediteranu gube živote.

Upozoravala sam još 2014. godine da prije svega treba rješavati uzroke te da se Europska unija mora početi oštrije boriti protiv krijumčara i trgovaca ljudima koji su u crno zaveli tisuće obitelji obećavajući im bolji život. Također bilo je nužno pomoći u stabilizaciji uvjeta u zemljama iz kojih su ljudi mahom napuštali svoje domove i omogućiti im utočište u prvoj susjednoj zemlji. Na takve aktivnosti je Europska unija trebala potrošiti i svoju pažnju i svoj novac. Preko milijun migranata stiglo je brodovima, 35 tisuća kopnom dok je 3770 migranata poginulo prilikom prelaska Mediterana, što je zastrašujuće.

Moramo biti učinkovitiji i iskorijeniti uzroke migracija. Djelovati treba prije nego se ljudi ukrcaju na brodove.

Giovanni La Via (PPE). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono stato fiero di un Presidente del Consiglio che ha detto «meglio perdere un voto che una vita nel Mediterraneo», e di questo ovviamente gliene sono grato. Ma, dall'altro lato, oggi non possiamo avere come imputata l'Italia, l'Italia che ha fatto un grande sforzo e ha dato un grande esempio di umanità nel Mediterraneo. Oggi non si può accusare l'Italia per ciò che è stato fatto.

L'Italia è stata lasciata sola e oggi è il Consiglio che ha questa responsabilità. Il Consiglio che alla fine di questo mese potrà, se vuole, trovare una soluzione. Il Consiglio che non può continuare a rinviare la soluzione, mentre il Parlamento ha una posizione definita, probabilmente non la migliore, ma sicuramente un gran passo avanti sul regolamento di Dublino. Oggi il mio appello è al Consiglio: fatevi un esame di coscienza, guardate quello che sta succedendo in Europa e nel Mediterraneo, non lasciate l'Italia sola, perché non è l'Italia l'unico responsabile di quello che sta accadendo. Le vostre mani sono sporche di sangue.

Julie Ward (S&D). –Mr President, Europe does not have a refugee crisis. We do have a crisis of solidarity, however. There is a refugee crisis in places like Jordan and Lebanon, where huge camps have been in existence for years, but here in Europe we've forgotten our fundamental values of solidarity and our moral responsibility to uphold human rights.

In the absence of governmental action in some Member States to provide humanitarian assistance for refugees and migrants, ordinary citizens have stepped in and saved lives. I have visited Calais and Paris many times and talked to people working on the ground. Organisations like Care4Calais in France and the refugee support platform in Belgium are great examples of how citizens' mobilisation can save lives.

At sea, however, the difficulties are much greater. Although a few organisations like SOS Méditerranée provide invaluable sea rescue work they cannot meet demand, so the EU and its Member States must make humanitarian assistance a priority of migratory policy, with sea rescue as a focus.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Aquarius è l'evidente dimostrazione della conseguenza derivante dall'assenza di una politica europea sui temi dell'immigrazione e sui temi dei profughi, ma è anche, stiamo attenti, l'evidente dimostrazione che una politica europea è assolutamente necessaria, non può mancare. A meno che, nei prossimi mesi, non vedremo il governo italiano spostare l'Italia nei mari del Nord, l'Italia avrà il problema degli immigrati e dei profughi e dovrà affrontarlo assieme agli altri. Serve una politica europea.

Purtroppo, a forza di eludere i problemi, sono stati i problemi a metterci con le spalle al muro. Oggi è evidente che sono necessarie delle politiche anche per impedire che l'opinione pubblica italiana slitti tutta su una posizione antieuropea. È stata finora la gallina dalle uova d'oro la questione dell'immigrazione per la Lega e per Salvini e credo che bisogna dar voce all'opinione pubblica, facendo in modo che il Consiglio europeo del 28-29 giugno....

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Giuseppe Ferrandino (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la scellerata decisione del Ministro Salvini di chiudere i porti alle navi umanitarie deve allarmarci e spronare il prossimo Consiglio europeo a prendere seriamente in considerazione la proposta votata dal Parlamento per il superamento di Dublino.

Cari colleghi, c'è un dato che non può essere sottaciuto: l'Italia è stata lasciata sola ad affrontare l'emergenza umanitaria. È una realtà sancita dai fatti e dalle dichiarazioni di questi giorni, in ultimo quelle del Commissario Avramopoulos.

Nonostante gli sforzi degli ultimi anni per arginare e controllare con umanità il fenomeno, solo il 31 % dei migranti approdati in Italia e in Grecia è stato poi accolto da un altro paese dell'Unione. Francia e Germania hanno accolto appena il 25 % e il 37 % delle quote previste e conosciamo benissimo l'approccio alla politica migratoria dell'Austria e dei paesi dell'Est. Fino a quando esisterà un'Unione europea frammentata sul tema della migrazione, non esisterà davvero un progetto europeo, perché siamo europei solo se abbiamo il coraggio di costruire ponti e non muri.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). –Gospodine predsjedavajući, nitko ne može ostati ravnodušan na tešku sudbinu migranata, među kojima je 120 djece, koji u teškim uvjetima na brodu čekaju da ih prime Italija ili Malta, koje to ne žele. Svi smo oko toga jako emotivni i u takvim je okolnostima najlakše upirati prstom u one koji su im zatvorili svoja vrata.

Ali ne smijemo zaboraviti da su države koje se sad olako demonizira dosad prihvale ogroman broj migranata i ne može ih se tek tako optužiti za manjak ljudskosti i solidarnosti. Moramo se odlučnije boriti protiv krijumčara koji svjesno i za profit dovode ljude u životnu opasnost. Ilegalna migracija potpuno je neprihvatljiva baš zato što ljude dovodi u pogibelj.

NGO-i koji spašavaju migrante na Sredozemlju trebaju to raditi u boljoj koordinaciji s državnim vlastima kako bi se izbjegle situacije u kojima brod sa spašenima nema gdje pristati. Za svakog spašenog migranta mora unaprijed biti osiguran smještaj u sigurnoj luci.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση με τα αυξημένα μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα «χτύπησε ταβάνι». Η Ελλάδα και η Ιταλία δεν αντέχουν άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Κάποιοι λοιπόν ασκούν εκ του ασφαλούς κριτική στην Ιταλία γιατί έκλεισε τα λιμάνια της, την ώρα που η Γαλλία, η Γερμανία, το Βέλγιο, η Δανία και η Σουηδία έχουν αναστείλει τη λειτουργία της Συμφωνίας του Σένγκεν. Την ίδια στιγμή η Γαλλία και η Γερμανία εκτέλεσαν μόνο κατά 30% τις υποχρεώσεις τους σε σχέση με τις μετεγκαταστάσεις προσφύγων από την Ελλάδα. Πρέπει επιτέλους να εκφραστεί στην πράξη και να εφαρμοστεί η περίφημη αλληλεγγύη και να καταργηθεί το «Δουβλίνο III», που έχει μετατρέψει σε αποθήκες ψυχών τις χώρες υποδοχής, δηλαδή την Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο οφείλει να σταθεί προ των ευθυνών του, να διαθέσει κονδύλια για το προσφυγικό, να ενεργοποιήσει ξανά το σύστημα των μετεγκαταστάσεων και του επιμερισμού ευθυνών. Οι κάτοικοι των νησιών του Αιγαίου, που φιλοξενούν ακόμη και τώρα χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες, στέλνουν κραυγή αγωνίας και διαμαρτυρίας.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). –Senhor Presidente, os seiscentos e vinte e nove migrantes que, em vez de garantir o salvamento, se viram à deriva, empurrados entre Itália e Malta, são magra expressão das centenas de milhares de travessias nos últimos anos.

São ténue lembrança dos setecentos e noventa e dois mortos este ano ou dos dezasseis mil que morreram nos últimos quatro anos do Mediterrâneo, vala comum do esquecimento. São demonstração inequívoca da total ausência de solidariedade da UE e de suas potências para com os que não têm nada a perder e arriscam a vida por dias melhores.

Bem podem jogar o jogo do empurra entre a UE e Estados-Membros. As responsabilidades dos que hoje fecham portos não diferem dos que antes deles o fizeram, criminalizaram organizações de resgate, assinaram criminosos acordos com países terceiros para repelir e conter as migrações. Não diferem dos muros de Espanha, Áustria, Hungria ou Grécia, ou dos autênticos campos de concentração em solo europeu.

Tudo com a convivência da UE e das suas políticas xenófobas e racistas que violam grosseiramente os direitos humanos, o direito internacional.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). –Señor presidente, miren este barco. Es un barco de papel, un barco de papel frente al transatlántico de la fortaleza europea. ¿Cómo es que no se ha convocado el Consejo de Ministros ante lo que está pasando? Estamos indignadas. Y nuestra sociedad, a la que representamos en este Parlamento —que, por cierto, hoy está vacío; que, por cierto, e insisto, no está ni el 10 % del Parlamento hoy aquí—, en un debate como este, está deshumanizada.

No se tiren la pelota entre unos y otros. No discutan entre el Consejo y la Comisión y el Parlamento, mientras el Mediterráneo es un cementerio de muertos. Porque esto va a seguir pasando. Esto ha sido un precedente del egoísmo. Esto ha sido un precedente de políticas fascistas. Y, además, no hace falta blindar las fronteras con guardacostas europeos, sino que hace falta poner recursos y poner la economía europea para evitar las causas que hacen que los emigrantes vengan aquí.

Tenemos que ser solidarios porque Europa sido emigrante. Y, sobre todo, el naufragio de Europa, el naufragio del transatlántico, frente a la dignidad de estas personas que vienen a salvar sus vidas.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). –Herr talman! Talman Tajani sa tidigare här att vi måste hitta en lösning, och det snabbt, och där håller jag med honom. Lösningen är inte att EU ska medverka till att mer eller mindre locka migranter till våra medlemsstater genom generösa bidrag och uppehållstillstånd. Vi ska vara medvetna om att de som kommer nu är upp till 99 procent ekonomiska migranter som tror att EU är en stor bankomat.

Vi kommer inte att kunna lösa detta genom en reform av Dublin, och den här tvångsfördelningen man pratar om. Den diskussionen har vi haft i flera år utan att nå fram till någon lösning, och vi ser land efter land ta avstånd från detta nu. Det är hög tid att göra om och göra rätt i stället. Istället för att agera båt-taxi åt människosmugglare är det bättre att titta på andra lösningar. Teckna ett avtal med något afrikanskt land dit vi kan sända tillbaka migranterna. På så sätt så motarbetar vi det här med att de ger sig ut i farliga båtar, och så räddar vi liv.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, το πρόβλημα της παράνομης μεταναστεύσεως στη Μεσόγειο δεν πρόκειται να επιλυθεί, διότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν έχει τη θέληση να πραγματοποιήσει τις ενέργειες εκείνες που απαιτούνται για την επίλυσή του.

Επιπλέον δεν επιδεικνύει αλληλεγγύη προς τις χώρες εισόδου. Ποια αλληλεγγύη έχει επιδείξει προς την Ιταλία, την Ισπανία, τη Μάλτα; Το ότι ανέχεται τις γειτονικές χώρες να κλείσουν τα σύνορά τους και να καταργήσουν στην πράξη τη Συμφωνία του Σένγκεν; Το ότι διανέμει κάποια κονδύλια τα οποία, όπως συμβαίνει και στην Ελλάδα, ουσιαστικά τα καταχρώνται κάποιες διεφθαρμένες ΜΚΟ; Το ότι κατηγορεί την Ιταλία διότι αποφασίζει το αυτονόητο, δηλαδή να μην επιτρέψει άλλους λαθρομετανάστες να έρθουν στη χώρα της;

Ακόμη χειρότερα είναι τα πράγματα με την Ελλάδα. Επιδεικνύει αλληλεγγύη η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όταν ανέχεται τον Ερντογάν να στέλνει κάθε μέρα χιλιάδες λαθρομεταναστών στην Ελλάδα, περισσότερους από όσους έχει κάθε άλλη χώρα της Ευρώπης; Ή όταν ανέχεται την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να μετατρέψει την Ελλάδα σε ένα απέραντο στρατόπεδο δυστυχισμένων παρανόμων μεταναστών; Έχει το θάρρος η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να φτιάξει hotspot στην Τουρκία ή να σταματήσει τη χρηματοδότηση και τις ενταξιακές συνομιλίες με την Τουρκία;

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, επιτέλους μία ευρωπαϊκή κυβέρνηση, η κυβέρνηση της Ιταλίας, επιδεικνύει υποδειγματική στάση στο ζήτημα που προέκυψε με το Aquarius. Πάρα πολλά ερωτήματα όμως παραμένουν αναπάντητα. Με ποια εξουσιοδότηση μπορούν τα μέλη μιας οποιασδήποτε ΜΚΟ να μεταφέρουν ανθρώπους, δρώντας στην πράξη σαν λαθροδιακινητές και δουλέμποροι; Οι συγκεκριμένοι επιβάτες του πλοίου ούτε ναυαγοί ήταν ούτε διέτρεχε κίνδυνο η ζωή τους. Με την υποστήριξη κάποιων προσπάθησαν να εκμεταλλευτούν το διεθνές δίκαιο και να μεταφερθούν στην Ευρώπη. Όμως κανένα διεθνές δίκαιο δεν επιβάλλει στο οποιοδήποτε κράτος να παραβεί τους νόμους του.

Το σημαντικότερο όμως ερώτημα είναι: για ποιο λόγο τα μέλη αυτών των ΜΚΟ δεν έχουν ακόμα συλληφθεί για εμπορία ανθρώπων; Για ποιο λόγο δεν έχει απαγορευτεί η λειτουργία των εγκληματικών αυτών οργανώσεων; Πρέπει άμεσα να σταματήσει η ανοχή που επιδεικνύεται και να εφαρμοστούν οι νόμοι των κρατών μελών, οι δε παράνομοι διακινητές των ΜΚΟ να καταλήξουν στη φυλακή όπου και αν ανήκουν.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank you for this very lively debate on the migratory situation in the Mediterranean. I take from this debate that we all share finally – or almost all of us – the same objectives, and that is very important for us. There cannot be one and only one answer. There is no single solution and we all know that. No Member State can do this alone. It is impossible. The only way is to adopt all the missing elements and to implement a comprehensive migration policy.

This policy starts with cooperation with third countries. It continues with the protection of our common European borders – our external borders. It is in line with a future-proof European asylum system based on solidarity and responsibility. It is very much relying on effective return of people that have no right to stay in Europe. It is completed by the creation of legal pathways to come to Europe and by effective integration policies for those legally living among us. We need to continue our common work and our joint efforts in all aspects in parallel.

As regards some of the points you raised – Mr Corrao and many of his colleagues here referred to the support given to Italy – we have worked continuously and relentlessly over the past three years to ensure that much greater solidarity is shown to all Member States facing disproportionate migration pressures due to their geographical situation. I want to commend the Herculean efforts made by Italy over these past years. The Commission – and you all know that it has stood and continues to stand by Italy politically, operationally and financially – has granted more than EUR 653 million to Italy under the EU migration and home affairs funds to date. On top of that, we have offered EUR 193 million in emergency assistance.

The European Borders and the Coastguard Agency Deployment is currently deploying 260 experts for Joint Operation Themis. Eighty asylum experts from Member States and interim staff have been deployed to support the operational activities. Europol guest officers are present in several hotspots and 12 963 persons in need of international protection have been relocated. We are also working closely with Italy to prevent departures from northern Africa. We have invested EUR 200 million in Libya to assist migrants, and EUR 46 million for border management. We will also grant Tunisia EUR 25 million for a border management project.

As I said, this approach has brought results. Arrivals in Italy have decreased significantly. I look forward to working with the new Italian Government to ensure that arrivals decrease even further.

As I said during my introductory remarks, I am not here to play any blame games, and anyway it doesn't help. The Aquarius incident shows that we need structural solutions and that solidarity cannot be an ad hoc or one-off thing. This is the essence of our discussions on Dublin, on stronger external borders, on cooperation with third countries and on our proposals today for more migration and borders funding.

These are European challenges which require genuine European solutions. This is not the responsibility of Italy alone or of Malta alone or of Spain alone. This is the responsibility of the European Union and its Member States as a whole.

Under these very pressing circumstances, and given the experience and the lessons we have learned over the last few years, we should reiterate our determination to safeguard the principles and unity of Europe in a spirit of responsibility. We should stand as one, guaranteeing a future-proof, balanced and fair European migration policy. All of us here have a great responsibility to show leadership and to ensure the unity and cohesion of our societies, avoiding divisive rhetoric. Migration has become a challenge for our unity. It is up to us to turn this into an opportunity, into a strong bond among EU institutions, among Member States and among our citizens.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I have listened carefully to your views on the humanitarian situation in the Mediterranean Sea. The topic is of crucial importance, and it is my hope that we will be able to find a common solution quickly. The migrants certainly deserve that but so do our constituencies.

We shouldn't forget that most of the refugees and asylum seekers, particularly children and women, were affected by war and terror in their home countries. Migration is one of the major humanitarian challenges that the European Union is currently still facing and, as we discussed together yesterday and today, we need a holistic approach to migration management. The European Union response to this challenge has two main dimensions: strengthening the instruments for limiting irregular migration and addressing the root causes of migration.

Many of you referred today to the reform of the Dublin Regulation system and – sharing the common understanding that the European Union needs a properly functioning common asylum system – the Council has not stopped working to enhance the security of our citizens, to strengthen border control and to manage the migratory process more efficiently. The Council has listened to you carefully and we welcome Parliament's input in this debate.

The Bulgarian Presidency fully shares your concerns and the sense of urgency around the need for asylum system reform which is both effective and protective. So we are doing our best to advance. We have proposed a qualitatively new approach to the Dublin Regulation. We are working not just on general principles but on the legal text of the regulation, article by article, and on concrete solutions. So we have built into the Dublin Regulation a new crisis mechanism for managing the migration and asylum systems in the Union when under pressure. The Presidency proposal provides clear criteria defining levels of pressure, and lays down measures aimed at establishing a proportionate response in each phase, allowing for timely mitigation, based on common action, of the challenges faced in addressing the root causes of the pressure at the very beginning, thus preventing escalation of the situation.

The Presidency is trying to strike a balance between responsibility and solidarity. As I have already mentioned in relation to the preparation for the European Council meeting yesterday, the process of seeking consensus is now being led by the President of the European Council. It is up to him and the leaders to look for compromises and propose a way ahead. Any solution that will be found should take account of the interests of all Member States – the frontline Member States and also the Member States that have been destination countries for asylum seekers.

Any decision will need to provide sustainable solutions that will help the Union to cope with situations similar to the one we faced a couple days ago.

President. – Thank you, Madam Minister.

I would like to thank you, colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the discipline and mutual respect that you have shown. You made the chairing easier and it was a pleasure to chair this debate.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Francisco Assis (S&D), *por escrito*. – O caso do navio «Aquarius», que os governos de Itália e de Malta recusaram acolher, apesar de transportar 629 pessoas resgatadas ao mar, veio lembrar de forma eloquente como o drama dos migrantes no Mediterrâneo é também o drama da Europa, ao interpelar e ao colocar em causa os princípios civilizacionais e humanistas que são a sua herança mais valiosa e o seu principal legado. Alguns avanços alcançados na gestão das fronteiras externas, no socorro aos refugiados e na resposta às causas duradouras dos fluxos migratórios através da ajuda ao desenvolvimento, não são suficientes para esconder o fracasso das várias tentativas de repartição do esforço de acolhimento de refugiados, distribuindo-os de forma solidária e proporcional pelos Estados-Membros. É evidente que os governos italiano e maltês fizeram uma opção condenável e chocante no caso do «Aquarius», virando as costas a seres humanos em perigo, mas não deixa de ser verdade que o esforço exigido a esses países é injusto e que não basta

aumentar as transferências financeiras para torná-lo justo. É lamentável que, três anos volvidos, a UE não tenha ainda sido capaz de reformar o Regulamento de Dublin ou de impor consequências aos Estados-Membros relapsos ao acolhimento de refugiados.

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – De odyssee van de Aquarius is meer dan een wake-upcall. Dit geval wijst ons op het belang van duidelijke Europese afspraken. Laat dit het ultieme argument zijn om Europees eindelijk de doorbraak te forceren, die maakt dat de ministerraad de hervorming van het asielbeleid deblokkeert, en tekent voor een snelle, uniforme afhandeling van asielaanvragen én een akkoord over de verdere uitbouw van een doeltreffende Europese grens-en kustwacht, met 10 000 grenswachters (7 keer meer dan vandaag). Geen beleid van pushbacks, maar een beleid dat voorkomt dat mensen nog in gammele bootjes stappen, en uitgewezen migranten effectief, maar wel correct terugstuurt. Zonder ze aan het lijntje te houden of terug op gammele bootjes te duwen. Een akkoord dat migranten de kans geeft om een aanvraag in te dienen in hotspots in Afrika, maar bescherming biedt aan oorlogsvluchtelingen, en zeker de meest kwetsbaren onder hen.

Ik hoop hartgrondig dat de Aquarius ook de impuls geeft voor de lancering van een ingrijpend Marshallplan voor Afrika. Wij hebben er alle belang bij om in de regio te investeren, in de eerste plaats in hernieuwbare energie en duurzame landbouw. Het bestaande trustfonds voor Afrika moet dringend worden uitgebouwd tot een alomvattend investeringspact, om kansen en perspectief in de regio te genereren.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Perante a fria desumanidade da UE, já morreram este ano cerca de 800 pessoas na travessia do Mediterrâneo. Nos últimos quatro anos foram mais de 16 mil os que pereceram, fazendo do Mediterrâneo uma gigantesca vala comum. Números oficiais que ocultam uma realidade muito provavelmente ainda mais sombria. Empurrados pela fome, pela miséria e pela guerra – fugindo de cenários de devastação nos quais a UE tem pesadas responsabilidades – chocam contra um muro de indiferença e desumanidade, erguido pela UE. O jogo do empurra a que assistimos, entre a UE e os Estados-Membros e dos Estados-Membros uns para os outros, é deplorável. Como deploráveis são as tentativas de criminalização das organizações de resgate e salvamento que atuam no terreno. Organizações cuja ação se torna necessária em face da omissão e negligência da UE e dos seus governos relativamente a ações humanitárias de resgate e salvamento. E deploráveis são ainda os acordos com países terceiros – com destaque para o assinado com a Turquia – para repelir, conter ou expulsar migrantes. As agências da UE no terreno, em lugar de ação humanitária, concentram-se na aplicação destes acordos. Os 629 migrantes à deriva no Aquarius, incluindo muitas crianças e mulheres grávidas, são uma eloquente expressão do que a UE se tornou.

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – A Földközi-tengeren a mihamarabb fel kell számolni az embercsempész hálózatokat és útvonalakat, mert a most kialakult rendszerben az embercsempészek döntik el ki jöhet Európába. Számukra semmilyen emberélet nem számít, és sajnos ehhez asszisztálnak az európai NGO-k is, amikor még líbiai vizekből „mentik ki” a migránsokat majd szállítják őket Európába. Az Európai Határ- és Parti Őrsége szerint víz, élelem és mentőmellény nélkül engedik tengerre a zsúfolt gumicsónakokat, arra számítva, hogy az NGO-mentőhajók úgys gyorsan megtalálják őket.

Ha valóban segíteni akarunk, akkor meg kell tudnunk akadályozni, hogy migránsok ezrei kockáztassák saját és gyermekeik életét azzal, hogy nyilvánvalóvá tesszük: illegálisan nem lehet belépni Európába. Fontos, hogy a gazdasági bevándorlók szétválasztása a valóban menekültstátuszra jogosultaktól már az Unió külső határain kívül megtörténjen, hiszen az Olaszországba érkező illegális migránsok kevesebb, mint 3% bizonyult valódi menekültnek. Mára végre eljutottunk oda, hogy egyre több uniós tagállami vezetőik közül elismeri és hangoztatja azt, amit a magyar miniszterelnök 2015 óta következetesen képvisel, hogy a külső határok védelme elsődleges kell legyen. Újra urai kell legyünk saját külső határainknak szárazföldön, tengeren egyaránt.

Ezért végre hatékony intézkedésekre lenne szükség, hiszen ma még az EU folyamatosan olyan helyzeteket menedzsel, amelyeket az embercsempészek kényszerítenek ki, ahelyett, hogy érvényt szerezne akaratának a külső tengeri határokon is.

Ana Gomes (S&D), in writing. – Salvini lies: it is not true that Italy is left alone with migration: last Friday I and other members of the Special Committee on Terrorism passed by the Aquarius, docked at Catania, and went all the way to the Pozzallo 'hotspot', which would not be equipped and able to articulate with European Law Enforcement Command structures to identify, screen and assist people arriving, if it were not for European funding, manning and organisation.

Salvini lies: portraying migrants and refugees as threats and omitting that inflows into Italy have dramatically decreased. And yes, maybe inflows are managed by mafias trafficking human beings, but only because other liars and fearmongers in European governments are fuelling their sordid business by refusing to open legal, controlled ways for migrants and refugees.

Italy and Malta violated international and European law by refusing 629 people rescued by the Aquarius. The Socialists now in power in Spain saved European decency and humanity. But that will not always work: we need governments to approve at the next European Council the Dublin Regulation reform and the full migration/asylum package, proposed by Parliament to ensure that the EU, in solidarity, manages migration, not the human traffickers.

Dietmar Köster (S&D), *schriftlich.* – Seit dem Jahr 2000 sind mehr als 35.000 Menschen auf der Flucht im Mittelmeer ertrunken. Die Unfähigkeit der Europäischen Union – und hier vor allem des Europäischen Rates –, diese von Menschen verursachte Katastrophe zu beenden, ist unerträglich. Das Europäische Parlament hat schon längst Vorschläge auf den Tisch gelegt, um dieses Desaster zu beenden. Doch der Rat ist politisch unwillig.

Nun hat diese menschenrechtsfeindliche Politik einen neuen Höhepunkt erreicht: Der italienische Innenminister Salvini, von der neofaschistischen Lega, hat dem Schiff Aquarius von SOS Mediterranee und Ärzten ohne Grenzen die Einfahrt in einen italienischen Hafen untersagt.

Auf dem Schiff waren 629 Menschen in Not. Salvini wäre nach internationalem Recht dazu verpflichtet gewesen, diese aufzunehmen. Mit seiner Hafenblockade stellt er sich gegen die Menschenrechte!

Ich freue mich als Sozialist darüber, dass die neue spanische Regierung sich bereiterklärt hat, die Menschen aufzunehmen. Es muss endlich Schluss damit sein, jene zu kriminalisieren, die durch ihr praktisches Handeln die Menschenrechte verteidigen. Ihnen gebührt unsere Solidarität.

Der Rat muss endlich seiner Verantwortung gerecht werden, damit das Sterben auf dem Mittelmeer beendet wird und eine menschenrechtsfundierte Flüchtlingspolitik umgesetzt wird! Der Rat ist gefordert: Die Dublin-Reform muss jetzt endlich auf den Weg gebracht werden!

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing.* – Unless we make a clear distinction between genuine asylum seekers and economic emigrants, European citizens will not understand our purpose on migration issues. Unless we have functioning policies and rules that deal fairly, strictly and effectively with such issues, on a European basis, populists and extremists will win the political challenge. Asylum seekers should be given all the protection they need. Economic migrants, unless they are needed by European economies, must be sent back. For this we need a strong and effective frontier control system that reaches out to neighbouring territories, inclusive of a security capability. But Europe should also have a functioning common policy to allow open and legal economic migration, matching migrants to needs identified and declared by Member States. It also should strengthen and widen its development aid outreach to sub-Saharan Africa, while streamlining the investment and operating activities of its own corporations in that zone – so as to promote job creation there. We have been declaring these objectives for a long while. There has been a lack of agreement and limp implementation. Whether via 'Dublin' or otherwise, the time has come for like-minded Member States to jointly consolidate and put into full effect these agreed policy directions.

László Tőkés (PPE), *írásban.* – Megkönnyebbüléssel üdvözölhetjük, hogy a spanyol kormány segítségére sietett az Aquarius hajó fedélzetére kimentett afrikai migránsoknak. A bajba jutottakon valakinek segítenie kellett. Emmanuel Macron francia miniszterelnökkel az élen sokan támadják Matteo Salvini olasz belügyminisztert, aki új migrációs politikájának megfelelően okkal és joggal kíván véget vetni az országában tetőző mediterrán migránsválságnak.

Valójában nem őt és nem Orbán Viktor miniszterelnököt kellene gyalázni a kialakult vészhelyzetért, hanem azokat, akik az évek óta tartó válságot Európára rászedték. Első sorban is Angela Merkel kancellárnőt és az ő meghívásszámba menő „willkommenskultur”-ját, valamint Brüsszel elhibázott bevándorlási politikáját, mely egész Európát veszélybe sodorja. Az Aquarius „hajótöröttjeinek” humanitárius válsága csupán következmény, melyet az említett politikusok, velük együtt pedig a kapzsi embercsempészek és a felelőtlen migránsbarát civilszervezetek idéztek elő. Szolidárisnak kell lenni – de nem így!

Boulad atyának van igaza, aki a hajó metaforájával élve helyesen állapította meg: senkitől nem várható el, hogy a süllyedés kockázatával terhelje túl a hajót, mert akkor mindannyian odavesznek. Ez a hajó pedig a jelen helyzetben: maga Európa. Üdvözlöm az olasz belügyminiszter és német hivatali kollégája, Horst Seehofer Európa külső határainak védelmére irányuló törekvését. Magyarország és a Visegrádi négyek felfogásának megfelelően az Uniónak gyökeresen meg kell változtatnia bevándorlási politikáját.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), schriftelijk. – Voorzitter, ik zou graag vertellen dat wat we de voorbije dagen gezien hebben schandelijk, ongezien en onwaardig is, maar de realiteit gebiedt mij om te zeggen dat er eigenlijk niets nieuws onder de zon is. Al sinds de inwerkingtreding van de Dublinverordening zien we dat migranten de speelbal zijn van Europese regeringen en administraties. Mensen worden niet geregistreerd en niet opgevangen, zodat ze stiltes onder de radar verdwijnen. Als migranten asiel aanvragen, hangt de onzekerheid van de Dublintransfer boven hun hoofd. En nu sluiten de havens zich voor kwetsbare mensen.

Dublin zorgt voor een 'zero sum game', en de democraten zijn de verliezers. Want vergis u niet, voor Salvini zit de winst hem niet in het feit dat Italië nu wel of niet 600 migranten moet opvangen. De winst zit er hem in dat hij kan scoren op de kap van kwetsbare mensen. Daarom richt ik me nu tot elke democraat die zich in de Raad bevindt: u moet nú handelen. Het spel moet ophouden. Hervorm Dublin nu, want met elk greintje waardigheid dat we van kwetsbare mensen afnemen, nemen we een beetje van onze eigen waardigheid weg. U moet nu handelen, omdat u de verantwoordelijkheid draagt voor wat de EU zal worden tijdens de komende verkiezingen.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D), schriftlich. – Die Vorgänge um das Flüchtlingsboot Aquarius in dieser Woche zeigen uns deutlich, wie weit Europas rechte Parteien bereit sind, zu gehen. An einer wirklichen Lösung sind sie nicht im Mindesten interessiert, noch schlimmer: Sie nehmen das Sterben im Mittelmeer in Kauf, um weiter ihre Politik der Vorurteile und Angstmache zu betreiben. Von Orbán, Kickl und Salvini habe ich nichts anderes erwartet. Dass mit Seehofer und Kurz jetzt auch Europas Christdemokraten in den Chor der Rechtsextremen einstimmen, ist brandgefährlich für die EU. Vorschläge für die Reform des europäischen Asylwesens liegen schon lange vor und werden immer wieder verzögert. Die Menschen erwarten sich keine Rhetorik, sondern Lösungen. Das Europäische Parlament erneuert seine klare Position immer wieder: Wir brauchen legale Einreisemöglichkeiten, klar definierte Verteilungsquoten und finanzielle Unterstützung der Herkunftsländer.

15. Parlamendi koosseis (vt protokoll)

16. Kutsealasid reguleerivate uute õigusnormide vastuvõtmisele eelnev proportsionaalsuse kontroll (arutelu)

President. – The next item is the report by Andreas Schwab, on behalf of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, on a proportionality test before adoption of new regulation of professions (COM(2016)0822 – C8-0012/2017 – 2016/0404(COD))(A8-0395/2017).

Andreas Schwab, Berichtersteller. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 50 Millionen Menschen, also 22 % der Erwerbstätigen in Europa, arbeiten in reglementierten Berufen, deren Ausübung an den Besitz bestimmter Qualifikationen gebunden ist oder in denen das Führen eines bestimmten Titels geschützt ist, zum Beispiel der Apothekerberuf oder der Beruf eines Architekten. Für eine ganze Reihe von Berufen, beispielsweise in den Bereichen Gesundheit oder Sicherheit, ist eine spezielle Reglementierung der berufsbezogenen Eintrittsbedingungen häufig gerechtfertigt. Es gibt jedoch auf europäischer Ebene in den 28 Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union immer wieder Fälle, in denen durch übermäßige, umständliche und nicht mehr zeitgemäße Vorschriften qualifizierten Bewerberinnen und Bewerbern der Zugang zu Berufen unverhältnismäßig erschwert wird.

Die Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union haben im regulären Gesetzgebungsverfahren darüber mitentschieden, dass das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip als allgemeines Rechtsprinzip in der Europäischen Union anerkannt wird – nicht nur im Primärrecht, sondern auch in der Berufsanerkennungsrichtlinie. Auch der Europäische Gerichtshof hat das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip auch im Bereich dieser Ausübung von Berufsrechten, die durch die Mitgliedstaaten eingeschränkt werden können, immer wieder bestätigt. Derzeit ist in der Richtlinie 2005/36, zuletzt geändert im Jahr 2013, festgelegt, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Verhältnismäßigkeit der eigenen Anforderungen, die den Zugang zu reglementierten Berufen oder deren Ausübung beschränken, prüfen und der Kommission die Ergebnisse dieser Prüfung vorlegen. Die Mitgliedstaaten können insoweit nach wie vor selbst über diese Regelungen und Bestimmungen beschließen, sofern sie die Grundsätze

des Primärrechts und das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip beachten.

Die Kommission hat auf Basis dieser Grundlage aber festgestellt, dass die Ausübung des Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzips durch die Mitgliedstaaten in den vergangenen Jahren leider nicht so gelungen ist, wie das eigentlich die Mitgliedstaaten sich selbst und der Kommission versprochen hatten, und hat deswegen einen neuen Vorschlag unterbreitet, wie das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip aus der Berufsqualifikationsanerkennungsrichtlinie künftig noch präziser und noch besser gefasst werden kann. Und auch wenn der europäische Gesetzgeber durchaus Zweifel daran hatte, ob die Wiederholung dieses Prinzips und die Präzisierung dieses Prinzips am Ende gesetzgeberisch wirklich sinnvoll ist, haben uns doch die vielen Beispiele überzeugt, die die Kommission vorgelegt hat. Deswegen haben wir uns im Binnenmarktausschuss am Ende mit großer Mehrheit dazu durchgerungen, diesen Gesetzgebungsvorschlag sehr engagiert und zügig auszuarbeiten. Ich bin allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, gerade den Schattenberichterstatern, dankbar, dass es gelungen ist, hier zu einer sehr einvernehmlichen Lösung zu gelangen.

Die neue Richtlinie legt deshalb nun einen europaweiten Maßstab für die Kriterien fest, die im Rahmen der Verhältnismäßigkeitsprüfung von den Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten analysiert und beachtet werden müssen, und damit wird künftig ganz klar geregelt, was Verhältnismäßigkeit in Bezug auf die Berufsreglementierungen bedeutet und welche Auswirkungen, Regelungen und Chancen dem Verhältnismäßigkeitsgrundsatz künftig angepasst werden müssen.

Aus meiner Sicht liegen die wesentlichen Fortschritte, die wir in diesem Bericht am Ende möglich machen konnten, darin, dass wir zum einen eine Klarstellung für die Gesundheitsberufe schaffen konnten, die gleichzeitig aber auch dem allgemeinen Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip unterworfen werden müssen, weil am Ende richterlich entschieden werden muss, welche Anforderungen an das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip zu stellen sind. Zum Zweiten ist mir wichtig, dass in dieser Richtlinie auch die grenzüberschreitende Dienstleistungserbringung über die Berufsqualifikationsanerkennungsrichtlinie hinaus nur verhältnismäßige Anforderungen vorsehen darf, damit tatsächlich im europäischen Binnenmarkt die Berufsausübung nicht unverhältnismäßig eingeschränkt wird.

Zum Dritten war uns von Anfang an klar, dass diese Richtlinie nicht der Deregulierung dient, sondern einer Präzisierung des Verhältnismäßigkeitsgrundsatzes, und wir damit an vielen Stellen nicht dem gewissermaßen vermuteten Impetus der Deregulierung gehorcht haben, sondern sichergestellt haben, dass eine vernünftige Regulierung auf Basis der Gesetzgebung der Mitgliedstaaten künftig genauso möglich bleiben wird wie bisher.

Zuletzt ist mir wichtig, dass wir auch dem Handwerk, das an vielen Stellen für unsere Volkswirtschaft und Gesellschaft eine wichtige Leistung erbringt, hier nicht nur durch die Anerkennung der Pflichtmitgliedschaft in der Kammer, sondern auch an anderen Stellen Rechenschaft haben ablegen können darüber, dass wir die meisterbriefliche Ausbildung als besonders wichtigen Beitrag auch zur Ausbildung junger Menschen ansehen.

Und schließlich ist natürlich bedeutsam, auch im Rahmen dieses Gesetzgebungsvorhabens, dass die Subsidiarität, also die Sicherstellung des Gesetzgebungsauftrags auf der Basis der mitgliedstaatlichen Ebene, erhalten bleibt und wir uns alle gegenseitig versprochen haben, dass wir die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten, sofern sie das Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip beachten, an keiner Stelle in Frage stellen.

Ich glaube, im Zusammenhang mit dem noch später zu beratenden Vorschlag zur Notifizierung, der die Mitgliedstaaten dann dazu bringt, entsprechende Maßnahmen der Berufsreglementierung zunächst der Europäischen Kommission zur Prüfung vorzulegen, wird es uns gelingen, den Ausübungsrahmen der reglementierten Berufe in der Europäischen Union, im europäischen Binnenmarkt, durch diesen Vorschlag zu verbessern. Deswegen hoffe ich, dass ihn am Ende auch alle Mitgliedstaaten beachten.

Abschließend nochmals ganz herzlichen Dank an alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die mitgearbeitet haben. Ich hoffe, dass wir damit einen kleinen, aber hoffentlich zielführenden Schritt für den europäischen Binnenmarkt gehen konnten.

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I'm really happy to be here today for this debate on the Proportionality Test Directive ahead of tomorrow's final vote. With this proposal, we have jointly delivered on the first part of our services package of January 2017. I really welcome your cooperation and your support. What do we want to achieve with this directive? You know that negotiations were thorough, they were intense, but we reached an agreement in just over a year, so relatively shortly.

Let me briefly recall the goal of the directive. We want to improve the quality of the future regulation of professional services. As your rapporteur said, they are of utmost importance for our economies. Business services, including professional services such as accountants, lawyers, engineers and architects account for almost 13% of EU value added. Regulated professions all together make up nearly 22% of the European labour force, so almost 47 million people. And research shows that services inputs, including professional services, account for about 40% of the value added in manufacturing industries. So it's extremely important for our economies.

We also note that poorly-designed regulation creates obstacles, especially for young graduates trying to access these professions and for professionals when carrying out their professions. So we need to ensure that across the EU, the new regulation is really proportionate in order to protect public interests and that it does not create needless obstacles.

This directive will help Member States with devising their regulations. It will mean that we can minimise any negative effects on the single market, on competitiveness or on the mobility of professionals. It does not prevent Member States from adopting new requirements, but it does prevent unjustified ones. We are not losing sight of existing requirements either. We adopted reform recommendations on the existing regulation of professional services as part of the services package. You discussed these recommendations recently – I'm really grateful for that, and I want to thank Mr Danti for a report that really encourages us to pursue this important work together with the Member States, and we are doing exactly that.

The Proportionality Test Directive complements this by helping Member State authorities to fulfil their obligations under existing legislation, and of course, court judgments. It sets out very clear rules on how to determine whether planned legislation is really fit for purpose and makes sure that this is determined in advance of legislation being adopted.

We have insisted many times that the Commission should make enforcement of existing rules a priority, and we are doing exactly that. But we have to recognise that ex-post enforcement actions are definitely not enough. The new directive will help us provide clarity on the general obligation of the principle of proportionality.

As I said, I'm really grateful for the way that we have worked together on this proposal. The compromise, I think, strikes the right balance. The outcome of the negotiations maintains the overall objective of the proposed directive. It maintains legal certainty and coherence, while at the same time making sure that important public interests such as patient safety – which was raised many times – and our human health are really clearly acknowledged.

There were many moments where some doubted that this directive should cover all of the professions, but clearly, the principle of proportionality applies to all professions, so I am grateful that this House – you, honourable Members – has managed to find a good compromise. I also welcome the enhanced transparency and additional focus on the principle of non-discrimination. Transparency has to be ensured before and after a new regulation is adopted in the Member States. Relevant stakeholders shall now be involved before Member States adopt the new regulation on professional services. The reason why the regulation was found to be necessary will be available to all after its adoption.

You also have drawn attention to the obstacles that may hit professionals when they want to provide temporary or occasional services, so I welcome the addition that proportionality of requirements related specifically to this temporary or occasional provision of services must be assessed.

The Qualifications Directive already says that professionals must be able to provide their services in other Member States without unnecessary administrative hurdles. But of course, too often Member States demand plenty of information from professionals instead of just using direct cooperation with other Member States via our well-established internal market information tool, IMI. Let me be clear that this does not affect the posting of workers or the application of local working conditions.

I think that the adoption of this directive will not be the end of our work in this field; rather, it is the beginning. We will look closely into the implementation of this directive and will assist Member States. We will place special emphasis on the transparency that you introduced for the regulation and its rationale via our regulated professions database. This database has really become a reference tool for professional regulations in the EU.

I would especially like to thank the rapporteur, the shadow rapporteurs, the competent ministers and, of course, the Presidency for your cooperation.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Pascal Arimont, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Über 5500 Berufe sind in der EU zurzeit reglementiert. Und immer noch gibt es erhebliche Probleme bei der gegenseitigen Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten. Wir erhalten nach wie vor sehr viele Beschwerden, wenn beispielsweise in einem Mitgliedstaat unsinnige Voraussetzungen verlangt werden, um seinen Beruf in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat auszuüben.

Das darf nicht sein. Aus diesem Grund ist diese Verhältnismäßigkeitsprüfung, wie sie jetzt hier über dieses Gesetz erlassen wird, ein wichtiger Schritt. Sie wird dazu beitragen, Berufsanerkennung grenzüberschreitend zu vereinfachen. Dies ist insbesondere für Menschen, die an einer Grenze wohnen, so wie ich sie vertrete, von größter Bedeutung. Denn viele Menschen verstehen zu Recht nicht, weshalb sie ihren Beruf, den sie in ihrem Land gut und qualifiziert ausüben, in einem anderen Land nicht ausüben sollen dürfen.

Ein anderer Bestandteil des sogenannten Dienstleistungspakets war die sogenannte elektronische Dienstleistungskarte, und ich komme ganz kurz auf sie zurück. Ich habe mich im Ausschuss ganz klar dagegen ausgesprochen und mit meinem Stimmverhalten sogar zu ihrer Ablehnung beigetragen. Weshalb war das auch wichtig? Diese Dienstleistungskarte hätte all die Probleme wieder heraufbeschworen, die wir mit der Entsenderichtlinie eigentlich bekämpfen wollten. Sie hätte effektive Kontrollen erschwert und dem Sozialdumping ein neues Einfallstor geboten. Wir müssen Sozialdumping aber effektiver bekämpfen, statt es noch zu vereinfachen. Natürlich bleibt es wichtig, dass Unternehmen ihre Dienstleistungen grenzüberschreitend anbieten können. Davon lebt unser Binnenmarkt. Es bleibt aber im gleichen Atemzug wichtig, die Unternehmen und die Arbeitnehmer vor unlauterer Konkurrenz zu schützen.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volevo ringraziare il relatore Schwab e gli altri colleghi relatori ombra per il lungo e impegnativo lavoro che abbiamo fatto insieme. L'obiettivo che ci eravamo dati era un obiettivo ambizioso. Si trattava di cambiare in parti consistenti il testo che ci era stato consegnato dalla Commissione. Dunque trovare equilibrio e convergenza su nuove formulazioni non era un'impresa di poco conto, ci siamo riusciti e questo è molto importante.

Avevamo come obiettivo questo e, insieme, quello di cercare soluzioni che non limitassero l'autonomia degli Stati membri. Doveva essere il nostro lavoro di supporto agli Stati membri, mantenendo la loro autonomia nel regolare le attività professionali e nel perseguire, attraverso questa regolazione, obiettivi di interesse pubblico, come è stato detto già nella discussione.

Ora abbiamo modificato quella proposta e siamo ad una conclusione, della quale mi piace sottolineare alcuni aspetti. Abbiamo assicurato che le modalità del test siano flessibili e proporzionate rispetto alle modifiche in esame. Non era così all'inizio. Abbiamo ribadito esplicitamente la competenza degli Stati membri nella regolamentazione delle professioni. Gli approcci diversi non sono da considerare come sbagliati o negativi, prima ancora che vengano prospettati, ma devono entrare in sinergia con la soluzione complessiva che stiamo qui valutando.

Abbiamo respinto – sì, perché non ci sono soltanto le cose positive che abbiamo aggiunto, ci sono anche quelle che abbiamo cancellato – la proposta della Commissione di creare organismi di supervisione indipendenti che potevano stravolgere il lavoro futuro, garantendo che la lista dei criteri da valutare sia proporzionata e meno pesante per gli Stati membri, anche attraverso l'eliminazione della valutazione di impatto economico che era nel testo iniziale.

Abbiamo rafforzato le misure di trasparenza e di consultazione degli *stakeholder*, a partire dalle parti sociali, e abbiamo infine mantenuto il riconoscimento esplicito nel testo della direttiva della specificità della regolamentazione delle professioni sanitarie, che tanto ha fatto discutere ma che tanta sensibilità aveva creato in tutti i paesi dell'Unione.

Abbiamo perciò l'autonomia degli Stati membri che evita la deregolamentazione e abbiamo contemporaneamente fatto crescere la trasparenza e il coinvolgimento delle parti sociali. Era un equilibrio necessario ma non semplice. Sono molto contento che ci siamo riusciti.

Richard Sulík, za skupinu ECR. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, test proporcionality sa snaží o odstránenie pretrvávajúcich bariér na jednotnom trhu. Dnes musia tí, ktorí chcú ponúkať odborné služby alebo zamestnať sa v inom členskom štáte, čeliť značnému počtu regulačných prekážok. Situácia je o to horšia v povolaniach, kde je potrebné preukázať odbornú kvalifikáciu, a 28 členských štátov má svoje vlastné pravidlá, ako by táto kvalifikácia mala vyzerať.

Záujemcov o tieto profesie potom čaká pomalý a byrokratický proces takzvaného vzájomného uznávania kvalifikácií. Z tohto dôvodu považujem test proporcionality za správny, pretože jeho cieľom je predchádzať nadmerným profesijným reguláciám ešte skôr, ako ich štáty prijímú.

Proporcionalita je dlho známy a smutne nevyháňaný princíp, inak by sme dnes nemali štáty s viac ako 500 regulovanými povolaniami, kým iným štátom stačí 70. Test proporcionality by mal štáty odradiť od zbytočných predpisov a prínosom našich rokovaní s Radou bolo tiež zachovanie princípu väčšej transparentnosti pri prijímaní národných predpisov. Som rád, že sa snažíme odstraňovať prekážky a nie ich vytvárať, a táto smernica je jedna z mála, ktorá naozaj má potenciál znížiť počet regulácií.

Natíska sa ale otázka, prečo nemôžeme byť v tomto prístupe dôslední. Dnes odstraňujeme bariéry, ale dva týždne dozadu sme odhlasovali novú úpravu smernice o vysielaní pracovníkov, ktorá úmyselne obmedzuje poskytovateľov služieb z iných členských štátov. Rád by som vedel, ako môžeme podporovať naraz dve protichodné iniciatívy a ešte sa tváriť, že nám ide o spoločný cieľ.

Jasenko Selimovic, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Madam President, the G7 Summit in Quebec brought many surprises. One of the biggest was the day after, when we realised that President Trump was not signing the final statement. The signal sent to the world was quite clear: the USA stands for protectionism, closeness and isolationism.

The question is what the EU answer should be, and I do strongly believe that our answer should be to stand by our beliefs. We do believe in openness, we do believe in trade, we do believe in mobility. These are not just instruments to boost growth; these are also our values we should stand by. And this is exactly what we are doing tomorrow. The vote tomorrow is about 5 500 professions that would be able to move freely in Europe. Almost 47 million citizens will be affected by that. In most cases they can move from one country to another, but there are still significant barriers. In some countries, you have to live in that country in order to be able to exercise the profession; in other countries, you have to exercise this continuously. I do believe that tomorrow we are not just creating an instrument to boost growth and job mobility; we are actually defining our values.

Thanks to the rapporteur and thank you to the co-rapporteurs for their very fruitful work. I hope that tomorrow we will have a clear vote on this subject.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, desde el primer momento ya expresé mi rechazo a esta propuesta de proporcionalidad, y las razones son muy claras: los Estados miembros son los únicos competentes para regular los sistemas profesionales y de formación, por lo que dar a la Comisión potestad alguna para formar parte de este proceso implica una ruptura con el principio de subsidiariedad.

Además, existen profesiones delicadas, como las relacionadas con la salud, que no deberían incluirse en este test. A esto se suma que ya existe un control sobre la proporcionalidad en las regulaciones, y lo realiza *ex post* el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea, con la ventaja de que lo hace para cada caso concreto, para cada norma que —se cree— vulnera el principio de proporcionalidad. Es más, los criterios que existen en la propuesta del Parlamento se extraen precisamente de las sentencias del Tribunal.

La idea de un test común es, por tanto, problemática en materia de competencias a todos los niveles. Por ello, desde luego, se rechazó en la Comisión de Empleo.

Mylène Troszczyński, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, non, les décisions nationales en matière de restriction d'accès aux professions réglementées ne sont pas des fautes morales.

L'action nationale est vertueuse lorsqu'il s'agit de limiter les effets de l'action de l'Union européenne et de sa déréglementation permanente, et bien plus légitime pour défendre les intérêts des Européens.

L'action nationale s'impose par des impératifs de recherche du bien commun, elle vise la protection des professions stratégiques au service du citoyen et pour sa protection. La concurrence déloyale et sauvage engendrée par la destruction de ces équilibres est le seul horizon que vous offrez à nos concitoyens.

Ce rapport force la main des pays membres par une censure de l'action nationale injustifiable et intolérable. Le contrôle de proportionnalité est une véritable mise sous tutelle, une autocensure assumée et un nouveau renoncement d'ailleurs de la France, puisque ses autorités viennent de recommander l'adoption de cette procédure. Ce concept de démocratie limitée menace de plus en plus la santé, la vigueur et la force de nos nations.

Soyez certains que le mépris du bon sens et l'ingérence toujours plus évidente de l'Union européenne seront les marqueurs des prochaines échéances électorales, et nous faisons confiance aux électeurs européens qui, eux, font preuve de bon sens. Nous l'avons récemment vu en Italie.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). –Madam President, thank you very much. I would like to congratulate my colleague Andreas Schwab for the work done on this dossier and for the compromise he reached in the negotiation. In the EU, qualification requirements can differ widely between Member States, resulting, among other things, in fragmentation of the single market. The proposed introduction of a proportionality test before adoption of a new regulation on professionals will on the one hand harmonise activities within the EU and on the other hand deepen the single market for services and foster growth.

I come from a country, Romania, and myself I studied medicine, where health professionals are very well trained but choose to leave the country for better jobs. Knowing the specificity of this profession, I think that the rapporteur is right to propose the creation of a specific status for healthcare professions. I fully agree that the Member States should take due account of the objective of ensuring a high level of requirements for healthcare professions, such as reserve activities, protected professional title, continuous professional development and rules relating to geographical distribution or the organisation of the profession, professional ethics and supervision, while respecting the minimal training conditions as laid down in Directive 2005/36/EC.

In conclusion, with all the improvements from the work in the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) Committee and in other committees, this proposal will strengthen the internal market and will make our Union greater and stronger.

Elena Gentile (S&D). –Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, pochissime riflessioni. La libertà di esercizio delle professioni, comprese quelle sanitarie, e la libertà di impresa sono prerequisiti fondamentali per valorizzare il capitale umano in un'Europa che punta alla crescita, tutelando i diritti sia dei consumatori sia dei lavoratori e dei professionisti e anche del sistema di impresa. Per raggiungere questo obiettivo è necessario impedire che vengano frapposti ostacoli sproporzionati e talvolta insormontabili che limitano l'esigibilità degli stessi.

Se è vero, come è vero, che, in mancanza di specifiche disposizioni finalizzate all'armonizzazione dei requisiti per l'accesso alle professioni regolamentate e al loro esercizio sono gli Stati membri ad assumersi la responsabilità della loro regolamentazione, la stessa però non può non essere incardinata nei principi inderogabili della non discriminazione e della proporzionalità, tendendo dunque alla omogeneizzazione anche in riferimento al meccanismo della valutazione reciproca. E dunque la valutazione ex ante di regolamenti già in vigore o di nuovi regolamenti ci sembra una scelta giusta e condivisibile per il corretto funzionamento del mercato, che noi vogliamo sempre più trasparente e sempre più a tutela dei consumatori.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). –Regels rond gereguleerde beroepen moeten proportioneel maar ook doelgericht zijn. Zijn ze dat niet, dan worden ze met deze test meteen weggefilterd. Het gaat dus om een instrument voor slimme regelgeving waarmee we de uitbouw van de Europese dienstenmarkt een stevig duw in de rug bieden.

Ik lees in deze wetgeving vooral dat de veiligheid van de patiënt te allen tijde primeert en ook dat mijn eigen regio, Vlaanderen, een ruime vrijheid toekomt in de organisatie van haar gezondheidsberoepen. Verplichte Nederlandse taaltesten voor dokters die in Vlaanderen aan de slag gaan, passen in mijn ogen dus perfect in de beginselen die deze nieuwe richtlijn zo nadrukkelijk in de verf zet: kwalitatieve, toegankelijke en efficiënte gezondheidszorg.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). –Pani Przewodnicząca! Mówimy o bardzo ważnej sprawie. Świadczą o tym liczby, które tu były przytaczane: że chodzi o 50 mln osób wykonujących zawody regulowane. Ale w co drugim wystąpieniu słyszę jakby uzasadnienie odwołujące się do służby zdrowia, do lekarzy. I nie wiem, czy to jest brak wiedzy, czy to jest manipulacja, ponieważ musimy pamiętać, że my mówimy o tysiącach, tysiącach różnych zawodów: o ślusarzu, murarzu, malarzu, a nie tylko o lekarzu, adwokacie czy architekcie. I te tysiące zawodów, wykonywane przez dziesiątki milionów ludzi, są straszliwie w Unii Europejskiej, a szczególnie w niektórych państwach członkowskich zbiurokratyzowane, przeregulowane. Skutek jest taki, że jest ograniczenie dostępu młodych ludzi, młodych adeptów do tych zawodów, ograniczenie konkurencji, a ograniczenie konkurencji oczywiście zwiększa ceny, zmniejsza jakość. Dlatego podoba mi się kierunek tej dyrektywy, ale łącznie z nią, równolegle, powinny iść w Unii Europejskiej i państwach członkowskich prace na rzecz deregulacji, zmniejszenia biurokracji związanych z zawodami regulowanymi.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). –Fru formand! Det er godt, at vi anerkender erhvervskompetencer på tværs af grænserne i EU. Derfor skal medlemslandene selvfølgelig også overholde nogle fælles regler. Det er helt fint for mig, at vi opdaterer disse regler i den nye proportionalitetstest, og at vi også styrker gennemsigtigheden. Men – og der er et men – for når det kommer til sundhedsområdet og reglerne for læger og sygeplejersker og social- og sundhedsassistenter osv., så er det efter min mening medlemslandene selv, der skal kunne bestemme over, hvordan de regulerer disse erhverv. Sundhed er noget helt særligt – det er en helt særlig sektor, og medlemslandene organiserer denne sektor på vidt forskellige måder. Derudover er der også sprogbarrieren. Derfor ærgrer det mig rigtigt meget, at vi i denne proportionalitetstestlovgivning ikke fik undtaget sundhed. Jeg synes ikke, det bør være en del af proportionalitetstesten. Sundhed bør stå over markedet. Jeg støtter forslaget i al almindelighed, fordi det er godt, at vi får opdateret reglerne.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). –Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich stehe dem Vorschlag der Kommission – wie bekannt – sehr kritisch gegenüber, und zwar aus zwei Gründen: Zum einen halte ich ihn für überflüssig, für unnötig, und zum anderen glaube ich, dass die Probleme, die wir sicher im europäischen Binnenmarkt haben, dadurch nicht gelöst werden.

Wir haben bereits Verhältnismäßigkeitskriterien in Artikel 59 Absatz 3 der Berufsqualifikationsrichtlinie, und es gibt eine Vielzahl von Entscheidungen des Europäischen Gerichtshofs, in denen diese Kriterien nochmal detailliert ausgelegt, dargestellt wurden. Es fehlt uns nicht am rechtlichen Rahmen, den gibt es bereits. Ich teile die Auffassung der Kommission, dass die Mitgliedstaaten in der Tat sehr erfinderisch sind, wenn es darum geht, ihren Markt abzuschotten, Markthindernisse aufzubauen – die Analyse teile ich vollumfänglich. Aber wir werden mit immer neuen Regeln das Problem nicht lösen, sondern es muss vollzogen werden; es muss dann auch mit Nachdruck, es muss schlagkräftig von der Kommission gegen bekannte Hindernisse vorgegangen werden, und daran fehlt es einfach.

Ich glaube, wir lösen mit der Neufassung dieser Verhältnismäßigkeitsprüfungsrichtlinie kein Problem. Im Gegenteil, wir schränken manche gute Regelung in den Mitgliedstaaten ein. Ich würde mir einfach wünschen, dass die Kommission da, wo sie Kenntnis davon erlangt hat, dass es entsprechende Beschränkungen, Hindernisse, Hemmnisse gibt, auch wirklich mit ganz großem Nachdruck gegen die Mitgliedstaaten vorgeht und die Hindernisse abbaut. Es wäre zehnmal sinnvoller und effizienter als wieder neue Regeln zu schaffen, wie das jetzt hier vorgesehen ist.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). –Madame la Présidente, je voudrais remercier le rapporteur et le rapporteur fictif pour la qualité de leur travail, travail qui était d'autant plus nécessaire que la proposition initiale de la Commission était d'une piètre qualité.

Cette critique, d'ailleurs, s'applique à tous les textes du paquet sur les services, qui répondent tous, en fait, à la même logique: sous couvert de revoir des aspects de procédure, que ce soit sur la proportionnalité, mais aussi sur les notifications ou sur la mise en place de la carte professionnelle pour les services, on veut priver les États membres de la possibilité de mettre en place des règles pour les professions réglementées, règles qui, faut-il le rappeler, n'existent que parce qu'elles correspondent à des raisons impérieuses d'intérêt général aussi importantes que la santé des Européens, la sécurité des consommateurs ou la sauvegarde de l'environnement.

Fort heureusement, le travail qui a été conduit par le Parlement permet de limiter, voire de supprimer les visées dérégulatrices de ce texte, en particulier en reconnaissant la spécificité des professions de santé ou en rappelant la primauté des règles sectorielles et le principe de *lex specialis*, qui doit continuer à s'appliquer.

Encore une fois, je voudrais féliciter ici le rapporteur et l'équipe de négociation, en particulier notre rapporteur fictif, Sergio Cofferati.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). –Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Jedną z podstawowych swobód w Unii Europejskiej jest swoboda podejmowania pracy oraz działalności gospodarczej. Aby to było możliwe, powinniśmy konsekwentnie usuwać wszelkie bariery stojące na drodze do mobilności, a przede wszystkim bariery administracyjne. O ich istnieniu świadczy chociażby fakt, że nadal w Unii Europejskiej tylko niewielki procent obywateli pracuje poza krajem pochodzenia. Jedną z barier stojących na drodze mobilności, nie tylko tej między państwami członkowskimi, ale także mobilności wewnętrznej są przeregulowane przepisy dotyczące dostępu do rozmaitych zawodów. Bardzo często są one przejawem protekcjonizmu, co w rzeczywistości zabija zdrową konkurencję i hamuje rozwój. Takie przeregulowanie zawodów, na przykład prawniczych, ma także negatywne skutki dla konsumentów, co ma swoje odzwierciedlenie w wysokich cenach usług prawniczych czy notarialnych.

Ocena zawodów regulowanych w krajach europejskich pokazała, że często regulacje krajowe nie są oparte na solidnej i obiektywnej analizie. Z tego też powodu wprowadzenie obowiązkowej analizy proporcjonalności jest niezwykle potrzebne. I z tego miejsca chciałabym wyrazić moje głębokie poparcie dla omawianej inicjatywy legislacyjnej. Ustanowienie wspólnych ram, przeprowadzanie testu proporcjonalności czy wprowadzenie nowych przepisów regulujących zawody pozwoli w większym stopniu wykorzystać możliwości tkwiące w jednolitym rynku i ułatwi dostęp do zawodów. Niestety propozycja ta spotkała się z krytyką wielu kolegów, między innymi z Komisji Zatrudnienia, dlatego chciałabym obalić kilka mitów na jej temat. Państwa członkowskie nadal będą samodzielnie decydowały o sposobie regulowania dostępu do zawodów. Nowa dyrektywa wprowadzi jedynie obowiązek przeprowadzenia testu, który ma pokazać, czy nowe regulacje są proporcjonalne. Dyrektywa w pełni respektuje zasadę pomocniczości i nie daje Komisji Europejskiej żadnych dodatkowych instrumentów zablokowania uregulowań na poziomie krajowym.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D). –Señor presidente, muchas gracias también al ponente y al ponente alternativo, Sergio Cofferati, por el gran trabajo que han realizado en relación con esta Directiva.

Es verdad que cada vez recibimos más quejas, especialmente de trabajadores jóvenes que se han formado, que han aprendido idiomas para mejorar su empleabilidad, aprovechándose de las ventajas del mercado único y de las ventajas que ofrece estar en la Unión Europea, y es verdad que muchas veces encuentran, después de ese gran proceso de formación, barreras burocráticas para poder acceder a esos trabajos en otros países distintos del suyo.

Por lo tanto, en esa dirección de mejorar la empleabilidad y la movilidad laboral, especialmente de la gente joven, está bien el avance que supone el test de proporcionalidad. Pero también es verdad que hay determinadas profesiones, especialmente las sanitarias, que ya tienen, en la Directiva de cualificaciones profesionales, un estatus especial que les permite esa movilidad sin que se pierda ni un ápice de la seguridad que tienen que garantizar a los ciudadanos en el ejercicio de esas profesiones.

Y es verdad, por eso, que pedimos la exclusión de las profesiones sanitarias del test de proporcionalidad, cosa que no hemos conseguido, pero hemos conseguido en el marco de las negociaciones de los trílogos un texto de transacción que puede mejorar ese punto intermedio en el que, dando la mayor seguridad a los ciudadanos, también mejoremos la empleabilidad del conjunto de los trabajadores en la Unión Europea.

Paul Rübig (PPE). –Frau Präsidentin! Recht herzlichen Dank auch der Kommissarin Bienkowska. Wir alle wissen – Angelika Niebler hat es schon gut auf den Punkt gebracht –, dass hier natürlich wieder die Gefahr besteht, so wie bei der Datenschutzgrundverordnung, dass eine enorme Bürokratie entsteht, und dass natürlich gerade diese unverhältnismäßige Bürokratieranwendung in den Mitgliedstaaten eine gewisse Gefährdung darstellt. Wir wissen, *gold plating* ist etwas, was sehr gut ankommt. Deshalb möchte ich anregen, dass man hier vor allem bessere Rechtsetzung anwendet in dem Sinne, dass jeder Mitgliedstaat wirklich den SME-Test durchführt und es dementsprechend für die Mitgliedsbetriebe so einfach und transparent wie möglich gestaltet.

Ich glaube, dass die Anerkennung der Pflichtmitgliedschaft ein positives Zeichen ist, dass natürlich die Anerkennung der Meisterprüfung – also dieses tradierte duale System – für uns von allergrößter Bedeutung ist und dass die Subsidiarität in diesem Bereich auch wirklich gelebt werden kann.

In diesem Sinne würde ich mich freuen, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten hier vor allem darauf achten, dass auch in den Gesundheitsberufen dementsprechende Regelungen geschaffen werden. Wir wissen, dass der Gesundheitstourismus auch in Europa eine wichtige Rolle spielt, und deshalb ist die Anerkennung der Berufsqualifikation in Verhältnismäßigkeit ein wichtiger und richtiger Schritt in die richtige Richtung.

In dem Sinne möchte ich mich bei allen beteiligten Kollegen bedanken. Wenn es vernünftig umgesetzt wird, ist es ein Schritt in die richtige Richtung.

Nicola Danti (S&D). –Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, io penso che la direttiva sul test di proporzionalità, grazie al lavoro dei colleghi, in particolare modo del relatore e del relatore ombra, dovrà servire ad aiutare le autorità nazionali a legiferare meglio, non certo ad impedire i legittimi interventi normativi da parte degli Stati membri.

Professionisti competenti e pienamente inseriti nella nuova dimensione digitale saranno infatti determinanti perché l'Europa resti competitiva nel mondo e per tutelare il nostro modello sociale. Per preservare un'alta qualità dei servizi professionali abbiamo quindi bisogno di politiche a sostegno, ma soprattutto di un quadro normativo comune, efficace e proporzionato.

Con questo testo abbiamo corretto un'impostazione sbagliata della Commissione, che considerava ogni intervento legislativo come un ostacolo alla crescita economica. Al contrario, signora Presidente e Commissario, credo che occorra promuovere norme che da una parte sostengano la sana concorrenza, l'accesso dei giovani al mondo del lavoro, la crescita e l'innovazione, ma che al contempo tutelino la qualità dei servizi erogati, gli obiettivi di pubblico interesse e i consumatori finali.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). –Madam President, we should be happy that we have come to the end of these negotiations on a very important piece of legislation. The Directive on the proportionality test before adoption, a new regulation of professions, because this is legislation which improves the functioning of the internal market for services. There are a number of other obstacles on this market, and we should be happy that at least one of them will be reduced.

I don't share the concerns of some of the colleagues here that this is going to undermine the competences of national states. This is a good step forward which should be followed by other initiatives, but for at least for this one I would like to express my thanks to the Commission, and of course to our rapporteur, Andreas Schwab. We are talking about the obligation now imposed on Member States, before they introduce a new regulation on regulated professions, to check to what extent these new proposals are effective, and whether they do not go too far in simply imposing restrictive conditions for provision of services.

This is a good day for the internal market for services, which has not been very lucky recently, and some of the initiatives have not been adopted by the Parliament. So for this reason, I express my joy and I would also like to express my thanks to all those who contributed to this final outcome.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). –Paní předsedající, já za tento návrh děkuji. Považuji ho za krok správným směrem pro otevřený vnitřní trh. Na půdě EP jsme v poslední době svědky spíše opačného postupu. Místo odbourávání administrativních bariér se tady budují nové překážky, např. při schvalování směrnice o vysílání pracovníků, to je skutečně ukázka.

Já se osobně domnívám, že Evropa potřebuje chránit především před protekcionistickými opatřeními členských států a před sociálním dumpingem ze třetích zemí. Výbor IMCO nedávno pohřbil návrhy o e-kartě. Ta mohla alespoň malým krůčkem přispět k funkčnějšímu trhu tím, že by zmírnila administrativní překážky. Ukázalo se však, že i odbourávání těchto překážek může být některými státy bráno jako útok na jejich trh práce.

Proto jsem ráda, že alespoň tomuto návrhu z balíčku služeb dáváme šanci, a věřím, že společný rámec pro provádění testu proporcionality pro všechna povolání, včetně zdravotnických, přispěje k odbourávání překážek pro větší mobilitu osob, ale zároveň také přispěje k posílení jistoty a kvality prováděných profesí na vnitřním trhu. Děkuji a doufám, že tento návrh bude schválen.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Csaba Sógor (PPE). –Madam President, while an occupational regulation can be a means to safeguard consumer interest, it can often turn into a rent-seeking activity for powerful occupational groups, with harmful effects on labour markets. Indeed, in most cases, there are valid policy reasons to justify the regulation of professions, such as the need to ensure good performance or for security or safety reasons. However, data shows that this is not always the case. According to Business Europe, many activities are regulated in only a few Member States and more than 25% of them are regulated in just one Member State. From the perspective of the internal market, mobile workers represent a meagre 3.3% of the total workforce. Intra-European mobility is already made difficult by factors such as language, access to information, bureaucracy and social security provisions. Overregulation of some professions adds another layer of burden for mobile service providers. As a measure to prevent further fragmentation of the single market, the proposed proportionality test system is therefore very welcome.

Maria Grapini (S&D). –Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, vreau să felicit raportorii, colegii care au participat prin amendamente la îmbunătățirea propunerii Comisiei. Este foarte important raportul și sper să fie mâine votat. Sigur că sunt profesii – așa cum a fost arătat în dezbaterile de astăzi – care trebuiau reglementate.

Prin această reglementare, sunt convinsă că se va ușura munca transfrontalieră, recunoașterea calificărilor. Statele au libertatea prin acest raport să certifice, dar trebuie să și raporteze. În același timp, cum spunea raportorul Schwab, sunt meserii, cum ar fi meșteșugurile, care ar trebui să fie reglementate unitar, precum și alte meserii. Eu consider că raportul este echilibrat și poate fi votat și sper să aducă o îmbunătățire pentru piața internă. Toți ne-o dorim dezvoltată și cu profesii foarte bune și, sigur, cu un aport la creșterea competitivității în piața internă.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). –Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η οδηγία που συζητούμε είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική, καθώς αφορά τουλάχιστον 47 εκατομμύρια άτομα και 550 επαγγέλματα. Ο στόχος βεβαίως είναι η εφαρμογή της αρχής της αναλογικότητας στην αναγνώριση των προσόντων, σε μια φάση ιδιαίτερα ενδιαφέρουσα για την Ελλάδα, όπου πλέον 500.000 Έλληνες νέοι επιστήμονες βρίσκονται στο εξωτερικό (400.000 νέοι επιστήμονες από την Πορτογαλία επίσης στο εξωτερικό).

Όλοι αυτοί προφανώς θέλουν τη δυνατότητα να αναγνωριστούν τα προσόντα τους για να εργαστούν και αναγκάστηκαν να ξειντευτούν από τις πολιτικές της τρόικας. Είναι προφανές ότι χρειάζεται εναρμόνιση, χρειάζεται και ένα περιθώριο εκτίμησης που πρέπει να διαθέτουν τα κράτη μέλη, ειδικά στο καθεστώς των υπηρεσιών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης για την προστασία της υγείας.

Κυρία Bieńkowska, σας θέτω υπόψη το σοβαρό θέμα στην Ελλάδα με το Συμβούλιο Αναγνώρισης Επαγγελματικών Προσόντων, όπου προκειμένου να αποκτηθεί η ισοδυναμία στα επαγγέλματα χρειάζεται αναγνώριση. Δυστυχώς δεν λειτουργεί το σύστημα. Ζητούμε την παρέμβασή σας για να γίνει αναγνώριση των προσόντων. Χιλιάδες συμπολίτες μου αναμένουν τις αποφάσεις αυτού του περιφερικού Οργανισμού.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I want to thank all the speakers who took the floor. Of course, I very much welcome the positive remarks. I listened carefully to the negative ones and to some concerns that honourable Members have. I would like once again to highlight the importance of this directive for the further improvement of the single market for services. This is one of the most important parts of our services package, and I am glad that, at least for now, we have this part of the package.

I want to add that professional mobility is a right of EU citizens and I will echo some of you in saying that the vote tomorrow will be about values and freedoms, not just about professional services. So I hope that, with that vote tomorrow, you will support the compromise that has been reached in the proposal. I think it is a good compromise and I want to thank everyone involved and everyone who cooperated with us and with whom we reached this outcome.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 14. kesäkuuta 2018.

Kirjalliset kannanotot (162 artikla)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Una regolamentazione intelligente delle professioni può rafforzare la crescita economica negli Stati membri e nell'UE nel suo insieme, purché questo non avvenga a discapito della stessa professionalità visto che non tutti gli Stati membri hanno gli stessi standard professionali. I test di proporzionalità della direttiva in questione non devono perciò concentrarsi solo sull'impatto economico quale criterio nella valutazione della proporzionalità dei provvedimenti, ma devono garantire la trasparenza, l'alta qualità dei servizi professionali forniti e un elevato livello di tutela dei consumatori, cercando di assicurare un equilibrio tra le restrizioni imposte a una libertà fondamentale e l'obiettivo di pubblico interesse. Gli Stati membri devono poter imporre diversi requisiti sull'accesso a determinate professioni, come l'appartenenza a organizzazioni professionali, la formazione continua e altri, che possono essere importanti per il conseguimento dell'obiettivo di interesse pubblico. I fornitori di servizi nell'ambito di professioni regolamentate sono già tenuti a soddisfare standard di qualità più elevati in termini di indipendenza professionale, istruzione o formazione permanente. Di conseguenza, tali professioni devono poter contare su provvedimenti proporzionati da parte degli Stati membri in cui forniscono i servizi.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *in writing*. – The European Union has managed to harmonise the requirements for various professions, such as brokers, auditors and others, in order to facilitate the free movement of workers across the EU and to unlock the full potential of the single market. Furthermore, the harmonisation of the professional services contributes to the higher protection of consumers. Although I support further unification, I believe a special status should apply to medical workers, due to the specificity of the healthcare system and a need to protect those services. The uniqueness of the public health system was confirmed by numerous rulings of the European Court of Justice, for example in the case Bressol and Others, dealing with the quotas for non-Belgian nationals in the francophone medical universities in Belgium. Therefore, such professions should be excluded from the scope of the proposal. Moreover, the directive sets the general obligations for Member States prior implementing additional restrictive measures. I welcome the addressing of this issue by the European Commission and an attempt to bring more clarity to the process. The Commission will be continuously assessing the national professional regulations and overview compliance with the existing EU legislation.

17. ELi ja AKV uue partnerluslepingu läbirääkimised (arutelu)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana keskustelu

Linda McAvanin kehitysvaliokunnan puolesta komissiolle laatimasta suullisesti vastattavasta kysymyksestä (O-000044/2018 - B8-0026/2018) ja

Linda McAvanin kehitysvaliokunnan puolesta neuvostolle laatimasta suullisesti vastattavasta kysymyksestä (O-000043/2018 - B8-0025/2018).

Bogdan Brunon Wenta, *deputising for the author*. – Madam President, I would like to speak on behalf of the Chair of the Committee on Development, Linda McAvan, because she cannot be here this evening.

The Cotonou Agreement with the countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific concerns the Union's cooperation with 78 countries. One in five of the world's population lives in those countries, and the proportion is set to rise. No other EU partnership agreement has a similar geographic scope.

The Cotonou Agreement covers trade, development, cooperation and the political dimension. It provides a detailed list of human rights and democratic principles that the parties must comply with. The agreement expires in February 2020 and negotiation must be launched by August this year. Many stakeholders have been consulted over the past two years and the partnership has been completely evaluated. Also, in the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly we have discussed the future of the cooperation beyond 2020.

Also, our Parliament contributed to the reflection by a resolution prepared by my colleague Norbert Neuser, which was adopted in October 2016. This resolution stressed that the next agreement should maintain the *acquis* of the Cotonou Agreement, notably the legally-binding nature of the agreement, the political dialogue and the essential elements of respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, democratic principles, the rule of law and good governance.

Ahead of the adoption of the mandate, our Committee on Development thought it would be useful to present the EP priorities for the upcoming negotiations, taking into account the fact that Parliament needs to give its consent to the final agreement and that it should also be fully and regularly informed about the negotiations whilst they are ongoing. We understand that agreeing on the mandate within the Council is taking longer than expected and is proving difficult.

Commissioner, Minister, as you have seen in the questions addressed to you, Parliament has a number of concerns, relating notably to the consequences of the shift towards regional compacts for the preservation of strong, overarching ACP cooperation. The question of the balance between the three regional components is also important in view of the enhanced partnership with Africa.

Political dialogue is a fundamental part of the Cotonou Agreement and must remain a central and legal pillar of the overarching framework and at regional level. We believe that the effectiveness of the political dialogue should be improved, notably through better monitoring of the human rights situation in the partner countries.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in particular Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 17, stresses the need for true multi-stakeholder partnerships. There is a need for a reinforced role for parliaments, civil society and regional and local authorities, starting right from the phase of negotiating the new agreement. The new partnership is perceived as one going beyond aid, and going further than a recipient-donor relationship. This is very welcome.

We insist on the need to put the 2030 Agenda, the SDGs and the European Consensus on Development at the heart of the future ACP-EU partnership. The eradication of poverty should remain a central element of this future agreement, and we should live up to the 2030 Agenda commitment 'to leave no one behind'.

With this debate, we would like to receive more information on the future institutional design and the future interplay between the Joint Council and the Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA). Let me take the opportunity to repeat the importance of strengthening the parliamentary dimension of the future agreement, guaranteeing real consultative power for the future overarching JPA and ensuring that it provides for open, democratic and comprehensive parliamentary dialogue. The ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly is an innovative institution, and we should take the opportunity of the future agreement to consolidate its legitimacy.

The European Parliament believes that the Assembly should be closely associated with the implementation of the agreement and that it should be regularly consulted on all matters of importance for the partnership.

Last but not least, the ACP side has decided to widely disseminate the negotiating mandate of the ACP Group of States. Can the Presidency promise that the Council will publish the negotiating directives? Also, will the Commission publish textual proposals during the negotiations? I look forward to your answers, and thank you very much for your attention.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I am grateful for the question, which gives us the opportunity to discuss this very important topic. ACP-EU relations after 2020 have been high on the agenda of all the Presidencies in the past four years and the Bulgarian Presidency has had the privilege of taking the lead at this crucial moment.

The Cotonou Agreement set a clear deadline for the start of the negotiations between the two parties and the Presidency spared no efforts to finalise the EU preparation process so that negotiations can open before the summer break.

Our relations with the ACP countries are at an important juncture. We have all witnessed the significant changes since the signing of the Cotonou Agreement. The world, the European Union and the ACP themselves are no longer the same. Our own reality has become much more complex. The European Union has 13 Member States more than in 2000 and the ACP countries have also developed in various ways.

Cooperation and interdependence at global level have gained even more importance in recent years, and relying on alliances is a key element of the European Union vision of multilateral values and principles on the international stage.

The Council took the upcoming negotiations with the ACP as a clear opportunity to strive for a new framework that responds most effectively to these new challenges. I am happy to note that the European Parliament has shared this approach since the beginning. There was also a convergence of views from early on with the ACP side that the new framework needs to be adapted to the new reality so that we can address global challenges more efficiently.

The 2030 sustainable development agenda will be the backbone of the new ACP-EU relationship. The EU position is therefore embedded in the European Consensus on Development and the new EU global strategy.

The Council is in the very final stage of an extremely intense discussion process to agree the negotiating mandate. Its slant is commensurate with the importance we give to our future relations with the ACP states. With only one outstanding issue, by far the major part of the negotiating mandate is agreed. The Presidency is confident that the last outstanding issue can be resolved in the coming days so that the negotiations with the ACP side can be opened shortly.

The vision of the European Union Member States is clear. We want to bring about a major change. Our aim is to leave behind the limitations of the donor-recipient relationship for good, and to open a new chapter with a bond between equal partners. Development, while an important part of our relations, should become one of the many areas of the complex, more political architecture.

The ACP group has great aspirations and we are convinced that the two parties together can become a driving force on important global issues. Let me give you an example: in the area of climate change, our joint efforts have been exceptionally fruitful. The ACP-EU Council of Ministers adopted the ACP-EU Joint Declaration on Climate Change on 1 June, ahead of the upcoming conference in December. With Poland taking over the chairmanship of the Pre-COP from Fiji, this allows us to maintain joint ACP-EU efforts over two terms of office and to steer our common agenda further ahead. This successful example needs to be replicated in other areas of global importance. On the EU side, we are convinced that we can do it, and are putting all our energy into achieving this.

The ACP-EU architecture is very complex and the different levels need to be readjusted to our new reality. The situation on the ground differs between the regions and countries, and regional and local players are gaining more and more importance. The EU intends to respond to this by shifting the centre of gravity and proposing tailor-made, action-orientated regional partnerships. We need to act at the most appropriate level, in line with the principle of subsidiarity, and to enhance the efficiency of the ACP-EU partnership. Our ambition is to agree on a more political framework with the ACP side. The new framework is intended to encompass all relevant matters of joint interest, such as human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy, the rule of law and good governance, human development, sustainable and inclusive growth, peace, security and justice, as well as mobility and migration.

It includes a strong commitment to the principle of leaving no one behind, which is not at all in contradiction with the objective of a modernised political partnership that goes beyond the traditional development-aid approach. It's quite the opposite. Only a comprehensive political partnership will put us in a position to build peaceful, well-governed and prosperous states and societies by accelerating progress towards the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals and thus to eradicate poverty and tackle discrimination and inequality.

I would like to thank the honourable Members for Parliament's valuable input and I count on your continued support as we pursue this important work.

Neven Mimica, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank Parliament and, in particular, Linda McAvan, Chair of the Committee on Development, and honourable Members Wenta and Neuser for their excellent work on this important matter. I welcome your resolution and the question on the upcoming negotiations of the partnership agreement between the European Union and the countries of the African, Caribbean and Pacific group of states.

Your position on the way forward and that of the Commission are broadly aligned. We share the conviction that we need a legally binding agreement that is based on the essential elements of our existing partnership, namely respect for human rights, democratic principles, the rule of law and good governance. They are all part of the *acquis* and must be strengthened in the new agreement. I also agree with your call to preserve a strong ACP identity.

Together, the European Union and ACP countries represent more than half of the UN membership. Such an alliance should be further exploited. Keeping the framework with 79 countries is fully compatible with having a tailored and strengthened approach to cooperation with the main regions.

Africa will remain very much in focus in the years to come. The future EU-Africa pillar should build on the existing joint Africa-European strategy and use its institutional set-up. At the same time, the importance of our Caribbean and Pacific partners will also be confirmed. The institutional and political architecture of the new EU-ACP partnership agreement will be key to this. Each region should have a distinct governance and a focus on regionally relevant priorities for dialogue and cooperation.

Political dialogue must be an integral part of the new partnership at all levels, including the ACP-wide level, the continental, regional and national levels, through the format most appropriate to the issues discussed. I also agree with your insistence that a core principle of the new partnership agreement should be a multi-stakeholder approach to dialogue and cooperation.

Let me also reassure you that the new partnership will fully confirm the commitment to implement the UN 2030 agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals. Eradicating poverty and leaving no one behind will remain core aspects of our relationship with the ACP countries, which will cover all topics on which there are mutual interests.

I also agree with you that the role of parliaments should be reinforced. Regional parliaments, in particular, should be stronger, matching the increased prominence of EU-Africa, EU-Caribbean and EU-Pacific regional councils in the future ACP-EU agreement.

As regards the rhythm of meetings, the Commission has proposed that the ACP-EU Council should be convened on an ad hoc basis. The Joint Parliamentary Assembly should work closely with the ACP Council of Ministers, according to those same principles.

Lastly, concerning publication of the negotiating directives, the Commission has suggested that the Council publish the final EU negotiating directive. It is ultimately up to Council itself to decide what it considers the most appropriate course to follow. Our counterparts in the ACP group adopted their negotiating mandate a few days ago at the ACP Ministerial Council in Lomé. Now it's up to the Council of the European Union to adopt ours.

I look forward to the debate on this important topic.

Frank Engel, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, étant donné que le temps est compté, je voudrais dire essentiellement trois choses.

Tout d'abord, s'il y a une raison pour maintenir le cadre UE/ACP que nous connaissons actuellement, ce serait pour des raisons stratégiques, parce qu'entre les deux blocs – si j'ose dire –, nous représentons une majorité d'États membres des Nations unies, et je trouve qu'à l'heure actuelle et compte tenu des autres facteurs en présence, notamment dans les pays bénéficiaires de la coopération au développement, il pourrait valoir la peine de rappeler avec vigueur à ces pays qui sont nos partenaires que l'attitude vis-à-vis de l'Europe serait logiquement une attitude de partenariat privilégié.

Ensuite, je voudrais que nous ne nous perdions pas totalement dans les fioritures. L'implication de la société civile et tout cela, c'est très bien, mais en fin du compte, ce qui importe, c'est que notamment dans la partie africaine du partenariat, nous soyons en présence d'États stables, qui fonctionnent, et avec lesquels un partenariat pour le développement a du sens. Je ne peux rien développer, par exemple, en Centrafrique tant que l'État n'existe pas, et ce n'est pas la société civile à elle seule qui va m'y aider; malheureusement, j'aurais besoin de troupes, troupes que nous avons refusées, armes que nous avons refusées au gouvernement centrafricain.

Enfin, toujours pour ce qui concerne l'Afrique, il y a une dichotomie que nous devons résoudre. Le Parlement panafricain couvre tout le continent et il faudra que nous déterminions la manière d'insérer notre relation particulière avec l'Afrique dans la relation globale avec la région ACP. Le nord de l'Afrique constitue, non pas nécessairement un problème, mais un élément absent jusque-là et qui doit être d'une façon ou d'une autre intégré, ce qui m'amène à considérer que l'accent, à l'avenir, devra de toute façon être mis sur une relation stratégique avec l'ensemble de l'Afrique.

Enrique Guerrero Salom, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, desde que se adoptó el Acuerdo de Cotonú, en el año 2000, e incluso desde sus revisiones en 2005 y 2010, el mundo ha cambiado bastante. Nuevos actores han aparecido en un cierto desorden mundial y seguro que ahora, al revisar nuestra próxima etapa, debemos tener en cuenta tres objetivos fundamentales.

En primer lugar, fortalecer el diálogo político. Muchos de los actores del grupo ACP son hoy relevantes en el mundo multipolar, y la Unión Europea comparte con ellos objetivos estratégicos en esa ordenación del mundo.

En segundo lugar, contribuir al desarrollo económico de muchos de esos países, la mayoría de los cuales están en situación de pobreza y necesitan inversiones, necesitan capacidad de ofrecer oportunidades a sus ciudadanos.

En tercer lugar, cooperar con ellos para el cumplimiento de los objetivos sostenibles de desarrollo. Juntos somos más de la mitad de las Naciones Unidas y juntos podemos avanzar, reduciendo la pobreza y, si lo hacemos, habremos avanzado mucho en el conjunto del mundo.

Desde luego, nosotros pedimos una mayor presencia del control parlamentario en la implementación del nuevo Acuerdo de Cotonú; queremos mantener la estructura de la ACP, pero al mismo tiempo dar un relieve a la integración regional dentro de su campo; queremos incrementar la rendición de cuentas y hay dos puntos fundamentales a los que quiero referirme.

El más importante es que no podemos condicionar la cooperación con estos países a que cumplan nuestras exigencias respecto de las políticas de migración. Nosotros tenemos que luchar contra la pobreza, y eso significa no condicionar nuestra ayuda.

El segundo elemento, desde luego, es respetar los derechos humanos y convertirlos en el eje de nuestra cooperación.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, ο μείζων στόχος μιας ισχυρής συνεργασίας μεταξύ της ΕΕ και των χωρών ΑΚΕ είναι η εξάλειψη της φτώχειας και η προαγωγή της βιώσιμης οικονομικής, πολιτισμικής και κοινωνικής ανάπτυξης των χωρών-εταίρων, με προοδευτική ένταξη της οικονομίας τους στην παγκόσμια οικονομία. Τόσο η ΕΕ όσο και οι χώρες ΑΚΕ θα πρέπει να επωφεληθούν από αυτή την ανταλλαγή εμπειριών μεταξύ τους.

Η διαπραγματευτική εντολή για τη μελλοντική συμφωνία μεταξύ της ΕΕ και των χωρών ΑΚΕ εγκρίθηκε πριν από 2 εβδομάδες στο Τόγκο. Στο πλαίσιο αυτής, οι θεμελιώδεις αρχές της συμφωνίας εταιρικής σχέσης του Κοτονού πρέπει να διατηρηθούν και να αποτελέσουν μέρος της μελλοντικής μας συνθήκης.

Η στήριξη και η προώθηση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και των δημοκρατικών αρχών, η ανάπτυξη πολιτικών για την οικοδόμηση της ειρήνης και την ενίσχυση της ασφάλειας στις ευάλωτες περιοχές, η προαγωγή της δημοκρατίας, η αντιμετώπιση της μετανάστευσης και της κλιματικής αλλαγής, η καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας και, τέλος, η αντιμετώπιση της επισιτιστικής ανασφάλειας αποτελούν θεμελιώδη ζητήματα που πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν.

Ο πολιτικός διάλογος πρέπει να παραμείνει κεντρικός πυλώνας στο γενικότερο πλαίσιο της νέας συμφωνίας, ενώ οι αρχές της αποτελεσματικής αναπτυξιακής συνεργασίας πρέπει να ενσωματωθούν πλήρως στη νέα συμφωνία εταιρικής σχέσης ΑΚΕ-ΕΕ.

Τέλος, σε πρακτικό επίπεδο πιστεύω ακράδαντα ότι η ΕΕ πρέπει να διαδραματίσει κεντρικό ρόλο στην εκπαίδευση και στην καλλιέργεια δεξιοτήτων προς τους λαούς των χωρών ΑΚΕ, με παράλληλη στήριξή τους να παραμείνουν στις χώρες τους και να εργάζονται γι' αυτές.

Σας ευχαριστώ, κυρία Πρόεδρε, για την υπομονή σας. Ευχαριστώ επίσης και τους διερμηνείς που έχουν την υπομονή να μας υποστηρίξουν στο έργο μας παρά τα προβλήματα που αντιμετωπίζουν οι ίδιοι.

Louis Michel, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Cotonou a eu l'immense mérite de combiner à la fois l'aide au développement, le commerce et le caractère politique de nos relations.

Ces éléments constitutifs de l'esprit de cet accord historique doivent évidemment non seulement être préservés, mais de mon point de vue, ambitieusement amplifiés dans un accord juridiquement contraignant. Nous n'avons pas le droit de manquer cette opportunité unique qui devrait nous permettre d'être enfin d'authentiques partenaires politiques.

Des partenaires dont les destins seraient irrémédiablement et pour le meilleur liés sur le plan économique, environnemental, industriel, éthique et politique. Je pense à de vraies politiques d'égalité hommes-femmes, à une politique migratoire humaine et légale, à la consolidation d'États régaliens dont l'autorité et la légitimité ne pourraient plus être remises en cause arbitrairement.

Alors Monsieur le Commissaire, je peux évidemment comprendre la proposition d'une structure en piliers chapeauté par une coupole de coordination. Dans le fond, c'est un petit peu poursuivre ce qui existe aujourd'hui. Mais moi, je ne peux m'empêcher d'y voir le risque de maintenir nos relations avec l'Afrique en particulier dans un carcan trop étroit. On pourrait très bien faire en sorte que le Pacifique et les Caraïbes aillent s'insérer dans leur réalité géographique, culturelle et historique naturelle.

Je suis de ceux qui pensent que la création d'une vaste zone de libre-échange couvrant les deux continents et dans le respect des accords d'association bilatéraux actuels serait une réponse efficace aux incertitudes qui défigurent le moral des Africains et des Européens.

La prospérité qui en découlerait, Monsieur le Commissaire, offrirait aux jeunes africaines et européennes une perspective d'épanouissement économique et démocratique sans précédent. Ce serait, de mon point de vue, la vraie et seule solution pour résoudre les difficultés que nous avons à gérer les phénomènes migratoires.

Moi, je ne vois pas de meilleur moyen de soutenir le pacte d'immigration initié par le secrétaire général des Nations unies, Antonio Gutierrez. Au-delà, je partage totalement l'argument de notre collègue Engel: une telle alliance offrirait évidemment au monde une influence positive bien plus grande. Cette vision-là des accords de Cotonou priverait enfin les populistes sordides de tout poil de leurs arguments cyniques et de leur rhétorique... (*l'orateur est interrompu par la Présidente*) ... donc je termine, je termine, et je répète ce que j'ai à dire! Cette vision-là des accords de Cotonou priverait enfin les populistes sordides de tout poil de leurs arguments cyniques et de leur rhétorique mortifère.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, la Unión Europea va a renovar el Acuerdo de Cotonú. Este acuerdo es el que regula nuestras relaciones con unos ochenta países de África, el Caribe y el Pacífico, entre los que se encuentran los países más empobrecidos del mundo.

Cotonú es un acuerdo de grandísima envergadura, pero tras casi veinte años no ha revertido la situación de extrema vulnerabilidad de estos países ante la economía globalizada; más bien se sigue condenando a África a ser una mera proveedora de recursos naturales. La industria sigue sin desarrollarse a pesar de su riqueza en recursos naturales, la desigualdad sigue aumentando, la seguridad alimentaria es una quimera y las violaciones de derechos humanos y contra el medio ambiente por parte de nuestras empresas europeas siguen ocurriendo con total impunidad.

Por eso, el nuevo acuerdo debe abordar algunos principios que aseguren la coherencia necesaria entre unas relaciones comerciales justas y el derecho al desarrollo. Debemos situar el acuerdo en el marco de la Agenda 2030 y del Acuerdo de París sobre cambio climático. Debemos incorporar la perspectiva de género de forma transversal, acabar con la insostenible explotación de recursos naturales, desarrollar las Directivas de transparencia para nuestras empresas, que deben pagar impuestos donde les corresponda y ser responsables de todas sus acciones en el exterior. Debemos fomentar la pequeña industria y la agricultura familiar, que es la que da de comer al mundo, y no debemos condicionar nuestra ayuda a nuestros propios intereses.

Tenemos por delante —y ya termino— un reto precioso: convertir a la Unión Europea en una auténtica exportadora de derechos humanos, más aún en aquellas regiones donde hemos esquilado durante siglos. En ese camino, encontrarán el apoyo de mi Grupo.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, au sein du Conseil, les divergences entre États membres sont telles que l'accord de Cotonou pourrait être caduc en 2020 sans qu'un nouveau texte ait pu être négocié.

Les négociations en cours pour l'après-Cotonou sont symptomatiques de l'impasse que constitue l'Union européenne.

L'article 218 du TFUE est très clair sur la procédure de négociation d'accords. Je le cite: «le Conseil statue à l'unanimité pour les accords d'association». Voilà pourquoi, au Conseil, la Hongrie a bloqué le mandat de négociation le 22 mai dernier en raison d'un désaccord sur la question migratoire. Puis le 24 mai, ce sont plusieurs États membres qui se sont opposés au texte de compromis qui aurait permis de lever l'opposition de la Hongrie.

Ouvrons les yeux, chers collègues, et comprenez que c'est aussi parce que les traités européens ne sont modifiables qu'à l'unanimité, conformément à l'article 48 du TUE, que nous défendons le Frexit afin que notre pays puisse agir librement.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, notre résolution est très positive sur la coopération interparlementaire et vise cette coopération. Mais nous ne disons que des banalités sur les politiques d'aide – associer la société civile, la bonne gouvernance, lutte contre la corruption – en oubliant comment faire des États africains des acteurs de leur développement, comme cela s'est fait en Chine, à Singapour et autrefois dans nos pays.

Par la budgétisation du FED, nous supprimons le caractère intergouvernemental indispensable à l'efficacité et à la bonne coopération selon le principe de subsidiarité.

Ce qui est plus grave, l'esprit de Lomé axé sur le co-développement, qui demandait des accords privilégiés pour l'achat des matières premières, qui demandait un certain protectionnisme pour développer l'emploi et l'activité sur place, cet esprit, déjà en partie abandonné avec les accords de Cotonou, nous l'oublions et conditionnons même notre aide à l'ouverture des marchés; nous détruisons en cela l'économie locale africaine.

James Carver (NI). –Madam President, can I say to the Commissioner that what strikes me most about this issue is that it is certainly not an agreement between equals. This should be a policy towards a level playing field, but when you read the fine detail the ACP countries will be lucky to get the scraps from the EU's table, whilst the EU ensures continued access to cheap raw materials whilst holding ACP states to difficult high standards of behaviour if they wish to continue receiving foreign aid from Brussels.

Can you imagine what would happen to an ACP country for behaving like, say, Spain has done over the issue of Catalan independence? Substitute Catalonia for any other independence movement and suddenly the EU's hypocrisy becomes embarrassingly obvious. This report is nothing more than a form of blatant neo-colonialism. We should be supporting initiatives to enable ACP countries to prosper, not to make them further dependent on aid regimes that have never worked, nor ever will, in their long-term best interests.

Joachim Zeller (PPE). –Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Mit dem Cotonou-Abkommen wurde die Beziehung der Europäischen Union und ihrer Mitgliedstaaten zu den 79 Staaten Afrikas, der Karibik und des pazifischen Raums auf eine umfassende Grundlage gestellt. In 18 Monaten läuft dieses Abkommen aus. Nicht mehr viel Zeit – so meine ich –, um über die Fortführung des jetzigen Abkommens oder über eine Neufassung zu verhandeln. Umso bedauerlicher ist es, dass der Rat im Mai der Kommission noch kein Verhandlungsmandat erteilt hat, die Verhandlungen nicht wie vorgesehen am 1. Juni beginnen konnten. Die Partner der AKP sind bereits vorbereitet.

Seit dem Beginn der Laufzeit des Cotonou-Abkommens im Jahre 2000 ist die Entwicklung nicht stehen geblieben. Längst hat zum Beispiel China in vielen AKP-Staaten Europa an Einfluss überholt. Dabei hat das Cotonou-Abkommen nicht nur die Handelsbeziehungen und die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit zum Inhalt, sondern soll auch den politischen Dialog und die Behandlung von Menschenrechtsfragen befördern.

Der Europäische Entwicklungsfonds als wichtigstes Finanzinstrument der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit mit den AKP-Staaten ist ebenfalls bis 2020 begrenzt. Das Parlament verlangt eine Fortführung des Fonds, allerdings als zweckbestimmter Teil des EU-Haushalts.

Der Fragen über die weitere Gestaltung der Beziehungen der EU zu den AKP-Staaten sind noch viele. Wir haben sie in unserer mündlichen Anfrage hier dargelegt. Sie gehören schnell beantwortet.

Ein Wort noch an die Kolleginnen und Kollegen: In der übernächsten Woche ist wieder die Paritätische Parlamentarische Versammlung AKP-EU. Ich hoffe, dass sich diesmal mehr Kollegen aus dem Europäischen Parlament daran beteiligen werden als bei den letzten Versammlungen. Wir sind es den Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus den AKP-Staaten schuldig.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). –Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'apertura dei negoziati per il nuovo accordo di partenariato tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati dell'Africa, dei Caraibi e del Pacifico rappresenta una grande opportunità per migliorare le caratteristiche dell'accordo di Cotonou e contribuire al raggiungimento degli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile. L'eradicazione della povertà, il rispetto dei diritti umani, lo sviluppo economico e sociale e l'integrazione degli Stati ACP nell'economia globale devono rimanere fari nella nuova negoziazione.

Allo stesso tempo, è necessario che le sfide odierne incarnate dall'Agenda 2030 dell'ONU e dall'Agenda 2063 dell'Unione africana vengano messe in luce anche nel nuovo accordo: sviluppo sostenibile, lotta al cambiamento climatico, definizione di vie legali di immigrazione e promozione della pace.

Abbiamo sottolineato, anche oggi, il ruolo che l'immigrazione ha nel contesto europeo. Il nuovo accordo tra i paesi ACP e l'Europa non può trattare di immigrazione solo in termini di rimpatrio. Deve trovare posto un'ambiziosa politica olistica, che consenta di lavorare in direzione dell'eradicazione della povertà e delle cause profonde dell'immigrazione.

Sul futuro accordo, il rafforzamento della dimensione parlamentare risulta essere una necessità. Chiediamo con insistenza che venga consolidato il dialogo politico a garanzia del rilievo democratico delle nostre attività. Per questo vediamo di buon occhio la possibilità di coinvolgere nelle riunioni periodiche ACP-Unione europea l'opposizione e la società civile.

Dobbiamo infatti lavorare sempre più con la cittadinanza e in direzione della cittadinanza. Attuare e rafforzare le politiche giovanili e di genere, costruire un sistema che consenta un controllo sul rispetto dei diritti umani, che tenga conto delle segnalazioni della società civile. Il rispetto e la promozione dei diritti fondamentali dell'uomo sono stati il caposaldo dell'accordo di Cotonou e dovranno essere allo stesso modo le basi su cui costruire il futuro accordo.

Puhemies. – Kiitos jäsen Kyenge. Tarkoitus todellakin oli vain korostaa sitä, että tulkkien takia täytyy puhua hieman hitaammin ja toivon, että muutkin muistavat sen.

Arne Gericke (ECR). –Frau Präsidentin! Waren Sie einmal auf Kiribati im Pazifik? Kennen Sie die karibische Insel Samaná? Waren Sie schon mal in Bangui, Hauptstadt der Zentralafrikanischen Republik? Herr Kommissar Mimica, Sie wissen, dass Entwicklungsarbeit in diesen drei Regionen ungefähr so viel miteinander zu tun hat wie Äpfel, Reis und Süßkartoffeln. Damit sind wir auch bei einem Kernproblem unserer AKP-Politik, und ich erkenne leider auch im Post-Cotonou-Prozess keine grundlegende Änderung.

Wir brauchen eine starke Regionalisierung der AKP. Widmen wir uns intensiv Afrika, der Karibik und dem Pazifik – gemeinsam, aber trotzdem getrennt! Betreiben wir unsere Entwicklungspolitik pragmatisch, nicht ideologisch! Unterstützen wir Projekte vor Ort statt das Budget korrupter Regime in Palästen, und schaffen wir Mittel zur Finanzierung von Entwicklung, zur Verhinderung von Flucht! Wagen wir die Finanztransaktionssteuer! Haben wir mehr Mut als Macron und Scholz zusammen! Besteuern wir das Tun der Superreichen, um den Ärmsten zu helfen! Das ist mein Wunsch für die Zukunft der AKP.

Charles Goerens (ALDE). –Madame la Présidente, la semaine passée, à l'occasion des Journées européennes pour le développement, j'ai eu l'occasion de rencontrer le ministre guinéen des affaires étrangères, qui m'a confié qu'il sera le futur chef négociateur pour les ACP et que le groupe ACP a déjà adopté son mandat.

Puis, nous avons eu une discussion à plusieurs sur les raisons qui bloquent l'adoption d'un mandat dans l'Union européenne et j'ai dit que nous pouvions demander à la Commission de qui il s'agit. On obtient rarement une réponse parce que la Commission n'est pas une adepte du *blaming and shaming*.

C'est la raison pour laquelle je vous demande à vous, représentant de la Commission, si les États suivants sont bien d'accord avec le mandat tel que vous l'avez proposé, notamment le Royaume-Uni, l'Irlande, le Danemark, la Suède, la Finlande, l'Estonie, la Lettonie, la Lituanie, les Pays-Bas, la Belgique, le Luxembourg, la France, l'Espagne, Malte, Chypre, la Grèce, l'Italie, la Bulgarie, la Roumanie, la Croatie, la Slovénie, l'Autriche, l'Allemagne, la Pologne, la Tchéquie, la Slovaquie et le Portugal.

Vous ne semblez pas me contredire, j'en déduis donc que c'est la Hongrie qui bloque ces négociations.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). –Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a relação futura com os países de África, Caraíbas e Pacífico deve assentar, antes de mais, no respeito pela independência e soberania dos Estados, no respeito pela vontade de cada povo. O lastro de séculos de opressão e dominação colonial não desapareceu. Ele está vivo nas relações atuais.

A interdependência assimétrica, o desenvolvimento desigual são realidades que nos devem fazer colocar no centro deste relacionamento, a cooperação para o desenvolvimento, o combate à pobreza, às desigualdades e as injustiças sociais. Em lugar de procurar exportar modelos de organização do Estado e da economia, a União Europeia deve respeitar as legítimas opções e prioridades dos países ACP.

Em lugar de procurar perpetuar as relações de domínio, para o que concorrem instrumentos como os chamados Acordos de Parceria Económica, a União Europeia deve reconhecer as necessidades específicas dos países ACP e o impacto negativo que neles têm as políticas de liberalização e desregulação do comércio internacional. Em lugar de tentar dividir para reinar, a União Europeia deve respeitar a unidade e a coesão dos países ACP.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). –Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fino ad ora l'accordo di Cotonou si è basato su tre pilastri: la cooperazione allo sviluppo, la cooperazione politica ed economica e la cooperazione in ambito commerciale.

Sulla politica commerciale c'è stato un totale fallimento. Alcuni paesi dell'Unione hanno impostato accordi di natura neocolonialista, in cui solo a parole si puntava a misure sostenibili sui diritti umani, su nuove norme sociali e sulla protezione dell'ambiente, ma di fatto si è alimentata la liberalizzazione degli scambi, imponendo a caro prezzo i nostri prodotti, come i nuovi farmaci, come i prodotti trasformati o quelli di tecnologia avanzata come i telefonini.

Mentre questo succedeva, questi paesi, in particolare la Francia, hanno fatto razzia di materie prime, dai materiali rari in Congo ai prodotti della pesca nel Senegal, ai combustibili fossili in Nigeria, all'uranio in Niger, ai diamanti insanguinati in Serra Leone e al cacao in Costa d'Avorio. La cooperazione politica avrebbe dovuto essere uno dei cardini dell'accordo di Cotonou, ma fino ad oggi non ha portato neanche lontanamente a quella stabilità che tutti quanti cercavamo. Ci sembra anzi che l'insicurezza venga alimentata e addirittura incoraggiata in modo da finanziare il business della vendita delle armi e anche quello dei migranti.

Nei negoziati va ribadito che il dialogo politico è un aspetto fondamentale dell'accordo di Cotonou e che esso deve restare un pilastro centrale nel quadro giuridico generale. Se vogliamo fare solo politiche commerciali senza pensare alla situazione dei diritti e senza un coinvolgimento significativo della società civile nel dialogo a tutti i livelli, anche il nuovo accordo fallirà come quello precedente.

Sul piano della cooperazione e dello sviluppo non ho timore ad affermare che sono di fatto limitate alla sola dimensione intergovernativa, che sfugge al controllo dei parlamenti e della società civile. Le riunioni delle istituzioni congiunte ACP-UE, e in particolare del Consiglio congiunto dei Ministri, hanno prodotto pochissimi risultati concreti e sperimentato una partecipazione purtroppo minima e di scarso livello.

La cooperazione allo sviluppo avrebbe dovuto avere l'obiettivo primario di eliminare la povertà. Purtroppo tutto questo non è avvenuto. Noi auspichiamo che il nuovo accordo affermi seriamente la condizionalità relativa al rispetto dei diritti umani e rafforzi veramente il dialogo politico, dando strumenti concreti per difendere i valori comuni del partenariato ACP-UE.

György Hölvényi (PPE). –Elnök Asszony! Három konkrét pontot teszek hozzá a Parlament álláspontjához. Először is, valódi, többszereplős partnerséget sürgetünk a jövőben, de ezúttal sem hivatkozunk a különböző vallási közösségekre, holott nélkülük nyilvánvalóan nem létezik társadalmi stabilitás és szegénység elleni küzdelem a legtöbb ACP-országban. Gondoljunk konkrétan a katolikus püspöki konferencia nagyszerű közvetítő szerepére Kongóban, a világ egyik legsúlyosabb humanitárius válsághelyzetét segítik elő. A Tanács és a Bizottság számára is üzeni szeretném: az új megállapodásban nem hagyhatjuk ki az egyházakat az EU-ACP együttműködés felépítményéből.

Másodszor: javítani kell az emberi jogok helyzetét. Igen, így van, csak egyetérteni tudok. Zéró toleranciát kell tanúsítanunk az egyéni vagy kollektív szabadságot sárba tipró rendszerekkel szemben. A jövőben szóba sem jöhet üzleti lepakálás az ilyen rezsimekkel. Végül az EP-határozat 19. pontjával szeretnék vitatkozni, ami számomra nagyon problematikus. A migráció ideológiai megközelítése, a tervezett bevándorlás egyszerűen az emberek becsapása, a bajban lévő emberek helyben segítése abszolút elsőbbsége helyett hamis üzeneteket küldenek. Becsapás őket a befogadás, a munkalehetőség, az integráció ígéretével megtevesztteni. Becsapás végletesen összekeverni a menekültek és a migránsok helyzetét. Miért? Mert ezzel jelentősen hátráltatják az egész világon jelen lévő óriási menekültválság megoldását.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). –Señora presidenta, señor comisario, la relación de la Unión Europea con la Comunidad de Países de África, el Caribe y el Pacífico es seguramente la más estratégica, veterana y experimentada de las que mantiene la Unión Europea. Cuatro convenios de Lomé y el Acuerdo de Cotonú del año 2000, revisado en 2005 y 2010, son una experiencia más que suficiente como para aprender y extraer las consecuencias.

Quiero poner el acento en el refuerzo de la cooperación política, la capacitación institucional para el refuerzo de los poderes judiciales, la garantía de la separación de poderes y la garantía de los derechos humanos y también de la lucha contra la corrupción y, por supuesto, la dimensión parlamentaria, porque de eso va la Asamblea Parlamentaria Unión Europea y África, Caribe y Pacífico, exactamente para reforzar la dación de cuentas, la rendición de cuentas, y la responsabilidad de los países en sus prácticas políticas.

Pero quiero también señalar que no es aceptable la vinculación de este refuerzo de la cooperación a la cuestión migratoria, ni muchísimo menos su condicionalidad a la política de retornos. Sencillamente esto está fuera de la cuestión.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). –Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Dziś pochylamy się nad odnowieniem porozumienia z Kotonu. Po osiemnastu latach jego funkcjonowania dziś połowa państw AKP nadal należy do najsłabiej rozwiniętych państw świata. Ich łączny udział w światowym handlu to mniej niż 5%, a udział w światowym PKB to tylko 2%. Dziś najpoważniejszym problemem jest niekontrolowana migracja, która jest ogromnym zagrożeniem dla rozwoju państw AKP, bowiem swoje ojczyzny opuszczają ludzie młodzi, silni i odważni, którzy mogliby wpływać na rozwój swoich ojczyzn. Zgadzam się z postulatem dotyczącym utworzenia skuteczniejszych mechanizmów na rzecz strategii z zakresu powrotów i readmisji. Unia Europejska powinna wspierać państwa AKP na miejscu i stymulować ich gospodarki.

Przedstawiciele państw AKP mówią tak do nas, przedstawicieli Unii Europejskiej: Czy chcecie doprowadzić do tego, żeby najsilniejsi, najmłodsi, najbardziej odważni opuścili Afrykę, żeby Afryka stała się tak naprawdę wymierającym kontynentem? Ta nieprzemyślana polityka migracyjna przynosi niestety złe owoce.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Željana Zovko (PPE). –Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani povjereniče, očekujem da današnja rasprava pridonese učinkovitijim pregovorima o novom sporazumu o partnerstvu između Europske unije i skupine afričkih, karipskih i pacifičkih država. Europska unija mora iskoristiti priliku koja joj se nudi u ovim pregovorima o novom sporazumu o partnerstvu nakon Cotonoua te razvoju pomoć staviti kao glavni instrument javne diplomacije.

Razvojna pomoć koju Europska unija pruža, mora imati veći vizibilitet i služiti kao alat učinkovitijoj vanjskoj politici. Time ćemo prevenirati sigurnosne ugroze koji su posljedica nepoznavanja solidarnosti koja se iz Europske unije iskazuje prema zemljama čije su demokracije u potrazi za konsolidacijom i stabilnošću. Obnovljena suradnja Europske unije sa skupinom zemalja afričkih, karipskih i pacifičkih država mora pridonijeti u postizanju mira i stabilnosti na globalnoj razini. Sa ovim zemljama Europska unija njeguje duboke povijesne veze kao i povlašteno partnerstvo.

Potrebno je zajednički djelovati na učinkovitijem upravljanju migracijom radne snage, povećati protok i mobilnost studenata, olakšati poslovne investicijske programe te intenzivnije djelovati protiv mreže krijumčara i trgovaca ljudima. U cilju prevencije, nužno je unaprijediti prikupljanje i razmjenu informacija, kao i jačati otpornosti društava i gospodarstava u državama koje su zahvaćene krizama.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Wydaje się że, polityka Unii Europejskiej wobec państw AKP to jest jednak fiasko, na szczęście jedno z nielicznych niepowodzeń Unii Europejskiej w polityce zagranicznej.

Prawie dwadzieścia lat funkcjonowania umowy, około czterdziestu lat funkcjonowania grupy AKP i jakie mamy tam osiągnięcia? Pokój? Nie – to bardzo często miejsca krwawych wojen. Demokracja? Rzadko można byłoby się podpisać pod tezę, że tam panuje. Prawa człowieka? Często są tylko i wyłącznie na papierze. Rozwój gospodarczy? Na ten temat trudno w ogóle się wypowiadać.

Podkreślam to może zbyt dobitnie, ale właśnie po to, żeby sobie uświadomili wszyscy ci, którzy zajmują się tą umową, że nie można powielić błędów z tych prawie dwudziestu lat. Nie można w tej samej filozofii realizować nowej umowy. Moim zdaniem, jednym z powodów niepowodzenia naszej polityki wobec krajów AKP jest to, że była ona, jak tutaj niektórzy podnosili, oparta na celu, jakim jest pomoc. Więc jak się wyłącznie stosuje pomoc, to bardzo często – nie chcę powiedzieć wyłącznie, ale bardzo często – trwoni się tylko środki, kapitał, a więc nie tylko pieniądze, ale też energię, czas etc.

Moim zdaniem, nowa umowa powinna być tworzona na zasadzie budowania partnerstw na rzecz osiągnięcia określonych celów, nie powinna to być tylko pomoc. Proszę zwrócić uwagę, że przecież bardziej efektywne, chociaż w krótszym czasie osiągnięte, są działania na przykład Stanów Zjednoczonych czy ostatnio Chin. Ale te kraje nie są nastawione na pomoc, tylko na realizowanie określonych celów i, moim zdaniem, to jest schemat, który powinniśmy przyjąć w tych relacjach.

Elly Schlein (S&D). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nuovo accordo dovrà essere profondamente radicato nell'Agenda 2030, con un meccanismo che permetta di monitorare i progressi compiuti da ambo le parti nell'attuazione dei nuovi obiettivi per lo sviluppo sostenibile. Particolare attenzione deve essere rivolta a quelli che erano gli elementi essenziali di Cotonou: rispetto dei diritti umani e dei principi democratici e dello Stato di diritto, che devono rimanere alla base della cooperazione. Aggiungo il grande tema della lotta all'evasione ed elusione fiscale, di cui i paesi in via di sviluppo già pagano il prezzo più alto.

Sull'immigrazione chiediamo al Consiglio e alla Commissione di non continuare sulla vergognosa strada, intrapresa negli ultimi tempi, di condizionare gli aiuti a un maggior controllo delle frontiere. Purtroppo, la proposta ci sembra troppo squilibrata verso i rimpatri e dice poco o nulla sull'apertura di canali di immigrazione legale. Cerchiamo di lavorare affinché il nuovo partenariato non abbandoni l'impegno sulla lotta alla povertà e sia uno strumento per affrontare i bisogni e tutelare i diritti e per uno sviluppo sostenibile che davvero non lasci indietro nessuno.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). –Senhor Presidente, num mundo marcado pela incerteza e pela fluidez das relações geopolíticas, as negociações deste acordo de parceria EU-ACP constituem uma oportunidade de fixar uma matriz de cooperação baseada no respeito pela autonomia, pelos direitos humanos, pela participação da sociedade civil e pela sustentabilidade, princípios que são cruciais para uma globalização humanista e justa.

É também importante salvaguardar que os blocos mantenham uma posição global sem prejuízo da abordagem específica no plano da negociação.

A cooperação União Europeia-ACP tem de constituir uma referência para as múltiplas parcerias de que o mundo necessita, alocando recursos que promovam um desenvolvimento digno e sustentável, contribuindo para reduzir as migrações forçadas e os fenómenos de pobreza e desigualdade extrema que estão a corroer as cidades do século XXI. E a resolução que hoje aqui discutimos é um compromisso do Parlamento Europeu com esta agenda de futuro.

Julie Ward (S&D). –Mr President, as an active member of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly, I have witnessed the importance of this framework. For post-Cotonou, I trust the Council will negotiate an EU-ACP relationship anchored in upholding the values of democracy, human rights, gender equality and the rule of law; one which will enable a vibrant and active civil society, including the work of human rights defenders. For instance, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, all Lucha and Filimbi members should be released, as should detained human rights defenders. The focus of our work with our partners at governmental and parliamentary level should be to ensure human dignity is respected everywhere. A strong focus on culture and education is also crucial. We need to make sure that intercultural dialogue becomes a key component of the ACP framework in order to use people-to-people contact as a means of achieving peace and prosperity. I also believe it is crucial to include a strong parliamentary dimension in order to strengthen the democratic foundation of our unique partnership.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). –Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, les négociations dans l'accord de partenariat post-Cotonou représentent l'occasion de renouveler les relations UE et ACP afin de relever les défis communs auxquels nous sommes confrontés.

Tout en saluant l'architecture générale pour la future coopération entre le groupe des pays ACP et l'Union européenne proposée par la Commission, je tiens à souligner que le programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030, les objectifs de développement durable, ainsi que le consensus européen pour le développement doivent constituer le noyau du futur partenariat.

En outre, il est essentiel que la lutte contre la pauvreté demeure un élément central du nouvel accord, tout comme des conditions liées au respect des droits de l'homme, y compris des références explicites à la responsabilité, au mécanisme de suivi et de révision en cas de non-respect.

De même, il est indispensable d'impliquer la société civile dans le dialogue politique et je réitère que sa pleine participation devrait constituer un élément contraignant du partenariat.

Pour conclure, j'insiste sur l'importance de renforcer la dimension parlementaire du futur accord en veillant à ce que la future Assemblée parlementaire paritaire (APP) assure un dialogue parlementaire ouvert, démocratique et global.

Maria Arena (S&D). –Monsieur le Président, l'accord de partenariat entre l'Union européenne et l'Afrique-Caraïbes-Pacifique est extrêmement important, et aujourd'hui nous devons nous repositionner dans le cadre d'un accord européen Afrique-Caraïbes-Pacifique.

C'est vrai qu'aujourd'hui, si on interroge les citoyens européens sur le Cotonou, le post-Cotonou, je pense qu'il y aura peu de citoyens qui savent exactement de quoi nous parlons. Idem pour les citoyens africains ou des Caraïbes ou du Pacifique qui, si on les interroge, ne sauront pas exactement de quoi nous parlons. Le premier défi que nous devons donc relever, nous Européens mais aussi avec nos partenaires, c'est de faire en sorte que ce qu'il y a dans ces accords soit connu de tous; je rejoins mes prédécesseurs qui ont dit qu'il fallait que la société civile soit impliquée dans le cadre de ces accords, dans le cadre de la discussion de ces accords, qu'il y ait une appropriation du processus par la société civile pour la négociation de ces futurs accords. Il me semble important que les populations européennes et les populations africaines, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique soient correctement informées de ce que nous faisons.

Deuxièmement, le travail que nous avons à réaliser au niveau parlementaire est également important; peut-être, sans doute même, avons-nous des choses à améliorer sur ce plan pour faire en sorte qu'entre parlementaires, nous puissions aussi définir un certain nombre de priorités, parce que des priorités et des défis pour le continent européen et le continent africain, les Caraïbes et le Pacifique sont importants. Les défis environnementaux, les défis liés à la démographie et à la population, les défis de l'utilisation des richesses, de la transparence et de la gouvernance sont des défis que nous avons en commun avec ces différents pays et avec les pays de l'Union européenne.

Je suis un peu triste aujourd'hui de voir que quand on s'adresse à ces pays, on ne le fait qu'avec la préoccupation de la migration, alors que cette même migration est en réalité une richesse que nous devons partager avec ces pays.

Alors je pense que le futur de Cotonou, c'est aussi le fait de pouvoir se projeter dans un avenir commun avec l'ensemble de ces pays et j'espère que nous réussirons tous ensemble ce défi.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι πολιτικές και οικονομικές σχέσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με τις χώρες ΑΚΕ πρέπει να οικοδομηθούν στη βάση των αρχών του αμοιβαίου οφέλους. Όμως, από τη μια μεριά, στην Αφρική οι ευρωπαϊκές πολυεθνικές αρπάζουν τις πλουτοπαραγωγικές πηγές, αρπάζουν τη γη, εκμεταλλεύονται τη φθηνή εργασία εκατομμυρίων εργαζομένων και ανταγωνίζονται με τους Κινέζους για τη δημιουργία διατροφικών μονοπωλίων. Από την άλλη, η αθρόα εισαγωγή αγροτικών προϊόντων από την Αφρική στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση διαλύει την ευρωπαϊκή αγροτική οικονομία, διαλύει την κάθε προστασία που υπάρχει στα προϊόντα ονομασίας προέλευσης, όπως είναι η φέτα, καθώς και στα προϊόντα με γεωγραφικό προσδιορισμό και προέλευση.

Το αποτυχημένο μοντέλο των βιομηχανικών ευρωπαϊκών εξαγωγών και των αγροτικών αφρικανικών εισαγωγών συμπληρώνεται με εκατομμύρια παράνομους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες, οι οποίοι εισέρχονται στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Πρέπει να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα για την προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, να απαγορευθεί η παιδική εργασία και η εκμετάλλευση των γυναικών και ταυτόχρονα να εφαρμοστούν οι αρχές της συμφωνίας του Κοτονού.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). –Señor presidente, señor comisario, si el objetivo de erradicar la pobreza en los países ACP es sincero, es necesario un nuevo marco de relaciones que ponga fin a la actual situación donde la Unión Europea impone acuerdos totalmente desiguales que permiten seguir saqueando sus riquezas, sus recursos naturales y sus bancos pesqueros y permiten continuar con el acaparamiento de tierras y también con sus mercados agrícolas.

Creo que los acuerdos que ha habido entre la Unión Europea y los países ACP no han contribuido al desarrollo de estos países porque perpetúan la situación de pobreza y miseria, porque buscan únicamente materia prima barata, costes laborales bajos y normativas ambientales laxas y abrir, eso sí, las fronteras para que las corporaciones multinacionales puedan comercializar estos productos con aranceles reducidos o aranceles cero.

Es urgente un nuevo marco de relación que realmente busque el desarrollo, busque el fin de la pobreza y se base en la soberanía y en el respeto de estos pueblos.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Zajmuję się polityką obronności, polityką bezpieczeństwa i tak patrzę na Afrykę: z punktu widzenia konfliktów, zagrożeń, ale także – niestety – tych najdramatyczniejszych zdarzeń, których w Afryce nie brakuje. I muszę powiedzieć, że także uważam, tak jak mój kolega Joachim Zeller, że potrzebne są ramy prawne, ramy polityczne, aby można być rzeczywiście skutecznym w reagowaniu na zdarzenia, które w Afryce się dzieją. I popieram także tę diagnozę wyrażoną przez Adama Szejnfelda, że tak naprawdę dziś nie możemy mieć satysfakcji z tego, co uzyskujemy w Afryce, ani z punktu widzenia bezpieczeństwa, ani z punktu widzenia socjalnego, ani z punktu widzenia ekonomicznego, ani też stabilizowania sytuacji tam, gdzie coś uzyskaliśmy. Chciałbym bardzo, aby Parlament Europejski, Unia Europejska, przygotowując nowe ramy umowy, pamiętała o najważniejszych celach do osiągnięcia i zastosowała nowe techniki czy nowe metody stabilizowania i poprawiania sytuacji w Afryce. Inaczej pieniądze będziemy wydawać tylko na uspokojenie własnego sumienia.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, conosciamo tutti l'importanza cruciale del partenariato ACP-UE, i grandi passi avanti nella lotta alla povertà che sono stati fatti e le grandi ed enormi sfide che però abbiamo ancora davanti. In quest'ottica stiamo riflettendo sulle innumerevoli varianti che possono riguardare il nuovo partenariato, tutti aspetti rilevanti, però non dobbiamo dimenticare quello che secondo me è l'aspetto più cruciale, ossia il finanziamento.

La budgetarizzazione del Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo va accolta con favore, ma a patto che ne resti preservata la sua destinazione. Quello che trapela circa la nuova proposta di strumento di vicinato, sviluppo e cooperazione internazionale, tuttavia, non ci rassicura affatto, anzi. Traspare infatti che la destinazione vincolante di fondi allo sviluppo sarà sacrificata sull'altare della flessibilità e che la lotta alla povertà cederà il passo nella gerarchia delle priorità alla difesa degli interessi dell'Unione europea.

Possiamo disegnare il partenariato ACP-UE migliore tra quelli possibili, ma se non ci assicuriamo che i fondi destinati al suo finanziamento non vengano sviati, avremo perso la più importante partita in materia di sviluppo e le conseguenze purtroppo si faranno sentire ancora per decenni.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). –Uudet neuvottelut tarjoavat mahdollisuuden nykyaikaistaa EU:n ja AKT-valtioiden välistä kumppanuutta. Komission ehdotus kolmesta alueellista kumppanuudesta Afrikan, Karibian ja Tyynenmeren valtioiden kanssa onkin erittäin tervetullut ja kannatettava pohja ja se myös vahvistaa kummankin alueen strategia tavoitteita.

Euroopan parlamentti on omalta osaltaan peräänkuuluttanut ihmisoikeuksia yhtenä kulmakivenä ja myös korostanut tasa-arvon edistämistä ja ilmastonmuutoksen torjuntaa. Toivoisin, että tulevassa kumppanuussopimuksessa näkyisi voimakkaammin kolme asiaa. Ensinnäkin selvä viittaus uusiin kestävä kehityksen tavoitteisiin ja kumppanuussopimuksen linjaaminen yhteen niiden kanssa ja niiden mittaaminen sitä vasten. Toinen on vahvempi naisten oikeuksien ote. Kolmas on kiertotalouden edistäminen aloittaen ennen kaikkea jätteettömästä yhteiskunnasta.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Neven Mimica, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to underline that what is at stake in the upcoming negotiations for a new partnership agreement with the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries is ultimately the role of the European Union as a global actor.

It is my hope that the Council will shortly adopt a decision to entrust the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy with the negotiation of objectives, strategic priorities and modalities whereby the EU can achieve such a global player's role with its ACP partners. Let me conclude by assuring you that Parliament will be immediately and fully informed at all stages of the negotiation procedure.

I am looking forward to continuing our fruitful collaboration, and I remain certain that Parliament will continue working to ensure that the European Union keeps on standing up for its values.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I am grateful for this interesting exchange. It shows a convergence of views on our side that the future ACP-EU partnership needs to be adapted to the new needs. This convergence is also due to the work of the European Parliament and the regular exchanges between all of us in the process of preparing the EU negotiating mandate.

While we need to build on the achievements of the Cotonou framework, it is imperative that the future framework take better account of the interests, needs and challenges of the different regions on the ACP side.

Concerning the questions from Mr Wenta and some other honourable Members, I would like to say that the Presidency will continue its efforts to allow the Council to adopt its mandate as soon as possible, in order for the negotiations to start as envisaged. The Council will make its decision on publication of the negotiating directives after we have agreed on the final text.

The negotiation process will be crucial. The Council will contribute, within the limits of its role, to its successful progress and will continue its exchanges on this important topic with the European Parliament.

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto una proposta di risoluzione conformemente all'articolo 128, paragrafo 5, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 14 giugno 2018.

18. Romasid käsitlevate riiklike integratsioonistrateegiate ELi raamistiku rakendamise ja järelmeetmed (arutelu)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'attuazione e seguito del quadro dell'UE per le strategie nazionali di integrazione dei rom (2018/2743(RSP)).

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to address the situation of Europe's Roma, our largest ethnic minority. Many Roma still face deep poverty, social exclusion and racial discrimination. We have a common duty to ensure decent life chances for all our citizens and we must pay special heed to those who find themselves in the most vulnerable situations.

This is a topic that goes to the heart of our common European values. Equal treatment and equal opportunities should be enjoyed by all of us. Sadly, in Europe, in the 21st century, this is not yet the case. It has already been seven years since the Council, the Commission and Parliament joined their voices to call for action to improve the situation of the Roma. Back in 2011, we launched the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies. Parliament and the Commission took the first steps and I'm glad to recall that the Council swiftly endorsed the framework and the European Council called for its rapid implementation. The Member States duly prepared their national strategies and began putting the framework into practice.

I'm also happy to note that, in its mid-term report published last year, the Commission was able to confirm the added value of the framework. It is particularly encouraging to read that the participation of Roma children in early childhood education is on the rise and that poverty is falling. There are definite signs that the implementation of the framework is bearing fruit.

But let us be honest, we have not yet managed to end the discrimination, the deep poverty and the long-term disadvantages that have weighed on Roma communities. There is no room for complacency. If anything, we must redouble the efforts to put things right and to offer the same life chances to all citizens, regardless of their ethnic origin.

This is why the Bulgarian Presidency has put an important emphasis on issues at the heart of advancing the agenda in this area. The Council is expected to adopt a set of conclusions on the early childhood development later this month. The focus has been put on promoting and protecting children's rights, combating child poverty and social exclusion and providing all children with equal opportunities, irrespective of their social, cultural, ethnic or other backgrounds.

Member States should continue to provide multi-disciplinary support to children and families from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as Roma children. Investing in early childhood education and care is of high importance, not only for reducing inequalities at a young age, but also for preventing the risk of poverty and exclusion in adulthood by laying the foundations for successful lifelong learning, social integration and employability.

The European Parliament has worked tirelessly to keep this topic on the agenda. In matters where our common values are clearly spelt out in the Treaty yet Union competences are limited, strong political voices are needed to motivate us and to move us forward, so I thank you for helping us to keep the momentum.

The framework focuses on four main areas: education, housing, health and jobs. These are the matters we must address. No one in Europe should be denied the basic prerequisites for a decent life. The Council has also made the point that racial discrimination is unacceptable because it is also a root cause of the social exclusion of the Roma.

May I also highlight just three other key issues. The Council has repeatedly stressed the importance of the gender dimension in this context and the need for gender-sensitive approaches. The Council also strongly believes that the Roma themselves should be allowed to participate in planning and implementing policies that concern them. Finally, we need an emphasis on the local level. It is the people on the ground who can make the greatest differences.

None of this is controversial. I believe there is a broad agreement between our institutions on the approach we should take. The tools and the strategic insights are already here. A strong and sustained political commitment is needed, along with more forceful implementation. The EU institutions have been playing a leading role in the campaign for Roma inclusion for some years now. This is most welcome. It's making a difference. Cooperation and funding at EU level can contribute significantly.

The framework we established in 2011 is due to expire in 2020. It is painful to admit that ten years have not been enough to significantly improve the situation of Europe's Roma. To make greater strides, we need both a sense of urgency and a long-term vision. For this reason, in 2016, the Council called on the Commission to propose a post-2020 strategy on Roma integration and the Council stands ready to work further on these vital subjects. I know Parliament will be a faithful ally in this process.

Neven Mimica, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the debate on this topic is a timely contribution to the Commission's ongoing evaluation of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies. We will publish the evaluation by the end of this year. It will analyse the achievements and challenges of the framework. These could then be the basis for reflections about possible policy suggestions for the post-2020 period.

Without prejudging the outcome of this process, it is already clear that we have not undone centuries of discrimination in the few years since the launch of the framework in 2011. However, we can see the first signs of progress in some areas, like education. Fewer Roma youths leave school early, dropping from 87% in 2011 to 68% in 2016. More Roma children participate in early childhood education, rising from 47% in 2011 to 53% in 2016.

Another important achievement is the development of necessary coordination and cooperation structures, such as national Roma contact points in all Member States and the annual European platform for Roma inclusion. The most important overarching challenge is the limited impact on improving the present situation of Roma. In several areas, there is still much to do. Less, although still way too many Roma are at risk of poverty: 86% in 2011 and 80% in 2016. Extreme forms of poverty such as hunger decreased slightly, but remain alarmingly high. Less, but still too many Roma have experienced discrimination when looking for work in the past five years.

In some aspects, the situation of Roma even worsened in past years. Segregation in education has persisted and even deteriorated. The Roma employment stagnates at low levels – 25% – and the rate of Roma youths not in education or in employment or training grew from 56% to 63%.

The housing situation of the Roma remains deplorable. Sadly, strong external factors such as the economic crisis, competing political priorities and the rise of anti-Gypsyism and nationalistic populist political movements have contributed to limit the progress. However, the Commission will strive to make the situation of Roma in Europe better, in concert with the Member States, which maintain the key competences in this area.

Livia Járóka, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Elnök Úr! A jelenlegi európai romastratégia talán nem hozta meg a hozzá fűzött reményeket. Ennek a legfőbb oka az, hogy az Európai Parlamenten egy nagyon erős dokumentum ment át, míg a Bizottság nem volt mindenben elkötelezett, hogy a Tanácsnak továbbvigye azokat a nagyon fontos pontokat, ami nélkül nem lehet ez a stratégia sikeres: célszámokat, a jogi alapot, büntetési lehetőségeket, és a legfontosabb probléma az, hogy igazándiból a romák nem tudnak részt venni ezekben a programokban, sem a tervezésükben, sem a kivitelezésükben. Ezért annyira nem hatékonyak.

Úgy érzem, hogy nagyon hiányzik a pénzügyi ellenőrzés, a pénzügyi ellenőrzés, mivel egy sokkal összetettebb helyzettel állunk szemben, mint 2011-ben. A romák foglalkoztatása még mindig elmarad a többségi nemzeti átlagoktól, miközben azt látjuk, hogy 2060-ra a munkaerőpiacon 30 millió ember fog hiányozni. Megengedhetetlen luxus Európának, hogy kiaknáztatlanul hagyjuk az európai szegényeket. Az aktív munkahelyteremtés talán most a legfontosabb. Nagyon sok eredményt elértünk, és köszönöm Panayotova asszonynak, hogy ilyen részletesen beszámolt róla. Én is egyetértek, mind a korai gyerekfejlesztésben, a többi kérdésben is. Köszönöm a Bizottság hozzáállását, mégis tovább kell lépniünk.

Az egyik nagy probléma az, úgy látom, hogy magában a parlamenti anyagokban egyre többször tűnnek fel a romákról, vagy tagállamok romapolitikájáról szóló hazug hírek. Ez nagyon-nagyon hátráltatja ugye az objektív képet, a jó gyakorlatokból nem tanulunk eleget, és úgy látom, hogy fel kell ezt a stratégiát nagyítani, száztíz millió legszegényebb európai emberre, amiből csak tízmillió roma.

Soraya Post, *on behalf of the S&D Group.* – Mr President, I want to start by thanking the Commission for launching the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies in 2011. Due to this, the Member States now have their national strategies and there are programmes and funds aimed at fighting anti-Gypsyism in its various forms. Although we are far from seeing the much-needed improvement in the lives of Roma in Europe, there has been some progress.

Now we need to up-scale the efforts following the clear and strong position of the European Parliament. This position was based on the concrete demands and proposals in the report entitled 'Fundamental rights aspects in Roma integration in the EU: fighting anti-Gypsyism' adopted by a threefold majority last year. In addition to addressing social inclusion, we need to situate anti-Gypsyism in the focus of the post-2020 EU framework and to introduce anti-discrimination indicators in all fields.

We need to set specific deadlines for measurable goals. There should be consultations with Roma representatives to avoid the creation of discriminatory programmes, or programmes that do not reach out to the Roma. We need close monitoring in order to identify quickly which actions can improve the situation on the ground and which do not. I therefore ask the Commission and the upcoming Presidencies to keep the fight against anti-Gypsyism on their agenda and support the continuation of the EU framework. The 10 million Roma in Europe must be equally entitled to enjoy the rights and opportunities established by our Treaties. Their situation depends on the continuation of the framework.

Last year we heard some hate speech, so let me just finish by expressing my hope that, during this debate, our colleagues will refrain from using hate speech.

Marek Jurek, *w imieniu grupy ECR.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się, że mogę występować w tej debacie. W moim rodzinnym mieście, w Gorzowie Wielkopolskim, mamy pomnik wielkiej polskiej poetki języka romskiego Bronisławy Wajs (Papuszy), mamy jej ulicę, o tym się uczą dzieci w szkołach. Mam nadzieję, że w waszych miastach również możecie się tym pochwalić. Jeżeli są takie przykłady, no to można podnieść rękę, chętnie zobaczę.

Bo sprawa nie jest dobra – my mamy problemy w Europie. Tylko w ciągu ostatniej dekady z Francji, z Włoch, z Danii Romowie byli wydalani. Martin Schulz, Guy Verhofstadt protestowali... No i co? No i protestowali, bo w tej sprawie nie podejmowano żadnych energicznych działań. Ja myślę, że powinniśmy pójść tym tropem, o którym mówiła Livia Járóka i koleżanka, która występowała potem: po prostu powinniśmy pracować wspólnie z tą społecznością. Pracować tak, jak pracują Węgry, a nigdy nie wykorzystywać instrumentalnie tej sprawy do walk politycznych. Ludziom po prostu trzeba pomóc.

Cecilia Wikström, för ALDE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Vi glömmer ibland att EU faktiskt byggdes på värden som tolerans och jämlikhet. Också i dag måste alla EU:s medborgare få samma möjligheter till skolgång, fri rörlighet, sjukvård, sociala rättigheter och allt annat, men tyvärr är situationen i alldeles för många medlemsländer oacceptabel.

Minoriteter utsätts för diskriminering och hatbrott, och särskilt romerna utsätts för systematisk diskriminering, fördomar, marginalisering och utanförskap runt om i EU. Det finns faktiskt platser i EU där romer inte ens har tillgång till rent vatten och där 80 procent av alla romer uppges leva i fattigdom. Där barn inte får vaccination mot sjukdomar vi trodde vi hade utrotat för länge sedan.

Romer har faktiskt levt i EU i över 700 år. Då hette det Europa, nu heter det EU. Deras kultur och historia är en viktig del av vårt historiska arv. Trots steg i rätt riktning, som till exempel 2020-strategin, måste det till snabbare åtgärder och större satsningar från alla medlemsländer för att få slut på den systematiska utbredda och oacceptabla diskrimineringen. Jag vill lyfta fram Soraya Posts initiativbetänkande från i höstas, som poängterar vikten av utbildning kring romernas historia och kultur och större satsningar för att få slut på social exkludering.

Alla människor har rätt till ett värdigt liv och rätt att välja sitt liv och forma sin framtid. Därför måste vi nu kräva att medlemsländerna ökar insatserna för integrering av romer, och på så sätt få slut på fördomar, diskriminering och marginalisering. Bara på det sättet kan vi bygga EU starkt för att möta framtiden.

Bodil Valero, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. –Herr talman! Det är uppenbart att det är mycket långt kvar för att nå en godtagbar nivå i hela EU, trots strategierna för integrering av romer. Det skulle nog behövas en rejäl Marshallplan för att nå hela vägen, för århundraden av diskriminering försvinner inte på bara några få år av aktivt arbete.

Vi gröna har tidigare föreslagit att det skulle behövas en mer specifik EU-strategi för integrering av romer, för att skynda på genomförandet av de nationella strategierna och för att hantera de frågor som är gränsöverskridande. Det säger nämligen en hel del om takten i de nationella strategierna när många romer lättare försörjer sig och sina familjer genom att resa till andra EU-länder, där de många gånger bor i tältläger och tigger framför matbutikerna trots 20 minusgrader, än ges möjligheten att hitta jobb på hemmaplan. Den fria rörligheten gäller självklart för alla EU-medborgare och ändå höjs vissa röster, till exempel i mitt eget hemland, för att förbjuda tiggeri. Vi löser inte problemen på det sättet. En EU-strategi skulle behövas för att dels komma till rätta med länder som inte genomför sina nationella strategier och andra regelverk, dels se till att EU-migranternas rättigheter garanteras när de nyttjar sin rätt till fri rörlighet.

Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Schaut man sich die *public consultation* zur Umsetzung der Roma-Rahmenstrategie an, dann zeigt sich: Es gibt wirklich nur marginale Verbesserungen seit 2011, und fast ein Drittel der Befragten stellt fest, dass sich die Situation sogar verschlechtert hat. Insbesondere Gesundheit, Arbeit, *housing*, Bildung und die Bekämpfung der Diskriminierung sind absolute Fehlstellen in den Mitgliedstaaten – man könnte auch sagen: alles. Es gibt keine einzige relevante Maßnahme – und das waren ja unsere Bedenken 2011 – zur Bekämpfung der Diskriminierung von Roma-Gemeinschaften und zur Bekämpfung von Rassismus.

Was wir wirklich dringend brauchen, bevor irgendeine Maßnahme überhaupt greifen kann, sind verbindliche Maßnahmen dazu. Die nächste Strategie muss daher Diskriminierung und Rassismus in den Mittelpunkt stellen und für ein effektives Mainstreaming in den Politikbereichen sorgen, auf EU-Ebene und in den Mitgliedstaaten, und zwar verbindlich.

Letzter Satz: Wir wollen nicht, dass die kommende Roma-Strategie irgendwie in einer Armutsstrategie aufgeht. Wir brauchen eine gesonderte Strategie, wenn wir es damit wirklich ernst meinen.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sento tante belle parole, qui in Aula. Si parla di inclusione sociale, uguaglianza, integrazione, *caring*, *sharing*, *peace and love*, eccetera, eccetera.

La Commissione sa di sbagliare finanziando questo progetto perché ad oggi i risultati di integrazione non esistono. Non esistono perché pretendete di integrare chi non vuole essere integrato. Basti pensare a quanti fondi sprecati in Italia. Cento milioni l'anno per gestire i campi rom di Milano, Roma e Napoli. Ventisette milioni buttati dal Comune di Roma per un progetto dai risultati scarsi per la scolarizzazione dei bambini nomadi.

L'UE mette a disposizione circa 26 miliardi e mezzo di euro dei contribuenti europei per finanziare questi progetti fallimentari che richiedono anche ingenti stanziamenti diretti nazionali, in parole povere quattrini degli italiani.

La dichiarazione della Commissione mi fa pensare che non sappia di cosa parla, perché in Italia, come testimonia l'ennesimo fatto di cronaca di ieri, si susseguono faide bellicose tra famiglie di nomadi che si contengono la proprietà, cari colleghi, di una minorenne segregata in schiavitù e costretta alla prostituzione. Regalare soldi a chi abitualmente commette questi reati significa esserne complici, anzi no, voi siete peggio, perché oggi volete continuare con questo pizzo disgustoso.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, παρά τα ευχολόγια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κυβερνήσεων για τους Ρομά, τα κρατικά και τα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια που κατασπαταλήθηκαν χωρίς αποτέλεσμα για την κοινωνική ένταξή τους, μέσα σε ένα σύστημα που όχι απλά παράγει, αλλά ζει από τις ανισοτιμίες και την εκμετάλλευση, είναι επόμενο ευαίσθητες ομάδες, όπως οι Ρομά και ιδιαίτερα οι γυναίκες, να γίνονται θύματα ακόμα μεγαλύτερων διακρίσεων, αποκλεισμών και γκετοποίησης. Πέφτουν θύματα ρατσιστικών και ναζιστικών συμμοριών ή λόγω της ανέχειας και της περιθωριοποίησής τους εκτίθενται σε εγκληματικά κυκλώματα, ενοχοποιούνται συνολικά, δηλαδή άδικα, σαν θύλακες εγκληματικότητας, ενώ ταυτόχρονα αποκρύπτεται ότι οι κορυφές των εγκληματικών κυκλωμάτων δεν βρίσκονται μέσα στους καταυλισμούς των Ρομά.

Ουσιαστική κοινωνική ένταξη των Ρομά σημαίνει μόνιμη σταθερή εργασία με δικαιώματα, προστασία των ανέργων, δημόσιες υπηρεσίες υγείας, απλοποίηση των διαδικασιών νομιμοποίησης των εμπορικών δραστηριοτήτων τους, παιδικοί σταθμοί, τμήματα βοηθητικής διδασκαλίας, ξερίζωμα του αναλφαριθμητισμού, εξανθρωπισμός στις κατοικίες τους με δρόμους, αποχέτευση, ρεύμα, νερό, σχολεία, ιατρεία, δημόσια μέσα μεταφοράς και, τέλος βέβαια, όχι διακρίσεις και ρατσισμός, αλλά σεβασμός στην κουλτούρα και στον τρόπο ζωής τους.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). –Pane předsedající, myslím, že je správné, že EU monitoruje situaci etnických menšin, a pokud jsou problémy, tak požaduje jejich nápravu a samozřejmě také členské státy podporuje v tom, aby řešily jejich situaci.

Dovolte mi konkrétně zmínit situaci v ČR. ČR má vlastní strategii romské integrace do roku 2020. Jejím smyslem je zvrátit negativní trendy ve vývoji Romů v oblasti vzdělávání, zaměstnanosti, bydlení i sociální oblasti. V ČR žije 245 tisíc Romů, z nichž polovina je integrovaná a polovina žije stále ještě v ghettech. Tady mi dovolu zmnit to, že pokud chceme pomoci a zabránit ghettům, vyloučení, chudobě, musíme Romům pomoci, ale samotní Romové musejí chtít a musejí být aktivní.

Česká vláda, především samotné školy usilují o jejich začleňování do vzdělávání, protože to je základní podmínkou jejich dalšího úspěšného života. A zde také pomáhá EU, protože z fondů EU se daří připravit řadu programů k integraci romských dětí a ke zkvalitnění jejich vzdělávání.

Jsem hrdá na to, že konečně v ČR se podařilo napravit křivdu a pietně upravit pozemek na místě bývalého romského koncentračního tábora v Letech u Písku. Byl to ministr kultury mé politické strany, který tuto aktivitu završil, a to je podmínka pro to, aby se Romové cítili bezpeční, aby se aktivně zapojili do zlepšení jejich života. My jim v tom budeme pomáhat.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). –Señor presidente, señor comisario, la lucha por la igualdad no está nunca completada, porque tampoco lo está la lucha contra la discriminación, aunque ese sea un pilar permanente de la Unión Europea y, desde luego, crucial para este Parlamento Europeo. Por eso hacemos lo correcto debatiendo el funcionamiento de las estrategias nacionales para la inclusión de la población romaní, porque eso es exactamente lo que ordenan las Resoluciones de este Parlamento.

Pero creo que este debate pierde el foco si examina país por país aquellos donde existe una mayor historia de integración de la población romaní, allí donde está más arraigada, como pueda ser por ejemplo el caso de España, o aquellos países donde el balance sea más deficiente. Porque lo realmente importante es apuntar a la población más vulnerable — mujeres, niños—: escolarización, empleo, vivienda, acceso a la sanidad, acceso a la educación e igualdad de oportunidades. Pero algo que sí podemos hacer y debemos hacer es excluir de este Parlamento Europeo el lenguaje del odio y la discriminación contra los gitanos que tantas veces hemos escuchado, cargada de odio energúmeno en este Parlamento Europeo, porque eso es absolutamente intolerable.

Ese sí que es un mandato que podemos cumplir: ser vigilantes y absolutamente intransigentes con el lenguaje del odio y la discriminación contra la población romaní en este Parlamento Europeo.

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

Livia Járóka (PPE), blue-card question. – My dear colleague, you have helped me so much from the Socialist side to push this dossier and we have talked so many times about what sort of financial background there should be behind it. Would you be reconsidering your Socialist view on whether the multiannual financial framework (MFF) should have a bigger budget for the many more poor people in Europe, because when we started this dossier we had 43 million poor people in Europe and about six million were non-integrated Roma. Now if we grow the document because poverty has doubled, would you be considering mentioning this dossier in the MFF? With a loan budget line of course.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), blue-card answer. – Thank you for your question, my respected colleague, Ms Járóka. Ever since the great recession got started, we Socialists have fought all along the way against the recessive austerity and in favour of a European budget in order to fight social exclusion. Inequality is on the rise and of course that goes precisely to those segments of the European social fabric which have been the victims of a long, protracted discrimination in history – the Roma community, of course, but not only them.

Let me say that making up the budget is not only a matter in this House for a single European political group and that of course I do favour an increase in those particular chapters of the social European budget.

The second thing I wanted to say to you is that, in the current dispensation of the European budget, there is 20% for social inclusion, including in the European Social Fund. And that is an absolute must when it comes to the integration of the Roma population in Europe.

Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE). – Señor presidente, a pesar de los esfuerzos de la Unión Europea y de los Estados miembros todavía existe una fuerte discriminación hacia la comunidad roma que dificulta su integración y participación en la sociedad, en especial en el caso de las mujeres gitanas.

La Comisión ha dado un paso al frente al reconocer como uno de los objetivos específicos del Fondo Social Europeo Plus la integración social y económica de comunidades excluidas como la romaní, con su subsecuente apoyo financiero. Por ello, desde el Parlamento tenemos que reconocer la lucha contra el antigitanismo como una prioridad europea y apoyar, sin fisuras, a los Estados miembros en el desarrollo, la aplicación y la supervisión de las políticas dirigidas a erradicarlos.

Es cierto -y se ha dicho aquí- que se pueden mejorar en múltiples ámbitos, en particular en materia de educación, empleo, salud y vivienda. Sin embargo, pienso que la prioridad se la tenemos que dar a la educación y la formación. En primer lugar, garantizando la escolarización y, en segundo lugar, evitando el abandono escolar, mejorando así sus perspectivas laborales y su integración y participación en la sociedad.

Y, por último, quiero destacar que es importante que las medidas no sean genéricas sino que tienen que dirigirse de forma específica a la comunidad gitana, contando con la participación activa de las ONG especializadas, así como con las propias organizaciones de gitanos. En España funciona muy bien, y yo creo que tenemos que seguir en esta línea.

Anna Hedh (S&D). –Herr talman! Trots att vi har en EU-ram för nationella strategier vad gäller romers rättigheter, och trots att medlemsländerna haft egna nationella strategier för integrering av romer sedan 2012, är det hittills få saker som har förändrats till det bättre. Europas romer är fortfarande extremt marginaliserade. De utsätts för fördomar och diskriminering och har inte alltid tillgång till grundläggande rättigheter.

Antiziganismen är utspridd och mer socialt accepterad än annan rasism. Detta är förödande både för romernas levnadsvillkor och för deras förtroende för samhället. Vi kan inte låta det här fortgå; vi måste göra mer. Det är självklart att kommissionen inte ensam kan bära ansvaret; det är i våra medlemsstater som förändringar måste ske, men kommissionen har ett oerhört viktigt ansvar att övervaka och granska att medlemsstaterna verkligen genomför sina strategier. Tyvärr finns det brister här som behöver rättas till.

Det bästa vi kan göra nu är att fortsätta arbetet med EU-ramen för nationella strategier för integrering av romer. Utan press från er, herr kommissionär och de andra i kommissionen, tror jag inte att de nationella regeringarna kommer att prioritera frågan eller göra vad som krävs, så vi kräver att ni fortsätter trycka på medlemsstaterna om romers rättigheter, gärna med en romstrategi.

Monika Beňová (S&D). –Vážený pán predsedajúci, chcela by som povedať, že mám taký pocit, že sme trochu neféroví k členským štátom. Budem hovoriť za moju krajinu, za Slovenskú republiku. Slovenská republika má svoju stratégiu, ktorou sa snaží napomáhať riešeniu problematiky Rómov. Máme rómskeho splnomocnenca. A viem, že je to takto vo viacerých krajinách, pretože som viackrát bola členkou fact-finding mission, ktorá navštívila viaceré krajiny, kde je väčšia komunita Rómov, ktorých považujeme za vylúčených alebo za skupiny, ktoré majú problém sa integrovať.

Ale naviažem na to, čo hovorila Lívia Járóka: bez spolupráce so samotnou rómskou komunitou nebudeme v týchto stratégiách úspešní. To, že máme výborné stratégie, je jedna vec, ale to, že ich nedokážeme implementovať aj preto, že veľká časť rómskych komunít nespolupracuje pri týchto stratégiách, je vec druhá.

A keď sme hovorili o vzdelávaní, chcem len povedať za moju krajinu, že moja krajina vytvorila všetky podmienky na to, aby rómske deti boli vzdelávané už od predškolskej výchovy, cez školy. Žiaľbohu, v prostredí svojich rodín nepociťujú žiadnu oporu v tom, aby sa vzdelávali, preto potom ukončia skôr školskú dochádzku a ťažko sa umiestnia na trhu práce. Navyše väčšina Rómov na Slovensku vykonáva skôr manuálnu činnosť, pretože také školy ukončí, a veľmi dobre vieme, že technologický pokrok neumožňuje vytvárať až toľko pracovných miest, aby takúto pracovnú činnosť mohli vykonávať.

(Rečníčka súhlasila, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty (článok 162 ods. 8 rokovacieho poriadku)).

Soraya Post (S&D), blue-card question. – Mr President, I am happy that Member States are doing their best, but do you really mean, Monika, that the Slovak Government is doing their best when they are creating walls and when they are creating segregated schools for Roma children? Is that the way to do integration? You have to ask that. You also had a sanction from the Commission because of the segregated schools.

Monika Beňová (S&D), odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Nie je pravdou, že na Slovensku sú vytvárané špeciálne segregované školy pre rómske deti. Práve naopak, slovenské vlády, či už súčasné alebo minulé, sa snažili vytvárať priestor na to, aby rómske deti boli integrované do riadneho vyučovacieho systému v riadnych školách. Problémom je, že máme rómske osady regionálne umiestnené v niektorých oblastiach a žiaľbohu, keďže je tam vyšší výskyt detí z rómskych osád, tak nie všetky spĺňajú svojimi vlastnými schopnosťami možnosť byť súčasťou iných škôl, a preto sú nie len pre rómske deti vytvárané špeciálne školy.

Presidente. –È prevista una *blue card* per oratore, non due, tre o quattro, altrimenti non diventa più una domanda, diventa un'altra cosa.

Julie Ward (S&D). –Mr President, Roma across Europe face countless problems, such as unemployment, poor housing, poor access to public services, multiple forms of discrimination and social, cultural and economic exclusion. Too little progress is being made, not to mention the anti-Roma prejudices that are still being promulgated, including at the highest political level in some Member States.

The Commission's recent public consultation showed that only in the field of education has there been any progress, and I am grateful for the work of the Committee on Culture and Education in that regard. In almost all the other areas – employment, healthcare, housing and discrimination – a large number of respondents declared that they saw little or no improvement. I wish particularly to mention the issues faced by Roma women, who find themselves at the intersection between anti-Gypsyism and sexism.

Problems in relation to discrimination against Roma need to be addressed through a rights-based approach and the EU has a responsibility to lead the way.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι Ρομά αποτελούν μια μειονότητα 10 έως 12 εκατομμυρίων, που επί αιώνες ζουν σε κοινωνική περιθωριοποίηση, αντιμετωπίζουν διακρίσεις και στερεότυπα που υπάρχουν εναντίον τους. Μην ξεχνούμε ότι εκατομμύρια Ρομά εκτελέστηκαν, δολοφονήθηκαν στα ναζιστικά στρατόπεδα συγκέντρωσης.

Εν τω μεταξύ έχουν περάσει τα χρόνια και όμως η φτώχεια και η κοινωνική περιθωριοποίηση συνεχίζεται για τους Ρομά. Φυσικά αυτό δεν μπορεί να αποτελεί άλλοθι για αντικοινωνική συμπεριφορά εκ μέρους τους. Απαιτείται η οικονομική ενίσχυση και η κοινωνική ένταξη τους. Πρέπει να διατεθούν κονδύλια και να ξεπεραστούν τα εμπόδια της γραφειοκρατίας.

Θα ήθελα να σας πω επ' αυτού, κύριε Επίτροπε, ότι πρέπει να στηρίξουμε την προσπάθεια που γίνεται για τους Ρομά στην περιοχή Καμηλόβρυσης της Φθιώτιδας έξω από τη Λαμία. Εκεί τα παιδιά πηγαίνουν σχολείο σε κοντέινερ, αντιμετωπίζονται προβλήματα ύδρευσης και φωτισμού. Πρέπει να ξεπεραστεί η γραφειοκρατία και να δοθούν κονδύλια για έργα μετεγκατάστασης στην περιοχή αυτή της Καμηλόβρυσης όπου υπάρχουν πάρα πολλοί Ρομά.

László Tóké (PPE). –Elnök Úr! Járóka Livia alelnök asszonnyal, az ügy jelentéstévőjével együtt büszke vagyok arra, hogy 2011-ben az EP a magyar elnökség égisze alatt fogadta el az európai romastratégiát. A Sargentini-jelentés vádaskódásaival ellentétben, Magyarország azóta is élen jár a stratégia életbe léptetése terén. Azt viszont szégyellem, hogy az EU és egyes érintett tagországok milyen keveset valósítottak meg stratégiai vállalásaikból.

Az EU sokszorosan több gondot fordít és pénzt költ az illegális bevándorlókra, mint saját európai cigány polgáira, s az ő integrációjukra. Az eddigiekből levonva a következtetéseket, nem szabad a polkorrekt verbalizmusnál megrekedni, hanem végre cselekednünk kell a mélyszegénységben élő romák millióinak a szociális, gazdasági, oktatási és egészségügyi integrációja érdekében! Az 1920 utáni stratégiánk erre kötelez bennünket.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). –Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário e Senhora Ministra, antes de começar gostava de dizer à senhora Beňová, nada do que a senhora disse é verdade e a senhora sabe bem disso.

As comunidades ciganas, a maior minoria étnica da União Europeia, são parte integrante da sociedade e economia europeias, mas continuam a ser privadas dos seus direitos fundamentais. Perseguidos ao longo de séculos, os cidadãos ciganos continuam hoje na Europa a ser vítimas de preconceito e discriminação na educação, no emprego, no acesso à habitação e às prestações sociais, tornando-os, por isso, especialmente vulneráveis à pobreza, exclusão social e ao tráfico de seres humanos.

São ainda frequentemente vítimas de despejos forçados, ataques racistas e maus tratos policiais e, nalguns Estados-Membros, impedidos de obter a cidadania e os documentos necessários para os serviços de saúde e de segurança social. Isto mostra que, apesar de algumas melhorias no domínio da educação, os Estados-Membros estão a faltar no seu combate à discriminação e torna urgente assegurar que o quadro da União para as estratégias nacionais de integração dos ciganos no período pós 2020 seja mais ambicioso e mais integrado, numa lógica de empoderamento e de fomento da participação das próprias comunidades ciganas – termino, Senhor Presidente – para que finalmente deixem de existir na União *romani* apátridas ou tratados como cidadãos de segunda.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). –Arvoisa puhemies, romanien asema ei tämän strategian myötä ole juurikaan jäsenmaissa parantunut. Se on parantunut konkreettisesti jonkin verran koulutuksen osa-alueella mutta syrjäytyminen sekä myös suhteellisesti huonompi asema työmarkkinoilla, julkisessa päätöksenteossa, palvelujen saannissa tai omaan elämään vaikuttamisessa ovat jatkuneet jotakuinkin entisellään.

Samaan aikaan myöskään yleiset asenteet – rasistiset ja romaneja syrjivät asenteet – eivät ole juuri korjaantuneet Euroopassa. Tämä kaikki puhuu sen puolesta, että tarvitsemme EU:n uuden puiteohjelman, jossa on nykyistä tiukempi seuranta ja myös korjaavat toimenpiteet jokaisen jäsenmaan osalta silloin, kun tavoitteisiin ei päästä. Se tarkoittaa, että tarvitaan erityinen osuus, joka puuttuu suoraan yleisiin asenteisiin, rasismiin ja syrjintään, joka on valitettavan yleistä eri jäsenmaissa. Sinänsä tämä on hyvä muistutus siitä, miksi tarvitsisimme myös syrjinnän vastaisen direktiivin.

Tarvitsemme myös vahvempaa romanien omaa osallistamista päätöksentekoon sekä julkisella että yksityisellä puolella ja lopuksi tarvitsemme sellaista koulutusta, joka vahvistaa romanien asemaa työmarkkinoilla suhteellisesti, eli ei siis halpa-työvoimaksi vaan niille osa-alueille, joilla tulevaisuuden työelämässä on kysyntää.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). –Elnök Úr! A romaintegrációs stratégiák megalkotása önmagában a roma közösségek speciális helyzetének elismerését jelentette, és azt a szándékot az EU részéről, hogy a tagállamokkal közösen szeretne tevékenyen részt venni a problémák megoldásában. Rendkívül fontosnak tartom, hogy az EU megpróbálja a tagállami hatóságok munkáját nyomon követni, de ezzel együtt látnunk kell, hogy a leginkább a kormányok tudnak érdemben tenni a stratégiák megvalósításáért.

A kérdéskör rendkívül komplex, legfontosabbnak mégis a szociális és oktatási dimenziót érzem, a roma közösségek felzárkózása ugyanis akkor lehet sikeres, ha tagjai azt érzik: van lehetőség kitörni a nyomorból, és az oktatás révén érdemben javulhat a helyzetük. Ha a kelet-közép-európai térség munkaerőpiaci folyamatait nézzük, akkor észre kell vennünk: óriási szükség van azokra a romákra, akik jelenleg az alacsony képzettségi szintjük miatt nem tudnak belépni a munkaerőpiacra. A romaintegráció tehát nem csak a romák számára fontos, hanem minden tagállam és minden helyi közösség sokszorosan profitálhat belőle.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! W Komisji Kultury w jakimś sensie zajmuję się taką opieką finansową nad programami w ramach Erasmus+. Z tego też powodu śledzę losy różnych mniejszości – także narodowych – funkcjonujących w tym programie. I muszę powiedzieć, że społeczność Romów tam nie funkcjonuje. To jest na granicy błędu statystycznego. Natomiast rzeczywiście leciutko – ale podkreślam – zaledwie lekko poprawiono sytuację najmłodszego pokolenia Romów, czyli krótko mówiąc – dzieci. O rok później opuszczają one szkołę, najczęściej jednak podstawowego poziomu. Zwracam na to uwagę, bo musimy niestety przyjąć do wiadomości tę zgodność opinii Rady i Komisji, że jest źle, ale do wiadomości akceptującej, jeżeli chodzi o realność oceny, natomiast – nieakceptującej, jeżeli chodzi o perspektywę. Potrzebny jest program zdecydowanie bardziej skuteczny, zdecydowanie lepiej adresowany i zdecydowanie lepiej koordynowany, także na poziomie krajowym. Tu są największe kłopoty.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Neven Mimica, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you for your clear and strong contributions, engagement and guidance on this important matter. It is obvious that, together, we need to continue an EU-level commitment. Roma strategies must be part of a broader narrative of inclusive structural reform that benefits all groups suffering discrimination and exclusion. In addition, hand-in-hand with socioeconomic inclusion, we will need an increased focus on fighting racism, in particular anti-Gypsyism, as well as clearer, measurable Roma integration goals, backed by robust transparent and inclusive monitoring.

The results of the EU framework evaluation will feed into reflection on the needs and directions of the post-2020 EU approach. I count on your strong support along the way.

Monika Panayotova, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, thank you once again for the opportunity to address this important subject in Parliament. The Council welcomes your determination to keep Roma inclusion on the agenda and to provide continuity.

Let me repeat that the Council has already called on the Commission to propose the post-2020 strategy. It has not yet been decided how exactly the work on this subject will be continued after 2020, but we are quite confident that – with the proposal for the Multiannual Financial Framework and the 25% guarantee financing under the European Social Fund + for social inclusion – the national Roma strategies will have the financing needed to implement them after 2020.

We believe the EU framework for National Roma integration strategies is a major achievement, a manifestation of our common commitment to social justice, so let us overcome our divisions and affirm our common humanity.

Presidente. –Ringraziamo la signora Ministra, che resterà con noi anche per la discussione successiva, mentre salutiamo e ringraziamo della sua presenza il Commissario Mimica.

La discussione è chiusa.

19. Keeleõppe parandamine ja keeleoskuse vastastikune tunnustamine ELis (arutelu)

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

— l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale al Consiglio sul miglioramento dell'apprendimento delle lingue e riconoscimento reciproco delle competenze linguistiche nell'Unione europea presentata da Cecilia Wikström, a nome della commissione per le petizioni (O-000055/2018 - B8-0029/2018) (2018/2707(RSP)) e

— l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sul miglioramento dell'apprendimento delle lingue e riconoscimento reciproco delle competenze linguistiche nell'Unione europea presentata da Cecilia Wikström, a nome della commissione per le petizioni (O-000056/2018 - B8-0030/2018) (2018/2707(RSP)).

Cecilia Wikström, author. – Mr President, in the name of my committee, the Committee on Petitions, I have the pleasure of presenting the oral question to both the Council and the Commission on improving language learning and the mutual recognition of language competences in the European Union.

In my Committee, we have received a number of petitions asking to improve language learning and the mutual recognition of language competences in the European Union. The petitioners claim that the existing differences in the teaching, evaluation and recognition of language skills in different Member States undermine the freedom of movement, which is very serious. They also claim that it discriminates against children in school whose mother tongue is one of the smaller languages of the 24 official languages of the European Union.

My Committee decided therefore to table this oral question to both the Council and the Commission on this issue, and both these questions were unanimously – and I underline, unanimously – adopted by the Committee on Petitions. According to Article 165 of the Treaty, Member States are exclusively competent for the content and the organisation of education and training systems. So in this sense, the offer of languages for secondary school exams is the decision of the Member State's Ministry of Education on the organisation of their educational system. However, proficiency in very much more than only one language is considered essential to strengthen employability within the European Union. It is also a critical key competence for active citizenship.

The EU therefore supports and supplements the actions of the Member States, with the aim to improve the efficiency of language teaching and learning. The oral questions to the institutions therefore tabled by my Committee are in line with the Commission's initiative on the creation of the European education agenda. I'm proud of that. We are completely (*inaudible*) within that scope, and in particular the concerned package of measures presented by the Commission in May this year suggesting, among other things, a Council recommendation for improving language learning.

The Committee on Petitions wanted to have a debate on these oral questions in this plenary, taking into account the adoption by plenary of the own initiative report by the Cultural Committee on modernisation of education in the European Union. The EU has long promoted language learning with an aim to increase mutual understanding and mobility, this by supporting supplementing actions and cooperation between national educational systems.

Parliament is taking serious note of these petitions that we have received, in which EU citizens do raise their severe concerns about the lack of teaching and recognition of language skills in their mother tongue.

Every EU citizen should be able to take advantage of their freedom to live in a Member State other than his or her own, and unfortunately this problem is today making it difficult to do so. Therefore, we ask and call upon the Council and the Commission to elaborate on the following issues – and I have them, there are four:

Firstly, what actions have you taken to support Member States in order to improve the mutual recognition of language competences in all the official EU languages, based on the levels existing under the common European framework of reference for languages?

Secondly, how does the Council and the Commission assess the added value of teaching official EU languages and particularly the recommendation for 'mother tongue plus two' in the context of modernisation of education in the EU, and more particularly for stimulating entrepreneurship, job opportunities and preservation of cultural diversities within the European Union?

Thirdly, does the Council and the Commission have recent and accurate data available concerning language assessment opportunities and the recognition of language exams, diplomas or certificates in the official EU languages other than English, French, German, Spanish and Italian – the big five? How can the European Union further support educational institutions that do provide classes in the official EU languages for EU citizens living in a Member State other than their own?

And lastly, what measures does the Council and the Commission intend to put in place in the European education area to develop an online system for the cross-border recognition and validation of EU language certificates for the purposes of school-leaving diplomas in order to facilitate accessibility to higher education across the EU?

Those are our four questions. They conclude my Committee's oral question to the two institutions.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, at the Gothenburg summit in November 2017 the EU Heads of State and Government chose education and culture as the first subject to be addressed under the new Leaders' Agenda, underlining their willingness to do more in these areas. The results of the Gothenburg discussions were formalised in the conclusions of the European Council meeting on 14 December last year, which emphasised that education and culture are key to building inclusive and cohesive societies. But the European Council didn't limit itself to such general statements: it also set out a number of specific areas for work to be taken forward.

I would like to mention two such areas, which are specifically relevant to the question posed today. The first is language learning, where the Heads of State and Government called for action so that more young people will speak at least two European languages in addition to their mother tongue. The second area is the mutual recognition of higher education and school leaving diplomas, and here Member States' cooperation is key. The benefits of multilingual competences impact upon all aspects of life. They contribute to mutual understanding and mobility within the Union. They increase our productivity, competitiveness and economic resilience. The lack of multilingual competences hampers the mobility of our citizens within the European Union and beyond and limits access to education, training and the labour market. At a time when Europe is looking to the future and seeking to re-engage, especially with young people, around an agenda of shared values, we believe multilingual and multicultural competences are crucial to creating a sense of belonging among Europeans.

Here, I would like to remind you that multilingualism was one of the core elements of the modernised Key Competence Framework adopted by the Council in May and the Council recommendation on promoting common values. The Council recommendation on key competences for lifelong learning is particularly relevant because multilingual competence is identified as one of the eight key competences which should be developed by the Member States' education systems. This update was not just a single act by the Council to address the common challenge in the European Union of the modernisation of educational institutions, but also part of the Member States' overall ambition to keep working on the New Skills Agenda for Europe.

The Council's recent extensive work on that matter, including the provision of a quality framework for language learning and recognition, started with the revision of the European Qualifications Framework. The revised European Qualifications Framework recommendation provided better understanding of qualifications and enabled better use of the skills available on the European labour market. The new Europass Framework, agreed recently, builds on the successful formula with easy-to-use tools to help people identify and communicate their skills and qualifications in all EU languages, which is a major boost for the recognition of all EU languages.

In addition, many other initiatives in Europe have supported the definition and development of language competences. The Council supports in a sustainable manner the use of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and recognises the impact of the European Language Label Award for excellence and innovation in language teaching.

Allow me to remind you that the Council held an education ministerial debate in February this year, when it called for a stronger Erasmus+ programme building on current successful instruments and further boosting participation. The call for an inclusive Erasmus+ programme, providing more and new participants with mobility opportunities, will increase the opportunities for young people both to learn more languages and to promote their own mother tongue with the European Union and beyond.

In May the Council adopted important strategic conclusions on moving towards the vision of a European Education Area, which recognised multilingual competence as an important building block of such an area. In the meantime, the Commission has issued a package of three further proposals for Council recommendations, including a proposal on the mutual recognition of higher education and school leaving diplomas and the proposal on improving language learning. The two proposed recommendations are particularly relevant to today's discussion. The recommendation on improving language learning focuses on language teaching and learning in compulsory education, covering both general and vocational schools, as well as multilingual competences in a lifelong perspective.

Both recommendations will be examined in detail by the Council. This process has only just begun and it is therefore too early at this point to comment on the substance. However, there is already broad consensus that these are the key areas to be addressed in seeking to build a European education area and it is my understanding that the ambition of the forthcoming Austrian Presidency is to seek agreement at least on the first proposal, on mutual recognition of diplomas, before the end of this year.

Therefore, on the issue of language learning, as well as mutual recognition of diplomas, it is clear that the work is progressing quite quickly. These issues are a priority for the Council, and Parliament can expect quality results during the upcoming Presidencies.

Presidente. –Ringrazio la signora Ministra e do il benvenuto al Commissario Navracsics, che ricorderà questa serata perché oggi è il suo compleanno e gli rivolgo gli auguri di buon compleanno.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you for this oral question which reflects Parliament's strong commitment to multilingualism. Just three weeks ago, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Council recommendation on the teaching and learning of languages. In fact, this proposal's recommendation is a response to the European Council which last December called on us, I quote, 'to enhance the learning of languages so that more young people will speak at least two European languages in addition to their mother tongue'.

Language learning and multilingualism have never been higher on the political agenda. We should use this momentum.

Let me now answer your questions. First, the mutual recognition of language competence is based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The Commission supports and encourages Member States to use this Council of Europe framework. It facilitates the assessment of language competences and helps to create mutual understanding and transparency for the recognition of such competences. In recent years, the Commission has reinforced its cooperation with the Council of Europe and its European Centre for Modern Languages, situated in Graz, Austria. We have supported several joint projects, including on the assessment of language competences.

Two practical tools have also been developed. First, the European language Portfolio, a document that helps language learners, at and beyond school, to record and reflect on their language learning and cultural experiences. The second instrument is the Europass Language Passport, which is part of the Europass online tool. These two instruments help validate language competences in a transparent and comparable manner. Countries can use them to move towards the recognition of different language competences.

On your second question, on teaching languages in the context of the modernisation of education in the EU: language competences are at the heart of our ambitious vision to create a European Education Area. Being able to speak foreign languages is a key condition for studying and working abroad. It provides valuable and much-demanded skills on the labour market, strengthens a sense of European identity and enable learners fully to discover Europe's cultural diversity.

The Commission proposal for a Council recommendation on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages stresses that young people need to be able to express themselves in three languages. First is the language of schooling, which is generally the national language; second is a language of international communication; and also a third language, which is most often relevant to their personal context. It is a priority for the Commission to support Member States in making language teaching and learning more effective.

Now, on your third question on language assessment and the recognition of language certificates, as well as support to educational institutions: in the 2014 Council conclusions on multilingualism the Commission was invited to explore the feasibility of assessing language competences across all Member States by using existing national language tests. In 2015, two studies were launched. The aim was to map national tests and compare the tests used across Europe to assess the language competences of secondary school pupils. However, these studies concluded that the data available at national level were not comparable.

The Erasmus+ programme supports language learning. In fact, this is one of its specific objectives. Opportunities for pupils to learn abroad, which we intend to boost in the future Erasmus programme, will also support the learning of languages. Moreover, teachers will benefit from continuous professional development and mobility schemes. We want to ensure that by 2025 every newly graduated language teacher will have spent at least six months learning or teaching abroad. Online training projects are also valuable for developing language competences.

Finally, to your fourth question on the recognition of language competencies in school-leaving diplomas: in May the Commission proposed the Council recommendation on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages. It stresses the importance of acquiring and developing adequate language competences in one's mother tongue plus two additional languages. To help people reach adequate competence levels, the recommendation promotes the concept of language-aware schools that embed language learning – the learning of both of foreign languages and the language of schooling – across curricula. This enables a focus on pupils' respective needs, circumstances, abilities and interests.

Language-aware schools value linguistic diversity and enable students to maintain their entire linguistic repertoire, including their home language or mother tongue when this is not the language of schooling. As a consequence, the prior learning and knowledge of languages which are not part of the curriculum can be formally recognised and can be added to school-leaving certificates. Currently it is not possible to acquire recognised qualifications in all European languages. Therefore, the Commission encourages Member States to step up their efforts to make language certificates more widely available.

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODEBSKI*Wiceprzewodniczący*

Светослав Христов Малинов, *от името на групата PPE*. – Бих искал да погледнем на днешния дебат като чудесна победа на каузата на малките официални езици. Наистина малките официални езици си заслужаваха един дебат в голямата зала в Страсбург.

Измежду петициите, които бяха в основата на днешния дебат, имаше и една българска петиция, особено впечатляваща петиция на Асоциацията на българските училища в чужбина. И макар да тръгна въпросът и дебатът под петиция на български учители, много бързо темата беше припозната като голяма общоевропейска тема, а именно защита на малките официални езици и най-вече на техните най-уязвими носители – децата, учениците.

Защото става дума за защита на онези млади хора, чиито родители са се възползвали от фундаменталното право на свободно придвижване или пък чиито родител, ако става дума за смесени бракове, и чието естествено владение на майчиния език не е оценено по достойнство, особено когато става дума за майчин език, който е официален на Европейския съюз.

Този дебат, тръгнал от комисията по петиции показва, че когато имаш кауза, когато имаш аргументи, гласът ти ще бъде чул от Европейския парламент, а както стана видно от отговора на комисар Наврачич, ще бъде чул дори от Европейската комисия. Защото става дума за принцип – принципът на равнопоставеността на всички официални езици. Няма връщане назад. Нещо повече, от чутото досега мисля, че Комисията и Европейският парламент ще изпреварят държавите членки в тази посока.

Петър Курумбашев, *от името на групата S&D*. – Основната цел на тази петиция, за която говори г-н Малинов и за която Асоциацията на българските училища заслужава поздравление, е в определени училища във всички държави членки да се предлагат изпити в края на средното образование на всички официални езици на Европейския съюз. Няма логика този въпрос да бъде решаван на ниво двустранни отношения между две отделни държави членки. Именно това е смисълът на Европейския съюз и на европейското право – този въпрос да бъде решен за всички официални езици във всички държави членки.

Всеки човек би искал децата му, независимо от това къде живеят или колко езика знаят, да говорят на неговия собствен език, на официалния език на неговата държава. Всеки език е врата към една култура. Твоят собствен език е врата към твоята собствена култура. Ние много се гордеем, че като българи дадохме третата азбука в Европейския съюз след латиницата и гръцката азбука, и аз много се надявам, че българските деца ще могат да четат и да пишат на кирилица навсякъде, във всяка държава-членка на Европейския съюз.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Επιτροπή Αναφορών είναι η επιτροπή στην οποία απευθύνονται οι πολίτες και έχουν τη δυνατότητα να θέσουν τα θέματα που τους απασχολούν. Το θέμα το οποίο εξετάζουμε σήμερα υπό μορφή ερώτησης είναι πραγματικά καθοριστικό, διότι η δυνατότητα των πολιτών να έχουν γλωσσικές ικανότητες, να μπορούν να μιλούν δύο επιπλέον γλώσσες εκτός από τη μητρική τους γλώσσα, είναι κάτι πολύ σημαντικό και καθοριστικό, ιδίως σε μια φάση όπου χιλιάδες νέοι από τον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο και την ευρωπαϊκή περιφέρεια, ακριβώς λόγω των πολιτικών λιτότητας και φτώχειας που υπάρχουν στις περιοχές αυτές, αναγκάζονται να έρχονται προς τις χώρες του σκληρού πυρήνα.

Είναι λοιπόν βασικό να δοθεί η δυνατότητα στη νεολαία, μέσω του Erasmus και των ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων, να έχει αυτές τις γλωσσικές ικανότητες, αλλά φυσικά πρέπει να υπάρχουν και διαδικασίες αναγνώρισης των γλωσσικών ικανοτήτων τις οποίες αποκτούν οι νέοι μας. Θεωρούμε σημαντικές τόσο αυτές τις πρωτοβουλίες όσο και τη στήριξη των καθηγητών ξένων γλωσσών.

Илхан Кючюк, *от името на групата ALDE*. – Искам да благодаря на всички, които работиха по темата, но преди всичко бих искал да благодаря и на Асоциацията на българските училища в чужбина, чиято петиция положи основите на този устен въпрос, който дискутираме тази вечер.

Знам, че Европейската комисия в такива случаи казва: „Въпросът е в компетенциите на държавите членки.“ И ние това го знаем много добре. В държавите членки се осъществяват специфичните езикови политики. В случая обаче не става въпрос само за образование, а за мобилност. За мобилност и свободно движение на най-ценния ни капитал – знанието. И наистина, какъв по-ценен капитал има от уменията и знанията на подрастващите поколения? Езикова компетентност е част от този капитал. Придобиването ѝ се насърчава като ключова компетентност.

Оказва се, че при мобилност може да се обезцени и загуби вече езиковата компетентност. Давам ви пример. Ученик от България с два чужди езика, английски и френски, пристига във Франция и остава само с един чужд език. Българският му вече не се брои, не се вписва никъде, не се признава, не се оценява. Това обезценяване води до неподдържането му и до загуба. Местната система всъщност казва: „Този език ти е излишен.“ Така казват много администрации за много езици, а излишни ли са наистина те? Не им ли трябва на държавите членки с тези редки познания, за да станат именно хората на още по-тесната интеграция на пазари и култури.

Тук не говорим за хармонизация, нито за образователни системи, нито за изпитни системи, нито за езикови политики. Необходим е механизъм, който да предаде стойност на придобитите езикови познания, независимо на кой език, как и къде са придобити. Не хармонизация, а механизъм по избор на държавите – дали с национални изпити, дали с признаване на сертификати или по друг начин. Подобен механизъм ще се яви като административна мярка, а не като образователна.

В заключение бих казал, че въпросът не стои само пред българските ученици и родители, а пред стотици хиляди европейски граждани. Мобилността означава отворени врати, а загубата на език затваря врати.

Liadh Ní Riada, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL*. – A Uachtarán, cuirim fáilte gan dabht roimh an díospóireacht seo mar ceapaim gur maith an rud é aitheantas a thabhairt dár n-éagsúlacht teanga. Is díospóireacht bheo leanúnach í cearta teanga san Eoraip agus sa bhaile in Éirinn. Mar shampla, tá ár rialtas féin ag déanamh faillí ar ár bpobal Gaeilge le heaspa seirbhísí agus easpa aitheantais, easpa múinteoirí agus easpa tacaíochta, go háirithe dúinne atá inár gcónaí sa Ghaeltacht.

Tá dearcadh rialtas na Breataine scannalach i dtaobh ár dteanga dhúchasach agus nílid toilteanach comhaontú Chill Rímhinn a chomhlíonadh maidir le hAcht na Gaeilge. Tá sé tábhachtach mar sin go seasfaimid mar Fheisirí go láidir ar son cearta teanga agus son cearta daonna i ngach gné dár saol. Tá ár dteangacha tábhachtach, ní hamháin dár bhféiniúlacht ach dár bhféinmhuinín, dár n-éiceolaíocht, dár gcultúr agus níos mó ná san.

Ach mar fhocal scoir, agus samhláim go bhfuil sé tábhachtach é seo a ardú agus sinn ag caint ar chúrsaí teanga ar ndóigh: tá deacrachtaí ag na hateangairí le riarachán sa Pharlaimint seo agus táim ag labhairt go díreach leis na hateangairí atá anseo trathnóna chun a rá libh go bhfuilimid in éineacht libh, táimid ag éisteacht libh, táimid in éineacht in bhur dtroid ar son cearta agus ar son bhur gcearta oibriúcháin. Beirigí bua, seasfaimid an fód libh.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, dernièrement des voix s'élevaient aux Pays-Bas, pourtant chantre de la mondialisation heureuse, contre la suprématie de l'anglais dans l'enseignement supérieur. Un réveil tardif à l'heure où pour l'étudiant international lambda, les journées sont rythmées par des cours en anglais et des conversations sur Skype dans la langue maternelle.

Les objectifs de Barcelone de maîtrise de deux langues étrangères comme gage de diversité auront fait long feu tant, de Bologne à Maastricht, le globish règne sans partage.

Comment s'en étonner alors que les institutions européennes entretiennent elles-mêmes un double discours permanent entre éloge du multilinguisme et une hégémonie de l'anglais disproportionnée au regard de son poids démographique au lendemain du Brexit.

Derrière la question de principe se profile celle de la considération accordée à des nations comme la France, État fondateur et contributeur net, alors que le renouveau des patriotismes essaime les ferments d'un printemps des peuples européens. De la réponse à cette question dépend la légitimité de l'Europe mais également sa survie.

Pál Csáky (PPE). –Elnök Úr, Biztos Úr! A Petíció Bizottságot a nyelvhasználatot illetően számos európai polgár kereste meg, ennek alapján kérdezzük ma a Bizottságot és a Tanácsot a felvetett kérdésekről. Előrelátó elgondolásnak tartom a két intézményhez címzett kérdésben megfogalmazottakat, ugyanis ha egy nyitott, egymás megértésére és megismerésére képes Európát akarunk, akkor azt a fiatalok oktatásával kell kezdenünk. Nyelvtudás nélkül nehezebb kultúránk megismerése, bonyolultabb az utazás és bonyolultabb a külföldi tanulás is.

Ezért is fontos, hogy erőteljes uniós támogatást kapjon minél több olyan kezdeményezés, amely a nyelvi sokszínűség erősítése céljából születik. Az Európai Unió sokat segíthet a tanulóknak, például a más tagállami nyelvvizsgák és bizonyítványok gyorsabb és rugalmasabb elfogadásával, vagy a más tagállami nyelvek oktatására specializálódott intézmények jobb támogatásával. Itt megállnék egy pillanatra, mert úgy gondolom, hogy hasonló, vagy talán még nagyobb támogatásra van szükségük a kisebbségi, vagy regionális nyelveket beszélő tanulóknak és diákoknak is. Ezért kérem a Bizottságot és a Tanácsot, hogy jövőbeli intézkedéseikben ne feledkezzenek meg az európai kisebbségi nyelveket beszélő fiatalokról sem.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). –Señor presidente, me parece de una gran oportunidad este debate sobre esta pregunta oral de la Comisión de Peticiones.

Creo que la mejora del aprendizaje de lenguas es una obligación y, aunque se han referido otros colegas a que, efectivamente, es una competencia de los Estados, yo creo que desde la Unión Europea, desde el Consejo y de la Comisión se pueden hacer más cosas. Somos el mayor espacio político común con mayor número de idiomas. Tenemos ahí países como Rusia o Estados Unidos con un único idioma, prácticamente. Es decir, por lo tanto, nosotros somos un gran espacio político con un gran número de idiomas, y eso es un valor compartido. Por tanto, hay que tomar iniciativas. Me han parecido interesantes las del Consejo, también las que ha anunciado la Comisión.

Yo soy de un país -España- con una lengua oficial pero con tres lenguas más oficiales en su territorio, y creo que eso es una riqueza. Hay que proseguir esas iniciativas y que las competencias de los Estados sean generosas con el hecho de que la Unión Europea favorezca el lenguaje y el aprendizaje de estos idiomas.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). –Pane předsedající, děkuji také panu komisaři za jeho zprávu a pozornost, kterou věnuje otázce jazykového vzdělávání. Myslím, že zájmem EU je, aby se lidé mezi sebou domluvili. K tomu potřebují nepochybně *lingua franca*, to je dnes angličtina, a pokud jsou nadaní, určitě zvládnou ještě další cizí jazyk.

EU musí také podporovat vzdělávání v mateřském jazyce. Samozřejmě, že to je v zájmu členských států, aby byly aktivní, podporovaly jazykovou gramotnost svých občanů, ale vzhledem k mobilitě je právě i na EU, aby jim pomohla, aby koordinovala jazykové vzdělávání, a proto navrhujeme mechanismus pravidelného transparentního hodnocení jazykových kompetencí napříč členskými zeměmi. EU by měla podporovat vzdělávací instituce, které zajišťují výuku v úředních jazycích EU pro občany, kteří žijí mimo svůj vlastní členský stát.

V neposlední řadě také bychom měli pomoci k dostupnosti univerzitního vzdělávání prostřednictvím on-line systému přeshraničního uznávání a potvrzování jazykových osvědčení pro účely osvědčení o ukončení školní docházky. Měli bychom k tomu také využít kompetenci, kapacity, které má třeba OECD. Chci v této chvíli poděkovat kolegovi Malinovovi za jeho iniciativu a panu komisaři za jeho spolupráci.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). –Elnök Úr! Az anyanyelvünk által meghatározott kereten való túllépés és az idegen nyelvek elsajátítása számos kulturális, szociális és nem utolsósorban, gazdasági előnnyel jár. Ugyanakkor az idegen nyelvek ismerete, és ebből kifolyólag a minőségi nyelvoktatás egyre inkább szükségszerűséggé válik a mai multikulturális világunkban. Seholy sem nyilvánvaló annyira ez, mint az Európai Unióban. Ezáltal adódik lehetőség egymás kultúrájának megismerésére, az egyes nemzetek közötti kapcsolatok elmélyítésére, de ezáltal valósul meg az EU egyik alapelve: a munkaerő szabad áramlása is, amely idegen nyelv gyakorlásának hiányában nem lenne lehetséges hatékonyan.

Ebből adódóan fontos, hogy az EU minden intézkedésével támogassa a nyelvoktatás korszerűsítését célzó elképzeléseket, hogy biztosítani tudjuk a korszerű nyelvoktatáshoz szükséges körülményeket. Fontosnak tartom azt is, hogy az alapnyelveken kívül nagyobb hangsúlyt fektessünk a szomszédos országok közötti kapcsolatok nyelvoktatás általi szorosabbá fűzésére is. Hasznosnak bizonyulhat, ha egy adott országban az alap idegen nyelven kívül oktatott idegen nyelv az adott ország valamelyik szomszédos országának a nyelve. Ezáltal a szomszédos országok közötti kommunikáció, és a kölcsönös gazdasági előnyökkel járó mobilitás is hatékonyabbá válhat.

Момчил Неков (S&D). –На територията на Съюза има редица семейства, чиито членове живеят, работят и учат в друга държава членка. Изборът да живееш, работиш или учиш на друго място не трябва да става за сметка на връзката с родния език и култура, а напротив, точно обратното. За съжаление, децата в тези семейства често губят връзката си с родния език. Това се дължи отчасти на факта, че повечето държави-членки на Европейския съюз, не предвиждат възможност за явяване на матуриретен изпит по така наречените малки европейски езици като българския, което е чиста проба дискриминация.

Културната и езиковата идентичност на всеки гражданин на Европейския съюз, независимо от това дали е роден в България или Англия, е нещо, което трябва да браним, и Европейският съюз трябва да играе ключова роля в този процес. Достъпът до равни възможности е нещо, с което не можем да правим компромис. След като имаме взаимно признаване на дипломи, смятам, че трябва да имаме и взаимно признаване на езикови компетентности.

Асим Адемов (PPE). –Една от политиките на Европейския съюз е да стимулира изучаването и разпространението на официалните езици в Съюза. В този смисъл, всеки един език извън основните като английски, френски, немски и испански, заслужава да бъде признат в образователните системи на страните-членки на Съюза. Но повечето от страните членки не признават изпити, дипломи и сертификати за езици, различни от изброените, което е дискриминация срещу учениците, владеещи т.нар. малки езици.

Все повече семейства с деца вече се установяват в друга страна-членка на Съюза, и за тях е важно децата да запазят връзката си с родния език. Стимул за тях ще е, ако знанията им по родния език се оценяват и оценките или сертификатът се признава при кандидатстване във висше учебно заведение. Трябва да се даде възможност на учениците, които говорят т. нар. малки езици и чиито родители са извън родната си страна, да изучават майчиния си език.

По статистически данни само от България има над 200 хиляди ученици в чужбина, но само 15 хиляди от тях са обхванати от български училища. Необходимо е да се осигури правна възможност за полагане на матура или друг изпит по всеки един от официалните езици на Европейския съюз. В това число и на българския език и резултатът от такъв изпит да се вписва в дипломата за завършен етап от обучение на съответната образователна система на държавата-членка на Европейския съюз.

Това, например, се прави вече в Съединените американски щати. Нормално е да се прави и в страните-членки на Съюза. Този проблем засяга не само българските ученици, но и учениците на всички страни членки. Владеенето на още един език ще е плюс за развитието на личността, за да бъде тя конкурентоспособна на пазара на труда.

Anna Záborská (PPE). –Vážený pán predsedajúci, Európska únia prispieva k rozvoju kvalitného vzdelávania podporovaním spolupráce medzi členskými štátmi. Ak je to potrebné, podporuje a dopĺňa činnosti členských štátov. Pritom by mala plne rešpektovať ich zodpovednosť za obsah výučby, organizáciu vzdelávacích systémov a kultúrnu a jazykovú rozmanitosť. Programy ako Erasmus sú dobrým príkladom šírenia tejto rozmanitosti a porozumenia naprieč celou Úniou.

Znepokojuje ma však, že jazykové skúšky nie sú rovnocenne uznávané všetkými štátmi Únie. Bežnou praxou je, že ak študent získa štátnu skúšku alebo iný ekvivalent certifikátu z anglického jazyka napríklad na Slovensku, má následný problém s jeho uznávaním v rámci ostatných krajín EÚ.

Tento týždeň sme hovorili o stratégii vzdelávania v Európskej únii. V rámci tejto stratégie je nutné prelínanie sa vysokškolského vzdelávania za predpokladu vzájomného uznávania jazykových certifikátov. Je to práve mobilita študentov v EÚ, ktorá pomáha zvyšovať odbornú prípravu mladých ľudí a v konečnom dôsledku ich zamestnanosť na trhu práce.

Každý členský štát má jedinečnú kultúrno-jazykovú identitu, ktorú by sme mali rešpektovať. Všetky štáty sú si podľa práva Únie rovné, a preto by aj prax uznávania jazykových kompetencií mala byť v tomto zmysle zosúladená.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). –Arvoisa puhemies, kielillä ja kielitaidolla on aivan erityinen merkitys osana eurooppalaisen identiteetin muodostumista ja myöskin ihmisten vuorovaikutusten parantamista ja eurooppalaisen politiikan ja dialogin kehittämistä sekä luonnollisesti myöskin edellytyksenä muuttaa työmarkkinoilla toisiin jäsenmaihiin.

Siksi osana tätä eurooppalaista koulutusalueetta olisikin aivan erityisesti panostettava kielenopetuksen lisäämiseen kaikilla koulutusasteilla. Kun puhun kielen, tarkoitan kahta kolmea erilaista kieltä. Samassa yhteydessä olisi myöskin tarpeen edistää näiden standardoitujen eurooppalaisten kielitestien leviämistä eri jäsenmaihiin ja eri koulutusmuotoihin niin, että voimme osoittaa kielitaidon tason yhteismitallisesti eri jäsenmaissa. Nämä ovat toivomukset komissiolle kielialueen vahvistamisen ja kielitaidon vahvistamisen osalta.

Julie Ward (S&D). –Mr President, I welcome the initiative for further promoting language learning, including ‘the mother tongue plus two’ ambition. Being able to speak several languages improves one’s employability and increases the likelihood of getting a qualified job. It is also a way to internationalise one’s career, which is very useful in a globalised world. Learning another language is also an incredibly enriching cultural experience which provides learners with social skills – in particular intercultural skills – and the ability to adapt to different social and cultural environments.

When you learn a language, you do not only learn about grammar and vocabulary, you begin to understand someone else’s vision of the world. Learning openness to other perspectives and being willing to learn a language yourself are amongst the most transferable skills that young people will need in a fast-changing globalised and diverse world.

Finally, as a disability rights champion and as a qualified BSL signer, I also want to mention the need to promote sign-language learning for a true and inclusive language diversity.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). –Един език не може да бъде голям или малък. В тази връзка не може, не е редно и не трябва да бъдат разделяни езиците в Европейския съюз на големи и на малки, защото езикът не се измерва с големината на територията. Територията се е променяла и се променя. Ако един език има поезия на него, ако един език може да прави изкуство, значи той е голям. Моят език има 1300 години история само на Балканите в Европа. Това е българският език. А азбуката, която сме създали и запазили, е създала, запазила и пренася хилядолетно културно наследство.

Ние сме част от Европейския съюз, всеки един то нас е различен, всеки един от нас носи част от своята култура, от своята памет. Затова езиците трябва да бъдат пазени и затова идентичността, самосъзнанието и самочувствието трябва да бъде запазено през запазването на езика, което става, когато даваме възможност на всеки един гражданин на държава от Европейския съюз да полага своите матуритетни изпити и да пази езика си. Това трябва да направим в Европейски съюз.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). –Senhor Presidente, como falamos de línguas quero dar o meu apoio aos intérpretes das 24 cabines desta câmara europeia para reivindicar o seu direito à greve e como falamos de línguas explicar que não há línguas grandes nem línguas pequenas, há línguas vivas ou línguas mortas.

O multilinguismo, o reconhecimento das competências linguísticas tem muita importância. Acabámos de aprovar uma iniciativa da cidadania europeia sobre as línguas minoritárias.

E quero chamar a atenção para que se apoie também as línguas minoritárias, as línguas maternas, línguas como a minha, a língua galega, que perde falantes, em especial nas crianças. Não se esqueçam, Comissão Europeia e Conselho, das línguas co-oficiais, co-oficiais de muitos povos europeus.

Przewodniczący. – Ja bym się jeszcze upomniał o takie języki tzw. martwe jak łacina.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! W Komisji Kultury jesteśmy wszyscy zgodni: uznawalność kompetencji językowych to jest cel, to jest pewne wyzwanie i to jest pewne dobro, do którego powinniśmy dążyć. Zgodni jesteśmy także z panem komisarzem. Notabene jakbym wiedział, co pan komisarz powie, może nie zabierałbym głosu. Ale jeden element nam ucieka cały czas: my mówimy tak, jakby nie było adresata tego postulatu. Ponieważ wiemy, że przynależy to do kompetencji poszczególnych państw, warto wymienić te państwa, z którymi mamy największy problem, gdzie nie uznaje się dyplomów, gdzie nie kategoryzuje się także uznawalności tego wszystkiego, co mieści się w obszarze kompetencji. Powinniśmy o tym mówić.

Byłem ministrem kultury przez siedem lat i wiem, że to jest niezwykle mobilizujące – wskazywanie wad, błędów, pokazywanie dokładnie adresu, który powinien zreformować albo zrealizować określone przedsięwzięcie, jest efektywne. Dlatego też mam prośbę do pana komisarza: mówmy, gdzie mamy największe problemy.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you for having this debate here in the Parliament, because it's reinforced our fundamental message that education is really probably the most powerful vehicle of social integration and social inclusion, and the language aspect of this vehicle is even more important in the European Union, which is a multi-lingual community. So it has its own social role, and the education of languages, both majority official languages and also the minority languages for the minority communities, is of utmost importance from the point of view of the future of Europe. But it is also the economic aspects of the education of languages. The more languages we know, the more competitive we are, and it can be one of the most important underpinning of the single market and the economic aspects of the European Union and also the future competitiveness of the European Union. So thank you for this very fruitful debate. I rely on you in the future when we encourage the Member States for closer cooperation to have the mutual recognition of diplomas and school papers and language certificates and working towards a European education area.

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for this important and enriching debate. I believe that there is a very wide consensus regarding the importance not only of learning foreign languages, but also of preserving the so-called smaller languages. This is not only key to the ambition of creating a European education area, but even more crucial to the task of building Europe for the future, based on common values and mutual understanding of our diverse traditions. Parliament can be sure that the Council will advance quickly on this agenda. Now please allow me to say a few words in my mother tongue.

— Бих искала да се обърна на български към всички Вас, тъй като това е последното ми участие в пленарна зала, последният дебат в качеството ми на министър за българското председателство, вземащ участие от името на Съвета.

Бих искала сърдечно да благодаря през изминалите шест месеца за изключително добрия дух и диалог на сътрудничество, който имаме; за привилегиата и честта да участвам в наистина важни дебати от европейския дневен ред, важни както за бъдещето на европейските политики, които са важни най-вече за бъдещето на европейските граждани. Така че за мен бе наистина чест да говоря от името на Съвета и да бъда с Вас в пленарна зала и с радост ще предадем шафетата от юни месец на колегите от Австрия.

Удоволствие е, че имам възможност именно последния дебат, в който взимам участие, да бъде посветен на младите хора, на образованието, на културното и езиковото многообразие, които са основата всъщност за изграждането на обща европейска идентичност на всички нас. И показваме, че всъщност, когато трите институции работят заедно в една посока, наистина съединението прави силата, което е и девизът на българското председателство. Благодаря Ви, наистина бе удоволствие за мен. Надявам се да е взаимно.

Przewodniczący. – To zawsze miło jest odczuć wspólnotę językową języków słowiańskich.

Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), *írásban*. – Először is szeretném megköszönni Malinov kollégámnak, hogy felkarolta ezt a kezdeményezést. Mint az EP Kulturális és Oktatási Bizottságának alelnöke nagyon fontosnak tartom, hogy a nyelvekről, a nyelvtanulásról, a nyelvek és diplomák elismeréséről az Európai Unió szintjén is beszéljünk. A nyelv a gyermek kognitív és szociális fejlődésének alapja, ezért elsődlegesen az anyanyelven való tanulás fontos. E mellett a többnyelvűség kompetenciájának is vannak előnyei az élet valamennyi területén.

A kisebbségi és többségi nyelvek és kultúrák egyaránt hozzájárulnak Európa sokszínűségéhez, erről konszenzus van. A kisebbségek védelme hozzájárul Európa etnikai, kulturális és nyelvi sokszínűségéhez. A demokratikus társadalmakban az anyanyelv oktatása, illetve az anyanyelven történő tanulás minden ember alapjoga, beleértve az őshonos nemzeti kisebbségeket is. Ezen jogot az államnak biztosítani kell. Annál is inkább, hogy az anyanyelv a legjobb eszköz az oktatásban, hisz a diákok saját nyelvükön tudják legeredményesebben teljesíteni az iskolai követelményeket. Nemrégiben az Európai Bizottság által közzétett A nyelvtanítás és a nyelvtanulás megközelítéséről c. javaslatban sajnos nem kaptak kellő figyelmet a kisebbségi és regionális nyelvek.

A szubszidiaritás elvével összhangban kérem az Európai Bizottságot és a Tanácsot, hogy dolgozzon ki javaslatokat a nyelvvizsgák és diplomák kölcsönös elismerésére, ezáltal is támogatva nem csak a nagyobb európai nyelvek terjedését, de a kisebb, regionális vagy őshonos kisebbségek által beszélt nyelveket is Európában.

Krystyna Łybacka (S&D), na piśmie. – W kontekście debaty nt. poprawy sytuacji w zakresie nauczania języków i wzajemnego uznawania kompetencji językowych w Unii Europejskiej podkreślam znaczenie umiejętności językowych dla zwiększenia mobilności w UE. W tym aspekcie zwracam się do Komisji, aby w ramach programu Erasmus umożliwić wszystkim beneficjentom programów dostęp do testów i kursów językowych. Takie rozwiązanie mogłoby przyczynić się zarówno do zwiększenia mobilności kadry naukowej i administracyjnej w ramach tego programu, jak również do poprawy kompetencji językowych wszystkich jego uczestników. Umożliwienie wszystkim nauki języków w ramach Erasmus stanowiłoby istotny wkład Unii na rzecz promowania wielojęzyczności i nauki języków obcych.

Ponadto w nawiązaniu do przygotowanego przeze mnie sprawozdania nt. modernizacji edukacji w Unii podkreślam konieczność większego włączenia nauki języków obcych do programów kształcenia i szkolenia zawodowego.

20. Parlamendi komisjonide koosseis (vt protokoll)

21. ELi elevandiluuturu sulgemine salaküttimisega võitlemiseks (arutelu)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie zamknięcia unijnego rynku kości słoniowej w celu zwalczania kłusownictwa (2018/2750(RSP)).

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you for putting this important matter on the agenda. It is a very timely debate, given the developments in relevant international forums, in particular the CITES Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, and also in some of the EU Member States and, of course, at EU level.

A number of measures have been taken since we learned about the latest increase in elephant poaching in several African countries. We have seen some encouraging signs since then, but many elephant populations are still at risk. The greatest danger certainly comes from the trafficking of ivory from source countries in Africa to consumer markets in East Asia.

Some EU Member States are unfortunately used as transit hubs by the traffickers. Of all the ivory that is being seized by national customs authorities, by far the biggest share concerns such transit shipments from Africa to Asia. Under the EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking, we have worked with Member States since 2016 towards the tightening of controls and increasing of relevant capacities.

We are also working with third countries at both ends of the trade flow: to help them fight poaching on the ground in Africa and to reduce demand for ivory in Asia. In addition, we have increased the development cooperation budget to fight elephant poaching and with contributions to the African Elephant Fund.

The current discussion about domestic ivory markets in the EU and elsewhere must be set against this broader global background. The Conference of the Parties to the CITES Convention adopted a resolution on this at its last meeting in 2016. The resolution calls on countries to close their domestic markets for commercial ivory trade if there is a legal market that is contributing to poaching or illegal trade. Already we have in place strict rules on ivory trade in the European Union: imports of ivory into the EU and exports from the EU have been banned since 1975 in respect of Asian elephants, and since 1990 in respect of African elephants. For ivory items that have been in Europe for a long time, domestic trade is strictly regulated with a system of certificates and demonstration of legal origin by traders.

The rules were tightened further in May 2017 with the adoption of a specific Commission guidance document. Since then, the export of old raw ivory from the EU has no longer been possible. EU Member States have unanimously supported this additional tightening of the rules and are following the guidance very closely, thereby ensuring uniform application of the rules. With this measure, the risk that ivory exported from Europe could fuel the demand in destination markets, and indirectly also the poaching in Africa, has been significantly reduced.

But we did not stop there. Towards the end of last year the Commission organised a public consultation to gather relevant data and to consult widely on possible additional measures regarding exports and sales of 'Old World' ivory items. The consultation attracted many responses and a clear majority of respondents called for far-reaching measures against domestic ivory trade. Those calls are often based on the precautionary principle, rather than on any specific evidence for systematic links between the legal ivory trade in the EU and elephant poaching in Africa.

On the other hand, EU stakeholders, such as makers of musical instruments or antique dealers, used the consultation to highlight the impact of any additional restrictive measures on their sources of livelihood.

The Commission is currently reflecting on the way forward and it will report to Parliament and the Council in the context of its progress report on the Wildlife Trafficking Action Plan.

Sirpa Pietikäinen, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Africa's elephant population is drastically declining and, at the same time, globally the legal ivory trade is – and remains – at the same level that it was at six years ago, even though different kinds of attempts have been made globally. The record for seizures of illegal ivory was, actually, in 2016. We have fewer than 440 000 elephants today and poachers kill an estimated 55 elephants per day. So we need drastic and good actions.

I would like to thank the EU Member States and the Commission for taking these steps forward, but this is not yet adequate. Illegal poaching and the illegal ivory trade will not stop as long as legal trade in any form is open. We need to close the domestic markets. The EU is still the largest domestic market for ivory in the world and, by the way, we are also a major transit point for illegal trading in wildlife goods.

China has banned the ivory trade domestically, the UK has one of the most stringent bans and the same goes for the USA and Hong Kong. What is actually needed now is for the EU to close its domestic markets totally. Exclusion through special permits would be allowed for some antique instruments or issues like that, but normal domestic trade should not continue anymore.

Jacqueline Foster, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I echo the remarks made by our former speaker, well done.

In April 2015, I sponsored an exhibition in the Brussels Parliament for the Born Free Foundation. The actress Virginia McKenna spoke passionately for an end to wildlife trafficking and a ban on the ivory trade. Prince William's speech in China endorsed our position, and last week in the British House of Commons, they voted for what will soon be one of the toughest bans on the trade of ivory in the world. This UK ban will be tougher than America's and China's, but nations acting alone cannot succeed in closing the market. Only global action can stamp out the trade in ivory and turn back the tide towards elephant extinction, and not forgetting the rhinoceros. We in the UK have consistently taken the lead; we were the first country to ban cosmetics testing on animals in 1998, but it took the European Union six years. With 20 000 animals slaughtered annually, waiting six years is not an option, Commissioner.

As long as Europe has a large market for ivory, the poaching of elephants will continue. I want future generations to be able to enjoy our world's diverse wildlife, not just read about it in history books. So if we act together now and close down this European ivory market, we can make a huge contribution towards saving these magnificent animals and stop the criminals who currently profit from the trade.

I therefore implore you Commissioner, to do something and act now and follow Britain's lead in abolishing this abhorrent practice.

Catherine Bearder, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the slaughter of elephants for their ivory continues, and it's abhorrent. We all know that, the public knows it, and it has to stop. But the EU is sitting still while others are taking real action. China and Hong Kong have closed their ivory markets, and even the UK, as we have just heard, is now coming forward with a total ban on all ivory. Yet the EU is still the largest exporter of so-called 'legal ivory' in the world.

That's the problem. We all assume the ivory we are exporting is legal. We assume that if an ivory carving, a knife handle or a snooker ball has paperwork saying it is pre-1947, it is legal and can be sold as antique – but that's not always the case. An Oxford University study to be released later this month shows that over two thirds of ivory sold legally on the EU market is in fact not pre-1947. It's clear that illegally-poached ivory is getting into the legal markets, and it's the marketplace that's driving demand, and that is driving the killing. Criminal gangs control this profitable trade. They forge paperwork and they get their new or reworked ivory onto the market. The only place where ivory belongs or should have any value is on the front of a live elephant.

So Commissioner, no half measures. All ivory trade is driving slaughter. Thousands of tonnes of ivory representing thousands of elephants – for what? Trinkets and criminality. We need a full and comprehensive EU-wide ban on ivory, with appropriate exemptions, now. I will not stand by while elephants die. The Members of this House support this position, as do the citizens of Europe. The Commission and its Member States must send this clear message to the rangers who protect and to the customers who buy: ivory has no monetary value any longer. Ivory in Europe is not for sale.

Benedek Jávor, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, elephants are under huge pressure, and poaching is the leading cause for that. While we are having this discussion here in the European Parliament, two elephants are being killed out there in Africa. They may be extinct within ten years in the wild.

Poaching is fuelled by the illegal ivory trade, which has increased dramatically recently, and the illegal trade in ivory is also closely connected to legal trade. Our current regulation is not sufficient and not effective. There are the problems of documentation, the green zone, on-line trade, and so on and so forth. As a sign, in 2016 two tonnes of illegal ivory was seized in the EU. Organised crime networks are closely related to wildlife crimes and the illegal trade in ivory.

Drastic steps are needed, and Parliament called on the Commission to make them. This is a popular cause; almost 70 % of European citizens support a complete ban on the ivory trade in the EU. We must listen to them; we must act.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Ivoorstroppers zijn gewelddadige criminelen die ervoor gezorgd hebben dat de olifantenpopulaties in de afgelopen eeuw zijn gedecimeerd. De ivoorhandel heeft de olifanten aan de rand van de afgrond gebracht. Het is bijna onvoorstelbaar, maar nog elke dag worden 55 olifanten gedood.

Europa speelt hierbij een dubieuze rol. Handel in ivoor is al bijna 30 jaar verboden. Toch staat Brussel nog steeds uitzonderingen toe voor zogenaamd oud ivoor. Daardoor kunnen bijvoorbeeld nog sieraden, schaakstukken en biljartballen hier op de markt komen en blijft de vraag naar ivoor bestaan. Europa vormt een heuse spil in de illegale ivoorhandel. De stroppers opereren in georganiseerd verband en deinen er niet voor terug om de olifanten uit te roeien.

Commissaris, wees duidelijk. Laat geen enkele twijfel bestaan en verbied alle handel in ivoor. Als u dat niet doet, dan kunnen we samen bekijken hoe olifanten op brute wijze worden uitgemoord.

En voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft. Dank u wel.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il numero degli elefanti vittime di bracconaggio è aberrante. Si stima infatti che per soddisfare la domanda mondiale di avorio vengano uccisi circa 30 000 elefanti africani all'anno. Questo fa di certe fasce territoriali africane un vero e proprio cimitero degli elefanti.

Certo, il bracconaggio non riguarda solo gli elefanti, ma tutta una serie di animali. Di fronte a un tale disastro riconosciamo il fatto che il piano d'azione dell'Unione europea contro il traffico di fauna selvatica, entrato in vigore lo scorso anno, costituisce un primo passo verso il contenimento della piaga del traffico d'avorio.

Tuttavia, le misure più restrittive adottate da Stati Uniti, Cina e Hong Kong risultano molto più efficaci. L'Unione europea dovrebbe alzare il livello di guardia adottando misure altrettanto severe. Occorre interrompere il ciclo di morte che coinvolge non solo gli elefanti ma anche le guardie forestali che dedicano la vita alla loro protezione.

Dall'Africa e dai cittadini europei ci è giunto un appello a cui dobbiamo rispondere. La lotta per la salvaguardia della biodiversità e della conservazione faunistica passa anche dalla fermezza nel combattere il mercato illegale dell'avorio.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). –In 2016 werkte ik als schaduwrapporteur mee aan de resolutie over de bestrijding van illegale handel in wilde dieren en planten. Ik pleitte toen voor een Europees verbod op ivoorhandel, zonder achterpoortjes. Want illegaal ivoor vindt altijd wel zijn weg naar het legale circuit.

Ik herhaal vandaag mijn pleidooi. Ivoorhandel is dodelijk voor de biodiversiteit en dreigt van olifanten en neushoorns 'levende dinosaurussen' te maken. Maar de ivoorhandel heeft nog andere desastreuze en vaak dodelijke gevolgen. De handel brengt jaarlijks miljarden euro's in handen van criminelen, milities en terroristische organisaties en creëert dus onveiligheid en instabiliteit. Bovendien neemt de handel in ivoor spectaculair toe en zijn we als Europese Unie betrokken partij als afzetmarkt en als draaischijf.

Een forse bestrijding van deze criminele activiteiten en het sluiten van onze ivoormarkt zijn nodig om de bescherming van de soorten en onze veiligheid te garanderen. De Europese Unie kan en moet het verschil maken.

Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL). –Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Alle zwanzig Minuten wird ein Elefant von Wilderern ermordet. Die EU ist der größte Exporteur von Elfenbeinprodukten, obwohl wir doch alle wissen, dass jeglicher Handel massiv dazu beiträgt, dass das grausame Abschlachten weitergeht. Nur ein ausnahmsloses EU-Handelsverbot für Elfenbein könnte die Elefanten vor dem Aussterben retten. Keine Ausnahmen, sage ich!

Oder wollen Sie Ihren Kindern und Enkelkindern irgendwann einmal sagen, dass es keine Elefanten mehr gibt, weil unsere Entscheidungen nicht konsequent genug waren? Haben Sie den Mut, Ihren Kindern und Enkelkindern auch die ganze Wahrheit zu sagen, dass nämlich das politische Establishment sich aus wirtschaftlichen Überlegungen zu Mittätern dieser abscheulichen Verbrechen gemacht hat? Elefanten leben seit zehn Millionen Jahren auf diesem Planeten. Wir dürfen einfach nicht zulassen, dass diese wunderbare Tierart für den Profit ausgerottet wird. Es ist höchste Zeit, den planetaren Vernichtungsfeldzug unserer Spezies zu stoppen.

Wir haben nur eine Erde. Sie zu bewahren, ist unsere oberste Pflicht, nicht der Wirtschaft zu dienen! Jetzt erwarten die Bürgerinnen und Bürger eine klare politische Antwort. Da gibt es nichts mehr, aber auch gar nichts mehr zu verhandeln, denn uns läuft die Zeit davon. Machen Sie endlich Nägel mit Köpfen! Ich sage Ihnen: keine Ausnahmen!

Zgłoszenia z sali

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αγορά του ελεφαντοστού είναι μια αγορά τεράστια. Εκατομμύρια παίζονται γύρω από αυτή την υπόθεση. Όπως αναφέρθηκε, 55 ελέφαντες την ημέρα σκοτώνονται, ουσιαστικά δολοφονούνται, προκειμένου να υπάρξει στήριξη στο παράνομο εμπόριο ελεφαντοστού. Αυτή η τεράστια λαθροθηρία έχει σημαντικές συνέπειες στο οικοσύστημα, στην ανάπτυξη, ταυτόχρονα δε οδηγεί σε διαφθορά και στηρίζει το οργανωμένο έγκλημα. Και, ενώ οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, η Κίνα, το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο έχουν λάβει σκληρά μέτρα, εδώ στην Ευρώπη αφήνουμε τα πράγματα να τρέχουν.

Πρώτα από όλα πρέπει να ληφθούν πολύ σκληρά μέτρα και να σταματήσει το ενδοενοσιακό εμπόριο ελεφαντοστού. Δεύτερον, πρέπει να γίνει έλεγχος για τα διερχόμενα είδη που υπάρχουν εδώ στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Επομένως χρειάζεται αποφασιστικότητα, χρειάζονται μέτρα τα οποία πρέπει να ληφθούν εδώ και τώρα.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). –Pane předsedající, i přes mezinárodní platný zákaz vývozu slonoviny dosáhl nezákonný lov slonů a obchod se slonovinou rekordních úrovní. Odhaduje se, že obětí pytláků se každoročně stane 20 až 30 tisíc afrických slonů.

Jednou z hlavních příčin tohoto vzestupu nezákonného obchodu je rostoucí poptávka po produktech ze slonoviny v Asii. Musíme si však přiznat i my, že stejně tak roste poptávka po slonovině v EU.

Během své práce na zprávě o palmovém oleji jsem mohla sama zjistit, jak EU až příliš často přihlíží tomu, kterak se podílíme na ničení přírody a biodiverzity. Tady se ovšem nevyplácí dívat se na druhou stranu, když to může zavinit vyhynutí živočišných druhů.

EU má své závazky a musí je dodržovat. Není jiné cesty, pokud si vážíme přírodního bohatství, není jiné cesty, pokud si chceme vážit sami sebe.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). –Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il commercio illegale di avorio minaccia l'esistenza di elefanti e rinoceronti selvatici e alimenta inevitabilmente quella domanda di manufatti di avorio ottenuti per vie illegali che mina ogni tentativo di controllo e riduzione degli scambi.

Ci siamo già rivolti alla Commissione su questo tema, in ultimo con una lettera il 3 maggio scorso, e torniamo qui a chiedervi – e lo faccio anche io insieme ai colleghi – come state valutando questo problema e questo aspetto in particolare del problema, quindi del commercio legale e di quanto appunto impatti su quello illegale. La comunità scientifica è unanime nel riconoscere che l'abbattimento illegale degli elefanti per mano dei bracconieri a caccia di avorio è la prima causa del loro declino e in Africa sono uccisi al ritmo allucinante di 30 000 esemplari all'anno.

Signor Commissario, la triste realtà è che fino a quando ci sarà il mercato dell'avorio, ci saranno anche il bracconaggio e i traffici illeciti. Per questo motivo, sono d'accordo con quanto richiesto dai colleghi: è necessario vietare totalmente le importazioni nell'Unione. Non c'è altro tempo da perdere, i tempi sono maturi e dobbiamo agire.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). –Panie Przewodniczący! Nie spodziewałem się obecności pana komisarza Navracsicsa przy tym punkcie. To jest inne portfolio. Dlatego też zwróć się do pana komisarza z jednym problemem, ale żeby nie było nieporozumień, zacznę od elementu dla mnie najważniejszego.

Nie jestem w stanie zaakceptować obecnej sytuacji, w której świat traci na handlu nielegalnymi elementami pochodzenia zwierzęcego od 8 do 20 mld euro rocznie. Nie jestem w stanie zaakceptować sytuacji, w której o 7000% wzrosła ilość polowań na nosorożce i co roku zabija się do 30 tys. słoni w Afryce – to niebywałe. Tu nie jesteśmy skuteczni. Ale muszę powiedzieć, że skuteczni jesteśmy gdzie indziej: w ściganiu albo utrudnianiu artystom przemieszczania się między kontynentami, wtedy kiedy posługują się instrumentami historycznymi, które są zrealizowane z palisandru brazylijskiego, z drzewa różanego z Madagaskaru lub zawierają inne elementy pochodzenia zwierzęcego. Zwracam uwagę na tę rozpiętość pomiędzy walką z patologią a utrudnianiem – w tym wypadku artystom – przemieszczania się między kontynentami.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for those valuable contributions to the debate. We have taken good note of your views and Mr Zdrojewski's remarks as well.

We are very much aware that the EU is expected to continue playing a leading international role in the fight against ivory trafficking. We are, of course, also aware of the measures taken by the United States, China and by some of the EU Member States. We are looking closely at those measures in our reflection on the EU regime on the ivory trade.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Pavel Poc (S&D), písemně. – Jednoznačně podporuji uzavření trhu EU se slonovinou. USA, Čína, Hongkong a Velká Británie již přijaly opatření k uzavření svých domácích trhů, která jsou mnohem přísnější než ta, která v současnosti platí v EU. Slon africký *Loxodonta africana* i slon indický *Elephas maximus* jsou uvedeni v přílohách Úmluvy o mezinárodním obchodu ohroženými druhy volně žijících živočichů a planě rostoucích rostlin (CITES). Podle stávajícího režimu úmluvy CITES je sice mezinárodní obchod se slonovinou zakázán, vnitrostátní obchod se slonovinou nicméně úmluva CITES neupravuje. Proto Evropský parlament opětovně požaduje uzavření trhu EU se slonovinou EU. Je potřeba si uvědomit, že nezákonný obchod se slonovinou se od roku 2007 více než zdvojnásobil. Nezákonný lov dosáhl v posledních letech vysoké úrovně. Uvádí se, že pytláci denně zabijí 55 slonů. Od roku 2011 bylo každý rok usmrčeno 20 000 až 30 000 slonů afrických. Přestože je obchod se slonovinou v EU přísně regulován prostřednictvím nařízení EU o obchodu s volně žijícími a planě rostoucími druhy a dovoz slonoviny do EU a obchod s ní uvnitř EU a její vývoz z EU není pro obchodní účely obecně povolen, má EU na celé situaci zásadní podíl. Pokud nedojde k uzavření trhu EU se slonovinou, nemůžeme čekat žádné zlepšení.

22. Kultuurile juurdepääsu struktuurilised ja rahalised takistused (arutelu)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Bogdana Zdrojewskiego w imieniu Komisji Kultury i Edukacji w sprawie barier strukturalnych i finansowych w dostępie do kultury (2017/2255(INI)) (A8-0169/2018).

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski, Sprawozdawca. – Panie Przewodniczący! Po raz pierwszy w Parlamencie Europejskim pojawia się sprawozdanie obejmujące całość problematyki uczestnictwa w kulturze, dokładnie barier w dostępie do niej.

Sam tytuł sprawozdania może nieco mylić, gdyż z badań poprzedzających ten dokument wynika, że największą barierą nie jest ubogość infrastruktury ani też cena dostępności, lecz braki edukacyjne. Oczywiście dla świata kultury, możliwości tworzenia nowych dóbr najważniejsze są: talent, praca, ale także oczywiście możliwości finansowe. Niemniej jednak kluczową barierą w odbiorze kultury są liczne zaniedbania edukacyjne.

Odpowiedzialność za rozwój kultury spada oczywiście na rządy państw i samorządy wszystkich szczebli. Powinna obejmować ona trzy elementy jednocześnie: kształcenie artystów, kształcenie publiczności i budowę infrastruktury dla spotkań pierwszych z drugimi.

Co w sprawozdaniu szczególnie warte jest podkreślenia? Po pierwsze, katalog praw człowieka do kultury (istniejących podstaw prawnych w tym dokumencie mamy 47), uznanie kultury za kluczowy obszar aktywności, docenienie znaczenia przemysłów kreatywnych, także dla pomyślności ekonomicznej Europy, uznanie roli dialogu kulturowego, odrzucenie zjawisk wykluczeń kulturowych, docenienie znaczenia dziedzictwa kulturowego, konieczności ochrony i promocji, także konieczność uwzględnienia zmian technologicznych, cywilizacyjnych dla uczestnictwa w kulturze.

Warto w tym miejscu przytoczyć art. 27 Powszechnej deklaracji praw człowieka o prawie każdego człowieka do swobodnego uczestnictwa w kulturze. Co kultura nam daje? Szansę na lepsze rozumienie świata. Pomaga budować społeczeństwo oparte na wiedzy. Jest najważniejszym źródłem procesów inkluzywnych, źródłem bogactwa, tworzy obszar szczególnych wartości, także pozytywnych emocji.

Które zapisy sprawozdania powinny zostać uznane za kluczowe? Jest ich 70, nie licząc preambuły i punktów uzasadnienia. Przytoczę raczej te, które są ilustracyjne, by pokazać skalę odniesień. Po pierwsze, niezbędność budowania strategii kulturowych na rzecz dzieci i młodzieży. To jest także zalecenie dla państw członkowskich. Uznanie dostępu do kultury za jeden z priorytetów agendy politycznej Unii Europejskiej. Konieczność upraszczania przepisów, rygorów, systemów podatkowych obejmujących przede wszystkim artystów. Ścisłejsze wiązanie uczestnictwa w kulturze z dostępnością do niej – przede wszystkim chodzi o bogactwo infrastruktury. Konieczność zapewnienia gwarancji finansowych, środków publicznych na rzecz kultury (tu mamy wezwanie do ochrony finansowej także w czasie kryzysu). Zwrócenie uwagi, że finansowanie aktywności w obszarze kultury to nie tylko wydatek, to także inwestycja. Jakość dostępu do kultury to źródło wzmacniania gospodarki kreatywnej. Konieczność redukcji obciążeń podatkowych w wymiarze transgranicznym. Uspójnienie polityki podatkowej w obszarze Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza w odniesieniu do podatku VAT. Oprócz wykluczeń ze względu na wiek, stan zdrowia, brak infrastruktury, zwłaszcza w miejscu zamieszkania, pojawia się nowe wykluczenie – wykluczenie cyfrowe.

Chcę bardzo serdecznie podziękować osobom pracującym przy zdobywaniu danych (Eurostat i Eurobarometr). To są główne, kluczowe lata 2011-2016. Przypomnę: sektor kultury to ponad 8 milionów zatrudnionych, to jest 3,7% pracujących. Aż 36% Europejczyków nie wzięło udziału w żadnym wydarzeniu kulturalnym w 2015 roku, ale aż 83% młodych ludzi z kolei brało udział w takim wydarzeniu artystycznym, na co też chcę zwrócić uwagę.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start by thanking the Committee on Culture and Education (CULT) and in particular the rapporteur, Bogdan Zdrojewski, for his work on this report. It raises the crucial issue of structural and financial barriers preventing access to culture.

Culture is not a side issue or an added extra. On the contrary, it is at the heart of the European project. This was confirmed by the Heads of State and Government in their conclusions last December. Culture is part of our identity. It gives meaning to historical events and feelings, and it helps us to communicate across languages and nationalities.

Culture and creativity are also important engines for economic growth, yet figures show that more than one third of Europeans do not participate in cultural activities at all. I share your analysis regarding the obstacles preventing wider cultural participation, both on the demand and supply sides. More efforts are needed to promote interest in culture, starting with children at a young age. At the same time, we need to ensure a market for cultural and creative professionals that is less fragmented, and where they have sufficient access to finance and enjoy viable contractual conditions.

Your valuable recommendations fed into the preparation of the proposal for a new European Agenda for Culture that the Commission presented in May. The new agenda intends to exploit synergies between culture and education, to strengthen links with other policy areas, and to help the cultural and creative sectors to grasp the opportunities of the digital shift. The Commission will play its part to help Member States achieve these goals.

Let me give you a few concrete examples. First, under the Creative Europe programme, the Commission will launch a project on cultural and creative spaces and cities to promote cultural participation and social and urban regeneration. Second, we will support regions in focusing their smart specialisation and macro-regional strategies on culture. Here the Commission is already promoting sustainable cultural tourism through a dedicated European initiative as part of the European Year of Cultural Heritage. Third, we will organise regular dialogue with the cultural and creative sectors in the context of the renewed industrial policy strategy. This will identify policy needs and support a comprehensive policy framework at EU level. Finally, the Commission will propose a mobility scheme for professionals in the cultural and creative sectors under Creative Europe.

We cannot have this discussion without mentioning the important role of the European Year of Cultural Heritage. One of the objectives of the year is to make cultural heritage accessible to all by removing social, cultural and physical barriers. I am grateful for the continued enthusiasm of the Parliament for the European Year, and I would like to use this opportunity to warmly thank President Antonio Tajani for organising a high-level event dedicated to the year in the European Parliament on 26 June. I hope that many of you will be able to take part. Let us keep up the momentum of the year and work together to ensure its legacy.

Turning again to Mr Zdrojewski's report: you stress the importance of proper financing and public support. This is indeed critical. The current Creative Europe programme already helps by promoting the circulation of cultural and creative works and of artists across borders – but we have to do more. This is why, in our proposal for the future Creative Europe programme published two weeks ago, we propose a funding increase of around 34%. This will enable us to reinforce support across the board, to add specific sectoral activities, to support the mobility of cultural and creative people and to encourage the activities of the European cultural and creative sectors on the world scene.

I would ask you to support our proposal for the future Creative Europe in the tough negotiations ahead. We have a great opportunity to create an ambitious framework for culture: a framework that will enable more Europeans from all backgrounds to take part in cultural activities, and a framework that will boost the circulation of European artworks and help cultural professionals and artists perform or work in other countries. Let's use this opportunity.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie komisarzu! Ja także gratuluję koledze Zdrojewskiemu bardzo dobrego sprawozdania dotyczącego zagadnienia dostępu do kultury. Jest to temat leżący u podstaw polityki kulturalnej, rozpatrywany zarówno z perspektywy narodowej, jak i wspólnotowej, ale przede wszystkim kluczowy z perspektywy obywateli. Zwracam uwagę na wykorzystywanie nowych technologii do celów kulturalnych, co jest szczególnie ważne, gdyż umożliwia dotarcie do nowych, trudno dostępnych lub nietradycyjnych odbiorców. Mówimy tu o narzędziach cyfrowych. Właściwie stosowane i wdrażane oraz poparte umiejętnościami cyfrowymi na odpowiednim poziomie mogą umożliwić pokonywanie barier w dostępie do kultury uwarunkowanych takimi czynnikami jak niekorzystne położenie geograficzne, niepełnosprawność, pochodzenie społeczne, język, brak czasu czy środków finansowych. Uważam, że narzędzia cyfrowe mogą być środkiem służącym pokonywaniu barier społecznych i w tym kontekście edukacja cyfrowa powinna być częścią procesu uczenia się już od najmłodszych lat w celu rozwoju odpowiednich kompetencji i wiedzy. Podstawowym środkiem finansowania działalności kulturalnej pozostaje publiczne wsparcie. Także i ja zwracam uwagę, że w finansowaniu sektora kultury i sektora kreatywnego ważną rolę może odegrać polityka fiskalna poprzez wprowadzenie obniżonych stawek VAT. W tym kontekście ważna jest lepsza koordynacja krajowych polityk kulturalnych oraz polityki fiskalnej jako narzędzia stymulującego udział w kulturze. Panie ministrze, jeszcze raz gratulacje.

Liliana Rodrigues, em nome do Grupo S&D. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais agradecer ao senhor relator a forma construtiva como trabalhamos e, de facto, chegamos a bons compromissos.

O primeiro compromisso, garantir um maior investimento e a mobilidade cultural diferenciada para as regiões ultra periféricas, montanhosas e remotas. Pedimos ainda financiamento para que as escolas possam visitar instituições culturais, bem como também pedimos bolsas de estudo de estágio nas instituições de cultura.

Defendemos, ainda, neste relatório a generalização do *European Student Card* e o acesso gratuito às instituições culturais da União Europeia, precisamente através desse cartão. Por outro lado, não menos importante, precisando, já aqui foi dito, de justiça fiscal na área da cultura para que não haja dupla tributação e que haja uma redução de impostos particularmente para a parte privada que financia a cultura.

O presidente da Comissão Europeia, Jean-Claude Juncker, afirmou que os artistas e os criadores eram as joias da coroa. Mais recentemente, o presidente deste Parlamento afirmou, e cito, «que a cultura mais do que a economia é que nos une». Ora, se a cultura tem de ser uma aposta, então porque é que temos apenas 0,15% do orçamento atual da União Europeia para o programa Europa Criativa? Porque é que no futuro também não vemos um maior destaque no financiamento dedicado à cultura?

Eu gostava, Senhor Comissário, de ver esta União tão preocupada com as décimas da cultura como se preocupa com as décimas do sistema bancário e financeiro. Gostava de ver como seria essa outra Europa que optasse por investir mais na cultura. Investir na cultura é investir na democracia, é investir na dignidade humana e na memória, a nossa memória.

Isto implica, insisto, a coragem política de descentralizar geograficamente o investimento feito na cultura e de apostar na mobilidade cultural. A mobilidade dos artistas europeus e de países terceiros é uma forma de promoção da paz, da partilha e divisões que implicam a desconstrução, perdão, de representações sociais e culturais estereotipadas. E quem não investe na cultura é porque não sabe de que é feito este mundo.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Iš tikrųjų aš irgi sveikinu kolegą B. A. Zdrojewski, parengusį tikrai gerą pranešimą ir noriu pasakyti, kad, nors jau tapo aksioma teiginys, kad gyvename skaitmeniniame amžiuje, kai viskas yra prieinama internete, visgi gyvenimas yra sudėtingesnis nei viena frazė. Kultūros paveldo prieinamumas yra kaip tik tai įrodantis pavyzdys. Neretai kultūros paveldas yra fiziškai sunkiai pasiekiamas, pavyzdžiui, kai jis yra atokiuose regionuose. Arba, kai skurdžiai gyvenantys žmonės paprasčiausiai yra per daug užsiėmę išgyvenimo klausimais ir nelabai turi galimybės domėtis kultūra. Arba, kai kultūros paveldas yra sukurtas retai naudojamomis kalbomis. Dar dažniau kultūros paveldas lieka nežinomus dėl jo menko išreklamavimo. Todėl reikia pasveikinti kolegą B. A. Zdrojewskio pranešimą, jame tikrai gerai aptartos struktūrinės kliūtys kultūros prieinamumui ir ieškoma jų sprendimų.

Martina Michels, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Im kulturellen Dialog prägen wir unsere Werte und unser Geschichtsverständnis, verhandeln, wie wir globalen Problemen menschlich begegnen – ob das in einem Film oder in einem Comic passiert, literarisch oder musikalisch, ist egal.

Der kulturelle Dialog ist ein Lebensmittel. Der Zugang für alle ist entscheidend. Entscheidend ist mehr interkulturelle Bildung in und außerhalb von Schulen. Entscheidend ist auch eine öffentliche kulturelle Infrastruktur mit einer verlässlichen Unterstützung durch europäische Förderpolitik für Innovationen und für das kulturelle Erbe.

Der Berichterstatter hat gute Arbeit geleistet und kooperativ ergänzt. Im Bericht sind deshalb die Nöte der Kultur- und Kreativindustrie deutlich erwähnt. Diese wachsende Branche darf kein Vorbild für eine Arbeitswelt sein, in der soziale Absicherungen unbekannt sind. Außerdem werden Künstler, die über die Grenzen hinweg arbeiten, mit Mehrfachsteuern belastet. Das muss sich schleunigst ändern.

Was noch nicht konkret im Bericht steht, sind moderatere Urheberrechtsregelungen und damit auch erweiterte Ausnahmen für unsere kulturellen Gedächtnisinstitutionen wie Museen, Archive, Bibliotheken. Da werde ich weiter bohren und abschließend festhalten, dass wir alle eines beherzigen sollten: Kultur für alle kostet, doch Unkultur kostet uns alle mehr.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). –Pane předsedající, dovoluji, abych na úvod poděkovala za tuto zprávu kolegovi Zdrojewskému. Je tak skvělá, že bylo velmi obtížné k ní připravit nějaký pozměňovací návrh.

Kultura, to jsou památky, to je divadlo, film, ale je to také to, jak se k sobě chováme, jaké prostředí kolem sebe vytváříme. Kulturní politika bývá často podceňovaná, podhodnocená, a to i finančně, přitom kultura je největší evropské bohatství ve srovnání se světem. Evropský tvůrčí průmysl, kulturní dědictví jsou největší na světě a mají obrovský ekonomický potenciál, přispívají k evropské soudržnosti a k jednotě v naší rozmanitosti. Současně v této době i kultura prochází digitalizací. Bavíme se právě o autorských právech, a to je také o dostupnosti autorských děl na internetu. Nejen o dostupnosti, ale také o kvalitě, a to bych chtěla zdůraznit.

Zpráva pana kolegy Zdrojewského reaguje na digitalizaci, a to velmi podrobně. Akcentuje nutnost dostupnosti pro znevýhodněné skupiny. Kultura nesmí být jen exkluzivní, proto také vítám pilotní projekt pro 18leté *Discover Europe*, při kterém na jízdenku zdarma tito mladí lidé mají objevit evropskou kulturu. Zkrátka musíme hledat efektivní řešení, podporovat kulturu z veřejných i soukromých zdrojů jako investici a začíná to u dětí v potřebě kvalitního vzdělání a výchovy pro budoucnost.

Julie Ward (S&D). –Mr President, access to culture and opportunities for creative expression are vital to enable democratic freedom and peaceful, equal societies. Member States must ensure that the socio-economic, personal or cultural background of citizens does not prevent them from participating in the cultural life of their local, national or international community. Cultural participation should be cross-cutting and be embedded within multiple policy areas if it is to truly have an impact.

Digital innovations have opened up new ways for people to access, produce and disseminate cultural content, but we need to do more to ensure that people have the digital skills and infrastructure in order to participate. Many rural areas, including those in my constituency in North West England, are still left behind without adequate broadband coverage.

In the United Kingdom, the Conservative Party has chosen to place austerity at the centre of its ideologically-driven political agenda. Civic spaces such as libraries, museums, galleries and swimming pools have closed down at an alarming rate, preventing citizens from accessing information, activities and opportunities to develop skills. For minority groups and those with multiple barriers, the effects have been profound.

So as this report eloquently outlines, access to culture in school is vitally important to encourage lifelong cultural participation. But despite this, the UK Government has introduced policies which actively prevent large numbers of secondary school children from studying any creative and cultural subjects. But working together as a union of Member States, we can always better fight for progressive, inclusive societies where access to culture is seen as the right of the many, not just for the privileged few.

Момчил Неков (S&D). –Вярвам, че няма политическа сила, която да не смята, че досегът до култура и участието в културни прояви е важно за личното израстване и обогатяване. Няма спор по този въпрос. Проблемът е, че въпреки че привидно има политически и обществен консенсус по въпроса и всички са съгласни за това колко е важна културата, когато се изработват националните и европейският бюджет, се оказва, че други сфери са по-приоритетни.

Днес в пленарна зала на Европейския парламент отново ще дебатираме колко е важно хората да имат достъп до различни културни мероприятия. В следващия момент обаче, когато изготвяме следващата многогодишна финансова рамка, европейските средства, заделени за култура, отново ще бъдат по всяка вероятност по-малко от 0,5% от общия бюджет на Европейския съюз.

Що се отнася до пречките пред достъпа до културата, ясно се очертават две. Едната е финансова, а другата е географски принцип. Голяма част от хората не посещават културни събития, просто защото не могат да си го позволят финансово. Тези от тях пък, които живеят в по-малките населени места, няма къде да отидат. Вярвам, че една нация, която не се грижи за културното развитие на своите граждани е обречена на гибел.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). –Arvoisa puhemies, kulttuurin ja taiteen lukutaito on lukutaitoon verrattava kyky ymmärtää yhteiskuntaa ja muutoksia ympärillä. Itse asiassa kulttuurin ja taiteen tekemisen ja lukemisen taito on tieteeseen verrattava kyky selittää, ymmärtää ja hahmottaa uusia asioita ympärillämme.

Se on keskeinen osa meidän sivilisaatiotamme ja sivistystämme sillä erotuksella, että jos varhaislapsuudesta puuttuvat edellytykset kulttuuri- ja taideilmaisun ymmärtämiseen, sen oppiminen myöhemmässä elämänvaiheessa kestää huomattavasti pidempään ja on hankalampaa. Siksi meidän yhteinen tehtävämme niin jäsenmaissa kuin Euroopan unionissa on painostaa ja panostaa siihen, että saamme myös kulttuurikasvatukseen kouluissa samanlaisen rahoituksen kuin luonnon-tieteille, teknologialle, insinööritieteelle ja matematiikalle ja että kulttuurikasvatus kuuluisi myös varhaiskasvatukseen jo päiväkodeissa. Erityisesti tämä on tarpeen niille lapsille ja nuorille, joiden kotitausta ei anna edellytyksiä eikä mahdollisuuksia laajaan kulttuuriin ja taiteeseen tutustumiseen.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). –Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πολιτιστική πολυμορφία προστατεύεται από τις συνθήκες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ενώ το δικαίωμα στην πολιτιστική κληρονομιά καθορίζεται στη Σύμβαση του Φάρο. Και πολιτιστική κληρονομιά σημαίνει και προστασία των πολιτιστικών αγαθών. Και εδώ ερχόμαστε στο θέμα των κλαπέντων αρχαιολογικών θησαυρών. Ένα σοβαρό θέμα το οποίο δεν θίγει η έκθεση. Και αναφέρομαι ειδικά στους κλαπέντες αρχαιολογικούς θησαυρούς από τα ναζιστικά στρατεύματα κατοχής στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1941-1944. Ακόμα περιμένουμε να επιστραφούν αυτοί οι αρχαιολογικοί θησαυροί!

Πέραν αυτού, είναι προφανές ότι θα πρέπει να υπάρχει προσβασιμότητα στον πολιτισμό. Κανείς δεν αμφισβητεί ότι πρέπει να επενδυθούν κονδύλια. Κανείς δεν αμφισβητεί ότι πρέπει να αξιοποιηθεί η ψηφιοποίηση και ότι πρέπει να στηριχθούν οι απόμακρες περιοχές, τα νησιά, εκεί όπου είναι δύσκολη η πρόσβαση στον πολιτισμό και στα πολιτιστικά αγαθά.

Αλλά επανέρχομαι στο ζήτημα της επιστροφής των κλαπέντων αρχαιολογικών θησαυρών από τα ναζιστικά στρατεύματα κατοχής στην Ελλάδα. Κάτι πρέπει να γίνει για το ζήτημα αυτό, κύριε Navracsics. Σας έχω θέσει το ζήτημα αυτό επανειλημμένα, σας το είχα θέσει μάλιστα και την ημέρα που ήρθατε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να εγκριθείτε ως Επίτροπος. Δεν πρέπει να κωφεύουμε στο ζήτημα αυτό.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). –Pane předsedající, domnívám se, že strukturální a finanční překážky v přístupu ke kultuře představují velký problém. Ano, asi ne ten největší, ale přesto rozhodně významný. Přístup ke kultuře totiž patří mezi základní práva všech občanů a zasluhuje tak naši pozornost.

Slavný český herec Jan Werich kdysi prohlásil: „Já myslím, že civilizace není dobrá, když je bez kultury. Člověk potřebuje ke štěstí a spokojenosti nejenom pohodlí tělesné, ale i duševní. Kultura a civilizace musí jít ruku v ruce.“ S tímto citátem zcela souhlasím.

V době po ekonomické krizi bychom měli dbát na to, aby byla kultura dostupná všem, a nikoli pouze vybraným. Kultura není záležitostí elit, ale všech bez rozdílu. Kultura je záležitostí natolik lidskou, že když o ni nebudeme pečovat, riskujeme mnohem více, než si myslíme.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me once more thank Mr Zdrojewski for this report, which very eloquently identifies all the barriers – structural and financial barriers – to access to culture. This is very important for us because, if we think of culture not only as a leisure-time activity or as a hobby, we have to acknowledge that culture plays a very important role in establishing and creating communities and also in keeping those communities alive, not only in urban areas but also in rural and remote areas. In some areas, culture is the only link of belonging, of community, which can keep the people there and keep people interested in living there.

That is why access to culture is a very important aspect of developing cultural policy at European level for the future. The report is a significant contribution in mapping out all these problems and we can design our road map for the future on the basis of your comments and contributions.

I would like to thank Parliament for this fruitful debate and for the report. We will work on overcoming all the barriers and difficulties in culture.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski, sprawozdawca. – Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo dziękuję za komplementy, także komplementy ze strony pana komisarza. Przyjmuję je też jako podziękowanie dla pracy tych wszystkich, którzy przygotowywali dane do tego sprawozdania, bo to trwało najdłużej. Natomiast jeżeli chodzi o konkluzje, przypomnę, że to właśnie edukacja może być dziś uznana za najważniejszy element decydujący o jakości uczestnictwa w kulturze. Owszem, o wielkości tego uczestnictwa decydują także inne elementy, w tym materialne, infrastrukturalne etc., natomiast edukacja, braki, wady, błędy w procesach edukacyjnych są absolutnie kluczowe i decydujące o jakości życia i uczestnictwa w kulturze.

Druga konkluzja, bardzo ważna, troszkę zaskakująca: dziś ważniejszy jest popyt niż podaż w obszarze kultury. Tak się stało, że na skutek rozmaitych barier, o których mówię w tym sprawozdaniu, podaż mamy bardzo, bardzo atrakcyjną i – można powiedzieć – ciekawą także z punktu widzenia różnorodności, ilości i wielkości etc., etc., natomiast mamy kłopoty z popytem. Aż 40% Europejczyków nie uznaje uczestnictwa w kulturze za istotne, kluczowe, w niektórych wypadkach nawet potrzebne.

Trzeci element: rudymenarna rola w przysposabianiu do uczestnictwa w kulturze przynależy rodzinie i szkole. Te dwa elementy, te dwa adresy są szczególnie ważne. Zwracam na to uwagę w swoim sprawozdaniu.

Kolejna rzecz: konieczność usunięcia przeszkód fiskalnych w mobilności artystów i specjalistów w dziedzinie kultury.

I ostatnia: niezbędna nowa spójna strategia cyfrowa ukierunkowana na działalność kultury. Czego chcę życzyć nam wszystkim? Abyśmy w kolejnej kadencji Parlamentu Europejskiego rozmawiając o tak ważnych kwestiach, rozmawiali w lepszym czasie, w *prime time*, może już nie w nocy. Tego życzę i panu komisarzowi, i nam wszystkim. Wtedy będziemy czuli, że kultura jest rzeczywiście jeszcze ważniejsza.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 14 czerwca 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit*. – Sur la place du village, le dernier café a fermé il y a quelques mois, le buraliste, échaudé par la hausse du tabac et la délinquance, s'apprête à plier bagage. Quant au cinéma, suspendu aux subventions municipales qui tariront bientôt, c'est peu de dire que ses films projetés avec un retard de plusieurs semaines peinent à drainer les foules.

Tel est, brossé avec un brin de lyrisme, le sort de tant de communes rurales françaises, où l'indigence de l'offre culturelle est le reflet d'une désertification dramatique, qui voit mettre la clef sous la porte 7 000 cafés par an et le taux de vacance commerciale culminer à 10 %.

Loin d'être accessoire, l'accès à la culture conditionne les perspectives de ces villes, car pourquoi une entreprise y investirait-elle demain si elle ne peut proposer à ses employés le cadre de vie qu'ils prisent ? Au regard de la persistance de « zones blanches », la numérisation seule n'y suffira pas. Mais, la grande tradition d'un théâtre véritablement populaire et itinérant nous rappelle que ces territoires ne sont pas voués à l'oubli et que, face à leur agonie, une action nationale résolue est urgente et nécessaire.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – Voorzitter, de toegang tot cultuur is niet vanzelfsprekend. Meedoen aan cultuur ook niet. In Nederland werd in 2011 een kaalslag aan bezuinigingen uitgevoerd in de cultuursector. Er werd 200 miljoen euro bezuinigd op de culturele sector. Subsidies werden geschrapt, want staatssecretaris Halbe Zijlstra vond dat particulieren ook zelf voor kunst en cultuur konden betalen. Kunst en Cultuur werden daarmee een zaak van de elite. Sterker nog: fiscale regelingen in Nederland maken het voor de elite mogelijk om te investeren in kunst en cultuur. Dit terwijl beide een verrijking zijn voor de gehele samenleving.

Deze bezuinigingen zijn nog steeds niet helemaal teruggedraaid. Dat moet wat mij betreft anders: de toegang tot cultuur vanuit scholen, buurthuizen en bibliotheken moet hersteld worden. Daarom pleit ik voor een Europese aanpak om cultuur voor iedereen toegankelijk te maken. De structurele en financiële barrières voor cultuur moeten opgeheven worden.

Europa roept de lidstaten op om cultuur niet kaal te plukken op momenten van krapte. Publieke toegang tot kunst en cultuur zorgt voor meer betrokkenheid van mensen bij de (Europese) samenleving. Gelijke kansen voor iedereen, dat is waar mijn Europa voor staat.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Problem barier w dostępie do kultury dotyczy instytucji kulturalnych, państw członkowskich i władz regionalnych. Swobodne uczestnictwo w kulturze winno być jednym z podstawowych zagadnień polityki narodowej, ale także wspólnotowej, zgodnie z zasadą pomocniczości. Aktywny i dostępny sektor kultury ma znaczenie dla wzmacniania aktywności i wiedzy obywatelskiej przy jednoczesnym propagowaniu dziedzictwa kulturowego oraz rozwijaniu różnorodności kulturowej. Konieczne jest ułatwienie inwestycji oraz dywersyfikacji finansowania sektora kultury i sektora kreatywnego, co pozwoli na uwolnienie potencjału tych sektorów w zakresie generowania wzrostu gospodarczego i zatrudnienia. Mają one przełożenie na działalność artystyczną, rozwój umiejętności, cyfryzację, innowację oraz formułowanie nowych modeli biznesowych, a także wzmocnienie konkurencyjności europejskiego sektora kultury i sektora kreatywnego. Raport przytacza pożyteczne rozwiązania, wzywając do włączenia aspektu dostępu do kultury oraz uczestnictwa w kulturze do głównego nurtu innych obszarów polityki. Raport podkreśla przekrojowość zagadnień związanych z kulturą oraz ich wpływ na inne dziedziny życia społecznego, w tym znaczenie dla wzrostu gospodarczego, dostrzegając konieczność dbania przez państwa członkowskie o odpowiednie kształcenie artystów i publiczności, a także o stan infrastruktury artystycznej oraz materialnego dziedzictwa kulturowego.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Vienas iš ES ir jos valstybių narių tikslų turėtų būti socialinės ir ekonominės nelygybės mažinimas. Dalyvavimas kultūrinėje veikloje yra vienas iš būdų, kurio dėka yra kuriamas priklausomumo visuomenei jausmas. Diskutuojant apie kultūros prieinamumą atmintume, kad kultūros veikla gali padėti stiprinti pasitikėjimą savimi ir gerinti gyvenimo kokybę, visų pirma tiems asmenims, kurie dėl nedarbo, ligos ar kitų priežasčių patiria tam tikrą marginalizaciją. Naudojantis proga, verta apgalvoti pranešėjo pasiūlymą dėl integracinio kultūros sektoriaus rėmimo, kuriame kiekvienas gali turėti vienodas galimybes dalyvauti ir vystyti savo kūrybinius igūdžius, neatsižvelgiant į jų socialinį ir ekonominį, kultūrinį ar religinį kontekstą arba į negalią. Kalbant apie kultūrą turime atsižvelgti į tai, kad Europos kultūros paveldas yra unikalus pasaulyje savo įvairove ir krikščioniškosios kultūros turtingumu. Naudojantis proga verta plėsti kultūrinį bei religinį turizmą, kuris gali būti vienas iš esminių faktorių lemiančių ekonomikos vystymąsi, taip pat paskatinti socialinę sanglaudą bei įtrauktį. Deja, finansiniai aspektai visada yra vieni iš esminių kultūros prieinamumo ir kultūros veiklos dalyvavimo kliūčių. Todėl yra būtinas pastovus kultūros sektoriaus rėmimas. Svarbus yra kultūros suinteresuotumo propagavimas ir jos supratimas per švietimo sistemą.

23. Esitatud dokumendid (vt protokoll)

24. Delegeeritud õigusaktid (kodukorra artikli 105 lõige 6) (vt protokoll)

25. Rakendusmeetmed (kodukorra artikkel 106) (vt protokoll)

26. Järgmise istungi päevakord (vt protokoll)

27. Istungi lõpp

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 22.36)

Kasutatud märkide selgitus

*	Nõuandemenetlus
***	Nõusolekumenetlus
***I	Seadusandlik tavamenetlus, esimene lugemine
***II	Seadusandlik tavamenetlus, teine lugemine
***III	Seadusandlik tavamenetlus, kolmas lugemine

(Menetluse liik sõltub õigusakti eelnõus esitatud õiguslikust alusest)

Parlamendi komisjonid

AFET	Väliskomisjon
DEVE	Arengukomisjon
INTA	Rahvusvahelise kaubanduse komisjon
BUDG	Eelarvekomisjon
CONT	Eelarvekontrollikomisjon
ECON	Majandus- ja rahanduskomisjon
EMPL	Tööhõive- ja sotsiaalkomisjon
ENVI	Keskkonna-, rahvatervise- ja toiduohutuse komisjon
ITRE	Tööstuse, teadusuuringute ja energeetikakomisjon
IMCO	Siseturu- ja tarbijakaitsekomisjon
TRAN	Transpordi- ja turismikomisjon
REGI	Regionaalarengukomisjon
AGRI	Põllumajanduse ja maaelu arengu komisjon
PECH	Kalanduskomisjon
CULT	Kultuuri- ja hariduskomisjon
JURI	Õiguskomisjon
LIBE	Kodanikuvabaduste, justiits- ja siseasjade komisjon
AFCO	Põhiseaduskomisjon
FEMM	Naiste õiguste ja soolise võrdsuse komisjon
PETI	Petitsioonikomisjon
DROI	Inimõiguste allkomisjon
SEDE	Kaitse ja julgeoleku allkomisjon

Fraktsioonid

PPE	Euroopa Rahvapartei (kristlike demokraatide) fraktsioon
S&D	Sotsiaaldemokraatide ja demokraatide fraktsioon Euroopa Parlamendis
ECR	Euroopa Konservatiivide ja Reformistide fraktsioon
ALDE	Euroopa Demokraatide ja Liberaalide Liidu fraktsioon
GUE/NGL	Euroopa Ühendatud Vasakpoolsete / Põhjamaade Roheliste Vasakpoolsete liitfraktsioon
Verts/ALE	Roheliste / Euroopa Vabaliidu fraktsioon
EFDD	Vaba ja Otsedemokraatliku Euroopa fraktsioon
ENF	Rahvaste ja Vabaduste Euroopa fraktsioon
NI	fraktsioonilise kuuluvusega parlamendiliikmed