



16. TOUKOKUUTA 2017 SANATARKAT ISTUNTOSELOSTUKSET

(C/2024/2800)

EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI

ISTUNTOKAUSI 2017–2018

Istunnot 15.–18. toukokuuta 2017

STRASBOURG

Sisältö	Sivu
1. Istunnon avaaminen	3
2. Neuvottelut ennen parlamentin ensimmäistä käsittelyä (työjärjestyksen 69 c artikla): ks. pöytäkirja	3
3. Sisäiset siirrot: tuumasta toimeen (keskustelu)	3
4. Globalisaation hallinta vuoteen 2025 (keskustelu)	20
5. Afrikan unionin komission puheenjohtajan Moussa Faki Mahamatin puhe	42
6. Äänestykset	46
6.1. EU:n ja Mongolian kumppanuus- ja yhteistyösopimukseen liitettävä pöytäkirja (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0074/2017 - Helmut Scholz) (äänestys)	47
6.2. EU:n ja Bosnia ja Hertsegovinan vakautus- ja assosiaatiosopimus (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0169/2017 - Cristian Dan Preda) (äänestys)	47
6.3. EU:n ja Norjan sopimus ulkorajojen ja viisumipolitiikan rahoitusvälineeseen osana sisäisen turvallisuuden rahastoa liittyvistä täydentävistä säännöistä (A8-0174/2017 - Tomáš Zdechovský) (äänestys)	47
6.4. EU:n liittyminen puuvilla-alan kansainväliseen neuvoa-antavaan komiteaan (ICAC) (A8-0187/2017 - Fernando Ruas) (äänestys)	47
6.5. EU:n sähköisen hallinnon toimintaohjelma 2016–2020 (A8-0178/2017 - Sabine Verheyen) (äänestys)	47
6.6. Vuosikertomus 2015 EU:n taloudellisten etujen suojaamisesta – petostentorjunta (A8-0159/2017 - Julia Pitera) (äänestys)	47

Sisältö	Sivu
6.7. Resurssitehokkuutta koskeva aloite: elintarvikejätteen vähentäminen ja elintarviketurvallisuuden parantaminen (A8-0175/2017 - Biljana Borzan) (äänestys)	47
6.8. Tullin toiminnan ja hallinnon ulkoisten näkökohtien arviointi kaupan helpottamisen ja laittoman kaupan torjumisen välineenä (A8-0162/2017 - Tiziana Beghin) (äänestys)	47
7. Äänestys selitykset	48
7.1. EU:n ja Bosnia ja Hertsegovinan vakautus- ja assosiaatiosopimus (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0169/2017 - Cristian Dan Preda)	48
7.2. EU:n sähköisen hallinnon toimintaohjelma 2016–2020 (A8-0178/2017 - Sabine Verheyen)	48
7.3. Vuosikertomus 2015 EU:n taloudellisten etujen suojaamisesta – petostentorjunta (A8-0159/2017 - Julia Pitera)	49
7.4. Resurssitehokkuutta koskeva aloite: elintarvikejätteen vähentäminen ja elintarviketurvallisuuden parantaminen (A8-0175/2017 - Biljana Borzan)	51
7.5. Tullin toiminnan ja hallinnon ulkoisten näkökohtien arviointi kaupan helpottamisen ja laittoman kaupan torjumisen välineenä (A8-0162/2017 - Tiziana Beghin)	54
8. Äänestyskäyttäytymistä ja äänestysaikeita koskevat ilmoitukset: ks. pöytäkirja	56
9. Edellisen istunnon pöytäkirjan hyväksyminen: ks. pöytäkirja	56
10. EU:n Syyria-strategia (keskustelu)	56
11. Kristittyjen tilanne Lähi-idässä (keskustelu)	80
12. Dadaabin pakolaisleiri (keskustelu)	97
13. HLBTI-henkilöitä koskevien neuvoston suuntaviivojen täytäntöönpano erityisesti Tšetšeniassa esiintyvän homoseksuaalisten (tai sellaisina pidettyjen) miesten vainon suhteen (keskustelu)	104
14. Moldovan tilanne (keskustelu)	115
15. Vuosikertomus 2014 toissijaisuus- ja suhteellisuusperiaatteista (keskustelu)	124
16. FinTech: teknologian vaikutus rahoitusalan tulevaisuuteen (keskustelu)	132
17. Seuraavan istunnon esityslista: ks. pöytäkirja	139
18. Istunnon päättäminen	139

16. TOUKOKUUTA 2017 SANATARKAT ISTUNTOSELOSTUKSET

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

1. Istunnon avaaminen

(The sitting opened at 9.00)

2. Neuvottelut ennen parlamentin ensimmäistä käsittelyä (työjärjestyksen 69 c artikla): ks. pöytäkirja

3. Sisäiset siirrot: tuumasta toimeen (keskustelu)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on Making relocation happen (2017/2685(RSP)).

Before I give the floor to Commission Avramopoulos, and good morning to you, Commissioner, I just want to announce that the Council has excused itself from this morning's debate.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all I would like to express my thanks for this timely debate on relocation just a few hours before we adopt the 12th report on resettlement and relocation.

There is no doubt that relocation is vital for the success of our policy. The success of our migration and asylum policy is based on solidarity and responsibility. We have said this many times before in this Chamber. This is why it is so essential that relocation works, in all its aspects, and is implemented by everyone. One element remains critical for the success of this scheme: political will, political determination and mutual cooperation and trust between the Member States offering relocation and the beneficiary Member States.

This is not for the benefit just of Italy or Greece. This is for the benefit of the entire European Union and our European asylum system because a properly functioning relocation scheme is also essential to prevent secondary movements and preserve the integrity of the free-borders Schengen area.

Member States have so far relocated, in total, more than 18 000 persons, and we have to acknowledge the tangible and important progress made on relocation, especially during the past five months. However, further efforts are needed and Member States should therefore deploy additional effort and flexibility to make the relocation of all eligible applicants currently in Italy and Greece happen.

But this cannot be the responsibility of just a few Member States: it has to be shared by all Member States. Our common goal is for all Member States to contribute fairly and proportionately to relocation. Right now 12 500 eligible applicants in Greece and around 4 000 in Italy are registered and ready to be relocated. If all Member States step up the number of relocations, it is entirely possible to achieve this goal by September. It is time – as I said before – to show political will and determination.

Member States should also fully implement the recommendations that we put forward in our regular reports. Most importantly, Member States should increase their monthly pledges in proportion to their relocations and increase their capacity to process application requests. While many Member States have increased their contributions, there are regrettably still a few Member States that have not relocated a single person. I want to be clear that this is in breach of their obligations.

More generally, Member States should also avoid overly restrictive or arbitrary preferences, should limit requirements causing delays in the transfer procedure and should give priority to applications concerning vulnerable applicants, in particular unaccompanied minors. In addition, the Commission urges Italy to speed up the procedures to identify and register for relocation all eligible applicants and to find mutually acceptable solutions on security interviews with relocating Member States. All those eligible for relocation arriving in Italy need to be channelled in an orderly manner to specifically designated relocation hubs. All Member States should relocate more unaccompanied minors, in particular from Italy.

I am glad to see that Parliament's draft resolution includes many of these recommendations and I really count on your support, honourable Members, to convince Member States – or rather governments – to implement them fully and strictly. Relocation is a joint effort that requires all Member States to contribute. Relocation is both an obligation and a moral duty. Thank you for your attention and I thank Parliament for its continued support.

(Applause)

Jeroen Lenaers, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Dank u, voorzitter. Dank ook aan commissaris Avramopoulos voor zijn bijdrage vanochtend en voor de vele updates die we in de afgelopen anderhalf jaar hebben gekregen. Ik geloof niet dat er ooit een onderwerp is geweest waarbij we zo nauw contact met de Commissie hebben gehad. Tegelijkertijd is het jammer dat de Raad hier vandaag niet aanwezig is. Vele vragen die we hebben, zouden immers juist aan de Raad gesteld moeten worden. Ik betreur het dan ook zeer dat de Raad hier vandaag niet aanwezig is.

Het is in september twee jaar geleden dat de Raad deze besluiten nam. Dat gebeurde toen in een tijd van crisis: er kwamen 180 000 mensen per maand binnen. Het was politiek gehacketak. Het duurde lang. Daarom roep ik hier vandaag nogmaals op om tot een permanent systeem te komen om in de toekomst in het kader van de Dublin-verordening dit soort crises voor te kunnen zijn.

Ik ben het met de commissaris eens dat de laatste maanden reden geven tot voorzichtig optimisme. We zien dat er meer mensen daadwerkelijk herverdeeld worden. Maar tegelijkertijd is het ook een beetje *too little, too late*. Gezien de verminderde instroom is dat getal van 160 000 inderdaad niet meer relevant. We moeten er echter wel voor zorgen dat alle kandidaten die in aanmerking komen, ook daadwerkelijk een plek krijgen. Dan stel ik mij de vraag hoe het in godsnaam kan dat sommige landen nog helemaal niks hebben gedaan, maar ook hoe het kan dat in een land als Italië in de afgelopen anderhalf jaar maar achtduizend mensen daadwerkelijk geregistreerd zijn. Er moet aan beide kanten iets gebeuren.

Tot slot wil ik aanstippen dat ik nooit voorstander ben geweest van verplichte quota. Maar we hebben in september 2015 en in de afgelopen anderhalf jaar gezien dat het op vrijwillige basis niet werkt. Laten we daar dus iets aan doen.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, la solidarietà non è un meccanismo che si applica *à la carte*, non è una scelta dettata dalla compassione nei confronti di chi fugge da guerra e persecuzione, non è un impegno dilazionabile nel tempo.

La solidarietà e la piena condivisione delle responsabilità sono principi cardine del nostro ordinamento e non strumenti a cui ricorrere volontariamente se sussistono alcune condizioni, se la nazionalità dei beneficiari è, ad esempio, di nostro gradimento, se l'età e il genere ci sembrano più appropriati. Questo sistema restrittivo e discriminatorio di preferenze è sanzionabile tanto quanto la mancanza assoluta di impegni. Scegliendo la strada della negazione del diritto si viola la dignità umana di migliaia di donne, uomini e soprattutto bambini, neghiamo loro i diritti fondamentali, li allontaniamo dalla legalità, li priviamo di un futuro.

Rallegrarsi di uno sforzo compiuto dagli Stati membri è un po' come considerare pieno un bicchiere che contiene alcune gocce d'acqua. L'11 per cento dei beneficiari di protezione internazionale effettivamente ricollocati non è certo un risultato di cui andare fieri. Solo due Stati membri su 28 che rispettano gli impegni, due Stati membri che proprio non ne vogliono sapere di accogliere i richiedenti asilo nei loro territori, molti altri invece che a parole promettono ma nei fatti smentiscono. Sono solo alcuni che, con grande difficoltà e lentezza, stanno facendo la loro parte.

E cosa succederà dopo il 26 settembre 2017? Quali garanzie avremo che gli obblighi non si esauriscono dopo quella data? Signor Commissario, il bastone alzato a mezz'ora della procedura d'infrazione, da solo, non obbligherà gli Stati membri a farsi carico degli obblighi di solidarietà. Occorre una politica migratoria sostenibile per garantire vie di accesso legali e sicure, creare canali di migrazione legale, nonché politiche di integrazione nei paesi di accoglienza.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Vanuit Griekenland en Italië zouden 160 000 mensen moeten worden overgebracht naar de andere lidstaten, waaronder België, Duitsland en Zweden. Het verwijt klinkt dat die plaatsen maar moeilijk ingevuld geraken omdat de lidstaten onvoldoende zouden meewerken, maar uit verslagen van de Commissie blijkt dat Griekenland en Italië er niet in slagen om de doorstroming te organiseren. Zo is er een enorme registratieachterstand in Italië. Het is dus oneerlijk om alleen met de vinger te wijzen naar het noorden. Bovendien klopt het helemaal niet dat amper asielzoekers werden herplaatst. De meeste asielzoekers die Europa binnenkwamen, reisden zelf verder richting Noord- en West-Europa. De herplaatsing is in de praktijk dus al een feit want de Dublin-regels omtrent opvang en registratie in de eerste lidstaat van aankomst, van waaruit men vervolgens kan worden herplaatst, worden in de praktijk nauwelijks gerespecteerd.

Hoe dan ook, de N-VA blijft erbij dat eerst de buitengrenzen moeten worden gesloten, anders is het dweilen met de kraan open. Concreet moeten we elke asielzoeker die met hulp van mensensmokkelaars illegaal aankomt in de EU, terugsturen naar een veilige plaats in de regio van herkomst. Zolang de EU een illegale aankomst blijft belonen met papieren, blijven gezinnen onderweg hun leven riskeren. We moeten daarom gaan naar een systeem van legale binnenkomst, gekoppeld aan een strikte maximumlimiet.

Angelika Mlinar, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Entscheidung über die Flüchtlingsumverteilung wurde von den Mitgliedstaaten als dringende und auch notwendige Solidaritätsmaßnahme getroffen. Allerdings – und das möchte ich hier ganz klar betonen – ohne ein dazugehöriges EU-Asylsystem, welches auf einem gemeinsamen Verantwortungsbewusstsein aufbaut. Denn genau daran fehlt es auch heute noch auf europäischer Ebene. Bis zum heutigen Tag ist die einzige Antwort von europäischer Seite auf Flüchtlinge, die nach Europa kommen, hauptsächlich eine: Grenzen schließen und Grenzen kontrollieren.

Noch immer befinden sich 62 300 Asylsuchende und Migranten und Migrantinnen in Griechenland und warten darauf, in einem der 28 Mitgliedstaaten aufgenommen zu werden, während Länder wie Jordanien, der Libanon, der Irak und die Türkei seit Beginn des Syrien-Konflikts vor fünf Jahren Millionen von Flüchtlingen aufgenommen haben. In diesem Sinne möchte ich auch den Europäischen Rat daran erinnern, dass der Umverteilungsbeschluss eine Entscheidung des Rates selbst war und von diesem auch angenommen wurde.

Im Zuge dieser Plenarsitzung werden wir über eine Entschliebung zu Syrien, über die EU-Strategie gegenüber Syrien und die Beziehungen zum Nahen Osten abstimmen. Daher frage ich mich: Wie können wir auf internationaler Ebene glaubwürdig bleiben, wenn wir nicht in der Lage sind, kleine Solidaritätsmaßnahmen innerhalb unserer eigenen Grenzen umzusetzen, wenn unsere eigenen Staats- und Regierungschefs nicht den Verpflichtungen nachkommen, die sie selbst eingegangen sind und die sie für alle Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtend eingeführt haben? Bis heute haben die Mitgliedstaaten nur einen geringen Teil der Umverteilung, die sie selbst zugesichert haben, auch wirklich und tatsächlich umgesetzt. Das liegt nicht am Können, sondern am Wollen, denn die Kapazitäten dafür sind vorhanden. Das ist uns, denke ich, allen klar.

Daher möchte ich hier und heute an die Zuständigen appellieren: Es ist höchste Zeit, dass die Mitgliedstaaten ihre sich selbst auferlegten Verpflichtungen auch erfüllen.

Barbara Spinelli, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, non è la prima volta che questo Parlamento chiede agli Stati membri di rispettare gli impegni e alla Commissione di smettere l'ottimismo in cui da tempo si compiace.

Agli Stati membri chiediamo anche di evitare i sotterfugi, penso al rifiuto di ricollocare i migranti giunti in Grecia dopo il 20 marzo 2016, all'indomani dell'accordo con la Turchia, un rifiuto illegale, secondo la Corte dei conti.

Per parte mia aggiungo una considerazione. La ricollocazione rischia di essere un inganno se abbinata all'approccio *hotspot* e alla decisione di ritrasferire in Grecia e in Italia, sulla base del sistema di Dublino, i migranti recatisi in altri paesi. L'insieme di tali misure mina l'abilità della Grecia e dell'Italia di gestire i flussi di rifugiati e migranti.

Per quanto riguarda l'Italia, nel 2015–2016 vi sono stati 5 049 trasferimenti Dublino e 3 936 ricollocazioni, cioè più persone sono state rispedite in Italia di quante ne siano state trasferite dall'Italia. La ricollocazione, dunque, è necessaria ma non basta. La verità è che la Commissione spesso fa di tutto per aiutare Italia e Grecia a perfezionare un sistema sbagliato, generatore di situazioni divenute insostenibili.

Grazie, signor Commissario, vorrei una risposta.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all the colleagues who have been working together with us, across the whole House, on making this resolution work. It shows how united Parliament is in calling for solidarity both among Member States and also with refugees. I would also like to thank the Commission, and the Commissioner especially, for again and again emphasising the fact that this solidarity needs to be shown: that this relocation needs to be made to happen.

Relocation is a very important tool for solidarity, but it is also a very important humanitarian tool. It obviously helps Member States which have received a lot of refugees, and it helps the refugees finally to find a place of safety and a place where they can build a new future. But I would go so far as to say it gives a great opportunity to Member States which have not yet had much experience with refugees. They will get support from the Commission, they will gain experience and, in terms of accommodation, it will be a situation in which they know when the refugees are coming, and which refugees are coming – which is not the situation that any Member State could face at some point in the future.

Therefore, it is very disappointing that the Council is not present here today because the problem, obviously, is not with the people speaking here today: the problem lies with the Member States and, as colleagues have pointed out, the problem is not one of capacity, the problem is not one of how we shall do this, it is purely a problem of political will.

There is a scandalous lack of political will. We are talking here about people who are fleeing from war and persecution, and we are talking about unaccompanied minors: those are the people who are mainly stuck in Italy and Greece. How horrible can that be: to leave unaccompanied children alone, in overcrowded conditions without any possibility of a safe future? I very much welcome the fact that the Commission has said it will take action, insofar as possible, against those Member States which are doing nothing.

Yes, relocation does not solve all the problems in the world. Yes, we still need a good Dublin system that puts solidarity in place. Yes, we do need common rules, legal access, etcetera, but relocation is a first step: a first step that will show how serious we are about our business.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, this question is an existential one for the EU. Your answer to this will define the future of your project. It will say whether the EU is to be a collective of freely cooperating peoples, based on friendship and enlightened self-interest, or a centralised coercive structure feared and hated in equal parts by its constituents, and bound one day to explode in a welter of vituperation and vindictiveness.

I urge you to look to the self-interest of your project, your peoples and your nations. However, my experience of the direction of your mentality leads me to the sad conclusion that you will continue along the path of self-destruction, both in terms of encouraging destructive economic migration from those poor benighted countries and in terms of sowing discord amongst your constituent nations.

Auke Zijlstra, namens de ENF-Fractie. – Ngo's werken samen met mensensmokkelaars. Ze hebben elkaars telefoonnummers. Ze zorgen samen voor een eindeloze stroom illegalen. De boten liggen elkaar voor de Libische kust op te wachten. Dat heeft Frontex bevestigd, maar dat doet er natuurlijk niks aan. De samenwerking met de mensensmokkelaars gaat zo ver dat er vorige week zelfs bijna een aanvaring is geweest tussen het onder Nederlandse vlag varende Sea Watch en de Libische kustwacht. Daarbij is er zelfs op die kustwacht geschoten. In een normale wereld zou Italië deze landverhuizers helemaal niet toelaten. Maar de EU verplicht Italië hiertoe.

De VN heeft ondertussen laten weten dat hooguit 3 % van deze mensen ooit in aanmerking zou komen voor erkenning. Dat betekent dat 97 % van die honderdduizenden niet alleen illegaal zijn, maar ook kansloos, ongewenst. Ze zouden teruggestuurd moeten worden, maar dat wordt niet gedaan. Daarom moet het volgende gebeuren: ten eerste, geen enkele herverdeling van deze migranten. Dat is immers het belonen van crimineel gedrag. Ten tweede, illegale binnenkomst in een EU-land moet automatisch uitsluiting van iedere verblijfstitel betekenen, want dan is die hele route meteen niet meer aantrekkelijk. Tot slot moet iedere samenwerking met de ngo's worden beëindigd en waar mogelijk moet vervolging worden ingesteld wegens hulp aan mensensmokkel. Ik roep de Nederlandse regering hierbij op daar werk van te maken, te beginnen bij dat schip van vorige week.

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

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL), domanda «cartellino blu». – Sarò molto breve. Vorrei chiedere al collega, ma a chiunque parli delle ONG come un pericolo e un «pool factor», di fornire le prove di quello che dicono, perché le ONG sono sotto attacco in maniera molto disonesta.

Auke Zijlstra (ENF), "blauwe kaart"-antwoord. – In dit geval ligt mijn sympathie bij Italië, dat zo wanhopig is dat het nu zelfs boten verstrekt aan de Libische kustwacht teneinde nog enige ordening hierin aan te brengen. Ik kijk gewoon naar de cijfers van de VN: 3 % komt eventueel in aanmerking voor een verblijfstitel als vluchteling en de rest niet. Hoe je het ook wendt of keert, de ngo's helpen erbij om die overige 97 % ook naar de overkant te brengen. Daarmee liggen die ngo's terecht onder vuur.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Asszony! 2015 óta az Európai Uniónak az eddigi legnagyobb kihívással kell szembenéznie: a népvándorlással, amely veszélyezteti Európa kultúráját, Európa identitását. És ebben a helyzetben a Bizottság még mindig ott tart, hogy számára az egyetlen fontos kérdés a menekültek kötelező szétosztása a tagországok között.

Ki a menekült? Ez a Parlament egy jelentés elfogadásával világossá tette, hogy ugyanolyan jogos a jobb élet reményében érkező migránsok befogadása, mint akik politikai üldöztetés elől menekülnek. Hogyan akarják megakadályozni az illegális migrációt? Hogy? A legális migrációt akarják bővíteni.

Ebben a helyzetben természetes, hogy vannak olyan országok, mint Magyarország, amelyek ezt nem fogadják el, nem akarják követni az utat, az úgynevezett társadalmaknak a párhuzamos kiépítésében, és elutasítják a kvótát, amivel jómagam is egyetértek.

Barbara Kudrycka (PPE). – Relokację jako wspólny wysiłek musimy przeprowadzać mądrze i odpowiedzialnie, biorąc pod uwagę różny stopień przygotowania społeczeństw na przyjęcie uchodźców po to, by zapewnić bezpieczeństwo Europejczyków, by osób posiadających prawo azylu nie narazić na ataki agresji, a populistom nie dać pretekstu do krytykowania Brukseli. Dlatego udział w relokacjach powinien być dla państw członkowskich dobrowolny, ale państwa muszą wywiązywać się ze swoich dobrowolnych zobowiązań: przygotować infrastrukturę, kadry, odpowiednio edukować swoje społeczności. Tak robią to związki gmin na Sycylii, opierając relokację na dwóch zasadach: dobrowolności i proporcjonalności.

Państwa członkowskie powinny wypełniać wcześniej podjęte dobrowolne zobowiązania, nie rozumiem więc, dlaczego rząd w Polsce nie przyjął siedmiu tysięcy uchodźców, w tym dzieci. Do przyjęcia tylu osób zobowiązał się poprzedni rząd Ewy Kopacz. Czterdziestomilionowy kraj naprawdę na to stać. Dlatego jestem dumna z inicjatywy władz wielu polskich miast i miasteczek, które zgłaszały chęć przyjęcia uchodźców, nawet jeśli dotyczyło to pięciu czy sześciu osób. Jeśli niewielka społeczność jest gotowa zaopiekować się jedną rodziną, pozwólmy jej na ten gest. To skandal, że rząd tego nie popiera. Nie wszyscy w moim kraju są więc niewrażliwi na nieszczęście i cierpienie innych. Nasze społeczeństwo obywatelskie nadal ma się nieźle, choć rząd PiS próbuje ograniczać jego swobody. Caritas i episkopat także oferują pomoc poprzez organizowanie korytarzy humanitarnych. Rząd PiS, który szafuje wartościami katolickimi, nie liczy się nawet z tym.

I na koniec nie zapominajmy, że relokacje nie powinny być traktowane jako klucz do rozwiązania kryzysu migracyjnego. To zaledwie jeden z instrumentów, których Europa ma więcej.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Az, hogy a háború és az üldöztetések elől menekülő emberek számára védelmet kell biztosítani, a tagállamok által vállalt nemzetközi jogi kötelezettség. Éppen ezért a menekültek áthelyezése nemcsak az európai szolidaritás, hanem egyben a közös felelősségvállalás kifejeződése is. Ezt nem Brüsszel kényszeríti az országokra, hanem a tagállamok maguk vállalták.

Nem háríthatjuk a felelősséget kizárólag a külső határon lévő tagállamokra. Ha nekik egyedül kell viselniük a terheket, akkor rendkívüli helyzetben összeroppanhat a menekültügyi rendszerük. Ennek következménye pedig emberi szenvedés és politikai zűrzavar. Ha rendet és biztonságot akarunk, akkor erős és szolidáris európai menekültügyi rendszerre van szükségünk. Ha ezt nem hozzuk létre, akkor veszélybe kerül Schengen és az egész európai projekt.

Lehet persze politikai haszonszerzésből azt hazudni, hogy az Unió mindenkit be akar engedni ellenőrzés nélkül, de tudjuk, hogy ez nem igaz. Az áthelyezés rendszere is hozzájárul ahhoz, hogy a menedékkérők közül csak azok jussanak be Európába, akik valóban nemzetközi védelemre szorulnak.

A valóság persze nem érdekli azokat, akik gyűlölet-, és félelemkeltéssel akarnak hatalmat szerezni vagy azt megtartani. Megoldásaik nincsenek, de mindent megtesznek, hogy másokat is megakadályozzanak a megoldások végrehajtásában. A hazug demagógok azonban vereségre vannak ítélve. Azt várjuk minden tagállamtól, hogy teljesítse a köteletségét, és fenntartások nélkül támogassa ezt a megoldást.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, ξανά «στο ίδιο έργο θεατές», τεράστιες προσφυγικές και μεταναστευτικές ροές προς την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα. Στα νησιά του Αιγαίου έχουν εγκλωβιστεί πλέον χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες, συγκρούσεις μεταξύ των διαφόρων μεταναστών κι όλα αυτά τώρα, καλοκαίρι, όταν πρέπει να υπάρχει ηρεμία, για να αναπτυχθεί η τουριστική περίοδος. Από τις περιφημες 66.400 μετεγκαταστάσεις απ' την Ελλάδα έχουν γίνει, σύμφωνα με αυτά που λέει η έκθεσή σας, μόνο 11.339, δηλαδή το 17% των μετεγκαταστάσεων, όταν μάλιστα το πρόγραμμα θα λήξει σε τέσσερις μήνες. Μια σειρά χώρες αρνούνται να προχωρήσουν στις μετεγκαταστάσεις, κι όμως η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει μέτρα εναντίον τους. Ακόμη και η Γερμανία δεν έχει προχωρήσει σε αυτά που οφείλει. Μόνο 12% μετεγκαταστάσεις έχουν γίνει στη χώρα αυτή. Στη Γαλλία μόνο 22% των μετεγκαταστάσεων που έχουν συμφωνηθεί. Τελικά, τι θα γίνει; Θα προχωρήσει η διαδικασία της μετεγκατάστασης; Δεν αντέχει άλλο ούτε η Ιταλία, ούτε η Ελλάδα. Υπάρχει πλέον πληθώρα προσφύγων που πρέπει να μετεγκατασταθούν από τις χώρες αυτές στις υπόλοιπες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, la question des réfugiés nous oblige, parce qu'elle concerne des vies, des espoirs et des destins. Vous l'avez rappelé dans votre conclusion, c'est à la fois une obligation et un devoir moral. Ce devoir moral et cette obligation nous obligent à la rectitude, ce qui signifie tout simplement, d'un point de vue juridique également, que nous devons respecter nos engagements. Tous les États doivent s'y tenir et il n'est pas tolérable que certains décident simplement de ne plus participer aux décisions qu'ils ont eux-mêmes construites et qu'ils ont eux-mêmes prises.

Il y a deux urgences absolues: s'occuper des goulets d'étranglement et diminuer les délais d'attente pour les décisions. C'est extrêmement important, pas seulement pour l'Italie et pour la Grèce, mais pour nos politiques européennes.

Deuxièmement, face à cette situation, nous avons aussi un devoir moral à l'égard des personnes vulnérables. La priorité doit être accordée aux enfants. En Europe, on ne peut pas laisser ces enfants en instance, en proie aux passeurs, aux trafics et à la traite d'êtres humains.

J'ai appris dans des rapports que certains États refusaient carrément de relocaliser ces mineurs non accompagnés. Cette question des réfugiés interroge sur ce que nous sommes. Nous devons être à la hauteur.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι αποφάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για ένα πρόγραμμα μετεγκατάστασης προσφύγων έχουν μείνει σε μεγάλο βαθμό ανεφάρμοστες, λόγω της απροθυμίας ορισμένων κρατών μελών να συμμορφωθούν με αυτές. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, έχει επιτευχθεί λιγότερο από το ένα πέμπτο του στόχου μετεγκατάστασης προσφύγων από την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα. Πρέπει να γίνει αντιληπτό πως η αλληλεγγύη είναι μια ενιαία κατοχυρωμένη στις ευρωπαϊκές συνθήκες και αποτελεί δέσμευση για τη συμπεριφορά όλων ανεξαιρέτως των κρατών μελών και όχι μια προαιρετική επιλογή. Παρ' ότι η απόφαση του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με το προσφυγικό ορίζει την κοινή στάση και συνεργασία των κρατών μελών, στην πράξη δεν βλέπουμε την απαιτούμενη αλληλεγγύη. Τα δεδομένα αυτά, σε συνδυασμό με τις καταγγελίες κατά ορισμένων κρατών μελών για διακρίσεις κατά την υποδοχή προσφύγων ανάλογα με την εθνικότητα ή τη θρησκεία τους, δεν τιμούν τις αρχές και τις αξίες της Ένωσης και θέτουν σε αμφισβήτηση τη συνοχή της. Η επιτάχυνση του

ρυθμού μετεγκατάστασης προσφύγων είναι αναγκαία ενώ, παράλληλα, οφείλουμε να διαμορφώσουμε ένα δικαιότερο και, κυρίως, αποτελεσματικότερο πλαίσιο υποδοχής και κατανομής των προσφύγων για τα επόμενα έτη. Χρειαζόμαστε άμεσα πράξεις και όχι δικαιολογίες.

Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE). – 160 000 mensen zouden uit Griekenland en Italië worden herplaatst naar andere lidstaten. Het was een oefening in solidariteit. Solidariteit met vluchtelingen, solidariteit onder lidstaten. We zijn nu twee jaar verder en van die 160 000 is niet zo heel veel terechtgekomen. Om het erger te maken is er ergens ook nog een nieuwe definitie ingeslopen. Alle vluchtelingen die in Griekenland aankwamen na het ingaan van de deal met Turkije op 20 maart 2016, zouden niet mogen worden hervestigd. Waarom niet? Wie heeft dat bedacht? Dit Parlement heeft drie keer ingestemd met dit herplaatsingssysteem en die clausule zat er niet in. De deal met Turkije is een persverklaring. De afspraak om niet te hervestigen is nergens op papier gezet en toch wordt die uitgevoerd. Lidstaten houden zich niet aan hun aantallen en worden nu beloond, want ze hoeven een stuk minder vluchtelingen op te nemen. Maar ze zijn er nog steeds. Het zijn nog steeds mensen die recht hebben op een nieuw bestaan. Je kunt de definitie veranderen, je haalt er de mensen niet mee weg.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, diciamolo sinceramente, questa situazione è davvero una grande vergogna. 160 000 persone che dovevano essere ricollocate e finora ne sono state ricollocate soltanto 18 400. Significa che ne vanno ricollocate 142 097 entro settembre.

Questa è la solidarietà dell'Unione europea e, mentre tutti parlano di populismi, di intervenire e di Unione europea più forte, noi ancora vediamo queste situazioni. L'Italia e la Grecia sono state scelte come campo profughi dell'intera Europa, io provengo da una regione, la Sicilia, che è totalmente al collasso, in cui peraltro la politica specula sulla gestione dei migranti. Ieri sono state arrestate una sessantina di persone in Calabria che avevano a che fare con la 'ndrangheta, con la criminalità organizzata, che speculavano sui migranti e noi continuiamo a parlare.

Allora, la cosa che va fatta in questo caso è passare dalle parole ai fatti, tagliare i fondi strutturali agli Stati che si rifiutano di aiutare.

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

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), blue-card question. – Besides the moral duty of the Member States, as mentioned here by the Commissioner, do you not think that the Member States should also meet their legal obligations to accept migrants, and that perhaps it is time for the European institutions to think about imposing sanctions on the countries that do not accept immigrants?

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – La ringrazio per la domanda, onorevole Frunzulică, è esattamente quello che stavo cercando di dire, correndo alla fine del mio intervento.

Noi purtroppo con le parole, richiamando alla solidarietà e richiamando agli obblighi legali, non siamo riusciti ad ottenere niente, allora probabilmente bisogna cambiare atteggiamento. Tagliamo i fondi strutturali europei a quegli Stati che non hanno rispettato gli impegni, che non hanno accettato di prendersi i migranti che andavano ricollocati nel loro paese.

Si può fare, facciamo.

Lorenzo Fontana (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ma guardate, io sono un po' perplesso perché, per carità, l'argomento è il ricollocamento e mi sembra che sia chiaro che fino ad ora non abbia funzionato molto, ma nella realtà dei fatti noi parliamo di un piccolo pezzetto di un problema molto più grande, che se fosse solo quello dei ricollocamenti sarebbe una cosa molto positiva, quasi.

Occorre tenere conto che l'anno scorso in Italia sono sbarcate 180 000 persone. Di queste, probabilmente, ci sarà un 5 per cento che scappa effettivamente dalla guerra e che riuscirà ad avere lo status di rifugiato politico quindi, eventualmente, sarà questo 5 per cento che sarà ricollocato.

Il problema vero sono tutti gli altri. C'è un piano europeo per riportarli a casa loro? Cosa pensiamo di fare? Di lasciarli tutti in Italia? È questo il grosso problema del quale nessuno parla e queste persone alla fine cosa vanno a fare? Vanno a ingrassare quelli che sono i lavoratori abusivi, vanno a ingrassare le maglie della criminalità. Proprio questa settimana sono state arrestate nella mia città persone che avevano presentato la richiesta di rifugiato politico ma che andavano a rubare, che spacciavano droga. Allora, diciamolo chiaramente, è una tratta degli schiavi quella che stiamo vedendo in questo momento e purtroppo c'è qualcuno complice, ci sono tante persone che fanno affari e c'è qualcuno complice, anche chi non fa niente per risolvere questa situazione.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, κυρίες, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, ξέρουμε ότι στις 26 Σεπτεμβρίου λήγει η προθεσμία για την εφαρμογή των αποφάσεων που έχουμε πάρει για τη μετεγκατάσταση. Παρά ταύτα, ξέρουμε ότι, παρά τις προσπάθειες που έχουν γίνει, το πρόγραμμα υπολείπεται. Και υπολείπεται για τρεις βασικούς λόγους: για τα κράτη μέλη εκείνα που δεν δέχονται κανένα πρόσφυγα, για τα κράτη μέλη που κάνουν επιλεκτικά αποδοχή αιτήσεων με βάση το προφίλ των προσφύγων, για τα κράτη μέλη που θέλουν δύο και τέσσερις μήνες για να απαντήσουν στις αιτήσεις. Πρακτικά, βλέπουμε ότι τα αποτελέσματα δεν μας δικαιώνουν. Δωδεκάμισι χιλιάδες μόνο έχουν μετεγκατασταθεί από την Ελλάδα και ο στόχος αποκλίνει σημαντικά.

Παράλληλα, κύριε Επίτροπε, ξέρετε πολύ καλά ότι η συμφωνία Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – Τουρκίας παρουσιάζει κι αυτή προβλήματα. Από πέρι τον Μάρτιο του 2016, που υπογράφηκε αυτή συμφωνία, 23.000 νέοι πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες έχουν έρθει στην Ελλάδα, ενώ αντίστοιχα μόνο 1.000 έχουν γυρίσει πίσω στην Τουρκία. Το πρόβλημα είναι μεγάλο και μπορεί να αντιμετωπιστεί μόνο με πολύ σημαντικές αποφάσεις. Αποφάσεις που θα είναι σκληρές σε βάρος των κρατών μελών που δεν εφαρμόζουν τις δικές μας αποφάσεις και δρουν τελείως ανεξέλεγκτα κατά το δοκούν, και αποφάσεις, ίσως, που θα πρέπει να παρατείνουν το πρόγραμμα, έτσι ώστε να μπορέσει να εφαρμοστεί, αλλά και να οδηγηθούμε ομαλά στον μόνιμο μηχανισμό μετεγκατάστασης, αυτόν που θα μπορεί να δώσει ουσιαστικές και βιώσιμες λύσεις στο πρόβλημα.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dei 160 000 ricollocamenti promessi in due anni dall'Italia e dalla Grecia verso altri paesi europei ne sono stati fatti solo 17 900. Una vergogna, come l'assenza del Consiglio oggi a questo dibattito.

Il tutto mentre il Canada, l'anno scorso, ha reinsediato in quattro mesi 35 000 siriani, con un oceano in mezzo, dimostrando che quello europeo non è un problema di numeri né di mezzi, ma solo di egoismi nazionali e di mancanza di volontà politica. I governi non hanno rispettato gli impegni presi, alcuni hanno adito la Corte di giustizia, altri hanno cercato di fare un *casting* dei richiedenti sulla base di criteri discriminatori o di avanzare non precisate esigenze di sicurezza per evitare di accoglierli. A questi Stati membri vorrei dire che volere i benefici di far parte di un'Unione senza mai volerne condividere le responsabilità è un atteggiamento infantile.

A questo si aggiunge che è assurdo non aver sospeso i trasferimenti in Italia e in Grecia di altri richiedenti ai sensi dell'ipocrita criterio del primo paese d'accesso su cui poggia il regolamento di Dublino, che speriamo finalmente di cancellare nella revisione in corso, così come è assurdo ricollocare solo nazionalità con una media di riconoscimento della protezione superiore a 75, perché ha prodotto sul campo vere e proprie discriminazioni contrarie alla Convenzione di Ginevra.

Con tutti questi limiti che vanno corretti i ricollocamenti non devono fermarsi, serve una nuova decisione del Consiglio perché si continui fino a una riforma di Dublino che renda strutturale un meccanismo centralizzato e permanente di condivisione delle responsabilità.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Madam President, Commissioner, the relocation scheme has been a failure because Member States are reluctant to implement it, for reasons that are very understandable. This kind of immigration is extremely costly to their societies both economically and socially.

We should abandon the concept of relocation and we should also abandon the idea that mass immigration to Europe is a solution to the problems of the Third World. What we need is a strict, Australian-style 'push back' policy at our external borders to stem the chaotic, illegal flow to Europe. Then, we need to give more support to the countries of origin, the countries of transit and the people in refugee camps.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, el Consejo ha disculpado su presencia, porque no quiere escucharnos. Saben que el Parlamento Europeo va a afean su actitud en la crisis de refugiados. Se comprometieron a acoger a 160 000 personas antes de septiembre de 2017 y la cifra global no llega al 11 % a punto de alcanzar el plazo.

Solo Finlandia acoge a menores no acompañados. La gran mayoría de países, incluyendo el mío —con pena lo digo—, se retrasa mientras decenas de miles de seres humanos sufren cada día mil barbaridades o miles mueren intentando llegar a Europa.

Hungría ha ido más allá, y se atreve a decir que no quiere gastar y que la soberanía de su país está en peligro si acepta un sistema de cuotas.

Pues bien, en 1948, tras sobrevivir al campo de Buchenwald, Léon Blum expresó con terrible lucidez que considerar la soberanía de los Estados como algo indiscutible e irrevocable llevó a la guerra; que, en nombre de ese dogma, se privó a la Sociedad de Naciones de toda fuerza ejecutiva.

El dogma de la competencia y de la soberanía nacional sin límite anula, también hoy, la ética, destroza la autoridad de las instituciones europeas y nos deshace.

No son palabras. Hacen falta sanciones para quien incumpla.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, nosotros ya dijimos que el sistema de cuotas no iba a funcionar y además era injusto e insuficiente. Pero es que estamos viendo que no solo es injusto e insuficiente: es que ni siquiera los Estados miembros lo cumplen.

Estamos viendo como casi ningún Estado miembro ha cumplido con algo que la propia ACNUR decía que ya no era suficiente. De hecho, se dice que este año tendríamos que acoger a un millón de refugiados en el mundo... y Europa no cumple, y ese incumplimiento es la muestra más clara de la crisis política del proyecto europeo.

España, yo creo que es un ejemplo paradigmático: de casi 19 000 personas —19 000 refugiados— que tendríamos que acoger, no hemos acogido casi ni el 5 %. Esto no se puede permitir y hay que tomar medidas. Y yo creo que hay que ser claro en este sentido.

Aquí, en estas instituciones europeas, se nos ha dicho que la austeridad era obligatoria y a quien no la cumple se le castiga. Nosotros decimos que por qué no cambiamos esa regla, que por qué no decimos que la austeridad sea optativa y el cumplimiento de los derechos humanos sea obligatorio; y a quien no lo cumple, que se le sancione. Eso podría empezar a cambiar las cosas.

Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Tack så mycket. Under hösten 2015 tog ju ett fåtal länder i Europa emot en oerhört stor mängd flyktingar på väldigt kort tid. Och mottagningssystem kollapsade, gränser stängdes och solidariteten mellan medlemsländerna var helt frånvarande, och hela EU-bygget började skaka.

Jag bor i två länder: Sverige och Spanien. Två länder med diametralt olika uppfattning vad gäller flyktingmottagande.

I Sverige tog vi under 2015 emot 163 000 flyktingar mot beräknade 80 000. Vi behövde inte ta emot hela den kvot av omfördelning som bestämdes, därför att vi redan hade tagit emot väldigt många. Men i Spanien, där har vi redan hört vad som händer – där tas det inte emot så många. Men samtidigt så vet vi också att de autonoma regionerna – flera av dem har förberett sig väl – har talat om att de vill ta emot flyktingar under lång tid, men den spanska regeringen säger tvärt nej.

Så här kan vi inte ha det. Att det faktiskt är så att regionerna vill, och regeringar säger nej. Vi måste ta den spanska regeringen i örat!

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). – Fru talman! Omfördelning, gemensamt ansvar och solidaritet – det låter vackert. Men som nästan allt i den här byggnaden är det byggt på drömmar och förhoppningar som aldrig kommer att besannas.

Oavsett vilken omflyttningslösning det blir i framtiden – för ni vill ju så gärna göra alla länder i Europa mångkulturella – så kommer det att misslyckas. Sverige har under många år haft en gigantisk migration, och vi lär oss sakta men säkert läxan.

Varje omflytningsprocess kommer att ta många år med tanke på att folk stannar kvar, och avviker efter att de fått nej på en redan lång process.

Själva avvisningen kommer säkerligen att överklagas och protesteras mot.

De tiotusentals som genom bedrägligt beteende illegalt kommer att dröja sig kvar i våra länder kallas av er "papperslösa". Några kommer att göra terrordåd som skedde i april i Sverige. En del utför tillgrepps- och våldsbrott, och i princip alla kommer att arbeta svart. Vad har de att förlora? De lever redan i strid med gällande rätt.

Om ni inte kan omplacera mer än 18 000 på två år, hur tänker ni då göra med de åtta till nio miljoner människor som förväntas komma från Libyen inom en snar framtid?

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, dans la novlangue européenne, on refuse d'appeler un chat un chat. L'Union réclame pudiquement des relocalisations. En réalité, elle a décidé une politique de peuplement: 50 millions de migrants à l'horizon 2060, selon l'aveu du commissaire Avramopoulos, le 8 juin 2015.

L'objectif est double: il s'agit, d'une part, de faire venir une main-d'œuvre à bas coûts pour permettre aux entreprises d'accroître leurs profits et, d'autre part, de briser les identités nationales pour transformer les citoyens en consommateurs dociles.

Le fer de lance de cette folle politique est le plan Juncker de septembre 2015, qui impose aux États de l'Union la relocalisation de 160 000 migrants arrivés en Grèce et en Italie.

Ce n'est évidemment qu'un début et les États l'ont bien compris; c'est pourquoi beaucoup résistent, à l'instar de la Hongrie et de la Pologne. Je les encourage à poursuivre leur résistance, car chaque nation a le droit de défendre son identité contre la submersion migratoire.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, falamos muito na solidariedade europeia mas não somos consequentes. Em dois anos chegaram às nossas fronteiras mais de um milhão e meio de pessoas e os Estados-Membros acordaram recolocar menos de cem mil durante o mesmo período, o que já de si é um número risível, e volvidos quase dois anos apenas 16 % desse compromisso foi cumprido, com as crianças não acompanhadas a serem particularmente afetadas. Há mesmo Estados que se querem excluir deste esforço.

Permita-me, Sra. Presidente, que refira o meu país. Portugal manifestou-se disponível para receber mais de 5 800 pessoas do que o inicialmente acordado. No total, anunciou o Primeiro-Ministro numa visita à Chanceler alemã, Portugal está disposto a receber 10 000 requerentes de asilo. Já antes, a sociedade civil e o chamado terceiro setor mobilizaram-se de forma impressionante e generosa. Ora, Portugal acolheu apenas 1 228 pessoas, cerca de um décimo do objetivo fixado por nós próprios.

De uma vez por todas, quem está a falhar? Será o Governo português? Será a Comissão Europeia? Ou a culpa é de terceiros?

Este Parlamento tem feito tudo o que está ao seu alcance para contrariar este rumo. Aprovámos rapidamente os mecanismos de urgência e os reforços orçamentais e apresentamo-nos hoje, aqui, com uma abordagem positiva. O tema deste debate é, aliás, fazer a recolocação funcionar. Sejam pragmáticos no diagnóstico, veja-se de uma vez por todas o que está mal e tomemos de forma resoluta todas as medidas necessárias, todas, sem exceção.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. Stimate coleg, am ascultat cu atenție ce ați spus și, cel puțin eu, am înțeles că dumneavoastră considerați că este perfect proiectul de transfer și relocare. Eu nu am aceeași părere și vă întreb: credeți că pentru a avea succes la acest proiect nu trebuie o comunicare mai bună din partea Comisiei către statele membre? Pentru ca acceptabilitatea cetățenilor să crească nu putem să spunem că iată, cum s-a spus aici de către domnul comisar, că trebuie să avem grijă de securitatea zonei Schengen. Și celelalte state ce să facă: să accepte doar refugiați? Mulțumesc.

Carlos Coelho (PPE), resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Senhora Deputada Grapini, concordo consigo que é melhor mais comunicação e melhor comunicação mas o problema não está aí. O problema está na vontade política. Há Estados-Membros que não querem colaborar com o esforço de recolocação. Há Estados-Membros que não querem fazer a sua parte e isto não funciona. Não podemos apelar à solidariedade europeia e, depois, ela não funcionar. Estou de acordo com aqueles que dizem que, à falta de boa vontade, se calhar, precisamos mesmo de um sistema vinculativo, de um sistema de quotas obrigatórias, de um sistema permanente de recolocação.

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε επίτροπε, τις ευθύνες των κρατών μελών και της Επιτροπής για τη βραδύτητα της μετεγκατάστασης της ανέλυσαν με εξαιρετική ακρίβεια οι συνάδελφοί μου. Εγώ σήμερα θέλω να καταθέσω μία συγκεκριμένη πρόταση. Στην Ελλάδα αυτή τη στιγμή, φιλοξενούμε λίγο περισσότερα από δύο χιλιάδες ασυνόδευτα παιδιά: τα μισά σε ειδικές δομές φιλοξενίας, και τα υπόλοιπα στις ασφαλείς ζώνες μέσα στους καταυλισμούς. Ένα μέρος από αυτά, λιγότερο από το ένα τρίτο, δικαιούνται μετεγκατάστασης καθώς είναι προσφυγόπουλα από τη Συρία, το Ιράκ και τα λοιπά, και είναι ντροπή που μία Ένωση πεντακοσίων εκατομμυρίων ανθρώπων δεν μπόρεσε να βρει μία ασφαλή και μόνιμη θέση για μερικές εκατοντάδες παιδιά που ξέφυγαν από τις ζώνες του πολέμου. Δεν αναφέρομαι στις υποσχέσεις για μετεγκατάσταση των 160 χιλιάδων προσφύγων ούτε για τις δεκάδες χιλιάδες που περιμένουν, με όλα τα χαρτιά έτοιμα, για την πρόσκληση που αργεί να έρθει. Μιλώ για λίγες εκατοντάδες παιδιά, πολύ λίγα, που πρέπει να αποκτήσουν ασφάλεια και σταθερότητα στη ζωή τους. Θα πρότεινα λοιπόν στο Σώμα, στο πλαίσιο της συνδιάσκεψης για το προσφυγικό που, όπως δήλωσε ο Πρόεδρος Tajani θα διεξαχθεί στις 21 Ιουνίου στις Βρυξέλλες, να δεσμευθούμε σε μια δήλωση: «τα παιδιά πρώτα, σήμερα!» και να απαιτήσουμε από τα κράτη μέλη ένα μικρό αλλά σημαντικό βήμα: όταν έρθει το φθινόπωρο, κανένα ανήλικο που δικαιούται μετεγκατάστασης να μη βρίσκεται στην Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία. Ένα μικρό βήμα για τη μετεγκατάσταση, ένα μεγάλο βήμα, όμως, για τη ζωή αυτών των παιδιών. Κύριε Επίτροπε, θα ήθελα τη βοήθειά σας για να δώσουμε πρακτικά το ανθρωπιστικό αυτό μήνυμα: «children first, now!».

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, relokácie a systém prerozdelenia utečencov do jednotlivých členských štátov nefunguje, to treba povedať asi jasne. Zo 160 000 migrantov v rámci povinných kvót bolo doteraz členskými štátmi prijatých len o niečo viac ako 10 %.

Slovenská republika spolu s Maďarskom podali žalobu, o ktorej začal rozhodovať Európsky súdny dvor. Utečenecké kvóty totiž boli prijaté v rozpore s odporúčaniami predstaviteľov členských krajín. Rozhodnutie malo byť prijaté jednomyseľne, ale namiesto toho väčšina prehlasovala menšinu. V takejto citlivej otázke a vo vyhrotenej atmosfére toto len prispelo k nárastu podpory pre extrémistické a protieurópske sily a politické sily v Európe.

Ak sa potvrdí, že sa môžu prijímať rozhodnutia bez súhlasu tých, ktorých sa týkajú, tak to bude mať za následok rozdelenie Európy a frustráciu obyvateľstva menších členských štátov EÚ. Nemôžeme rozdeľovať EÚ na západ a východ, na neposlušných a zodpovedných a vonkoncom nemožno obchádzať rozhodnutiami demokraticky zvolené vlády a vôľu občanov. Ja chcem oceniť, že EÚ zriadila hotspoty, dala právomoci novozriadenej Európskej pohraničnej a pobrežnej stráža a že sa vyvinulo veľké úsilie.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Ik ben heel blij dat dit thema vandaag besproken wordt in de plenaire vergadering in Straatsburg. Ik vind het alleen ontzettend jammer dat de Raad hier vandaag niet aanwezig is. We moeten namelijk de situatie van de mensen ter plaatse bekijken. In de kampen in Italië en Griekenland verblijven 23 000 niet-begeleide kinderen in mensonwaardige omstandigheden. Ik heb dergelijke kampen bezocht. Er is geen water, geen toegang tot gezondheidszorg, geen school. Deze kinderen zijn slachtoffers, geen daders.

Europol heeft vorig jaar gezegd dat 10 000 kinderen in Europa vermist geraken wanneer ze over de grens komen. Waar zitten ze? In de prostitutie? In een ander land? Zijn ze gedood voor hun organen? Ik wil hier vandaag één pleidooi houden. Elke lidstaat moet zijn verplichtingen nakomen. Laten we prioriteit geven aan de niet-begeleide minderjarigen. Zij verdienen onze bescherming. Dat is Europa.

Kinga Gál (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr! Magyarország a kezdetektől azon az állásponton van, hogy a relokáció nem lehet kötelező jellegű, és ezért is támadta ezt az Európai Unió Bíróságán. Ugyanakkor 23 tagállam ma megszavazta a kötelező kvótát. Ennek ellenére másfél év alatt 160 ezerből mindössze 18 000 migráns került áthelyezésre. Ez a kötelező kvóták alkalmatlanságát bizonyítja, és azt erősíti, hogy bármiféle szétosztás csakis önkéntes lehet. A jelenleg tárgyalás alatt álló létszámküszöb nélküli migránsbetelepítési program és a kilátásba helyezett büntetés is elfogadhatatlan.

Nem ez az egyetlen módja a tagállamok közötti szolidaritás elvének érvényre juttatására. A szolidaritást határvédelemmel, a rendészeti szervek közötti együttműködéssel és humanitárius programokkal is ki lehet fejezni. Magyarország eddig mintegy 900 millió eurót fordított határvédelemre és a magyar kormány folyamatosan bővíti humanitárius szerepvállalását a Közel-Keleten.

A kötelező betelepítést meghívásként értelmezik a migránsok és bátorítást jelent az embercsempészek számára is. Ezért ameddig hagyjuk, hogy százezres embertömegek lépjenek be Európába ellenőrzés nélkül, ameddig nem választjuk szét a gazdasági bevándorlókat a valódi menekültektől már az Unió határain kívül, addig bármilyen kötelező jellegű migránskvóta vagy hasonló alapon működő jövőbeli mechanizmus kontraproduktív lesz és alkalmatlan a probléma kezelésére.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, es una vergüenza que el Consejo no esté aquí, pero mucha mayor vergüenza es que cada vez que el Consejo ha actuado poco, tarde y mal en la dirección equivocada, reuniéndose hasta altas horas de la madrugada para tomar decisiones, hemos dicho aquí, en todas las lenguas oficiales de la Unión: «¿Qué más da, si no las quieren cumplir?» Toman decisiones y las incumplen clamorosamente.

Hay un problema moral. Italia, abandonada a su suerte. Miles de muertes en el mar, 180 000 personas en campos de alojamiento en los países de primera recepción, con un Reglamento de Dublín que hay que reformar. Hay un problema político. No es técnico, es falta de voluntad política, por parte de los Estados miembros, de cumplir con el Derecho europeo. Un problema jurídico, falta de vías legales para poder entrar en la Unión Europea sin abandonarse a las mafias que trafican con personas, falta de visados humanitarios.

Pero también ausencia de sanciones a los países incumplidores. Lamento decirlo. España, un país con capacidad de acogida, que incumple clamorosamente las cifras comprometidas en el propio Consejo, decisiones después desmentidas una y otra vez por el Consejo.

Por tanto, la respuesta solo puede ser una. Y tiene que ser jurídica, por parte de la Comisión: sanciones. Sanciones, de una vez, a los países incumplidores. No procedimientos de infracción que se prolongan durante dos años, de contenido puramente moral —una reprensión, una amonestación—. No. Sanciones económicas a los países incumplidores, que no pueden disfrutar de ayudas europeas mientras no entiendan que el mandato de solidaridad no es un buen deseo; es un mandato jurídico vinculante. Está en el Tratado de Lisboa y los Estados tienen que cumplirlo.

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

Marek Jurek (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie pośle! Trafnie pan zauważył, podobnie jak wielu mówców, że państwa Europy nie zgadzają się po prostu – niektóre otwarcie, inne praktycznie – na ten mechanizm przymusowego rozsyłania imigrantów po Europie. Pan mówi, że solidarność to jest przymus. Czy naprawdę uważa pan, że dla zastąpienia idei Unii Europejskiej ideą Unii Euromaghrebu warto uruchamiać kolejny kryzys w Europie?

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor Jurek... Cuántas veces y en cuántas lenguas oficiales hemos tenido que explicar que los países que se adhirieron a la Unión Europea, ratificaron el Tratado de Lisboa y se comprometieron con su entrada en vigor, estaban aceptando un compromiso vinculante de solidaridad en la gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión y en el aseguramiento de la libre circulación en el interior de la Unión.

La solidaridad no es un buen deseo, no; la solidaridad es un mandato vinculante. Y esto significa que cuando existen inmigrantes que entran por una frontera y están en campos de alojamiento, en campos de acogida, se necesita una respuesta europea, conducida por la Comisión y cumplida obligatoriamente por todos los Estados miembros. Y para los Estados incumplidores, sanciones.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru Formand! Igen i dag skal vi diskutere EU's forslag om tvungen genfordeling af migranter i Europa, og lad os nu for første gang være ærlige i dette hus og erkende, at det har været en stor fiasko.

Vi har ikke lykkedes med at genfordele en brøkdel af de ganske få, der i første omgang blev stemt igennem Rådet, og det eneste, vi har opnået, er en enorm splittelse af Den Europæiske Union. Grækenland og Italien siger helt logisk, at de vil ikke ende op med alle migranter, der ulovligt krydser ind til Europa. Nordvesteuropa siger helt logisk, at vi ikke ønsker at være endestationen for alle migranter, der ønsker at komme til de rigeste og mest givende lande, hvis man er migrant, og Øst- og Centraleuropa siger, at de ikke ønsker at gentage de fejl, der er begået i Vesteuropa.

Lad os nu finde en rigtig løsning på migrationsproblemet. Lad os implementere en australsk *push back*-model, når vi alligevel må erkende, at der hverken er vilje til eller realisme i at modtage millionvis af migranter og flygtninge her på kontinentet.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Nejdříve mi dovoluňte trochu reagovat na mé předřečníky. Dámy a pánové, myslíte si, že když někomu nařídíte, že má něco dělat, že to v životě funguje? Já mám 4 malé děti. Když jim říkám, že musejí uklízet, tak věřte, že děti nikdy neuklízí. Když použiji slovo muset, nátlak, sankce, tak to dítě reaguje tak, že ještě více se snaží bojovat proti těm sankcím, a to si myslím, že je tato debata.

Někomu nařizovat, aby něco dělal proti své vůli, je prostě nesmysl. Já už jsem říkal, pane komisaři, několikrát na tomto místě, že celý relokační mechanismus je prostě jeden velký utopistický projekt. Kdyby tento projekt fungoval, tak je to tady tak, že vlastně pouze 30 % států odmítá přijímat uprchlíky nebo podřídí se tomuto relokačnímu mechanismu. Tak by bylo rozděleno asi, podle mých propočtů, nějakých 120 000 uprchlíků, ale prostě 120 000 uprchlíků nebo potřebných lidí rozdělených není.

O tomto systému se bavíme 2 roky. Já si myslím, že tento systém je zbytečně upnutý a upínáme se na něj jako na jediné řešení migrační krize, ale jediné řešení migrační krize to není. Přiznejme si to, přiznejme si kriticky, že tento systém nikdy nebude fungovat. Solidarita, která je vynucená pod formou pohrůzek, prostě nikdy nebude fungovat.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem przypomnieć, że tymczasowy mechanizm relokacji nie został poparty przez wszystkie państwa członkowskie. Relokacja została ustanowiona przez Radę do Spraw Wewnętrznych, by obejść zasadę jednomyślności państw członkowskich w Radzie Europejskiej. I to jest grzech pierworodny tej decyzji.

Rzady Słowacji i Węgier złożyły skargę do Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej, powołując się na zasadę proporcjonalności i równowagi instytucjonalnej, a my w Parlamencie Europejskim nawet nie czekamy na wyrok Trybunału, tak jakby on już zapadł. Może powinniśmy wykazywać więcej szacunku wobec Trybunału.

Relokacja jest także odrzucana przez znaczną część społeczeństw tych państw, które ją poparły. Jest bowiem oparta na przymusie zarówno wobec relokowanych, jak i wobec tych, którzy mają ich przyjmować, a którzy także mają swoje prawa, o czym Unia zdaje się zapominać. Dlatego mechanizm relokacji nie działa i nie będzie działać.

Salvatore Domenico Pogliese (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sul tema dell'immigrazione il Parlamento, la Commissione e il Consiglio, e l'Europa nel suo complesso, si giocano una grande fetta di credibilità.

Il Parlamento aveva auspicato, in attesa della modifica di Dublino 3 che finalmente da qui a breve si concretizzerà, che si applicasse un principio solidaristico fra tutti gli Stati membri, non lasciando sole l'Italia e la Grecia nell'affrontare un flusso migratorio che non ha precedenti nella storia del nostro continente. Avevamo accolto con grande entusiasmo il piano dei ricollocamenti, ma oggi è davvero imbarazzante commentare questi dati: 18 000 ricollocamenti effettuati, l'11 per cento del progetto che era stato avanzato dalla Commissione, dal Consiglio e dal Parlamento.

È stato chiesto all'Italia di fare uno sforzo aggiuntivo sul tema delle identificazioni, e ciò è stato puntualmente fatto. È stato chiesto all'Italia di creare nuovi *hotspot*, e questo è stato puntualmente fatto, ma commentare oggi i 5 413 ricollocamenti dall'Italia credo che sia un dato davvero imbarazzante.

Tutto ciò non può essere consentito, gli Stati membri devono rispettare gli impegni assunti e, se ciò non dovesse accadere, bisogna avviare le procedure di infrazione e bisogna trovare, Commissario, anche misure estensive per arrivare ai 160 000 ricollocamenti entro il 26 settembre 2017.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Migrationskrise zeigt auf tragische Weise, dass in der EU einiges nicht mehr funktioniert. Wir sehen hier diese Probleme wirklich hautnah, und leider Gottes wird es auf dem Rücken von armen Menschen ausgetragen. Egal, aus welchen Gründen sie migrieren, sie haben alle einen Grund.

Die EU ist gestartet als Projekt der Bürger, und was haben die Mehrheitsfraktionen dieses Parlaments daraus gemacht? Sie haben ein Kopfprojekt daraus gemacht! Da werden Theorie-Lösungen erfunden, die in der Praxis nicht funktionieren, weil sie nämlich nicht akzeptiert sind bei den Bürgern und in einigen Mitgliedstaaten.

Deshalb müssen wir aufhören, Theorie-Lösungen zu erfinden, die halt nicht funktionieren. Wir müssen auf Freiwilligkeit setzen, wir müssen darauf setzen, dass Kooperation gefunden wird und dass man sich dann allerdings auch an getroffene Vereinbarungen hält. Ich halte es für ausgesprochen populistisch, dass jetzt hier in diesem Haus einige sagen, man müsste hier Strafen aussprechen, wenn man sich nicht an die Vereinbarungen hält. Wo werden denn diese Strafen ausgesprochen, wenn es um die Eurokrise geht? Da sagt jeder: nein, keine Strafen. Wir müssen uns wieder an das halten, was vereinbart ist.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Begunski val, ki je bil najmočnejši v letih 2015 in 2016, je v Evropo pripeljal več kot milijon migrantov in beguncev. Evropska unija si je zadala cilj, da naredi realokacijo 160 000 beguncev, in kot vidimo, je samo dobra desetina le teh pristala v državah, kamor bi naj bile namenjene.

Probleme imamo na obeh straneh, tako države, ki ne želijo sprejeti beguncev, kakor tudi begunce, ki imajo za cilj šest, osem najbogatejših evropskih držav. Vse skupaj kaže na določen problem in potreben je temeljit razmislek.

Iz države, iz katere prihajam, je tudi generalni upor med ljudmi proti beguncem, vendar je uspelo vladi pripeljati v državo večji delež, kot je delež izpolnjenih kvot v okviru Evropske unije. Drugače je bilo, ko je bila kriza v Bosni, ko smo v Slovenijo sprejeli 70 000 ljudi, se pravi razmislek, ali je model pravilen, in večja politična volja je potrebna za boljše izpeljat ta program.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, la crisi migratoria che si è rivelata per le sue dimensioni una vera e propria crisi umanitaria ha registrato, lo sappiamo, un deficit di solidarietà e una mancata condivisione del principio di responsabilità, che non solo mette a rischio la tenuta politica dell'Unione ma che, purtroppo, è la causa principale del fallimento del programma di ricollocamenti.

Senza la partecipazione di tutti gli Stati certo non potremo raggiungere entro settembre gli obiettivi prefissati dal programma. Credo quindi sia indispensabile non solo prorogare il programma di ricollocamenti, ma prevederne l'obbligatorietà necessaria. E mi auguro veramente che non si debba ricorrere a meccanismi sanzionatori perché sarebbe veramente triste per tutti quanti noi assistere a questa continua mancanza di solidarietà da parte dei paesi europei.

Occorre però che alla crisi migratoria si dia una risposta europea. Il sostegno finanziario accordato recentemente all'Italia è un segnale importante del riconoscimento del lavoro svolto dal mio paese, ma occorre accelerare anche sull'approvazione di strumenti legislativi quali il pacchetto d'asilo e il regolamento di Dublino necessari a tal fine.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, la semana pasada el lehendakari vasco, en su visita al presidente de la Comisión Europea, recordaba la disposición del Gobierno que preside y la sociedad a la que representa para colaborar en la construcción del proyecto europeo. Hacía propuestas para reforzar la política social y, entre ellas, una sobre los corredores humanitarios para refugiados que completa el plan adoptado en su día en el País Vasco para acoger a personas que sufren y necesitan ayuda, pero que no llegan porque, en este caso, España no aloja a los que debe, mientras ciudades y regiones -quienes de verdad prestan los servicios a estos colectivos- tienen planes y disposición.

Por eso, pregunto al comisario cómo se integra ese conocimiento y esa actitud a la hora de planificar políticas, tomar decisiones y ejecutar programas vinculados a estas materias, porque la actitud de muchos ciudadanos y en las instituciones más próximas a ellos tiene muy poco que ver con la insolidaridad con la que los Estados, desde arriba, afrontan este reto.

Por eso, el Consejo no está aquí. Y por eso, los Estados que incumplen los acuerdos merecen ya sanciones.

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, me duele en el alma ver cómo Consejo, Comisión y hasta nosotros hablamos de números —absolutamente ridículos, en cualquier caso, ante la dimensión real de lo que está ocurriendo—, cuando deberíamos hablar de personas. ¿Quiénes somos nosotros para negar un futuro a Saled o a Denis, a quienes conocí el viernes en el campo de Mineo?

El Consejo adoptó un sistema sabiendo que no lo iba a cumplir, un sistema que en realidad busca a quién expulsar, no a quién recibir. Y, mientras tanto, todas las personas que llegaron después del 20 de marzo son condenadas al limbo, al menos las que consiguen sobrevivir al infierno de la travesía, porque están muriendo muchas más personas de lo que pensamos.

Señorías, es nuestro pasado, y quién sabe si algún día no podría ser otra vez nuestro futuro. Pero ¿necesitamos realmente sufrir nosotros para poder sentir el sufrimiento de estas personas?

Señorías, no son números, son personas.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, haber hecho el debate hoy sin el Consejo francamente se puede calificar simplemente de auténtica vergüenza, porque encima de no cumplir sus compromisos, no viene ni a dar la cara.

Miren, tenemos un problema gravísimo con la aplicación del mecanismo. De las 160 000 personas que debían ser reubicadas, solamente lo han sido 12 000 desde Grecia y 5 000 desde Italia. Y, encima, el número de llegadas no deja de aumentar. Quiero recordar que, en Italia, en el año 2016 aumentaron un 18 % las llegadas con relación a 2015. Y la opción de empezar a hacer acuerdos en frontera y desentendernos de lo que pasa con nuestros refugiados no es una opción viable. Hay que cumplir esas cuotas.

Y me dirijo a la Comisión Europea: ante el incumplimiento flagrante de los países miembros, como España, por ejemplo, que solo ha cumplido un 5,5 % de lo que se había comprometido, ustedes tienen dos opciones: asumir su fracaso y seguir con la indignación de mucha gente que no entiende esta situación, o realmente, poner pie en pared, ser valientes y empezar a aplicar -como va a decir nuestra Resolución- procedimientos de infracción y sanciones a aquellos Estados que no cumplen.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (ΝΙ). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ίσως τον αρμόδιο για τη μετανάστευση Επίτροπο Αβραμόπουλο απασχολεί η πολιτική του επιβίωση, διότι μόνο κλαυσίγελο προκαλεί η αυτάρεσκη προσπάθεια να εμφανίσει ότι το πρόγραμμα μετεγκατάστασης αποδίδει και είναι επιτυχές. Ο αρχικός στόχος των 160.000 ατόμων για μετεγκατάσταση μειώθηκε σε 98.000, ενώ είναι πολύ πιθανό τελικά να μην υπερβεί τις 34.000, με καταληκτική διορία τα τέλη Σεπτεμβρίου. Κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο, θα παρουσιαστεί ως επιτυχία η μετεγκατάσταση περίπου 18.000 ατόμων σε σχεδόν δύο χρόνια. Απόδειξη του παράλογου σχεδιασμού του προγράμματος των μη ικανοποιητικά αποτρεπτικών μέτρων και του καταδικασμένου υποτιθέμενου ελέγχου των μεταναστευτικών ροών, είναι η αύξηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης κατά 36% στην Ιταλία το 2017, με ελάχιστο ποσοστό λαθρομεταναστών να πληρούν τα κριτήρια μετεγκατάστασης. Όσοι κατηγορούν την Ευρώπη πως γίνεται μία ήπειρος φρούριο, εγώ θα έλεγα πως μακάρι να ήταν. Ίσως τότε δεν θα επιτρεπόταν στις ΜΚΟ να συνεργάζονται με λαθροδιακινητές, αλλά κυρίως να εκβιάζεται η Ευρώπη απ' την Τουρκία του Ερντογάν. Τελικά όσοι κατηγορούν την Ένωση για αδράνεια, ίσως έχουν δίκιο. Σύντομα η Ευρώπη θα καταντήσει μία αποικία αφρικανών και ασιατών λαθρομεταναστών.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pan komisař konstatoval, že přerozdělování nefunguje, ale bohužel zde nebylo řečeno proč.

V květnu 2017 vydala Komise tabulku, která ukazuje velmi rozdílný přístup. Ostatně Velká Británie se rozhodla k důslednému řešení a odchází z Unie a není tajemstvím, že právě nelegální migrace a obavy z ní byly jedním z hlavních argumentů pro brexit. Solidarita je princip, na kterém EU stojí. Uprchlíci, kteří potřebují pomoc, kteří mají nárok na pomoc, těm musíme pomoci a capacity na to máme.

ČR se přihlásila k tomu, že přestože byla přehlasována, tak svoji kapacitu – necelých 3 000 uprchlíků – přijme. Do dnešního dne se bohužel tuto kapacitu nepodařilo naplnit a od ministerstva vnitra mám informaci, že to není jen neochota ČR, ale nepřipravenost uprchlíků k této realokaci.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, συμπληρώνονται δύο χρόνια από την πρότασή σας για δημιουργία προγράμματος μετεγκατάστασης. Τότε, την είχαμε καλωσορίσει ως δείγμα αλληλεγγύης. Ελπίζαμε ότι, επιτέλους, τα κράτη μέλη και η Επιτροπή κατάλαβαν πως η διαχείριση των προσφυγικών δεν αφορά μόνο τις χώρες της περιφέρειας. Παρά τις καλές σας προθέσεις, το αποτέλεσμα δεν είναι το αναμενόμενο. Μόνο 12.700 από τους 63.000 πρόσφυγες, όπως προβλεπόταν αρχικά, έχουν αυτή τη στιγμή μεταφερθεί από την Ελλάδα σε άλλες χώρες της Ένωσης. Συγχρόνως, από τις 62.000 που βρίσκονται εγκλωβισμένοι στην Ελλάδα, 50.000 είναι στην ηπειρωτική χώρα και οι υπόλοιποι στα νησιά του ανατολικού Αιγαίου. Θέλω να σας ρωτήσω, τι θα γίνει επιτέλους με τις χώρες που αρνούνται να συμμετάσχουν στο πρόγραμμα αυτό; Θα υποστούν τις ανάλογες κυρώσεις; Επίσης, μετά το καλοκαίρι που λήγει η ισχύς των αποφάσεων, τι σχέδια έχετε; Τι θα γίνει με τις χώρες που βρίσκονται στα εξωτερικά σύνορα; Τέλος, αυτή η συζήτηση διεξάγεται ενώ έχουν δει το φως της δημοσιότητας δημοσιεύματα που λένε ότι έχουμε αύξηση των κρουσμάτων σεξουαλικής εκμετάλλευσης των προσφύγων. Γι' αυτό λοιπόν συνυπογράφω την πρόταση του συναδέλφου Μιλτιάδη Κύρκου να δοθεί άμεση προτεραιότητα στους νέους πρόσφυγες για μετεγκατάσταση.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me start by expressing my thanks for this very interesting debate. I would like to repeat what Ms Kyenge said, that there is no solidarity à la carte. We have said it many times; and as Ms Ska Keller said, solidarity is one of the tools and ways for showing unity in practice.

Madame Griesbeck, vous avez, vous aussi, très bien souligné l'aspect moral de la relocalisation.

Let me say that I share many of your views and I count on your continued support, as I said in my introductory remarks.

Relocation is often reduced in numbers, but we should not forget that we are talking about people who are in need of protection. Our shared duty, moral and political, is to make sure that they get this protection as soon as possible and in a manageable way for the European Union. This is the essence of emergency relocation schemes.

That is why our focus right now is to make sure that everyone eligible is relocated to all Member States before September. Member States that have not yet relocated anyone, or have not relocated for more than a year, should make progress immediately. If no action is taken within a month, we will specify our position on making use of our powers under the Treaties, and in particular on the opening of infringement procedures: I am very clear on that.

Let me also say that I understand your concerns and remarks on the deadline and the future, but these relocation schemes have not been set up as an intermediary step in view of the reform of the Dublin system: they are an emergency measure. Of course, as we very clearly said, Member States' legal obligations do not stop after September 2017: if you have an outstanding bill, you have to pay it.

I also took note of your views on the opportunity to revise the scope of the relocation decisions. But, as I said, our priority at the moment is to relocate all migrants in need of protection who are currently eligible. We need to focus on that objective. If all Member States actively contribute, this is perfectly possible and feasible – and I count on you to help us make it happen.

Let me now shift to Greek since my compatriots have asked me some questions.

Αγαπητοί Έλληνες ευρωβουλευτές, μου δίνετε την ευκαιρία να πω δυο λόγια στη γλώσσα μας γι' αυτό το πολύ σημαντικό θέμα για την Ελλάδα η οποία βρίσκεται, όπως είπαμε πρωτότερα, μαζί με την Ιταλία στην πρώτη γραμμή με αποτέλεσμα αυτές οι δύο αυτές χώρες να δέχονται την μεγαλύτερη πίεση. Για την κατάσταση στην Ελλάδα θα ήθελα να τονίσω ότι, εάν τα κράτη μέλη τελικά ανταποκριθούν στις υποχρεώσεις τους, είναι απόλυτα εφικτό, όπως είπα πρωτότερα, να μετεγκατασταθούν, μέχρι τον Σεπτέμβριο, όλοι οι υποψήφιοι που βρίσκονται στην Ελλάδα, περίπου 12.400 άτομα. Θα ήθελα να τονίσω εδώ ότι η Ελλάδα έχει ολοκληρώσει όλες τις διαδικασίες και, εφόσον η καλή αυτή συνεργασία συνεχιστεί, θα πετύχουμε τους στόχους μας. Όπως είπα, κάποια κράτη μέλη δεν συνεργάζονται και, στο σημείο αυτό, θα ήθελα να πω ότι η ανοχή και η υπομονή αρχίζουν πλέον να εξαντλούνται. Πιστεύω ακράδαντα στην αξία της συνεννόησης, του διαλόγου και της πειθούς. Έτσι έπρεπε να ξεκινήσουμε και αυτό κάναμε. Τώρα όμως έχουμε φτάσει σε ένα οριακό σημείο.

Η απόδειξη ότι αυτή η στρατηγική αποφέρει τελικά αποτελέσματα είναι ότι οι ρυθμοί μετεγκατάστασης έχουν αυξηθεί σημαντικά τους τελευταίους μήνες. Όμως, όπως είπα στην αρχή, αν δεν υπάρξει συμμόρφωση, το επόμενο βήμα της Επιτροπής θα είναι, και να μην έχετε καμία αμφιβολία περί αυτού, να υποστηρίξει πολιτικά, αλλά και νομικά την πολιτική της. Όσον αφορά τώρα τη δήλωση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – Τουρκίας, θα ήθελα να σας πω, επειδή ακούστηκαν κάποια σχόλια πρωτότερα, ότι λειτουργεί και λειτουργούσε ακόμα και κάτω από πιεστικές και δύσκολες συνθήκες, με σημαντικά αποτελέσματα και, μιας και αναφέρθηκαν κάποιοι συνάδελφοί σας σε αριθμητικά στοιχεία, θέλω να σας πω ότι πριν από περίπου ένα χρόνο και δύο μήνες, σημειώνονταν μέχρι και 12.000 διελεύσεις την ημέρα, ενώ αυτός ο αριθμός έχει πέσει πλέον κατά μέσον όρο στα 50 με 60 άτομα και πρέπει να κρατήσουμε αυτή τη συμφωνία, αυτή τη συνεννόηση, ζωντανή. Οι δε επιστροφές, απ' την άλλη μεριά, προς την Τουρκία συνεχίζονται. Χθες βρέθηκαν στην Αθήνα και είχα συνάντηση με τους αρμόδιους υπουργούς της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης και, δεν σας κρύβω, ότι με ικανοποίηση ενημερώθηκα για την επιτάχυνση και αυτών των διαδικασιών. Και τέλος, όπως πολύ σωστά επεσήμανε ο κύριος Κύρκος: ναι, οι ασυνόδετοι ανήλικοι αποτελούν πράγματι την προτεραιότητά μας. Αυτό το μήνυμα πρέπει να περάσει σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη γιατί, ειδικά από την Ιταλία – νομίζω το έδιξαν κάποιοι Ιταλοί συνάδελφοί σας – δεν γίνονται αρκετές μετεγκατάστασης ανηλίκων. Να σημειώσω τέλος ότι και σ' αυτό το σημείο υπάρχει πρόοδος.

Και, σε κάθε περίπτωση, η συζήτηση που διεξάγεται σήμερα εδώ κατέδειξε ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στηρίζει την πολιτική των μετεγκαταστάσεων και τις προσπάθειες της Επιτροπής και θα ήθελα, στο σημείο αυτό, να εξάρω και το έργο των Ελλήνων ευρωβουλευτών, αλλά και να εκφράσω δημόσια τις ευχαριστίες μου προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο για τη στήριξη της πολιτικής μας. Από την πρώτη κιόλας στιγμή υπήρξατε οι βασικοί υποστηρικτές και τελικά θα κριθεί και από την δική σας συμβολή η επιτυχία της πολιτικής μας η οποία ανταποκρίνεται πλήρως και στο πνεύμα των Συνθηκών και στο βαθύτερο ηθικό και πολιτικό περιεχόμενο των αποφάσεων και της πολιτικής που από κοινού έχουμε υιοθετήσει.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Președinte. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc joi, 18 mai.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Lorenzo Cesa (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Non esiste ombra di dubbio che sia necessaria una strategia globale sul tema dei migranti. Per cercare di arginare la crisi, nell'estate del 2015 abbiamo adottato due decisioni di emergenza per ricollocare migliaia di rifugiati. Gli Stati in prima linea come Italia, Malta e Grecia hanno già fatto il loro dovere in termini di accoglienza. Il mio Paese ha soccorso più di 625 mila migranti dall'inizio dell'esodo. Nel 2016 il numero è aumentato di otto volte rispetto agli ultimi tre anni. Adesso tocca agli altri Stati che fanno parte dell'Unione farsi partecipi di una soluzione in linea con un dovere di accoglienza.

Quattro Stati membri stanno accettando numeri molto limitati di migranti, mentre due si rifiutano di partecipare alla ridistribuzione. L'applicazione concreta del principio di solidarietà, evocato dai Trattati è decisiva! Se non sapremo rispondere a questa emergenza avremo fallito il compito primario della nostra Unione.

Maria Grapini (S&D), *în scris*. – Transferul și relocarea sunt politici necesare pentru a rezolva criza refugiaților, dar trebuie să avem în vedere și prevenția. Când este un incendiu sigur acționăm să stingem focul, dar trebuie apoi verificată cauza și cine se face vinovat.

Faptul că trebuie să protejăm 23 000 de minori neînsoțiți nu poate fi pus în discuție. Copiii trebuie protejați! Dar a analizat cineva cum au ajuns copiii neînsoțiți? Ce facem să nu mai apară?

Apoi procesul de transfer al migranților nu trebuie să fie într-un singur sens. Comisia trebuie să stabilească clar cum vor fi repatriați azilanții. Și apoi, domnule comisar, trebuie să comunicați clar o politică comună privind securitatea cetățenilor europeni. Nu puteți să continuați să cereți tuturor statelor acceptarea de migranți, dar să vorbiți de asigurarea securității doar a spațiului Schengen.

Țara mea pe nedrept nu face parte din spațiul Schengen. Ce să le explic concetățenilor legat de obligațiile de a primi migranți, dar în același timp de excluderea lor de la măsurile de securitate? Cred că umanist ce sunt că drepturile și obligațiile trebuie să fie aceleași pentru orice cetățean european.

Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE), na piśmie. – Głowa Kościoła katolickiego, papież Franciszek, od miesięcy apeluje o aktywną pomoc uchodźcom. Wzywa wszystkich katolików, by okazywać wsparcie tym, którzy uciekli przed okrucieństwem wojny, i nie odwracać się od ich tragicznego losu.

Polska to kraj w przeważającej mierze katolicki. 87% Polaków uważa się za ludzi wierzących. Rządząca partia, na czele z prezesem PiS, Jarosławem Kaczyńskim, bardzo często odwołuje się do wartości chrześcijańskich i afiszuje się swoją religijnością. Tymczasem ich stosunek do kwestii uchodźców przepełniony jest nienawistną retoryką obliczoną na tani poklask, promującą tym samym postawy ksenofobiczne, czy wręcz rasistowskie. Jak bowiem interpretować słowa Jarosława Kaczyńskiego mówiącego, że uchodźcy roznoszą robactwo i inne choroby? Tę samą hipokryzję i cynizm prezentują najważniejsi politycy PiS, m.in. premier Beata Szydło, minister spraw wewnętrznych Mariusz Błaszczak czy prezydent Andrzej Duda.

Tak jak inni posłowie PSL nie zgadzam się na stałe kwoty relokacyjne uchodźców. Jednocześnie nie zgadzam się na odmawianie pomocy matkom z dziećmi, sierotom, nieletnim, którzy przebywają na terenie Grecji i Włoch. Oczywiście nie można nikogo zmuszać, by przyjechał do danego kraju, ale uważam, że Polska, w imię solidarności ludzkiej i europejskiej, jest w stanie i powinna przyjąć osoby najbardziej potrzebujące naszej pomocy.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Η Επιτροπή πανηγυρίζει στην τελευταία της έκθεση για τον ρεκόρ αριθμό μετεγκατάστασης προσφύγων που σημειώθηκε τον Μάρτιο. Και θεωρεί επιτυχία τις 16.000 μετεγκαταστάσεις που έγιναν μέχρι σήμερα, παρόλο που ο αρχικός στόχος που τέθηκε ήταν να μετεγκατασταθούν 160.000 πρόσφυγες. Μέχρι τότε θα συνεχίσουν τα κράτη να αρνούνται να φιλοξενήσουν τους πρόσφυγες παραβιάζοντας έτσι θεμελιώδεις αρχές της ΕΕ και ενισχύοντας ταυτόχρονα τις δυνάμεις ξеноφοβίας και ρατσισμού στην Ένωση; Μέχρι τότε θα γίνονται ανεχτά τα ρατσιστικά τους κριτήρια; Η Διεθνής Αμνηστία προειδοποιεί για τις απάνθρωπες συνθήκες επιβίωσης των προσφύγων. Αλλά η ΕΕ αποδεικνύεται κατώτερη των περιστάσεων για να επιδείξει έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη και ανθρωπισμό! Εάν θέλουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε την προσφυγική κρίση πρέπει να κατανεμηθούν ίσες ευθύνες. Να καταργηθεί ο κανονισμός «Δουβλίνο 2». Να αρθεί άμεσα η συμφωνία ανταλλαγής προσφύγων με την Τουρκία. Να ληφθούν κυρώσεις ενάντια στα κράτη που δεν τηρούν τις δεσμεύσεις τους και να δημιουργηθεί ένα μόνιμο και δίκαιο σύστημα μετεγκατάστασης των προσφύγων. Και το σημαντικότερο, να σταματήσει η Ένωση να στηρίζει τους πολέμους και τις ξένες επεμβάσεις γιατί αυτά δημιουργούν τα κύματα προσφύγων.

4. Globalisaation hallinta vuoteen 2025 (keskustelu)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind Declarația Comisiei referitoare la Valorificarea procesului de globalizare până în 2025 (2017/2655 (RSP)).

Jyrki Katainen, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, on the subject of globalisation and trade links with Beijing, I got back from there only a few hours ago, and if I look tired it is because of the long flight from Beijing.

Today we are discussing the reflection paper on harnessing or shaping globalisation. We are not passive in this regard, but rather an active operator in shaping or harnessing globalisation. This is the second of five planned reflection papers to steer the broad debate on the future of the EU further, following publication of the White Paper on 1 March. It takes an honest look at what globalisation has brought to the EU. The fact is that, even if the EU has greatly benefited from globalisation, this means little to our citizens if the benefits are not shared fairly and more evenly.

The benefits of globalisation are numerous. People travel, work, learn and live in different countries. They interact with each other on the web, sharing their ideas, cultures and experiences. Students have online access to courses run by leading universities across the world. Countries can produce more for less by specialising in what they do best and exploiting economies of scale. International competition and scientific cooperation have accelerated innovation. European exports have grown as customers worldwide demand the high-quality goods and services we supply. Eighty percent of our exporters are small and medium-sized companies so the beneficiaries of global value chains are those European SMEs and their workers. Actually, EUR 1 billion of exports supports 14 000 jobs in the EU. Imports are equally important as 80% of them consist of raw materials, capital goods and components necessary for the EU economy to function. Globalisation has also helped lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and has enabled poorer countries to catch up.

But globalisation also brings challenges. The benefits of globalisation are not shared evenly between regions and people. Many Europeans are concerned that globalisation is leading to inequality, job losses and social injustice or to a lowering of environmental health and privacy standards. For instance, countries with lower wages, environmental standards or taxes have increasingly competed with Europe in low-skill and low-value-added segments of industry, leading to factory closures, job losses or downward pressure on our workers' pay and conditions. Some foreign companies and governments have engaged in unfair trade practices, such as dumping, tax evasion or subsidisation, that can lead to overcapacity and unfair advantages.

These strategies deprive EU governments of tax revenues and contribute to unfairness. Many citizens consider that globalisation and uncontrolled migration directly threaten their identity and way of life. Citizens are anxious about not being able to control their own future, let alone the future of their children. These concerns must be recognised and addressed. However, the solution lies neither in isolationism, which has led to disastrous outcomes in the past, nor in laissez-faire politics.

The evidence presented in the reflection paper shows clearly that globalisation can be beneficial where it is properly harnessed. The EU must ensure a better distribution of the benefits of globalisation by working together with Member States and regions, as well as with international partners and other stakeholders. Together we should seize the opportunity to shape globalisation, in line with our own values and interests, in order to respond to its opportunities and challenges.

The question is how to do so, and it is vital to have an open and wide-ranging debate about that. The reflection paper offers some ideas in this respect. On the external front, the paper focuses on the need to shape a truly sustainable global order, based on shared values and a common agenda. The EU has always stood for a strong and effective multilateral global rulebook, and it should continue to develop this. For example, the EU could push for new rules and higher standards to create a level playing field by addressing harmful and unfair behaviour such as tax evasion, government subsidies or social dumping. Effective trade-defence instruments and better enforcement of domestic and international rules could also help the EU to act decisively against countries or companies that engage in unfair practices.

The EU's progressive trade and investment agreements should continue not only to open markets in a reciprocal way but also to enhance global governance on issues including human rights, working conditions, food safety and environmental protection.

On the domestic front, the paper insists on the need to protect and empower citizens through robust social policies and to provide the necessary education and training support throughout their lives. This will equip people for the future and will redistribute wealth more fairly.

The paper also underlines the importance of ensuring that Europe remains a competitive and innovative economy that will allow it to maintain its leading role in the world. This requires a vision for the future, in order to modernise our economy by embracing digitalisation, technological and social innovations, decarbonisation and the circular economy. It also requires smart specialisation, smart digital, industrial, tax or innovation policies and an improvement in the business environment.

The EU cannot achieve all of this by itself. It is a shared responsibility, not only of the EU and the Member States but also of regions and municipalities throughout Europe. The main word we have to assess carefully is 'resilience'. What are the policies needed in order to strengthen the resilience of our people – our citizens – and also our Member States?

Françoise Grossetête, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Vice-Président de la Commission, chers collègues, l'inquiétude de nos concitoyens quant à la mondialisation est très grande et c'est cette inquiétude qui nourrit les populismes de tout genre en Europe. On l'a encore constaté récemment en France, lors de la campagne qui a précédé l'élection présidentielle, où les extrêmes ont totalisé 40 % des voix lors du premier tour.

Je félicite donc la Commission, qui cherche à faire de la pédagogie sur la place de l'Europe dans le monde et sur les réponses concrètes à mettre en œuvre.

L'Union européenne doit vivre avec la mondialisation, mais elle doit la maîtriser et il est indispensable de ne pas nous replier sur nous-mêmes. Toutefois, l'Union européenne doit se défendre activement pour éviter de subir les conséquences néfastes d'une mondialisation qui est parfois sauvage. En outre – vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire –, l'équité dans le partage des bénéfices est indispensable.

Il faut donc accélérer d'urgence la modernisation de l'Union, de notre économie et des instruments de défense commerciale pour que le cas de l'acier, par exemple, ne soit pas isolé. Il faut être plus ambitieux sur la réciprocité d'accès aux marchés publics et soutenir notre industrie plutôt que d'acheter ailleurs ce que l'on produit en Europe.

Nos entreprises doivent pouvoir se battre à armes égales à l'international, nos emplois en dépendent. En 2050, aucun pays européen ne fera partie à lui seul des dix plus grandes économies. L'Union européenne trouve donc là une raison majeure d'exister. Comment négocier un accord commercial lorsque l'on a un poids économique dérisoire face à des pays comme la Chine, l'Inde ou les États-Unis? C'est là que la compétence européenne dans ce domaine est bien essentielle.

C'est pourquoi j'aurais aimé que nous soyons plus ambitieux, parce que votre document de réflexion est une bonne chose, mais il ne va pas assez loin. J'aurais souhaité un plan d'action concret sur des sujets aussi essentiels que le contrôle des investissements étrangers dans les domaines stratégiques – c'est cela qui garantit les emplois – car l'emploi est bien la seule réponse sociale pour nos concitoyens.

La mondialisation ne sera heureuse que si l'Union européenne n'est pas peureuse face aux défis qui s'imposent à elle.

Jeppe Kofod, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, on behalf of the S&D Group, I would like to congratulate Vice-President Katainen and First Vice-President Timmermans. With this reflection paper, the Commission is putting its finger squarely on perhaps the greatest challenge facing EU citizens: harnessing globalisation. Former UN Secretary-General Mr Kofi Annan captured the challenge before us when he said if globalisation is to succeed, it must succeed for poor and rich alike. It must deliver rights no less than riches. It must provide social justice and equality no less than economic prosperity and enhanced communication.

Globalisation has created enormous wealth. However, it has not been fairly shared. Instead, it has been enjoyed by a privileged few. Globalisation has spread industries, trade and services but it has also put established rights, standards, values, wages and even jobs under enormous pressure. When 45% of Europeans feel threatened by globalisation, this is not a challenge. It is a problem. And let us be honest. Unmanaged globalisation creates real problems for ordinary citizens. Real wages for middle class Europeans have stagnated or even decreased, and youth unemployment remains close to 20% in the euro area. While citizens bear the burden of austerity-only policies and reduced welfare, the world's richest companies and individuals pay as little as 0.005% in tax, as was the case with Apple in Ireland. Since 2015, the richest one per cent of the world's population has owned more wealth than the remaining 99%. This is not harnessing globalisation. This is globalisation run amok.

The latest Eurobarometer shows that 74% of Europeans want more EU action against tax fraud. Let us take our cue from them. Let us act now. Therefore, I propose that the Commission develop a public 'harnessing globalisation' scoreboard. Let us make it crystal clear what the EU is doing to harness globalisation. When we adopt the EU blacklist on tax havens with strong sanctions, when real wages across Europe stop rising, then we will see real change. So I hope you will establish this scoreboard and I think you should do it right now.

Hans-Olaf Henkel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Katainen! Sie haben natürlich Recht: Die Globalisierung ist ein Segen für die Menschheit. Den Ländern, die sich davon abschotten, geht es ja wirtschaftlich viel schlechter als den Ländern, die daran teilnehmen. Wir sehen das zum Beispiel an Kuba oder an Nordkorea oder neuerdings auch an Venezuela. Vergessen wir doch nicht, dass die Globalisierung nicht nur Waren, Kapital und Dienstleistungen, sondern auch Werte, Ideen, Menschenrechte und Demokratie um die Welt bringt. Das ist richtig! Die vermeintlichen Verlierer der Globalisierung, wie zum Beispiel Länder in Afrika, leiden darunter, weil die Globalisierung an ihnen vorbeigeht, sie leiden nicht durch die Globalisierung.

Deshalb bin ich der Meinung, wir sollten hier in diesem Parlament mit der europäischen Nabelschau einmal aufhören und die ganze Welt in den Blick nehmen. Gerade hat ein schönes portugiesisches Lied den European Song Contest gewonnen, aber doch kein europäisches. Auch unsere Unternehmen in Europa denken schon längst national und global, aber doch nicht europäisch. Haben Sie von einem europäischen Automarkt gehört? Ich kenne ihn nicht. Es gibt einen japanischen Automarkt, einen deutschen, einen amerikanischen, einen britischen.

Also hören wir auf mit der weiteren Vertiefung der Europäischen Union, bemühen wir uns um die Vollendung und die Erweiterung des Binnenmarkts, und laden wir dazu gleich am Anfang Großbritannien ein!

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, how to make globalisation a win-win and avoid a race to the bottom is the billion euro question. In recent years, trade agreements have been hotly debated and I remain convinced that the EU should lead in promoting rules-based trade as a frame around globalisation. This frame of rules must always be based on our fundamental principles and high standards, and take off the sharp edges that globalisation can indeed exacerbate.

The Commission's Trade for All strategy and the globalisation paper published last week map out what this leadership should look like. We must be rule makers, not rule takers. I believe there is room for more focus on the impact of technology on jobs and inequality. As much focus as there has been on trade, we hear little about the future of work, as well as the significance of maintaining the rule of law in a hyper-connected world. Here, too, the EU must be a global leader, especially as the US retracts, including when it comes to setting norms in the digital economy and digital trade.

But that is only part of the picture. The EU Member States should take much more responsibility for redistributing the macroeconomic benefits of access to third country markets more evenly at home, to re-school, redistribute and innovate as much as possible. Why do we not see a white paper from them? Indeed, let us not overlook how globalisation and interconnectedness around the world has lifted hundreds of millions out of poverty and creates mutual dependence, which contributes to greater stability. Europeans benefit from globalisation. Our smartphones, clothes and many different foods would not be in our homes and lives without it. Let us make sure we look at the impact of globalisation and the technological revolution in a comprehensive way and avoid a race to the bottom. Let us meet the challenges by finding solutions, not in isolation or protectionism, but by taking this a step forward.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Begriff Globalisierung beschreibt eine Produktionsmethode, in der sehr große Unternehmen das Endprodukt definieren und dafür international optimierte Produktions- und Wertschöpfungsketten aufbauen. Machen wir uns bewusst: Es sind Menschen, deren Schicksale in diesen Arbeitsprozessen verbunden werden. Vor 150 Jahren schrieb Karl Marx im Kapital schon von der notwendigen Anpassung der Produktionsverhältnisse an die Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte.

Wir müssen für die Lebensqualität aller Menschen entlang der Wertschöpfungskette Sorge tragen und den regulatorischen Rahmen dafür schaffen. Das gilt für Arbeitnehmerrechte, für Menschenrechte, für den Schutz der Natur bei der Produktion. Das gilt auch für Steuern und damit den gerechten Beitrag zum Gemeinwohl aus einer Wirtschaftskette.

Wir müssen für Produkte, die auf den EU-Markt gelangen, eine breite Sorgfaltspflicht einführen. Wer am Ende einer Kette den größten Gewinn erzielen will, muss in die Verantwortung für die Produktionsbedingungen genommen werden.

Ich würdige ausdrücklich, dass die Kommission die neuen Zielstellungen für nachhaltige Entwicklung in ihrem Papier als Maßstab betont. Das müssen wir in unseren Gesetzgebungen und Standards durchdeklinieren. Nachhaltige Entwicklung definiert den Rahmen wirtschaftlicher Entwicklung – überall.

Yannick Jadot, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Président, vous venez de découvrir que la mondialisation générerait des perdants. Bravo pour votre lucidité.

Vous venez de découvrir que la mondialisation était deux fois plus grosse que la planète, qu'il y avait deux fois trop de prédation sur les ressources, deux fois trop de pollution. Bravo pour votre clairvoyance! Vous venez de découvrir à vos dépens, grâce à la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, qu'on ne peut pas faire une politique commerciale contre les citoyens qui s'étaient mobilisés à travers des pétitions contre le TAFTA et contre le CETA. Vous venez d'apprendre à vos dépens, grâce à la Cour de justice, qu'on ne peut pas faire une politique commerciale contre les parlements nationaux. Mais ce que vous proposez, c'est toujours la même chose: soit la mondialisation, c'est-à-dire continuer – en faisant un peu mieux, en communiquant un peu mieux – à mettre en concurrence les territoires, les salariés et les choix de société et, ainsi, à construire les extrêmes droites, soit l'isolationnisme et les extrêmes droites qui, d'ailleurs, en Grande-Bretagne, aujourd'hui, ne veulent que du libre-échange.

Il y a une troisième voie. C'est de soumettre les politiques commerciales aux politiques climatiques comme l'accord de Paris, aux enjeux de santé, aux droits sociaux et à la démocratie. Alors là, l'Europe protégera les...

(Le Président coupe le micro de l'orateur)

Rolandas Paksas, *EFDD frakcijos vardu*. – Pone pirmininke, kolegos. Man gi atrodo, kad mes diskutuojame klausimu, kuris savo prasme yra neteisingas. Jei globalizacija kuria gerovę visuomenei, neigiamų pasekmių lyg ir neturėtų būti. Jeigu mes iš anksto rengiamės pripažinti kitaip ir šiandien diskutuojame apie neigiamas globalizacijos pasekmes, tai mes *a priori* turime sutikti, kad atitinkamo lygio Europos ir pasaulio politikai nesugeba, nesugebėjo ir neaišku, ar sugebės ateitį užtikrinti visuomenės apsaugą nuo neigiamų globalizacijos pasekmių. Tad šiandien daug įdomesnė galėtų būti diskusija ne apie globalizacijos žalą, bet klausimo dėl visuotinio Europos Sąjungos referendumo svarstymas dėl Bendrijos narių pritarimo ar nepritario transatlantinių kompanijų veiklos metodų ir monopolio apribojimui, dėl globalių kompanijų apmokestinimo bent jau tiek, kiek apmokestinimas smulkus ir vidutinis verslas.

Edouard Ferrand, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous faites preuve d'un cynisme absolu.

Vous avez délibérément jeté les peuples européens dans la mondialisation la plus vertigineuse, la plus dangereuse avec votre politique de libre-échange absolue et la kyrielle de traités que vous avez imposés, avec votre politique de submersion migratoire qui vise à l'effondrement de l'identité de nos nations et de la civilisation européenne, avec votre soumission à des intérêts diplomatiques et stratégiques qui ne sont pas ceux des nations ou de continents, de l'Atlantique à l'Oural.

Aussi, lorsque vous entendez évoquer les ravages de la mondialisation, faites d'abord votre mea-culpa.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, la Commission a fermé les yeux pendant plus de 20 ans sur les conséquences néfastes de la mondialisation. Elle en a été l'un des artisans actifs, l'exécutant extrêmement zélé, et elle admet aujourd'hui qu'il peut y avoir des problèmes. C'est bien, mais très insuffisant.

Si je lis le document de réflexion publié la semaine dernière, je n'y vois que la réaffirmation de l'inéluctabilité de la mondialisation, son caractère principalement bénéfique analysé de façon purement comptable. Les futures actions que l'on dessine, à part un pilotage accru des politiques nationales, sont surtout la continuation des politiques actuelles.

Tant que vous resterez dans le système de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce, dans le système d'un libre-échange généralisé de libre circulation sans contrôle des personnes, des marchandises et des capitaux, vous ne pourrez pas protéger les Européens contre les effets néfastes de la mondialisation, à commencer par ceux qui résultent de la concurrence déloyale des bas salaires et des emplois pratiqués dans des conditions d'esclavage en dehors de l'Union européenne.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Globalisierung findet statt, und da kann man entweder richtig mitmachen, oder man kann es richtig bleiben lassen. Wir erleben ein Land auf der Welt, das macht da nicht mit, nämlich Nordkorea. Dass es den Menschen in Nordkorea so dreckig geht, liegt zum einen an dem Menschen verachtenden Diktator, aber zum zweiten auch daran, dass das Land komplett abgeschottet ist und die Menschen keinerlei Zugang zu internationalen Warenströmen und den Vorteilen davon haben.

Wenn wir also bei Globalisierung mitmachen wollen, dann müssen wir Globalisierung gestalten. Das ist genau das, was wir als Europäische Union schon seit Langem tun. Unsere Unternehmen profitieren: Autos, Champagner, Gemüse, Mode, alle möglichen Produkte aus europäischer Produktion verkaufen wir in die ganze Welt, und auf der anderen Seite profitieren unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger, unsere Verbraucher von einem Riesenangebot aus der ganzen Welt. Wer sich mal kurz besinnt, was er in den letzten Tagen und Wochen alles eingekauft hat und wo es herkommt, der weiß sehr wohl, dass Globalisierung etwas ist, was, richtig gemacht, sehr große Vorteile haben kann.

Was wir doch de facto brauchen, ist eine geregelte Globalisierung. Wir sollten uns gemeinsam überlegen, wie wir auch von mancher Fehlleitung, die wir über unsere Begriffe haben, wegkommen. Wir nennen unsere Abkommen meistens Freihandelsabkommen. Aber das Thema, Märkte zu öffnen, ist doch heutzutage nur noch ein kleinster Teil unserer Abkommen. In aller Regel sind unsere Abkommen doch Abkommen, um Globalisierung zu regeln, um Handelsbeziehungen zu regeln, um unsere Standards durchzusetzen und genau die Sorgen und Nöte unserer Bürgerinnen aufzugreifen. In dem Sinne wünsche ich mir, dass wir gemeinsam mit der Kommission unsere Handelspolitik weiterentwickeln.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – In de reflectienota van de Europese Commissie staan interessante uitgangspunten. De Commissie wordt vaak ten onrechte, maar vaak ook terecht verweten alleen maar met het liberale gedachtegoed bezig te zijn. Het is heel belangrijk dat daar nu grenzen aan worden gesteld. Interessant is dat sociale en ecologische normen op gelijke voet moeten worden geplaatst met economische uitgangspunten. Interessant is ook dat we in de Europese Unie veel meer moeten investeren om onze mensen weerbaar te maken en een eerlijke verdeling van de welvaart mogelijk te maken.

Maar, beste Commissie, we moeten oppassen dat we niet alleen interessante nota's schrijven. Uit recent onderzoek blijkt dat de bevolking pro-Europees blijft maar grote vraagtekens plaatst bij de oplossingen die Europa aanreikt. Er moet boter bij de vis komen. Met andere woorden: we moeten onze handelsakkoorden, ons investeringsbeleid en ons fiscaal beleid binnen de Europese Unie op een heel andere leest schoeien.

Marian Harkin (ALDE), blue-card question. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commission for this paper, but it is not before time. Often, the debate on globalisation is polarised. On one side we have the gung-ho supporters of free trade, regardless, and on the other we have the protectionists, for whom no trade deal is ever right. For me, this is the challenge of our generation: to manage globalisation so that free trade is fair trade. As you said, Commissioner, this must ensure that the benefits of trade are distributed fairly among our citizens. But in the last decade this has not happened in the EU. While our economy has grown overall, real incomes of middle-class households have largely stagnated.

Commissioner, some of the messages to be sent to our citizens are contradictory. We, for example, have extra-judicial courts to enforce investors' rights but no binding mechanism to enforce environmental standards, health and safety standards and decent work conditions. However, I do welcome this paper and the work done by Commissioner Vestager in trying to ensure that large corporations pay their fair share of tax, a crucial element for fair globalisation. At EU level, investment in universal broadband access allied to lifelong learning will be essential if EU citizens are to benefit from globalisation. Finally, as rapporteur for the Globalisation Fund, I believe it has a role to play in providing a safety net, but it must be adequately resourced and sufficiently flexible so that it is available to workers in the SME sector.

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

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – Thank you very much for taking the question. It was an excellent speech, if I may say so: a lot better than we normally get around here. You actually mentioned large corporations paying their share of tax. What do you think of the way that the Government of Luxembourg has handled this issue over the past 10 to 15 years? I just wonder if you have an opinion about that.

Marian Harkin (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – This is a global issue and probably can only be solved at a global level, and the OECD is doing some excellent work there with their BEPS project. Commissioner Vestager is pushing out the boat at European level and that needs to be done. A number of governments in the EU need to look at this issue to ensure that the mismatches between tax systems cannot be exploited by large corporations. I think all governments have a responsibility, but some more than others. I am not going to mention names.

Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL). – Hr. formand! Globalisering har store fordele og store ulemper. Der er ikke nogen tvivl om, at rigtig mange mennesker har fået mere frihed og mere rigdom ud af de store forandringer, men vi må ikke være blinde over for skyggesiderne af globaliseringen. Vi har grupper af mennesker, som virkelig har tabt på helt afgørende punkter: De har mistet deres job, de har mistet muligheden for at forsørge deres familier, og ikke mindst har de mistet troen på en bedre fremtid.

Det betyder ikke, at globalisering i sig selv er en dårlig ting, men det betyder, at vi skal tøjle den langt bedre i dag, end vi hidtil har gjort.

I denne forbindelse må man sige, at EU's økonomiske politik har været med til at trække udviklingen i den gale retning. Vi skal styrke fagforeningerne, vi skal ikke knække deres ret til at forhandle, som vi har gjort i Grækenland. Vi skal styrke det sociale sikkerhedsnet og ikke forringe det, som EU har krævet gennem anbefalinger i en lang række lande, og vi skal skabe nye arbejdspladser ved at investere og ikke ved at skære ned og ned, som finanspagten kræver.

Når borgerne mister troen på en bedre fremtid, skal vi søreme tage det meget, meget alvorligt.

Petr Mach (EFDD). – Pan komisař Katainen tady představil plány, jak chce Evropská komise zvládat globalizaci do roku 2025. Podle mě je to z podstaty nesmyslná myšlenka.

My se můžeme přizpůsobit globalizaci, obchodu, kontraktům, které mezi sebou dělají jednotlivé firmy, jednotliví lidé, ale ne s ní bojovat. Já, když jsem slyšel pana komisaře, jak si vymezil vůči *laissez-faire* volného trhu a jak se další řečníci vymezovali vůči svobodnému trhu, tak mám pocit, že jsem zde asi jediný, kdo zastává ten princip *laissez-faire* volného trhu.

Když jsem poslouchal, pan Scholz zde dokonce citoval Karla Marxe, další zde volali po vytváření černých listin zemí s nízkými daněmi atd. Takže já mám pocit, že bez ohledu na politickou stranu tady sedí vedle sebe jenom samý socialista, komunista, jen Komise, to je výjimka, tam jsou samí socialisté vedle sebe.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Economisten, multinationals, bankiers, politici en media hebben jarenlang de voordelen van de globalisering overschat en overdreven terwijl de nadelen werden weggerelativeerd. De Commissie erkent nu op een halve bladzijde dat de mondialisering ook negatieve effecten heeft, maar besluit vervolgens niettemin dat er geen weg terug is. Wat ondertussen in de Europese industrie verkeerd afloopt, wordt dichtgeplamuurd met alweer een Globaliseringsfonds, dat de pijn van de meest ophefmakende fabriekssluitingen moet camoufleren.

In die globale wereld is er altijd wel iemand die ergens voor minder geld en minder sociale bescherming zijn arbeid wil of moet verkopen. De hyperglobalisering leidt tot een economie waarbij producten gemaakt worden door kinderhanden in het oosten en geconsumeerd worden door steuntrekkers in het westen. Met als gevolg: hongerlonen in lageloonlanden, werkloosheid in het westen en milieuvervuiling door transport. We hebben een nieuwe economie nodig die zonder isolationisme maar ook zonder naïviteit de kansen van de vrije markt benut. Kortom, een economie voor onze eigen Europese bevolking.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εντελώς απροσδόκητα οι χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως δέχθηκαν την ισχυρή επίθεση της παγκοσμιοποίησης και οι λαοί συνειδητοποίησαν ότι κινδυνεύει να καταστραφεί η εθνική, κοινωνική, οικονομική, θρησκευτική και πολιτισμική τους ύπαρξη. Πρέπει λοιπόν να αντιδράσουμε. Πρώτα απ' όλα, τα κράτη πρέπει να ενισχύσουν την εσωτερική τους συνοχή, διατηρώντας τις αρχές και τις αξίες της ιστορίας και του πολιτισμού τους. Πρέπει επίσης η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να αλλάξει τη μορφή που έχει σήμερα. Πρέπει να γίνει πάλι η ένωση των λαών και των εθνών, ούτως ώστε να ενδιαφερθεί με αγάπη για τον πολίτη, να ασχοληθεί με τα προβλήματά του και να τον προστατεύσει. Τα κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως πρέπει να συνεργαστούν με ισοτιμία και αλληλεγγύη, ούτως ώστε να μπορέσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να διαμορφώσει μια οικονομική πολιτική που θα της επιτρέψει να συνάψει επωφελείς γι' αυτήν συμφωνίες με άλλα κράτη. Πρέπει να συνεργαστεί με τις άλλες παγκόσμιες δυνάμεις, ούτως ώστε να σταματήσουν οι πόλεμοι, να σταματήσει η παράνομη μετανάστευση, να αναπτυχθούν οι τρίτες χώρες και, τέλος, να μπορέσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να διατηρήσει τις αξίες της. Πρέπει, για να τιθασεύσουμε και να χαλιναγωγήσουμε την παγκοσμιοποίηση, να δεχθούμε τις οποιοδήποτε θετικές πλευρές της και να τις ελέγξουμε, γιατί όπως έλεγε αρχαίοι Έλληνες «ουδέν κακόν αμιγές καλού».

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, Caras e Caros Colegas, a União Europeia precisa de estar unida para aproveitar as oportunidades e vencer, em simultâneo, os desafios decorrentes da globalização. Só unidos, de forma coordenada, de forma concertada, é que poderemos modelar, controlar e regular a globalização.

Orgulhosamente sós, os protecionismos defendidos pelos radicais de esquerda e de direita não são solução, quebram a solidariedade e aumentam a pobreza.

A União Europeia tem de atuar em conjunto e de forma solidária para impor reciprocidade e uma concorrência justa e leal. Na União Europeia, temos de apostar no conhecimento, na inovação e investigação, no combate à pobreza e às desigualdades.

Em simultâneo, temos de exportar os valores da democracia, o respeito pelos direitos humanos, a defesa dos direitos sociais e ambientais.

Não podemos ter medo.

Juntos seremos capazes de deixar um mundo melhor para as gerações vindouras e a globalização modelada permitirá mais qualidade de vida para todos os habitantes do planeta e, a nivelar, tem de ser sempre por cima. Evitar o *dumping* social, evitar as desigualdades é algo que poderemos conseguir e temos a obrigação de o conseguir, todos unidos.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Es ist völlig klar, dass wir am Anfang einer Debatte über die Globalisierung stehen – wie wir Globalisierung gerecht managen können. Ich finde gut, dass die Kommission auch einen integrierten Ansatz fährt, die externen und die internen Dimensionen beachtet, wobei ich zwischen den Punkten drei und vier noch ein Ungleichgewicht sehe, dass die externen stärker in den Fokus genommen werden und man die internen sicherlich noch mal ein bisschen weiterentwickeln könnte. Zu den externen gehört natürlich Handelspolitik eminent dazu!

Und die Frage, dass wir jetzt nicht nur Handelsbarrieren abreißen und dann der Welt ihren Lauf lassen, sondern Regeln setzen wollen, das ist explizit formuliert, und das finde ich richtig und gut.

Auch, dass der Europäische Gerichtshof heute in dem Urteil über das Singapur-Abkommen gesagt hat, dass die nachhaltige Entwicklung, Arbeitnehmerrechte und Umweltstandards wesentlicher Bestandteil der Handelspolitik sind, und dass deren Einhaltung auch zum Maßstab für weitere Schritte genommen werden muss, ist richtig und das muss Konsequenzen für zukünftige Handelsabkommen haben.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, sabemos há muito que a chamada globalização, viabilizada pelas aquisições da ciência e da técnica, não é neutra do ponto de vista político.

Esta globalização correspondeu à expansão e consolidação das relações de produção capitalistas e à afirmação do capitalismo como formação económica e social dominante à escala planetária.

Os efeitos desta globalização são os efeitos do sistema que a produziu. As suas contradições são também as contradições do sistema que a produziu: a contradição entre o carácter social da produção e a apropriação privada dos meios de produção, a contradição entre um sistema que ou cresce e acumula ou morre e os limites de uma terra que, sendo generosa, é finita.

A cada vez maior concentração da riqueza nas mãos de uma ínfima minoria tem, do outro lado da moeda, a globalização da exploração do homem e da natureza, a pobreza, a exclusão, a iliteracia, a doença e a guerra.

A União Europeia é um agente desta globalização.

O socialismo é a única saída.

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). – Mr President, reading between the lines, the Vice-President of the Commission seems to think that the EU can, like a kind of King Canute, roll back the tide of globalisation. Well this is of course not only not true, but also absurd. Now my new great friend as of the last four years, the Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström, was at one time apparently a psychiatric nurse, and it would seem that these psychiatric skills are badly needed within the Commission. I hope that Cecilia Malmström will have a moment to administer to her colleagues.

At every voting session here in the European Parliament, colleagues vote for rules, laws and regulations that inhibit innovation and destroy jobs, and the direct consequence is low growth, or zero growth, or even minus growth such as that which exists in Greece and Italy. I can see that the Vice-Commissioner finds that very amusing. This is not the way to deal with globalisation. You should think again.

President. – I hope that if the Commissioner accepts your suggestion she will have an assured place of work in Europe!

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, le document de réflexion présenté par la Commission la semaine passée arrive au moment opportun pour alimenter notre réflexion d'ensemble sur l'avenir de l'Europe à l'horizon 2025.

La mondialisation est un fait qu'il faut bien sûr intégrer dans notre analyse comme une chance potentielle à exploiter, plutôt que de la présenter comme la source de tous les maux de notre société.

Bien sûr, dire que la mondialisation est la source de tous les maux est une erreur. Cela provoque le repli sur soi, la montée des populismes en tous genres et le retour du protectionnisme qui – c'est le paradoxe – ne protège pas assez et est une illusion. Aujourd'hui, parler du protectionnisme, c'est vraiment manquer un peu de raison.

Pour profiter pleinement de cette chance qu'offre la mondialisation, il faut que l'Europe s'invente une identité particulière et, du point de vue des affaires étrangères – dont je m'occupe au quotidien –, cela signifie promouvoir une coopération internationale renforcée pour établir un ordre international qui repose sur des règles et sur des normes élevées.

L'ouverture des marchés et les avancées technologiques ne sont pas en contradiction avec la protection des droits de l'homme et la protection du bien-être. C'est notre philosophie.

Je crois que l'Union européenne est un exemple réussi d'ouverture économique fondée sur des règles et sur cette protection des droits. Nous avons le devoir d'assumer le rôle de chef de file et de continuer de défendre cette combinaison entre l'ouverture des marchés et les droits.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Bruno Gollnisch (NI), question «carton bleu». – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, mon cher collègue, vous vous êtes élevé contre le protectionnisme. Admettez-vous cependant que, conformément à un usage séculaire, des droits de douane – qui n'ont jamais empêché complètement le commerce – puissent, par exemple, compenser l'avantage qui résulterait, pour un exportateur, des bas salaires qu'il pratique sur le plan intérieur?

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE), réponse «carton bleu». – Je crois que votre question part d'une mauvaise compréhension de ce qu'est le marché. Comme le disait tout à l'heure M. Henkel, mon collègue du groupe conservateur, le marché, c'est le mouvement des biens, des personnes ou des idées et chacun profite de ce qu'il a de meilleur.

Parfois, il est intéressant pour un travailleur d'accepter un salaire plus bas que celui de chez vous s'il vient par exemple de Bulgarie ou de Roumanie. Parfois, c'est un Français qui souhaite promouvoir une idée qui n'a pas encore été inventée en Pologne ou en Lettonie. Le résultat, c'est cette réalité complexe qu'on appelle marché. Ce sont des biens, des personnes, et chacun tire avantage de ce qu'il a de mieux – une capacité de travail, de réflexion, d'invention. C'est ça le marché. Ce n'est pas ce que vous voulez faire en isolant un pays ou un autre.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Het stuk “Het in goede banen leiden van de mondialisering” heb ik met veel interesse gelezen want er bestaat inderdaad een spanning tussen de winnaars en de verliezers van de globalisering. De discussie-nota van de Commissie kunnen we wat mij betreft dus echt als een omslagpunt zien. Niet langer worden alleen maar de voordelen van vrijhandel en globalisering benadrukt. De Commissie komt nu met voorstellen voor eerlijke handel en voor bescherming tegen oneerlijke concurrentie. Wat mij betreft moeten we in het vervolg ook tot afdwingbare sociale en milieunormen komen.

Tegelijkertijd moeten we ook duidelijk zijn: de Commissie zit niet op de stoel van de lidstaten. Juist de lidstaten hebben veel instrumenten in handen om ervoor te zorgen dat we komen tot een eerlijke verdeling van de lasten en lusten van de handel in de wereld. Hervordering van gegroeide welvaart gaat via belastingen, uitkeringen en toeslagen. Ik zou dus zeggen: hulde aan de Commissie dat ze het debat op gang brengt, maar roep ook de lidstaten op hun welvaart te versterken, want dat is wat er nu moet gebeuren.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, over the last decade we have talked mostly about unheralded crises and emergencies, but we cannot use these words when coping with globalisation because it is a long-term challenge and opportunity. We must look at the big picture when working on the future of Europe. Today our duty is to persuade European citizens that we must resist our own European backlash against international trade and international trade agreements and be involved in shaping globalisation.

A lot of answers to the globalisation challenge are to be given at national level. I am thinking here of education and training and of coping with inequalities and exclusion. Industries based on the new drivers of growth must go global to be competitive, but we also need an educated discussion on our role as Europe in shaping globalisation. Only then can Europe deliver as the best possible vehicle to make globalisation work for us. A big question is whether a future EU-US global leadership on rules-based, open, fair trade in a multilateral framework is still possible. We must work on it.

But of course, globalisation is much more than trade. Neither Europe nor the US can profit from global uncertainty or instability or weak global governance that is not relevant, efficient, transparent and accountable. Let me conclude by saying that sustainable globalisation can happen only through cooperation among outward-looking partners.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare la Commissione per questo documento sulla globalizzazione, un processo che è di fatto la realtà in cui viviamo e che va indubbiamente governato, finalmente ce ne siamo resi conto.

Intanto è bene capirsi, quando parliamo di globalizzazione abbiamo oggi sempre più a che fare con una competizione mondiale basata sulla capacità di innovazione tecnologica per far fronte alle sfide di un'economia lineare che non regge più il consumo attuale delle risorse del pianeta e in grado di mettere sul mercato prodotti e servizi che possono rispondere meglio alle esigenze dei consumatori.

Insomma, per tornare a crescere e per continuare a garantire il nostro prezioso sistema di *welfare*, dobbiamo allora posizionarci nei settori chiave ad alta tecnologia. Per fare questo dobbiamo puntare con decisione su investimenti, risorse fresche in ricerca e innovazione e aiutare le imprese, soprattutto le piccole e medie imprese, cuore del nostro sistema, a rinnovarsi e dall'altra parte, però, mettere in campo politiche di protezione sociale per gli esclusi da questo processo e politiche che sappiano ridistribuire i benefici a tutta la fascia della popolazione.

L'Europa ha la dimensione e la capacità per stare da protagonista in questo scenario se, però, cominciamo subito a mettere in atto azioni concrete.

Tokia Saïfi (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, contrôler la mondialisation, c'est avant tout mettre en place une concurrence équitable et loyale. L'ensemble des acteurs économiques doit respecter les mêmes règles. Nous ne voulons plus de cette Europe naïve qui ouvre ses marchés sans contrepartie.

La Commission commence enfin, mais timidement, à parler de réciprocité. Il est grand temps qu'elle en fasse un pilier de sa politique commerciale, comme nous le demandons depuis de nombreuses années. Notre unité doit être notre force et nous devons le démontrer en agissant de façon concertée.

Nous devons également lutter contre toutes les formes de dumping, qu'il soit social, environnemental ou fiscal, et, par conséquent, j'espère que les discussions sur la modernisation des instruments de défense commerciale seront bientôt terminées et permettront de les renforcer.

Enfin, je souhaite rappeler que c'est dans cette optique de maîtrise de la mondialisation que nous avons appelé, avec mes collègues du groupe PPE, à ce que la Commission légifère en matière d'investissements étrangers. Nous ne pouvons pas laisser plus longtemps des investisseurs étrangers prendre le contrôle des secteurs stratégiques en Europe. La Commission doit absolument donner suite à cette démarche, et ce au plus vite.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the Commission paper on harnessing globalisation says that the EU must pursue a progressive trade and investment agenda which not only opens markets but enhances governance on issues like human rights, working conditions and environmental protection.

Many of us have been vocal in opposing certain EU trade proposals like EPAs, ISDS and TTIP, CETA and others. However, we need to recognise that the EU is the only large international actor, which makes it a stated priority to advance on progressive social values. This is an agenda that we must defend and strengthen by emphasising, for example, the decent work agenda and the alternative trade mandate.

In the meantime, my own government in the UK is desperately trying to strike up shameful trade deals and arms deals at all costs with various serial human rights violators, such as Saudi Arabia. I am very afraid that a Brexit led by Tory Britain would not be a progressive force in this world. Britain must continue to work with the EU regardless of Brexit to advance progressive social and benign globalisation for the good of all of us on this planet.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso (PPE). – Señor presidente, la globalización trae oportunidades pero, no nos cabe duda, también comporta retos. Es la realidad que ha traído progreso para todos, pero también dificultades para muchos, dificultades que explota el populismo: saca partido de quienes se preguntan de qué sirve tener un iPhone si no pueden tener trabajo.

Europa, por el contrario, les da respuestas. Hablo del Fondo de Adaptación, que ayuda a quienes pierden su empleo; hablo de la política de cohesión, que trabaja para que nadie se quede atrás. Pero ello no es suficiente. La política de cohesión ha de seguir siendo el pegamento de Europa porque constituye la solidaridad de esta, y el resto de herramientas que se utilicen han de tener un valor añadido.

Hay que reconfigurar la globalización a base de políticas sociales, como se manifestó en la Declaración de Roma del pasado mes de marzo. Pongámonos, pues, en marcha sin perder un solo segundo.

Por ello, creo que la Comisión acierta con esta reflexión, porque la globalización no puede servir solo para tener un iPhone; también debe servir para que en nuestras regiones haya trabajo.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, estamos ante el reto de salvar a la globalización de sí misma. La ola de nativismo —proteccionismo con tintes autoritarios— que ha recorrido Occidente durante el último año y medio está directamente relacionada con los malestares producto de la globalización.

El comercio internacional ha sacado a centenares de millones de personas de la pobreza —es innegable— pero, a la vez, ahonda en unas desigualdades que nos están desgarrando y genera no pocos perdedores: los perdedores de la globalización.

Si queremos continuar disfrutando de sociedades abiertas, es necesario: uno, imponer reglas claras, sostenibles y exigentes a la globalización, al mismo tiempo que restituir los mecanismos de compensación para repartir sus beneficios.

Para proteger la dimensión liberal política de la Ilustración, que hoy está en jaque, la única forma es restituir nuestro modelo social.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Αντιπρόεδρε Katainen, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, είμαστε σήμερα εδώ για να συζητήσουμε τον τρόπο με τον οποίον θα κατανείμουμε τα οφέλη της παγκοσμιοποίησης αλλά, κυρίως, οφείλουμε να δώσουμε μία απάντηση στο φόβο των αποκλεισμένων από την παγκοσμιοποίηση. Οι αριθμοί που περιλαμβάνονται στο έγγραφο προβληματισμού της Επιτροπής παρουσιάζουν τις διαστάσεις της μεγάλης πρόκλησης της παγκοσμιοποίησης. Ένα δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ συναλλαγών, 14.000 θέσεις εργασίας. Την ίδια ώρα όμως, το 45% των Ευρωπαίων εκτιμούν ότι η παγκοσμιοποίηση είναι απειλή, ενώ το 53% θεωρούν ότι αποτελεί κίνδυνο για την ταυτότητα της πατρίδας τους. Οφείλουμε, κατά τη γνώμη μου, να προχωρήσουμε άμεσα.

Καταρχήν, στη ρύθμιση των σχέσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με τους διεθνείς εταίρους της και στην ενίσχυση του καθεστώτος ελέγχου και κυρώσεων της παράνομης δραστηριότητας των ξένων επιχειρήσεων στο έδαφός μας και διεθνώς.

Δεύτερον, στην ουσιαστική ανταλλαγή των καλών πρακτικών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών στους νέους τομείς της οικονομίας, όπως είναι το ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο, η κυκλική οικονομία, τα νέα υλικά, ώστε να αυξήσουμε συνολικά την ανταγωνιστικότητα.

Τρίτον, η εκπαίδευση να γίνεται με το βλέμμα στο μέλλον, με έμφαση στη διεθνοποιημένη δραστηριότητα των μαθητών και των φοιτητών μας.

Και, τέταρτον, να έχουμε ειδικούς δείκτες για τα κράτη μέλη που χρησιμοποιούν κονδύλια για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, ώστε να βλέπουμε πώς είναι η ένταξη των ανέργων στην παραγωγή και πώς δημιουργούνται βιώσιμες θέσεις εργασίας. Μόνο έτσι θα μπορέσουμε να ωθήσουμε τους πολίτες να κατανικήσουν τον φόβο τους για το μέλλον που δεν μπορούν να σχεδιάσουν.

Emmanuel Maurel (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, après tant d'années d'aveuglement et de naïveté, la Commission européenne reconnaît enfin que la mondialisation libérale peut aussi avoir des effets négatifs et contribue à créer des inégalités fortes entre ceux qui gagnent beaucoup et ceux qui pâtissent de ce phénomène.

C'est la première fois, finalement, qu'elle met l'accent sur la nécessité de la réciprocité en matière de marchés publics et d'investissements, mais aussi sur les instruments de défense commerciale.

Selon moi, il faut désormais passer de la parole aux actes. Oui, il est possible d'avoir des accords commerciaux progressistes, mais pour cela, il faut plus de règles, plus de normes environnementales, plus de normes sociales et plus de supervision démocratique. Oui, il est possible de protéger les industries européennes mais pour cela, il faut avoir l'audace d'instaurer un «Buy European Act», comme toutes les grandes nations le font pour protéger leurs entreprises.

Enfin, si on veut véritablement réguler la mondialisation, il faut s'attaquer à la racine du mal, c'est-à-dire à l'optimisation fiscale et à l'évasion fiscale. Pour ce faire, il faut inclure la conditionnalité fiscale dans nos accords commerciaux pour créer un monde plus juste. Par conséquent, il est temps de passer aux actes.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the Commission for this important reflection paper that represents food for thought for all of us considering the future of the European Union. Many Europeans, particularly young ones, see how being connected with people in other countries and continents can improve their lives. They are right to do so. Around a third of national income in the European Union comes from trade with the rest of the world.

But, at the same time, many Europeans are also apprehensive. They see globalisation as synonymous with job losses, social injustice and low environmental health and privacy standards.

Now is therefore the time to consider what the European Union can do to shape globalisation in line with our shared interests and values, to ask what we can do to protect, defend and empower European citizens, especially the most vulnerable, and to agree on how the European Union, from its institutions to Member States, regions, municipalities, social partners, wider civil society, businesses, universities and its international partners, can come together to harness globalisation.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo creo que nadie cuestiona los beneficios de la globalización, pero para combatir el malestar que se está produciendo en nuestras sociedades yo sugiero tres cosas que me parecen importantes.

En primer lugar, yo pienso que es necesario un sistema de protección de los sectores económicos más vulnerables a la competencia global; creo que nuestros tratados comerciales no lo han hecho suficientemente hasta la fecha.

En segundo lugar, creo que es imprescindible proteger el trabajo menos cualificado, que es el que más sufre con el dumping social, con la competencia globalizada. El trabajo no cualificado necesita de protección legal —salarios mínimos, rentas mínimas—. Esta es una medida que hay que incorporar a las políticas europeas.

Y, en tercer lugar, yo creo que Europa tiene que ser cabeza de los movimientos internacionales para extender los derechos humanos, como un suelo mínimo de expansión a la globalización productiva; que todos los países del mundo tengan un suelo mínimo de producción con unos derechos laborales mínimos.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Úr! A globalizáció olyan történelmi folyamat, amelyet megállítani nem lehet, de irányítani, szabályozni lehet, sőt kell. Nem értelmetlen globalizációellenességre van szükség, hanem európai értékeken alakuló és alapuló alkalmazkodásra. Nem kétséges, a globalizációnak sok nyertese van. De beszéljünk most a vesztesekről. Azokról, akik úgy érzik, ebben a megváltozott világban elveszítik mindazt, ami nekik fontos volt, a munkájukat, a társadalmi megbecsülésüket, helyüket a világban. Éppen ezért nekünk úgy kell alakítanunk a globalizációt, hogy az ne csak egyesek, hanem mindenki számára esélyt jelentsen. A már hátrányos helyzetbe került, munkájukat elvesztett emberek helyzetén aktívan segíteni kell, például célzott támogatással, képzéssel, szociális gondoskodással. És mindenekelőtt határozottan és világosan szembe kell fordulnunk azzal a populista politikával, amely kihasználva az emberek félelmeit ismét a nacionalizmus, a gazdasági protekcionizmus zsákutcájába akarja vezetni Európát.

Ska Keller (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, first of all let me also say that I very much welcome that the Commission has come up with such a reflection paper. This is because I think it is the first time that the Commission is actually also acknowledging there are problems around globalisation. I think that is a very good thing. It is a very good start.

Unfortunately, we see little action, let us say, in the paper. There are a lot of very important words, like realising concerns and pointing out the right problems. That is all very nice and very fair, but I think – as colleagues have also said – that we should move forward to action. We need concrete things. In other reflection papers there was more concrete action – we would say not enough, but there was some – but I think here, on globalisation, concrete action is missing.

Let me mention some areas where I think we can move to direct action. Firstly, to end the race to the bottom between Member States when it comes to workers' rights. Let us think about posted workers. I think it is very important that we safeguard the rights of all workers inside the European Union. Let us also review trade agreements. It is possible to do them in such a way that benefits European Union citizens as well as the citizens in our partner countries, but for that we really need to change the way in which we do trade agreements at the moment.

We also need to lead the fight against climate change. We should not wait for others to follow the path or maybe also do something, but we need to be more ambitious in targeting the reduction of CO₂ emissions, because we have no time to waste. If we lose our planet, there is not a second one we can go to.

We also need to get serious about fighting tax avoidance and tax evasion – because I think those are key issues when it comes to social justice – by making sure that big companies which greatly profit from globalisation pay their due share and making sure that we can also afford investment, for example in education, good social services and sustainable jobs.

I think here the European Union can really do something, because no nation state can deal with those issues alone. We need the European Union, but we also need to make sure that we do concrete things.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, the benefits of globalisation in both rich and poor countries are often invisible, easily taken for granted and easily forgotten in times when people are feeling distressed about it. As is rightly pointed out in the reflection paper, globalisation is an overall positive force for change in Europe for wide groups – exporters, consumers, students, researchers and so on – and it has also lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty across the globe.

Globalisation is a fact, and there is no magic on-off switch to it. Even if we closed borders to trade, capital and people, it would not solve economic inequalities. Instead, it would definitely cause more harm. Eastern Europeans with experience of Communism know that better than most. What we should do, however, is to upgrade our policies, which have not kept pace with the opening of markets and technological disruption. We have done far too little up to now to make globalisation work for everybody. It is time to change that.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, me alegro de que la Comisión haya dado el paso de presentar este documento y poner encima de la mesa este debate, porque evidentemente la globalización es una realidad, el proteccionismo no es la solución y lo que es una opción es cómo queremos que sea. Y, desde luego, si la globalización no es justa, si no es inclusiva, si no reparte igualdad de oportunidades, si no reparte los beneficios para todos y si deja a alguien atrás, lo que será es el final de un futuro para los muchos millones de personas que ven su situación amenazada, porque no ven capacidad de empleo en ese porvenir. Y la globalización, como su nombre indica, requiere políticas globales.

Yo estoy de acuerdo con la posición de la Comisión de que no basta un posicionamiento de la Unión Europea. Todos los gobiernos nacionales, regionales, locales se tienen que implicar, pero todas las políticas de la Comisión también. Si no actúan de la mano la política industrial, la política de innovación, la política social para dar oportunidades de empleo y protección a las personas, me temo que no ganaremos esta batalla.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, globalizacijski su procesi donijeli niz pozitivnih stvari, ali imaju i određene negativne manifestacije poput gubitka radnih mjesta u zapadnim državama. Nažalost, bojim se da europske države, ali ni tvrtke, nisu uvijek primjereno reagirale u pokušaju zaštite svog prosperiteta.

Protiv ekonomije s jeftinom manualnom radnom snagom ne smijemo se boriti ograničavanjem protoka roba ili slobode naših građana, nego uvođenjem tehnološki kompleksnijih proizvodnih procesa i proizvodnjom sofisticiranijih, tj. boljih, proizvoda.

U radnike se također mora ulagati. To je zadaća poslodavaca, ali i samih radnika koji moraju razumjeti da je danas gotovo nemoguće ući i nakon nekoliko desetljeća izaći s tržišta rada s istim zanimanjem i kompetencijama. Države članice tu mogu i moraju pripomoći olakšavanjem prekvalifikacije, ali i smanjenjem poreznog opterećenja kako bi radnicima i poslodavcima ostalo više novca za ulaganje u znanja i vještine.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señor presidente. Yo les agradezco el estudio, porque hacen frente al elemento distintivo del siglo xxi, que es la globalización. Ahora bien, apuntan a la necesidad de reglas multilaterales con fuerza ejecutiva. Pero ¿cuáles? ¿Cómo?

Porque, efectivamente, hay que actuar sobre lo social y hay que actuar sobre los derechos humanos a nivel mundial. Pero hay otra cuestión: no perder las reglas europeas con fuerza ejecutiva. Hoy mismo el Consejo no ha venido, porque ha fracasado en el tema de sus propios pactos en las cuestiones de la reubicación.

Y me parece que en el estudio falta un apartado que es muy, muy importante: la democracia y la geoestrategia en un mundo globalizado; un mapa, también, histórico sobre los regímenes democráticos, y uno cualitativo sobre el caudillismo o cómo están degenerando regímenes democráticos formalmente aceptados como tales.

Y hay otra cuestión que también me parece que falta: las multinacionales en la revolución digital y su tensión sobre el poder en los ejecutivos en los pequeños países, y sobre la imposición fiscal y la evasión fiscal.

Todos estos asuntos los necesitamos para poder evaluar mejor lo que ustedes apuntan, que queda un poco ingenuo.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – To téma je skutečně tak globální, že ho nelze postihnout ve všech aspektech. Já bych se zaměřil pouze na dva ve svém příspěvku.

Jako zásadní pro obchodní vztahy já vnímám v globalizovaném světě právě otázku reciprocity. Je skutečně velmi důležité, aby třetí strany, pokud získávají přístup na evropský trh, tak aby za to EU a její členské země získaly nějaké konkrétně měřitelné výhody. To dokonce i v oblasti lidských práv, pokud se bavíme o celé řadě témat, porušování lidských práv v okolních státech, tak je důležité, abychom dokázali prosadit i naši vizi lidských práv právě v návaznosti na např. přístup na náš trh nebo na poskytnutí nevýhody.

Jedna věc, která se týká dumpingu. Já bych chtěl skutečně vyzvat k tomu, pokud trváme na velmi přísných kritériích pro určité výrobky připuštěné na náš trh, tak abychom zároveň trvali na těchto kritériích i pro třetí strany.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, en 2011, une étude de l'OCDE indiquait que la mondialisation génèrait des inégalités. Aujourd'hui, en 2017, je remercie la Commission d'avoir effectivement reconnu ces inégalités.

Pourtant, la réponse concrète de la Commission ne va pas dans le sens d'une meilleure maîtrise de la mondialisation. Au contraire, elle met un coup d'accélérateur sur une dizaine d'accords de libre-échange construits sur le modèle mondial des années d'avant la crise de 2008. Il y a une certaine forme d'incohérence entre vos réflexions et vos actions.

La Commission, me semble-t-il, est prisonnière de l'idéologie d'ouverture maximale alors que d'autres, ici, dans cette assemblée, sont reclus dans la fermeture totale. À mon sens, ces deux voies sont dangereuses car destructrices du bien-être.

Pourtant, il existe des méthodes pour maîtriser cette mondialisation. Si vous êtes à court d'idées, je vais vous en donner: par exemple, la conditionnalité fiscale, la lutte contre le dumping, avec le chapitre développement durable obligatoire assorti de sanctions, ou encore la protection des investisseurs, mais pas contre les forces publiques.

Aujourd'hui, toutes ces idées ne sont pas portées concrètement par la Commission et, par conséquent, nous sommes déçus.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, άργησε να ξυπνήσει η Επιτροπή για τις δυσμενείς επιπτώσεις της νεοφιλελεύθερης παγκοσμιοποίησης, η οποία διέλυσε κυριολεκτικά την οικονομία των κρατών, οδήγησε σε στρατιές φτωχών και ανέργων, αύξησε τους κοινωνικά αποκλεισμένους. Οδήγησε σε μετεγκατάσταση επιχειρήσεων, στο outsourcing, έκανε τους πλούσιους πλουσιότερους, οδήγησε στη διαμόρφωση τριγωνικών σχέσεων, στη φοροδιαφυγή και στη φοροαποφυγή. Διότι αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα. Και οφείλετε να καταλάβετε ότι πρέπει να επιστρέψετε στην αρχή της κοινοτικής προτίμησης, η οποία ήταν βασική αρχή πάνω στην οποία οικοδομήθηκε η ΕΟΚ και, εν συνεχεία, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Θα πρέπει να στηριχθεί η ευρωπαϊκή βιομηχανία, όπως επίσης και ο αγροτικός τομέας. Επίσης, θα πρέπει να παλέψουμε για δίκαιο εμπόριο και όχι να έχουμε αυτή την ασυδοσία με την TTIP και την CETA στην οποία επιμένετε. Να αντιμετωπιστούν οι αθέμιτες πρακτικές. Υπάρχουν κράτη, όπως η Κίνα, στα οποία δουλεύουν και οι φυλακισμένοι. Υπάρχει παιδική εργασία και ανεχόμαστε αυτή τη διαδικασία του φιλελεύθερου εμπορίου. Πρέπει να σταματήσει επιτέλους η κατάσταση αυτή.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc domnule președinte, domnule comisar, cred că o să vă placă ce declar acum doar prima parte. Mi-a plăcut sinceritatea cu care ați prezentat globalizarea, oportunități și provocări, pericole. Este o analiză pe care eu o văd foarte sinceră, dar vă obligă, domnule comisar, vă obligă să convingeți Comisia că piața internă a Uniunii Europene este în suferință.

Am mai spus-o și o spun și astăzi: acordurile comerciale trebuie făcute pe principiul câștig-câștig. Dacă avem acest dezechilibru în acordul comercial, IMM-urile în primul rând vor fi spulberate, producătorii din Uniunea Europeană vor avea de suferit și, până la urmă, consumatorii, pentru că standardele înalte europene sunt bune pentru protecția consumatorului. Dar să verificăm intrarea în piața după aceleași standarde și să nu lăsăm să intre contrafacere, contrafacere de trei ori, pe preț, pe structură, pe compoziție, pe brand, ceea ce de fapt duce și la distrugerea locurilor de muncă și la neprotecția consumatorilor.

Vă rog, domnule comisar, convingeți Comisia că acordurile comerciale trebuie făcute în acest spirit.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Members very much for a very wide-ranging discussion. It was good that Members brought many different dimensions to the discussion.

First, let me say a couple of words about the nature of the paper. This is not an action plan. This is a reflection paper, one of five reflection papers intended to promote wide discussion, not only here but also in Member States, amongst the stakeholders – national parliaments, governments and also NGOs and various organisations. We need to give direction to our policies on how to shape globalisation.

My second point is that the EU itself is an example of rules-based globalisation. We are a product of globalisation. We deliberately decided to create a borderless Europe where people – students, the labour force, whoever – can travel across borders without any difficulty. We have created Erasmus, the single market – which is, by the way, a free-trade agreement – and common action towards climate policy, and we are about to create the circular economy regulatory environment. So this is what globalisation is in Europe, and we should take this elsewhere as well, shaping globalisation so that it is rules-based and based on values we believe in.

Many Members rightly stated that we should not send out the message that the EU, Parliament or the Commission can address all the negative effects. In fact, many of the tools which need to be used are in the hands of the Member States. Education and social policies, for instance, are in the hands of Member States.

I will give you a couple of concrete examples of what Member States can do. We have to strengthen the resilience of individuals and societies. There, for instance, the quality of education and the quality of teacher training is of the utmost importance. The better quality education we have, the better prepared our citizens are for changes. I like the word ‘resilience’ because it means that, whatever happens, we are resilient in facing challenges and we are strong enough and innovative enough to harness the negative effects of globalisation.

Many Members, quite rightly, raised the issue of trade policy. This is part of globalisation. Globalisation is not only about trade, but trade is part of it. For instance, the EU-Korea trade agreement was agreed some five or six years ago, and since then our trade has increased by EUR 15 billion euros. As we know that EUR 1 billion of additional trade or exports support roughly 14 000 new jobs, increasing trade to Korea has supported some 200 000 jobs in Europe.

I will put this figure in a local context. The country I know best is typically considered to have a Nordic high-cost welfare society. Regardless of high costs and a welfare-society structure, a well-known European car manufacturer established a factory in Finland. This was possible because of robotisation. I do not know which part of the world the robots’ components came from, but nevertheless robots made it possible to produce cars in a high-cost welfare society. The town in which the factory is situated is the town with the highest number of robots per capita, and it is the very same town that has the highest number of vacancies per capita. So this is another example of globalisation. Also, thanks to our trade agreement between the EU and Korea, those cars manufactured in a high-cost welfare society can be sold to Korea.

That is just one example. Another example come from Sweden. You may remember that when the car manufacturer Saab went bankrupt, some five years ago, it was a big shock to the town of Trollhättan, where roughly 3 000 people lost their jobs. Since then, labour unions, together with employers’ organisations, public authorities and the private sector have worked together, and today three out of four people who lost their jobs have found a new job and the unemployment rate is lower than it was before the bankruptcy. Thanks to active policies and action at local level, they have managed to create new opportunities for citizens.

My final point is that we must be a shaper of globalisation. I very much liked it when some colleagues said that we should be not a rule-taker but a rule-maker. That is why the Commission has proposed an external investment plan, because we want to influence sustainable development in our developing partner countries, for instance in African countries. The better we manage to support inclusive economic growth in Africa, the less reason there is for irregular migration and, of course, quality of life and fairness will increase in those countries.

I hope that you will bring this discussion to your constituencies, promote a forward-looking discussion on globalisation and try to identify which policies are in the hands of the Member States or local authorities and which policies are in our hands here, as European legislators and decision makers, which should be taken forward in order to shape globalisation in a positive manner.

Președinte. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – Europa heeft een van de meest open economieën ter wereld, en de handel met onze partners heeft veel welvaart en jobs voortgebracht. Maar elders in de wereld stoten onze bedrijven al te vaak op grenzen. We mogen best wat minder naïef worden. De tijd is aangebroken om de excessen van wilde vrijhandel en het eenrichtingsverkeer een halt toe te roepen: niet met gesloten grenzen, maar vooral via een eerlijk speelveld en het beschermen van onze kroonjuwelen. Onze energiecentrales, vliegvelden en telefoonnetwerken mogen we niet zomaar in handen laten vallen van agressieve staatsbedrijven van buiten de EU. De EU moet werk maken van de door Duitsland, Frankrijk en Italië gesteunde plannen om elke mogelijke investering van buitenaf in Europese strategische sectoren te monitoren en desnoods een halt toe te roepen. Globalisering betekent ook handelswaar verscheppen van het ene continent naar het andere (en soms weer terug). Dat kan nu wel goedkoper zijn, maar is het dat nog als we de milieukosten volledig in rekening brengen? In tegenstelling tot in Europa (via ETS en niet-ETS) wordt die impact in andere continenten veel minder of niet verrekend. Dat moet dringend op tafel komen, ook als anderen in de Wereldhandelsorganisatie niet mee willen.

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente. La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social. No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés. Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), in writing. – Developed countries have led the way in many of the new technologies. However, competition will increasingly come from emerging economies that are rapidly moving up the value chain. The divide between more technologically advanced regions and those that are less advanced risks widening unless governments invest in education, equip their citizens with the right skills, encourage innovation, ensure fair competition and regulate smartly where needed.

If globalisation is to succeed, it must succeed for poor and rich alike. It must deliver rights no less than it delivers riches. It must provide social justice and equality as much as economic prosperity and enhanced communication.

A more interconnected world will bring new opportunities as well as increased threats, so there should be an upgrade of our policies, which have not kept pace with the opening of markets and technological disruption. We have done far too little up to now to make globalisation work for everybody. It is time to change that.

I welcome the Commission's Reflection Paper on Harnessing Globalisation as I believe globalisation can be beneficial where it is properly harnessed.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito*. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente.

La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social. No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés.

Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Nicola Danti (S&D), *per iscritto*. – L'umanità ha sovente sperimentato forme di interdipendenza culturale ed economica tra diverse società e culture attive in aree geografiche molto distinte le une con le altre.

La globalizzazione che interessa il nostro tempo, tuttavia, presenta caratteri inediti in ragione di fattori eccezionali come le nuove telecomunicazioni, internet e i moderni mezzi di trasporto. Crisi economiche, mutamenti politici ma anche il rapido avvicinarsi delle mode e la diffusione di nuovi beni di consumo hanno oggi la capacità di diffondersi e influenzare le comunità di ogni nazione sul globo in tempi straordinariamente brevi.

Sotto il profilo economico, la globalizzazione ha certamente il grande merito di aver salvato milioni di persone dalla povertà e dalla miseria. È parimenti vero, tuttavia, che la globalizzazione ha implicato anche una meno equa distribuzione della ricchezza, oltre che serie alterazioni nel mercato del lavoro.

Credo pertanto che l'Europa abbia oggi l'ambizioso compito di riuscire a guidare il fenomeno della globalizzazione, al fine di trarne tutti i benefici possibili per i cittadini e le imprese, epurandoli al contempo degli effetti collaterali sulla società.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no solo para una minoría.

Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente. La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los trabajadores europeos frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social.

No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés. Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), por escrito. – Desde hace tiempo los socialistas venimos insistiendo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. No deben existir víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Debemos asegurar que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al contrario.

Solo con una Unión fuerte seremos capaces de encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente.

La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social.

Adam Gierek (S&D), na piśmie. – Globalizacja jest jednym z najistotniejszych wyzwań stojących przed Europejczykami. I chociaż przyczyniła się do wzrostu gospodarczego w UE, to korzyści z niej płynące nie są ani automatyczne, ani równomiernie rozłożone. Jej skutkiem jest m.in. delokalizacja przemysłu i wzrost bezrobocia na wspólnym rynku. UE powinna dążyć do stworzenia nowych, sprawiedliwszych zasad działania na globalnym rynku: odnieść się do unikania opodatkowania, pomocy państwowej oraz dumpingu społecznego. Należałoby wprowadzić uczciwy system podatkowy, dzięki któremu globalne korporacje nie mogłyby unikać płacenia należnej części podatków tam, gdzie zyski zostały wypracowane. Skuteczne instrumenty ochrony handlu oraz wzajemność (zrównoważenie) w stosunkach handlowych mogłyby pomóc w tym procesie. Należy wzmocnić ochronę socjalną oraz położyć nacisk na edukację i szkolenia, które pomogłyby obywatelom w dostosowaniu się do zmieniających się warunków globalnych. Również europejski przemysł oraz oczywiście zatrudnieni w nim pracownicy muszą być lepiej chronieni. UE powinna być swoistym przewodnikiem i aktywnie promować handel oparty na sprawiedliwych zasadach. To my musimy ustanawiać reguły, a nie podporządkowywać się regułom ustanowionym przez innych.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), por escrito. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente.

La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social. No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés.

Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), por escrito. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente.

La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social. No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés.

Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Krystyna Łybacka (S&D), na piśmie. – Europejczycy, aby sprostać szybko zmieniającej się rzeczywistości gospodarczej i społecznej, muszą posiadać wysokiej jakości wykształcenie i umiejętności zawodowe. Stałe rozwijanie nabytych umiejętności i kompetencji jest obecnie kluczowe dla znalezienia i utrzymania pracy. Aby zrealizować ten cel, nasze działania powinny koncentrować się na poprawie dostępu, jakości i skuteczności edukacji i szkoleń. Musimy zapewnić wszystkim obywatelom szanse na rozwój zawodowy i osobisty w każdym wieku. Naszą politykę trzeba ukierunkować na wzmocnienie pozycji obywateli i ich zdolności dostosowania się do przemian powstałych w wyniku procesów globalizacji i digitalizacji. W szczególności powinniśmy skoncentrować się na zapewnieniu równości szans edukacyjnych dla wszystkich. Dalej kluczowa jest walka z bezrobociem wśród młodych ludzi oraz wzmocnienie i szybka implementacja europejskiej Gwarancji dla młodzieży, której zakres powinien być rozszerzony na młodych ludzi do 30 roku życia. Kolejno, budżety kluczowych programów w zakresie edukacji, takich jak Erasmus+ i Europa dla Obywateli, powinny zostać zwiększone, tak aby skuteczniej można było realizować założone cele i promować równe szanse wśród młodych ludzi. Nie możemy zapominać także o wartościach, które nas łączą. W tym kontekście ważne jest rozwijanie wolontariatu europejskiego oraz określenie jego prawnego statusu uwzględniającego prawa i obowiązki wolontariuszy.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az elmúlt években a jobboldali kormányok képtelenek voltak a globalizációt az emberek érdekébe állítani. Úgyis mondhatjuk, hogy a jobboldali kormányokat egyszerűen legyőzte a globalizáció, cserben hagyta az embereket. Különösen igaz ez Magyarországon. Most ezek a kormányok és pártok próbálnak azzal kampányolni, hogy ők mégis meg tudják védeni az embereket a globalizáció káros hatásaitól. Elhisszük nekik? Nem hiszem.

Olyan kormányzásra van szükség mind az Európai Unióban, mind Magyarországon, ami valóban képes megszelídíteni a globalizációt. Képes megállítani a munkahelyek külföldre vitelét, az olcsó termékek dömpingjét. Olyan politikára van szükség, amely képes megszüntetni a globalizáció legrosszabb melléktermékét: a társadalmi egyenlőtlenséget. Ehhez azonban nem a határzár, a drótkerítés, a védővámok a megoldás. Ezek adhatnak hamis biztonságképet, de a valóságban csak rontanak a helyzeten. A drótkerítés vajon megállítja az olcsó kínai termékeket, vagy csökkenti függőségünket az orosz gáztól? Nem hiszem. Egyszerűen jobbaknak kell lennünk, mint a kínaiak vagy az oroszok. Innováció, tudásalapú társadalom, oktatás, vállalkozások kellenek, nem pedig éhbéért dolgoztató üzemek. Nem megy egyik napról a másikra. A hagyományosan erős magyar szürkeállomány ott van, rajtunk múlik, hogy mit kezdünk vele.

Eva Maydell (PPE), in writing. – I welcome the Commission's Reflection Paper on Harnessing Globalisation and their efforts to make this central part of the discussion on the future of Europe. I also congratulate the successes of the Globalisation Adjustment Fund but I am concerned about its long-term orientation. For my generation there is no doubt that managing globalisation successfully means riding the wave of digitalisation and technological innovation. This can be both empowering and disruptive for our labour markets but it is a sine qua non condition for success. Europe needs to focus on two priorities.

First we need to equip our citizens with the skill necessary for the global workplace. Those are digital competence with higher profile. Mainstreaming training programmes for digital skills is the way to go. Already today 90% of all jobs require some level of digital skills.

Second, in the age of internet of things, robotics, artificial intelligence, Europe needs to have a regulatory environment unlocking the potential of data flow, and even more, making Europe an incubator for innovation. Here we will be stronger if we move together and not as separate Member States. Completing the Digital Single Market is the step that we should take now.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D), *in writing*. – No one was ready or prepared for the outcome of globalisation! In the beginning, we saw globalisation as an opportunity for countries, companies and people to travel, expand, grow and connect. Only later on did we recognise the wide range of economic and social spill-overs that affected all parts of our lives and people all over the globe.

Lack of control, mismanagement, misguided development policies, the race to the bottom and the lack of rules associated globalisation with job losses, social injustice, squeezed living standards, rising inequalities and low environmental, health and privacy standards. The globalisation backlash has led to political disenchantment and an increase in the protectionist movements and populist politics that were the leading force behind a few elections' outcomes, as well as the Brexit referendum. In today's world, isolation is definitely not the answer and global cooperation is increasingly important. However, we need to realise that modern capitalism, not managed in way that can benefit all, makes people restless for not being in control of their own lives and their own future.

Globalisation requires a new institutional architecture and a new moral ecology, and I am afraid that unless we take active steps now, populism, radicalisation, and xenophobia will continue to spread across our countries.

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE), *raštu*. – Sveikinu Europos Komisiją pristačius globalizacijos temai skirtą dokumentą ir inicijavus atviras diskusijas. Didėjanti piliečių baimė globalizacijai ir jos grėsmėms jaučiama visur, o Komisijos įvardinti teigiami globalizacijos reiškinių aspektai, tos baimės neišsklaido. Diskutuoti neužtenka, turime įrodyti savo piliečiams, kad nesame pasyvūs globalizacijos proceso stebėtojai ir sugebame užtikrinti piliečių lūkesčius, bei paimti iš globalizacijos proceso, kas geriausia. Be abejo nereikia užsisklęsti savyje, tačiau turime išmokyti savo interesus ginti efektyviau. Būtinai konkretūs sprendimai mokstinėje politikoje, švietime ir darbo rinkoje, siekiant kuo geriau kontroliuoti sudėtingus socialinius, ekonominius ir kultūrinius procesus. Būtinai tinkamesnis ir platesnis abipusiškumo principo taikymas. Socialiai tvari ir konkurencinga žinių visuomenė, turi sudaryti sąlygas savo šalių piliečiams ne tik lanksčiai reaguoti į darbo rinkos pokyčius, bet globalizaciją išnaudoti, kaip galimybę plėsti ribas, pažinti kultūras ir bendromis jėgomis kurti naują ateities pasaulį.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Wydaje się, że nie uwzględniliśmy w Unii w wystarczający sposób zmieniających się uwarunkowań zewnętrznych. Świat rozwija się obecnie niezależnie od Europy, mimo że długo nie mogliśmy się z tym pogodzić. Zmieniło się m.in. podejście nowego gospodarza Białego Domu do spraw europejskich. Wprawdzie ostatnio staje się ono bardziej przyjazne niż to wynikało z zapowiedzi kampanijnych, ale jest pewne, że nie będzie takie jak za poprzednich prezydentur.

Procesy globalizacji i funkcjonowanie rynku światowego wymagają ustanowienia pewnych reguł w zakresie handlu czy działania instytucji finansowych, które stwarzałyby pewien ład, ponieważ w przeciwnym razie nieskoordynowane działania będą prowadziły do chaosu, czego przykładem jest ostatni kryzys gospodarczy. Stąd tak ważna rola unijnej dyplomacji, w tym dyplomacji gospodarczej i handlowej.

Wydaje się, że nawet prezydent Stanów Zjednoczonych nie jest w stanie zatrzymać globalizacji. Mimo wycofania się USA z Porozumienia Pacyficznego (TPP) i zawieszenia rozmów z Europą (porozumienie TTIP), handel międzynarodowy dalej się liberalizuje, o czym świadczą choćby kolejne porozumienia handlowe negocjowane przez Europę m.in. z Mercosurem (Argentyna, Brazylia, Paragwaj i Urugwaj), Japonią, Meksykiem, Australią i Nową Zelandią czy wejście w życie na początku bieżącego roku Umowy o ułatwieniach w handlu (Trade Facilitation Agreement – TFA) w ramach Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO).

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), *schriftelijk*. – Het is positief dat de Europese Commissie nu in de discussienota over “het in goede banen leiden van globalisering” openlijk toegeeft wat velen al heel lang zeggen: globalisering heeft niet alleen voordelen, maar ook veel nadelen. Het verschil valt op tussen woord en daad. Dat blijkt soms al subtiel uit de woordkeuze van de Commissie: “Veel Europeanen zijn ook bezorgd. Zij associëren mondialisering met verlies van banen, sociaal onrecht of lage normen op het gebied van milieu, gezondheid en privacy en zijn bang dat door mondialisering hun tradities en identiteit worden uitgehold.” Het gaat hier niet om louter perceptie, maar om bittere sociaal-economische en ecologische realiteit. De Commissie zegt dat we na dit debat beter in staat zullen zijn “duurzame en eerlijke oplossingen te bieden die beantwoorden aan de verwachtingen van de Europese burger.” Dat valt te bezien. Want de drang om bilaterale vrijhandelsverdragen genre CETA en TTIP af te sluiten houdt onverminderd aan. Deze verdragen, zo is al uitgebreid aangetoond, zullen niet bijdragen tot meer duurzame en sociale normen. Dit soort vrijhandelsbeleid leidt niet tot een *race-to-the top*, maar tot een *race to-the-bottom*. Het zou de EU sieren als ze deze niet-coherente houding zou erkennen.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), *în scris*. – Sunt convins că procesul globalizării nu numai că va continua în anii ce vin, dar se va și accelera. Acei politicieni care cred că pot proteja locurile de muncă prin unele măsuri de limitare a efectelor globalizării vor constata, curând, lipsa de eficiență a unor astfel de măsuri.

Dacă la sfârșitul secolului trecut, globalizarea a fost accelerată mai ales de prăbușirea sistemului economic socialist și extinderea fără precedent a economiei de piață, în prezent, acest proces este împins mai departe de către progresul tehnologic.

În consecință, Uniunea Europeană trebuie să susțină pregătirea forței de muncă, capabilă să răspundă cerințelor globalizării, infrastructura modernă și inovația. În acest fel, Europa va rămâne atractivă pentru investiții și afaceri și nu va deveni un muzeu în aer liber.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), *por escrito*. – Como socialistas, venimos insistiendo desde hace tiempo en la necesidad de que la Unión sitúe entre sus principales prioridades una gestión más valiente y ambiciosa de la globalización para conseguir que los beneficios de este fenómeno sean para todos y no sólo para una minoría. Por tanto, acogemos positivamente la presentación del documento de la Comisión que sirve para abrir un periodo de reflexión y que, como paso imprescindible para alcanzar una solución, reconoce los impactos negativos que la globalización tiene en nuestras sociedades. Sin embargo, en su análisis, la Comisión pone demasiado énfasis en los mercados y no lo bastante en la gente.

La Unión puede, y debe, proteger a los y las trabajadoras europeas frente a la competición desleal y el dumping social. No debe haber víctimas de la globalización, ni en Europa ni en el resto del mundo. Para ello, debemos asegurarnos de que nuestros valores, principios, reglas y estándares dan forma a la globalización y no al revés.

Solo desde una Unión fuerte conseguiremos encauzar y aprovechar la globalización, recogiendo los beneficios de vínculos más estrechos entre países y continentes, al tiempo que protegemos a nuestra ciudadanía y sus empleos, y promovemos un crecimiento sostenible global.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A chamada globalização, viabilizada pelas aquisições da ciência e da técnica no último meio século, nunca foi neutra do ponto de vista político. A globalização corresponde, hoje, a um instrumento ao serviço das classes dominantes com poucos ganhadores que continuam a explorar milhões de perdedores. Assim foi no passado e assim continua a ser no presente.

Os efeitos desta globalização são os efeitos do sistema que a produziu. As suas contradições são também as contradições do sistema que a produziu. A contradição entre o carácter social da produção e a apropriação privada dos meios de produção. A contradição entre um sistema que «ou cresce e acumula ou morre» e os limites de um planeta generoso mas finito.

Mas esta globalização faz igualmente emergir os limites históricos de um sistema cujas contradições são, hoje, por demais evidentes e com as quais nos confrontamos todos os dias. A União Europeia, como agente desta globalização, continua a resistir aos ventos da História, encenando fugas para a frente que não resolvem o problema, antes adiam a rotura necessária para a emergência de uma nova sociedade: a sociedade socialista.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Arvoisa puhemies, globalisaatio on muuttanut elämäämme nopeassa tahdissa. Yhteydet, tieto ja palvelut liikkuvat lähes reaaliajassa internetissä, ihmiset opiskelevat ja käyvät työssä yli rajojen ja matkustavat enemmän kuin koskaan ennen. Kansainvälinen kauppa tuottaa Euroopalle tuloja: joka seitsemäs EU-alueen työpaikka on viennin varassa. Jokainen lisämiljardi vientiä tarkoittaa meille keskimäärin 14 000 uutta työpaikkaa. Globalisaation hyödyt eivät ole kuitenkaan jakaantuneet tasaisesti. Koventuneen kansainvälisen kilpailun seurauksena Euroopasta on myös poistunut paljon perinteisiä työpaikkoja. Moni kansalainen on aiheellisesti huolissaan omasta tulevaisuudesta. Globalisaation haasteisiin on tartuttava sekä Euroopan unionin ja jäsenmaiden tasolla että paikallisella tasolla. Euroopan unionilla on mahdollisuus olla globalisaation hallinnassa vahva suunnannäyttävä. Me olemme maailman suurin kauppamahti, investoija ja kehitysyhteistyörahoittaja. Meidän on varmistettava kansainvälisen kaupan ja verotuksen reilut säännöt. Jäsenmaiden vastuulla on huolehtia kansalaistensa koulutuksesta, osaamisen päivittämisestä ja työmarkkinoiden uudistamisesta niin, että jokaisella on mahdollisuudet ja valmiudet pysyä mukana työelämän muutoksessa. Avoimuudesta on ollut meille hyötyä ja hyödynme siitä jatkossakin, kun olemme osana näyttämässä globalisaation suuntaa.

(Ședința a fost suspendată timp de câteva minute.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

5. Afrikan unionin komission puheenjohtajan Moussa Faki Mahamatin puhe

Le Président. – Chers collègues, c'est un plaisir pour moi de recevoir aujourd'hui le Président de la Commission de l'Union africaine, Moussa Faki Mahamat.

Monsieur le Président, vous êtes le premier président de la Commission de l'Union africaine à vous adresser à cette assemblée. L'Afrique est une priorité pour l'Union. Nous partageons beaucoup sur le plan des valeurs et de la culture, mais aussi beaucoup de défis: sécurité, immigration, chômage, changement climatique. C'est pourquoi nous devons renforcer notre partenariat stratégique et travailler ensemble, d'égal à égal, pour trouver des solutions concrètes aux préoccupations de nos citoyens.

Je salue les efforts de l'Union africaine dans sa lutte contre le terrorisme. Notre coopération est essentielle dans le Sahel, dans la région du lac Tchad, dans la Corne de l'Afrique ou encore en Libye. Nous avons un intérêt commun à gérer les flux migratoires, à combattre la traite des êtres humains, à prévenir la radicalisation.

Il est aussi indispensable de créer des possibilités d'emploi pour la jeunesse africaine en Afrique. Nous devons donc développer une forte diplomatie économique et investir plus et mieux sur ce continent.

J'exprime ma forte préoccupation pour la crise alimentaire et la famine qui ravagent de nombreuses régions africaines. Demain, à l'occasion de sa visite à Strasbourg, je discuterai avec le Secrétaire général des Nations unies de cette crise humanitaire. Je suis convaincu que nous devons renforcer nos liens avec les États africains mais aussi, et surtout, à un niveau interinstitutionnel, avec notre organisation sœur, l'Union africaine.

Monsieur le Président, vous avez la parole.

Moussa Faki Mahamat, *président de la Commission de l'Union Africaine*. – Monsieur le Président, honorables Députés, Excellences, Mesdames, Messieurs, je me réjouis de l'opportunité que vous m'offrez de prendre la parole devant votre prestigieuse assemblée représentative des peuples européens dans leur diversité.

Le partenariat Afrique-Europe, renforcé depuis notre premier sommet au Caire en 2000, a franchi dans son exaltante aventure des étapes décisives. Je suis convaincu que le prochain sommet de novembre, en cours de préparation, constituera une nouvelle étape dans notre marche vers un avenir radieux pour nos peuples.

Le couple Afrique-Europe a une belle histoire où se sont croisées, par le passé, les ombres et les lumières mais, de nos jours, il s'enorgueillit de sa vivacité, de son dynamisme et de ses promesses d'un futur horizon tout en bleu. Jalons successifs d'une série d'apports, d'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée, l'Égypte, la Grèce, la Phénicie, Rome et Carthage tissaient, depuis des siècles, entre nos deux continents, la toile d'une relation indissoluble.

La colonisation, tout au long de deux siècles, aura mis face à face nos cultures et nos civilisations si différentes dans leurs spiritualités et dogmes structurants, mais complémentaires dans leur humanisme et leur essentielle et impérissable inclination à la liberté.

La colonisation de l'Afrique par des puissances européennes a été, assurément, un moment controversé de notre histoire commune. Oui, il y eut la domination, l'exploitation, l'asservissement, l'esclavage même, cette insulte exécrable à la dignité humaine dont les traces ne disparaîtront pas comme par enchantement.

Des poètes célèbres ont immortalisé cette affliction. Des penseurs et intellectuels africains et européens ont interprété et exploré ce segment de notre histoire. Des hommes politiques ont fait du procès de la colonisation et de l'hymne à la gloire de la décolonisation le paradigme de leurs doctrines libératrices. Tous ont, à juste titre, tiré les leçons adéquates pour que cela ne se répète plus jamais.

Cependant, je ne suis pas venu aujourd'hui, en passéiste, remuer le couteau dans les plaies et encore moins me laisser tenter par l'illusion d'une construction d'un destin continental en m'épanchant de l'exaltation d'un passé révolu. J'ai tout simplement voulu, en propos liminaire de mon intervention, souligner le caractère indélébile des cicatrices laissées par ce legs d'hier, tel qu'il est forgé et inscrit dans la mémoire collective des peuples africains.

L'histoire de notre relation, comme toute histoire, ardente et passionnelle, n'a pas eu que des ombres. Elle est aussi – heureusement – une histoire de lumières, d'échanges féconds, d'influences culturelles et spirituelles réciproques, enrichissantes, vivifiantes et émancipatrices.

Cette rencontre a, à travers les siècles, contribué à l'héritage civilisationnel qui est le vôtre, qui est le nôtre.

Mesdames, Messieurs, notre environnement international se recompose à une vitesse surprenante et non moins inquiétante. De nouvelles puissances émergent, cherchant leur place dans un monde devenu multipolaire. De nouveaux défis se posent, pour lesquels le seul espoir de solution durable réside dans l'action collective et solidaire.

Dans cette restructuration d'un univers géostratégique, par ailleurs fortement mondialisé, l'Europe et l'Afrique semblent inévitablement vouées à l'entente stratégique, saisies par l'évidence, vitale, de leur communauté de destin. Leur histoire, leurs valeurs différentes mais complémentaires, leur proximité géographique fait de chacune le prolongement de l'autre, les y incitent et les y engagent sans cesse, avec force et raison.

Mesdames, Messieurs, pour s'épanouir et porter ses fruits, le partenariat entre l'Union européenne et l'Union Africaine doit reposer sur des principes solides et dessiner tous les champs à la mesure de son envergure multidimensionnelle, de ses ambitions visionnaires et de ses enjeux globaux, en constante extension.

Le respect mutuel, l'égalité, la liberté et la solidarité sont les repères et les jalons inaltérables d'une relation solide, durable, mutuellement avantageuse.

L'Afrique a rassemblé ses intelligences pour concevoir et adopter un agenda ambitieux pour les cinquante prochaines années, visant la construction d'une Afrique intégrée, prospère et en paix. À l'examen, pareil agenda recoupe certaines questions essentielles, la stratégie Afrique-Europe dont nous célébrons ensemble, cette année, le dixième anniversaire. L'agenda 2063 est aujourd'hui le fanion de l'Union Africaine. C'est lui qui balise nos chemins vers le futur et jette les bases de notre coopération internationale et nos partenariats stratégiques.

Quoique l'Afrique ait été et demeure le théâtre de très nombreux conflits meurtriers dont les principaux se situent à la Corne de l'Afrique, au Sahel, dans le bassin du lac Tchad et en Afrique centrale, les éléments de sa renaissance sont aujourd'hui tangibles.

Elle regorge de richesses que sont ses mines, ses ressources halieutiques, ses immenses étendues arables et surtout la vitalité de sa population majoritairement jeune. Une bonne gouvernance articulée sur une vision courageuse et déterminée de l'intégration africaine, des incitations commerciales, un effacement des barrières douanières, des initiatives innovantes en agriculture propre et énergies renouvelables, et des technologies et services constitue un levier essentiel de la renaissance recherchée.

Son taux de croissance économique est demeuré soutenable ces dix dernières années. Viendra soutenir notre ambition une lutte sans merci contre l'impunité, la gabegie, la corruption, le gaspillage et le détournement des fonds publics. De ce point de vue, la priorité pour nous porte sur la mise en œuvre des instruments pertinents adoptés par les instances compétentes de notre Union et le respect par les États membres des engagements qui y sont contenus.

La réforme de l'Union africaine décidée par le sommet de janvier 2017 se présente comme une réelle chance de notre renaissance en ce qu'elle commande résolument une prise en charge de l'organisation par nous-mêmes. À ce titre, elle est appelée à soutenir fortement les tendances positives observées.

Notre continent conjugue désormais toutes ses forces pour faire reculer, en vue de les éradiquer, les drames sociaux auxquels elle fait face à travers la sécheresse, la famine, les conflits armés et les violations des droits de l'homme.

Ces crises et conflits placent les questions jumelles de paix et de sécurité en tête de nos priorités. Faire taire les armes à l'horizon 2020 est un objectif que nous poursuivons avec acharnement et détermination.

La lutte contre le terrorisme, le djihadisme et la radicalité est au cœur de notre engagement constant en faveur de la paix, la sécurité et la stabilité auquel nous consacrons des efforts inlassables et vigoureux, tant en prévention qu'en gestion et reconstruction post-conflit.

Nous apprécions hautement l'appui multiforme que nous apporte l'Union européenne dans ce combat à travers, notamment, la Facilité de paix.

Mesdames, Messieurs, toutes les expertises actuelles et prospectives indiquent avec certitude que l'Afrique est la région du monde qui souffre le plus de la dégradation de l'environnement naturel et des changements climatiques. Les effets ravageurs sur la faune et la flore réduisent – parfois annihilent – de manière irréversible la possibilité même de la vie dans de larges espaces du continent. Le paradoxe atrocement déconcertant réside ici dans le fait que l'Afrique, continent le moins pollueur de la planète, est celui qui souffre le plus des changements climatiques.

N'est-il pas, à cet égard, superflu de rappeler que l'Afrique ne bénéficie que de portions congrues des efforts et sacrifices internationaux pour contrecarrer ou, à tout le moins, soulager l'universelle menace que font peser sur l'humanité les changements climatiques? Cette question est l'un des champs de notre partenariat qui devra désormais être mieux appréhendé, mieux traité, mieux priorisé.

À cette exigence est intimement liée l'ouverture de larges couloirs aux secteurs privés africain et international. Il faut aussi se féliciter que le commerce européen avec l'Afrique ait augmenté ces dernières années de 50 %, ramenant le volume global de l'investissement privé européen à environ 200 milliards d'euros par an.

L'entreprise est le premier créateur de richesses, d'emploi et de prospérité économique. Son rôle crucial dans notre développement économique et social se taillera désormais une place de choix dans nos politiques et partenariats stratégiques.

Notre profonde conscience des impératifs d'une nouvelle gouvernance économique nous encourage à nous situer dans la perspective d'une zone continentale de libre-échange.

Cette conscience nous rend particulièrement attentifs et sensibles aux idées d'investissement dans le privé et à l'invention hardie d'un plan Marshall pour l'Afrique, concepts défendus opportunément par la présidence allemande du G20. Du haut de cette prestigieuse et honorable tribune, j'exprime notre ferme soutien à ses démarches dans cette direction.

La jeunesse africaine représente plus de 60 % de la population. Les femmes constituent, quant à elles, plus de la moitié du peuplement actuel de l'Afrique. Jeunesse et dimension de genre sont dans notre vision stratégique des préoccupations transversales qui arrosent tous nos programmes conduits seuls ou en partenariat avec d'autres acteurs.

La question de l'émigration de pans entiers de nos jeunes en Europe pose un double défi: à ceux qui se jettent aveuglément sur les chemins du naufrage, comme à ceux qui, sans préparation, se trouvent submergés par ces flots d'êtres humains.

Le défi que nous lançent tous ces phénomènes n'a point de solution, à l'exception d'une seule: développer l'Afrique et réinventer pour notre jeunesse un avenir meilleur sur le continent. Notre partenariat trouve ici un champ, encore inexploité, d'une exceptionnelle communauté d'intérêts et d'avantages mutuels.

La diaspora, considérée dans notre vision comme la sixième région d'Afrique après celles du Nord, du Sud, de l'Est, de l'Ouest et du Centre, occupe dans notre agenda une place importante. Sa contribution multiforme au développement du continent puise dans les ressources intellectuelles et financières qu'elle véhicule.

Mesdames, Messieurs, j'ai insisté dans les passages précédents sur les champs du partenariat qui nous sont à peu près communs. Ils sont l'essentiel du message que vous me faites l'honneur d'écouter.

Je serais cependant incomplet et ma soif ardente de vous parler à cœur ouvert, sans fard, resterait inassouvie si je ne posais pas la question de fond du rapport à établir entre l'universalisme de notre partenariat et son relativisme.

De nombreuses questions attestent, une fois posées, des nuances, voire parfois des divergences entre l'Europe et l'Afrique. Il n'est pas de mon tempérament, ni de la philosophie politique sur la base de laquelle les chefs d'État ou de gouvernement de l'Afrique m'ont élu, de prêcher le conflit des civilisations, des cultures, des religions. Mon credo sur ce terrain est le dialogue, la recherche du consensus, la découverte mutuelle, l'entente, la solidarité des civilisations, des cultures et des religions. Je plaide non en faveur de la construction de murs pour se protéger de l'Autre mais pour la construction de ponts pour socialiser et communier avec cet Autre.

(Applaudissements)

En construisant des ponts, nous ne saurions prêcher l'uniformité et la négation des différences. Notre diversité est le moteur de notre mouvement, de notre vie, de notre dynamisme.

N'est-il pas injuste, déshonorant et nuisible d'éluder, par abus diplomatique, cette féconde diversité?

Oui, l'Afrique a des vues qui lui sont propres sur une série de questions: les questions de justice pénale internationale et de la compétence universelle, les rapports entre la justice, la paix et la réconciliation.

À l'évidence, le mot d'ordre, souvent galvaudé, «aux problèmes africains, des solutions africaines» ne saurait servir d'alibi ou de prétexte de légitimation des déviances ou autres égarements politiques. Il n'en garde cependant pas moins une brûlante actualité. Je me réjouis ici de la vigilance remarquable des sociétés civiles africaines et de leur mobilisation sur la quasi-totalité des champs de notre coopération.

Peut-être, honorables Parlementaires, trouverez-vous que j'ai surchargé le train de notre partenariat. J'ose espérer me protéger de ma turpitude par la fameuse formule de Jules Verne: «Rien ne se fait de grand qui ne soit une espérance exagérée».

Mesdames, Messieurs, je vous invite à considérer que vous avez en Afrique un cœur ouvert, un esprit éveillé et des mains fermes, laborieuses mais généreusement tendues.

Je vous remercie de bien vouloir considérer cette invitation et, davantage encore, d'accepter mes vifs remerciements pour votre bienveillante attention.

Je vous remercie.

(L'Assemblée, debout, applaudit l'orateur)

Le Président. – Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie. Comme vous le voyez, nous sommes déjà en train de bâtir les ponts entre l'Union européenne et l'Union africaine. Les députés se sont levés pour vous saluer et pour vous remercier de votre discours. Maintenant, il faut commencer à travailler. Il faut être pragmatique et concret. Je pense qu'avec M^{me} Mogherini, qui est la Haute représentante de l'Union européenne pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité, nous pouvons faire du bon travail.

Le Parlement est fortement engagé sur ce sujet. Il faut bâtir des ponts au niveau économique, au niveau politique ainsi qu'au niveau des transports. J'ai toujours été favorable à l'idée de relier les réseaux transeuropéens de transport et les réseaux transafricains de transport que vous êtes en train de bâtir. Il faut beaucoup travailler ensemble. Je suis optimiste, mais il faut aussi être très clair. Nous ne pouvons pas gagner le défi contre le terrorisme et nous ne pouvons pas résoudre le problème de l'immigration si l'Europe et l'Afrique ne travaillent pas ensemble. Voilà pourquoi il faut renforcer ces liens et, je le dis à mes amis européens, il faut toujours regarder l'Afrique non pas avec des lunettes européennes, mais avec des lunettes africaines.

Voilà où en est l'amitié entre l'Union africaine et l'Union européenne. Par conséquent, vous êtes toujours le bienvenu au Parlement européen.

Encore un grand merci.

(Applaudissements)

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

6. Äänestykset

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest głosowanie.

(Wyniki i inne szczegóły dotyczące głosowania: zobacz protokół)

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, colleagues, we have just listened to the address by the leader of the African Union, which I think is an important event, and, on that occasion, I have a request to the leadership of this House. Just a few days ago we learned that Dr Denis Mukwege, the Sakharov Prize laureate, will no longer get full protection from the United Nations. Already last month, one of his collaborators was savagely murdered, and there are threats against his collaborators. I would like the leadership of this House, together with Ms Mogherini, who was here just now, to use all their connections, talk to the UN, and make sure that he gets full protection for the work that he is doing.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję Pani Poseł, odnotowaliśmy i to będziemy z panią Mogherini omawiać.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Mr President, I would also like to use this opportunity to ask for your support and, on behalf of this House, draw the attention of the Mexican authorities to the murder of Javier Valdez Cardenas, a brilliant journalist who bravely exposed corruption, drug trafficking and organised crime in his country. His brutal murder yesterday was a signal to discourage other investigative journalists. We want to tell the Mexican authorities that we honour his memory and want them to bring the perpetrators to trial for this despicable murder.

Przewodniczący. – Jeżeli Państwo pozwolą, żeby zaoszczędzić Wasz czas, nie będę odczytywał tytułów sprawozdań, ponieważ to mamy wydrukowane, i od razu po nazwisku sprawozdawcy przechodzimy do głosowania.

6.1. EU:n ja Mongolian kumppanuus- ja yhteistyösopimukseen liitettävä pöytäkirja (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0074/2017 - Helmut Scholz) (äänestys)

6.2. EU:n ja Bosnia ja Hertsegovinan vakautus- ja assosiaatiosopimus (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0169/2017 - Cristian Dan Preda) (äänestys)

6.3. EU:n ja Norjan sopimus ulkorajojen ja viisumipolitiikan rahoitusvälineeseen osana sisäisen turvallisuuden rahastoa liittyvistä täydentävistä säännöistä (A8-0174/2017 - Tomáš Zdechovský) (äänestys)

6.4. EU:n liittyminen puuvilla-alan kansainväliseen neuvoa-antavaan komiteaan (ICAC) (A8-0187/2017 - Fernando Ruas) (äänestys)

— Przed rozpoczęciem głosowania:

Fernando Ruas (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, muito rapidamente, apenas para sublinhar a importância desta adesão da União Europeia a este comité internacional. É o organismo internacional de produtos de base do algodão e que junta atualmente 27 países, entre produtores, negociantes, consumidores. Este comité é um dos poucos organismos de que a União Europeia não faz parte. Ora, fazendo parte de outras instituições, como organizações internacionais de produtos tais como o açúcar, o azeite e o cacau, não se percebia muito bem como não integrava este grupo e, portanto, espero, por isso, contar com voto positivo, aliás, de acordo com aquilo que aconteceu na comissão respetiva, e é tudo.

6.5. EU:n sähköisen hallinnon toimintaohjelma 2016–2020 (A8-0178/2017 - Sabine Verheyen) (äänestys)

6.6. Vuosikertomus 2015 EU:n taloudellisten etujen suojaamisesta – petostentorjunta (A8-0159/2017 - Julia Pitera) (äänestys)

6.7. Resurssitehokkuutta koskeva aloite: elintarvikejätteen vähentäminen ja elintarviketurvallisuuden parantaminen (A8-0175/2017 - Biljana Borzan) (äänestys)

6.8. Tullin toiminnan ja hallinnon ulkoisten näkökohtien arviointi kaupan helpottamisen ja laittoman kaupan torjumisen välineenä (A8-0162/2017 - Tiziana Beghin) (äänestys)

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam głosowanie.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone na kilka minut)

7. Äänestysesitykset

7.1. EU:n ja Bosnia ja Hertsegovinan vakautus- ja assosiaatiosopimus (Kroatian liittyminen Euroopan unioniin) (A8-0169/2017 - Cristian Dan Preda)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Uniunea Europeană finanțează reformele din Bosnia cu aproape 900 milioane EUR până în 2019. Numai anul acesta trimitem în Bosnia 44 milioane EUR.

Însă pacea de la Dayton din 1995 a creat instituții nefuncționale astăzi. Poate a fost necesar atunci ca să se încheie războiul, însă astăzi fac ca această țară să nu poată funcționa. Nu se poate adopta o lege decât în fiecare republică, Republica Srpska, Federația Bosnia și Herțegovina, plus cantoanele din Bosnia și Herțegovina, ca atare practic este nefuncțional și asta trebuie remediat, pentru că războiul s-a încheiat, repet, și țara trebuie să meargă înainte.

Pentru ca Bosnia să aibă un viitor european, politicienii din Sarajevo trebuie să aplice reformele politice și administrative, să combată corupția, să ia măsuri pentru reducerea șomajului. Mulțumesc.

7.2. EU:n sähköisen hallinnon toimintaohjelma 2016–2020 (A8-0178/2017 - Sabine Verheyen)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Guvernarea electronică este vitală pentru o guvernare în interes public. Trebuie creat un portal digital pentru accesul deschis și transparent la informații al cetățenilor și IMM-urilor. Digitalizarea se referă la furnizarea obligatorie a datelor, dar în același timp la accesibilitatea informațiilor pe care oamenii sau IMM-urile le doresc.

Oamenii au nevoie în fiecare zi de acces direct și rapid la informații, să ne gândim numai la administrație, la cea fiscală sau la cea de sănătate. Extinderea benzii largi este esențială pentru o conectare rapidă, mai ales în România, unde 47% din populație trăiește în mediul rural.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Plan rozwoju administracji elektronicznej na lata 2016–2020 to jeden z ważniejszych planów dla rozwoju cywilizacyjnego Unii Europejskiej. Trudno sobie bowiem w dzisiejszych czasach wyobrazić rozwój społeczeństwa elektronicznego bez e-administracji.

Jest z tym jednak duży kłopot, zarówno w skali Unii, jak i w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. W sektorze prywatnym komunikacja elektroniczna jest już powszechna i trudno sobie wyobrazić rozwój gospodarki i przedsiębiorczości bez elektroniki, natomiast e-administracja kuleje. Bardzo ważne jest, aby w ramach planu rozwoju administracji elektronicznej w Unii Europejskiej nadal ten priorytet realizować i osiągać zawarte w planie cele.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, today I voted against the EU eGovernment Action Plan 2016–2020. I fully support the use of the internet and modern technology to enhance democracy, but I believe it should be a matter for individual Member States. Forcing new techniques on Member States may well run contrary to local cultures and could disenfranchise the many who are not used to using such systems.

Furthermore, it is abundantly clear that the internet is not secure, and rushing into eGovernment threatens the security of nations.

I also have grave – very grave – issues over the potential for the imposition of Brussels-generated censorship and the overall loss of personal liberty. The digital single market is a poorly disguised attempt by the European Union to take control over the internet, and the cosiness between the European Union and some internet giants makes me uneasy. I object to the power grab and I encourage all Member States to do their own thing.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc domnule președinte, am susținut acest raport, l-am votat, însă în discuțiile și în dezbateri am spus de ce trebuie să nu rămână doar un plan de acțiune pe hârtie. Avem foarte multe probleme cu mediul rural. Există doar 28% din populația din mediul rural conectată la internet. Nu putem să facem o e-guvernare în piața internă dacă nu conectăm și mediul rural.

De asemenea, avem nevoie de creșterea abilităților cetățenilor, nu numai a lucrătorilor în administrație. Trebuie și cetățeanul în raport cu administrația să aibă abilități de utilizare a calculatorului. Și apoi să nu uităm de atacurile cibernetice din aceste zile. Trebuie să asigurăm protecția.

Concomitent aceste lucruri trebuie făcute și trebuie să dezvoltăm într-adevăr e-guvernarea pentru că aduce foarte mult profit, combate corupția, crește productivitatea și, evident, crește gradul de informare a cetățenilor. Avem nevoie de plan, dar trebuie concomitent să ne preocupăm cum dăm fondurile de coeziune pentru zonele sărace și zonele îndepărtate pentru a nu discrimina acești cetățeni.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já jsem tento akční plán podpořil a poněkud se divím tomu, že by tato agenda měla spadat do výlučné působnosti členských států, jak jsme slyšeli i od kolegyně.

Já jsem přesvědčen, že právě pro realizaci zejména všech těch čtyř základních svobod, ale obecně i pro přeshraniční eGovernment, je elektronizace státní správy naprosto klíčová. Je důležitá i v dalších oblastech, jako je právě venkov. To již zde bylo zmíněno. Nebo elektronizace zdravotnictví může kvalitativně přispět k vylepšení kvality života.

To jsou všechno oblasti, do kterých musíme investovat, do digitalizace postupů při rozhodování orgánů veřejné správy. Mohl bych toho zde napočítat daleko více. Skutečně prioritou 21. století musí být zajištění elektronizace veřejné správy na všech úrovních a přístupu k internetu pro všechny sféry obyvatelstva EU.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Všichni jsme si vědomi toho, že v posledních letech se digitalizuje všechno kolem nás. Proto já vítám akční plán Evropské komise, která se snaží respektovat ten trend, který postupuje v naší společnosti.

Jsem naprosto přesvědčen o tom, že právě digitalizace veřejné správy pomůže zlepšit jak její dostupnost, tak i kvalitu veřejných služeb, tak i boj proti korupci a pomůže občanům jednotlivých států, např. malým a středním podnikatelům, na které je často při této otázce zapomínáno.

Osobně si pak do budoucna myslím, že je potřeba se zabývat přeshraničním eGovernmentem, protože podle mého názoru je to důležitý krok k tomu, aby se naplnily čtyři základní svobody EU.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, today the EU voted on a government action plan on digital control of EU institutions in the public sector. What does this actually mean? Listen to the words placed in the documents. What it actually means is that the EU wants to know about every individual's data in the European Union being controlled in every country's public bodies: the tax system, the NHS. This document today says that the EU wants to have Big Brother beyond any concept of Big Brother. If you have private data with your doctor, the EU will know about it. If you have data about your taxation, the EU will know about it. Your passport, the EU will know about it. From the moment you get up in the morning to the moment that you go to bed at night, EU bodies will know everything about you. Big government, the big state, the big EU is here.

7.3. Vuosikertomus 2015 EU:n taloudellisten etujen suojaamisesta – petostentorjunta (A8-0159/2017 - Julia Pitera)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Mulțumesc. În 2014 s-au încasat din TVA mai puțin cu 160 miliarde EUR față de veniturile reale obținute din TVA. În plus, sumele fraudate în ultimii trei ani au crescut în mod constant. Nu există încă un sistem unificat, unificator, unitar de date care să poată fi comparate între statele membre. Ca atare, este greu de măsurat ce face fiecare și cum colectează și unde greșește. Dar probabil că și asta e făcută în mod special. De aceea este obligatoriu, în concluzie, să susținem și să facem cât mai repede instituția Procurorului European antifraudă care să fie independentă, eficientă, imparțială și care să lucreze împotriva fraudei și cu precădere, să nu uităm, să aibă puterea să pună sechestru asupra bunurilor care se presupune că au fost fraudate sau asupra banilor, așa încât să poată fi confiscate.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this report, which unfortunately highlights a negative trend in fraudulent practices in the EU, which increased by 36% in comparison to 2014. It is apparent that there are still many legislative loopholes which need to be addressed when it comes to identifying and tackling fraudulent financial activity among the members of the European Union. In order to reverse this trend and protect EU financial interest, enhanced cooperation at EU level and between EU bodies and the Member State competent authorities is crucial. In addition, I strongly agree that OLAF as an institution should work more efficiently; investigations must be shortened and recommendations to the Member States better enforced. Finally, it is time to value seriously the role of whistle-blowers in disclosing irregular practices. Whistle-blower protection should be made a clear priority.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – È molto complesso parlare di frodi nell'Unione europea, perché ciò che emerge dalla relazione annuale e che noi abbiamo voluto sottolineare in commissione REGI è che in realtà non si può fare affidamento sui dati.

In Europa ci sono sistemi giuridici diversi, non esiste una fattispecie riconosciuta come frode a livello comunitario, gli Stati membri hanno piena discrezionalità nel comunicare il numero di frodi rilevate o accertate. Tutti meccanismi che complicano il quadro e lo espongono a facili strumentalizzazioni. Non è detto, per esempio, che gli Stati che dichiarano più frodi siano effettivamente i più corrotti, spesso vuol dire semplicemente che hanno un sistema più efficace di controllo.

Poi bisogna distinguere tra frodi e irregolarità. In particolare per quel che riguarda la politica di coesione la difficoltà delle procedure e la burocrazia determinano un elevato numero di irregolarità, che rare volte però alla fine vengono accertate come frodi.

Allora la strada da seguire è quella che stanno percorrendo l'OLAF e i servizi nazionali di coordinamento antifrode, gli AFCOS, che stanno facendo sforzi per accertare proprio questo.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc domnule președinte, de la bun început spun că am votat, am susținut acest raport. Am spus în dezbateri și vreau să repet și acum: fraudele se fac transfrontalier, datele statistice arată că în mod deosebit pe TVA, care de altfel este și taxa care susține cel mai mult bugetele naționale. Nu pot să nu spun că în acordurile comerciale cu țările pe care le are Uniunea Europeană, exact de acolo vin și foarte multe produse contrafăcute, contrafăcute pe preț, contrafăcute pe cantitate sau pe compoziție.

De aceea cred că este bine să avem acest raport, dar nu vom putea dacă nu va funcționa uniunea vamală și nu va funcționa uniunea vamală dacă nu vor fi finanțate sistemele de informatizare pentru transmiterea datelor.

Și sunt de acord cu sechestrul bunurilor dar numai când sunt dovedite fraudele, nu când sunt suspectate.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, I voted against this annual report on the protection of the European Union's financial interests, entitled 'Fight against fraud'. I want to see fraud resolved and I want to see a very strong position taken on fraud, but when you have a system and an organisation like the European Union policing itself – and we know the many faults in that particular area – then you will understand why I could not support a report that, quite frankly, papered over the cracks, did not want to deal with the issues and was in essence a token gesture.

Had the report been a lot stronger in accurately identifying the scale of the issues, and had there not been amendments submitted that actually highlighted the countries at fault, then I might have supported its adoption, but I want to see scrutiny, transparency and accuracy. I do not want to see the detail being hidden.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já jsem dlouho váhal, jak se k této zprávě postavit. Nakonec jsem se tedy zdržel při hlasování a využívám šance vysvětlit svůj politický postoj.

Já jsem proto, abychom velmi tvrdě bojovali proti finančním podvodům a hájili finanční zájmy EU, ale na druhou stranu musím přiznat, že některé formulace v dané zprávě mi připadají hodně abstraktní a s některými bohužel se nemohu zcela ztotožnit.

Např. si myslím, že nepomůže příliš v boji proti podvodům to, že zřizujeme úřad evropského prokurátora. Ve chvíli, kdy pouze určitá část států se k této nové instituci přihlásila a tedy nemalá část zemí takovýto úřad nebude respektovat a nebude spadat pod jeho působnost. To se domnívám, že příliš v boji proti finančním podvodům nepomůže.

Myslím si tedy, že bychom měli hledat trochu jiné cesty, než které byly v dané zprávě navrženy.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, vótálas i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo mar a rinne 553 Fheisire as 676; agus dár ndóigh is fadhb í seo a bhí ann riamh agus, faraor, beidh sé linn go deo. Ach ní hé sin le rá gur cheart dúinn cur suas leis; caithfimid a bheith ar an airdeall i gcónaí go háirithe má bhaineann sé le caiteachas airgid an Aontais.

Cuireann sé déistean orm go bhfuil mí-úsáid agus mímhacántacht ag dul i méid in ionad ag dul i laghad maidir le caiteachas airgid an Aontais. Dá bhrí sin, tá sé thar a bheith tábhachtach go mbeadh pionós dian ar na tíortha agus ar na tionscnaimh éagsúla nach bhfuil macánta agus, freisin, ba chóir dúinn níos mó cumhachta a thabhairt d'OLAF agus, b'fhéidir d'Europol, agus níos mó acmhainne a thabhairt dóibh chun deireadh a chur leis an gcleachtas mímhacánta seo.

7.4. Resurssitehokkuutta koskeva aloite: elintarvikejätteen vähentäminen ja elintarviketurvallisuuden parantaminen (A8-0175/2017 - Biljana Borzan)

Ustne vyjašnenia dotyczące głosowania

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, всяка година 1 милиард и 300 милиона тона храна се губят или разхищават, като само в Европа цифрата е 88 милиона тона. В България процентът на гражданите, живеещи под прага на бедността, е малко над 40 процента. Над 30 процента от дохода им бива „изяждан“ така да се каже от трапезата.

Същевременно над 900 хиляди тона храна се изхвърлят в България. За мен като гражданин е тежко, когато видя нашите баби, дядовци, майки и бащи да ровят или да обикалят около кофите. Това е социално безотговорно и силно вярвам, че бизнесът трябва да заеме активна роля.

Похвални са стъпките, които българският омбудсман Мая Манолова предприе, както и усилията и постигнатото от българската хранителна банка. Но борбата с този социален проблем трябва да бъде диктувана от правителството, а не да се очаква от гражданите да настояват за това. Не трябва да чакаме съвети за добри практики отвън, а трябва сами да предложим мерки за оползотворяване на остатъчния хранителен ресурс.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W tęsknocie za Polską znany poeta Cyprian Kamil Norwid pisał: „Do kraju tego, gdzie kruszynę chleba podnoszą z ziemi przez uszanowanie dla darów Nieba... Tęskno mi Panie...”.

Dlatego między innymi zauważam także moralną konieczność przeciwdziałania marnotrawieniu żywności wszelkimi sposobami i środkami oraz zgłaszałam poprawki szczególnie dotyczące konieczności poprawy jakości żywności. Mimo, że głosowałam za sprawozdaniem, szkoda, że nie odnotowano problemu, jaki, moim zdaniem, jest niezwykle ważny, szczególnie z powodu wysokiego odsetka jej marnotrawienia w gospodarstwach domowych.

W sprawozdaniu poruszono szereg ważnych aspektów, jednak jednym z ważnych, a nieuwzględnionych aspektów jest zła jakość żywności, szczególnie przetworzonej, wyprodukowanej z użyciem pestycydów, konserwantów i innych dodatków, antybiotyków, dodatkowo często fałszowanej, która, przewożona tysiące kilometrów, jest po prostu niesmaczna i szybko – nawet jeszcze zdatna do spożycia – staje się niejadalna.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, one bag out of four is thrown away in Europe. This is economically, environmentally and morally unacceptable. Back in 2011, when we did the report in this Parliament, I started a campaign in Sweden called Basta to Food Waste, a grassroots movement to get people to change their lifestyle without reducing their living standards. Therefore I very much welcome our vote today in favour of substantially reducing food waste, continuing to keep the issue high on our agenda and raising awareness.

We have voted to have a common definition and common methodology to measure food waste, and that will also help us to exchange good practices. Member States must facilitate food donations. There are still tax rules and legal requirements that make it easier for retailers and restaurants to throw away edible food rather than reusing it or giving it to those in need. Innovative solutions and shared economic co-cooking should also be encouraged and, most importantly, the difference between 'best before' and 'use by' dates has to be made clear to consumers.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – V Evropski uniji letno ustvarimo kar za 88 milijonov ton zavržene hrane, medtem ko si kar 55 milijonov Evropejcev niti vsak drugi dan ne more privoščiti kakovostnega obroka. Dobro polovico prehranskih odpadkov ustvarjajo gospodinjstva in seveda tudi javni sektor. Ti odpadki sicer nastajajo vzdolž celotne prehranske verige, od kmetij preko živilske predelovalne industrije do trgovin in seveda tudi supermarketov.

Po podatkih organizacije za hrano in kmetijstvo je namreč v svetu podhranjenih kar 793 milijonov ljudi, v sami EU pa kar 55 milijonov. Raziskave kažejo, da se v EU v enem letu v prehranski verigi zavrže na primer 377 ton paradižnika. Za pridelavo takšne količine paradižnika pa je potrebnih 90 km² površin, 57 milijard litrov vode in 7 milijonov delovnih ur, pridelek pa konča na smetišču. In kot smo slišali danes, je to odprto področje tudi za tako imenovano krožno gospodarstvo, zato pa je potrebno tudi prisluhniti davčnim olajšavam in bolj učinkovitemu naročanju, kar je zelo pomembno.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Efektywne gospodarowanie zasobami jest obecnie wyzwaniem cywilizacyjnym. W ramach tego zadania mieści się również szacunek do żywności. Tymczasem w Unii Europejskiej marnujemy rocznie prawie 90 milionów ton żywności. Najwięcej, bo 53 %, w gospodarstwach domowych, ale nie lepiej jest na innych etapach łańcucha żywnościowego, np. w przetwórstwie (19 %) czy w gastronomii (12 %). Biorąc jednak pod uwagę, że najwięcej żywności marnuje się w gospodarstwach domowych, główny nacisk trzeba – moim zdaniem – położyć na podnoszenie świadomości obywateli w tym zakresie, rozwój świadomości konsumenckiej.

Inną kwestią są ułatwienia dla tych, którzy mogliby się podzielić, ale na przykład mają przed sobą barierę podatkową. Myślę tutaj o dyrektywie dotyczącej VAT. Konieczne są zmiany, które umożliwią bezpodatkowe przekazywanie żywności w postaci darowizn.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Ridurre lo spreco alimentare è una questione morale e anche una questione economica, perché 88 milioni di tonnellate di rifiuti alimentari all'anno equivalgono a 173 chili per cittadino europeo, una quantità enorme, della quale i più non hanno neppure consapevolezza.

Gli sprechi purtroppo si verificano in tutti i passaggi della catena alimentare. Per questo serve un'azione coordinata che coinvolga dal produttore al consumatore e che si occupi di favorire soprattutto le donazioni, perché nel mondo, non lo dimentichiamo, ci sarebbe cibo per tutti ma non tutti hanno cibo.

Per fortuna ci sono anche le pratiche che favoriscono le donazioni e, oltre a questo, ci sono le esperienze che minimizzano gli sprechi, per esempio attraverso delle applicazioni che a fine giornata alcuni commercianti usano per mandare degli alert e applicare degli sconti sui prodotti freschi.

Considerato che lo spreco alimentare è però opera di famiglie, di consumi privati, dobbiamo mettere in campo delle politiche che includano la formazione e l'educazione già a scuola. È nostra responsabilità.

Franč Bogovič (PPE). – Povsem nesprejemljivo je in vsi se s tem strinjamo, da ne smemo zavreči kar 170 kg hrane vsak od nas v Evropi vsako leto. Se pravi eno tretjino hrane zavržemo, ob tem pa 10 % ljudi nima virov za kvalitetno hrano. Vedeti moramo, da več kot pol te hrane zavržemo v gospodinjstvih, potem še v ostalih delih te prehranske verige od predelave, gostinstva, trgovinskega sektorja.

Zato je nujno to, kar piše v poročilu, narediti veliko na ozaveščanju mladih, ozaveščanju potrošnikov, lokalnih skupnosti. Prav je, da se v to vključijo prostovoljci, tudi strokovna javnost, ki lahko veliko pripomore k boljšemu izkoriščanju hrane.

Zakonodajni okvir, kar smo zapisali v poročilu, roki uporabe, tudi olajšave za dobičke in pa tudi za tiste, ki darujejo hrano. Pomembno je pa tudi okoljsko breme, ki ga ustvarja zavržena hrana, saj predstavlja kar 8 % emisij toplogrednih plinov, zato so nujne te spodbude, tudi da v kontekstu krožnega gospodarstva te odpadke uporabimo kot vir, ne pa da obremenjujemo okolje.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, votei contra esta iniciativa porque não vai reduzir os desperdícios alimentares. Pelo contrário, vai fomentar mais ainda o lucro da distribuição e da indústria alimentar que continuarão tendo ao seu alcance muito mais alimentos de que precisam e a baixos preços, com a certeza de que terão saída na doação e no negócio da alimentação para os animais.

Também abre as portas a incentivos fiscais no futuro para as doações e para financiar com fundos públicos a recolha, o transporte, o armazenamento e a distribuição das doações.

Entretanto, o desemprego direto e indireto continuará aumentando com o desaparecimento da pequena e média agricultura, e a pobreza, a exclusão social e o desperdício de energia também.

A fome não se combate com caridade, combate-se com políticas que garantam rendimentos e salários decentes para toda a população. Reduzir a produção, regular as produções em relação aos mercados, equilibrar a oferta e a procura, procurar mercados locais, vender produtos frescos e a granel e adotar datas de vencimento, reduzindo as embalagens de longa duração, são alguns dos passos no bom caminho.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já obecně některé iniciativní zprávy nevítám, ale tato je rozhodně pro mě velmi důležitá, protože upozorňuje na problém, který každý z nás může svým chováním tak trochu ovlivnit.

Ve světle toho, kolik milionů lidí na světě každý den hladoví, každé vyhozené jídlo z naší lednice představuje vlastně facku těmto lidem. Ta zpráva je velmi dobrá, je popisná, ukazuje, kolik milionů tun jídla vyhodíme, kolik milionů tun zdrojů spotřebujeme na zpracování takového potravinového odpadu atd. Je tam navrženo jedno, podle mého názoru, velmi smysluplné opatření, a to je otázka právě té pobídky v oblasti daně z přidané hodnoty.

Byl bych velmi rád, kdyby Komise na tento apel slyšela. Já jsem tuto zprávu podpořil, jak vyplývá z mého vysvětlení, které teď provádím, ale chci zároveň říci, že nemůžeme zůstat pouze u této zprávy. Musíme lidem říci, že je to také hlavně o jejich chování. Takže: osvěta, osvěta, osvěta.

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, la lutte contre le gaspillage alimentaire est probablement l'un des actes manqués les plus flagrants de nos politiques européennes. Cinquante textes européens s'y attellent, plus même: des directives, des règlements, des résolutions et malgré cela, chaque foyer européen jette chaque année l'équivalent de 400 euros de nourriture. C'est un gaspillage inacceptable, amoral même, quand on connaît – et ils ont été cités – les chiffres de la pauvreté en Europe.

La Commission n'a d'autre choix que celui de l'ambition, à savoir rectifier le tir et être aux côtés du Parlement européen pour réaliser nos objectifs de réduction des déchets alimentaires, à savoir moins 30 % d'ici 2025 et moins 50 % d'ici 2030.

Deux points sont essentiels: clarifier l'étiquetage, d'une part, comme cela a déjà été dit, car les «à consommer de préférence avant» et les «à consommer jusqu'au» sont de véritables autoroutes pour le gaspillage, et penser global, d'autre part, si l'on veut le réduire du producteur au consommateur. L'agriculture, la pêche, l'environnement, la santé, la TVA: tous ces secteurs sont concernés, mais il nous faut un moteur, une véritable volonté, une véritable stratégie de l'Union européenne.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Já bych k této zprávě řekl, že jsem pro ni hlasoval, protože ji považuji za velmi důležitou, ale možná mi v ní chybí jedna zásadní věc, která tu nebyla zmíněna, a to, že neexistuje vlastně metodika, jakým způsobem změřit plýtvání potravinami. Myslím si, že Evropská komise by měla začít právě od tohoto bodu.

Potom bychom se mohli dostat k dalším bodům. Třeba jaké obaly můžeme dnes užívat proto, abychom s potravinami nemuseli dále plýtvat, nebo vysvětlení pojmů spotřebujte do nebo minimální trvanlivost. Já si myslím, že řada spotřebitelů vůbec rozdíl mezi těmito pojmy neuznává nebo o něm neví.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, arís vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo mar a rinne 623 Fheisire as 676 sa chás seo; agus taispeánann sé sin go dtuigeann feisirí cé chomh tábhachtach is atá an t-ábhar seo agus cé chomh tábhachtach is atá sé dúinn chun rud éigin a dhéanamh faoi. Dar ndóigh, tá na figiúirí den bhia a chaitear amach gach uile bhliain scanrúil. I ndáiríre, tá sé mímhórálta. Féach ar na figiúirí: 88 milliún tona de bhia caite amach gach uile bhliain san Aontas ar chostas €143 billiún ag úsáid an méid uisce a ritheann trí abhainn an Volga sa Rúis agus ag cur 3.3 billiún tona astaíochtaí CO₂ san atmaisféar. Is léir go gcaithfid aontú chun deireadh a chur leis seo.

7.5. Tullin toiminann ja hallinnon ulkoisten näkökohtien arviointi kaupan helpottamisen ja laittoman kaupan torjumisen välineenä (A8-0162/2017 - Tiziana Beghin)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Unia celna jest jednym z głównych filarów Unii Europejskiej. Prawo stanowione w tym zakresie jest jednak skomplikowane, a procedury bardzo trudne. Ogranicza to w pewnym zakresie działalność małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw – myślę tutaj o działalności transgranicznej – a ułatwia niestety nielegalną działalność firmom przestępczym.

Konieczne są zatem zmiany przepisów i procedur, w tym także wdrożenie rozwiązań elektronicznych. Ale nie tylko przepisy, nie tylko procedury są istotne. Ważne jest też to, żeby wzmocnić współdziałanie między administracjami celnymi państw członkowskich. Równie istotne jest to, co zostało podniesione w dokumencie, a więc wzmocnienie współpracy administracji celnej z przedsiębiorstwami. Jeśli te zadania zostaną wykonane, być może będziemy mieli lepsze efekty w tym obszarze.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, at the core of these proposals is the creation of yet another European Union control body, this time to manage Member States' customs authorities. Now, as always, the European Union is dressing up a power grab, and I emphasise 'a power grab', as something beneficial – in this case, to prevent illegal and counterfeit goods entering the Union. But the reality is that Brussels is looking to extend its control and to reduce again the sovereignty of Member States. Remember that the freedom of movement, people, services and goods is in place as a key pillar, and yet it seems at odds with what we have been voting on this morning.

The salami tactic for power-grabbing has been going on for years, and I am very glad that, once Brexit finally takes place, the United Kingdom will not have to cede yet more power and more control to Brussels – to yet another EU body – in respect of what should be a Member State competence.

Tiziana Beghin (EFDD). – Finalmente la relazione dogane è stato approvato e arrivare a questo punto non è stato facile, perché questa è una relazione scomoda, che denuncia come alcuni Paesi non applichino i dovuti controlli in dogana facendo entrare nel mercato europeo miliardi di EUR di prodotti contraffatti o addirittura pericolosi.

Una relazione che è stata osteggiata fin dall'inizio, qui in Parlamento, prima un lungo conflitto di attribuzione, poi una serie interminabile di colpi bassi parlamentari e, infine, la scorsa settimana la richiesta di alcuni partiti di rinviare il voto a data da destinarsi.

A tutti coloro che hanno provato a fermarci io voglio dire che non ci sono riusciti e voglio invece ringraziare tutti quelli che hanno supportato la nostra battaglia, la maggioranza in effetti. Non è stato facile ma alla fine la relazione dogane è realtà e ora auspico che la Commissione dia subito seguito alle nostre raccomandazioni.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc domnule președinte, profit de ocazie că este raportarea aici să o felicit. Da, nu a fost ușor și nu este niciodată ușor să obținem un raport, însă astăzi am dezbătut și am votat două rapoarte importante.

Combaterea fraudei și comerțul ilicit sunt două lucruri de care trebuie să ne preocupăm și nu se vor putea face decât dacă există o cooperare, o transmitere de date pentru că, așa cum am spus, și comerțul ilicit se face transfrontalier, se fac importuri nesupravegheate.

Este nevoie ca statele membre să conlucreze în acest sens și trebuie să spunem că atât comerțul ilicit cât și fraudă sunt ca un cancer pentru IMM-uri, mai ales, pentru întreprinzătorii care lucrează corect, dar sunt și un pericol pentru cetățean pentru că nu numai importurile de alimente despre care vorbea raportarea, dar jucăriile, îmbrăcămintea și toate celelalte produse pot să fie un pericol pentru consumatori.

De aceea am susținut raportul, dar trebuie să solicităm Comisiei, așa cum am spus-o în dezbateri, să vină permanent să ne informeze cu îmbunătățirile care apar sau cu măsuri noi pentru a obține rezultate pozitive.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pokud se týká této zprávy, já jsem ji podpořil. Skutečně považuji celní unii za jeden ze skvělých projektů EU a chci poděkovat všem celníkům za vynikající práci, kterou vesměs odvádí.

Ano, je pravdou, že celní řízení je mnohdy velmi složité, administrativně náročné a je naším úkolem, abychom tuto administrativní náročnost co nejvíce odstraňovali. Musíme také motivovat samozřejmě celní úřady ke spolupráci a koordinovat právě na evropské úrovni tu jejich spolupráci, která mnohdy skutečně vážne. Je to velmi důležité právě z hlediska potírání nelegálního obchodu, protože ten porušuje to právo vyžadovat plnění všech povinností.

Kdo porušuje právo, většinou získává nějakou neoprávněnou výhodu a ten, kdo jej dodržuje, se potom tedy dostává do velmi nevýhodné situace, takže my bychom měli zajistit dodržování práva i na úseku právě celní unie.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Já jsem tuto zprávu také překvapivě podpořil, protože považuji EU a celní unii v ní jako základ nějakého budoucího světového vývoje.

Celní orgány podle mě hrají významnou roli při ochraně také ekonomických zájmů. Je důležité, aby měly efektivní strategii a také, aby snižovaly důsledky škod nelegálního obchodu. Se vzrůstajícím mezinárodním obchodem je ale potřeba čelit novým výzvám při obchodování. Je potřeba zlepšit spolupráci celních orgánů a především výměnu dat mezi celními orgány. Také je důležité, aby celní orgány v jednotlivých členských státech postupovaly stejně a aby nebyl opakovaně různorodý výklad evropských pravidel.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, today the EU voted on a report on the tools needed to facilitate trade with countries outside the European Union. The report, which is here in my hand, actually says that complex rules and procedures can overburden small and medium-sized enterprises, placing considerable strain upon them. I have been arguing for the past two and a half years that this is what the EU has been doing through its rules across the whole of Europe. It also recognises the need for free trade and cooperation agreements and says that it has them with South Korea, Canada, the US, China and Japan. Yet when it comes to Brexit and the United Kingdom, in this report the views on free trade and small business between the EU and the UK goes out of the window as MEPs in this Chamber – as you can see, an empty one at the moment – demand further punishment of the United Kingdom rather than entering into a free trade arrangement. That is the EU negotiating style.

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

8. Äänestyskäyttämistä ja äänestysaikeita koskevat ilmoitukset: ks. pöytäkirja

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 13.35 i wznowione o godz. 15.20)

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

9. Edellisen istunnon pöytäkirjan hyväksyminen: ks. pöytäkirja

10. EU:n Syyria-strategia (keskustelu)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de la Declaración de la vicepresidenta de la Comisión y alta representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad sobre la estrategia de la Unión para Siria [2017/2654(RSP)].

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, thank you very much, and I apologise for the delay. We had a longer-than-expected college meeting and I apologise for that. I am particularly glad that we have the opportunity to again share in this Hemicycle the work we are doing on Syria – especially today, as the UN has reconvened the talks: intra-Syrian talks in Geneva just started this morning. I spoke just a couple of hours ago with Staffan de Mistura again, the UN Special Envoy, who has this morning concluded the first renewed round of talks with the Syrian parties, for a new round aiming at entering into the substance of the political transition, including on constitutional setup. This is the process on which and in which the European Union is investing, supporting the intra-Syrian talks, the UN facilitation and the work of the Syrian opposition, the civil society, especially the women of Syria – work that we support every day with our teams, both in Geneva and in Brussels, but also in the region.

So the European Union has a special role to play, to help the Syrian people end the war in their country. The European Union is not a military actor in Syria. I know some might argue that this makes us a less powerful player in the region. Even if, as you know well, I always value a lot whenever we manage or we decide to use also our hard power in some situations that require this, I strongly believe that the fact that we are not a military player in the Syrian crisis makes us stronger in the political context of trying to solve the problem and the crisis there, exactly because we have not taken part in the devastation of the country, and at the same time we have been on the side of the civilian population, all through the war, as the first humanitarian donor for Syrians both within and outside the country. Exactly for this reason, we have a stronger role to play when it comes to the political mediation and solution.

First of all, let me stress one basic thing that sometimes we take for granted, but I think in these times we are living, it is definitely not something that is irrelevant: we are the ones contributing to the humanitarian work inside Syria and around Syria. We are the ones bringing aid through the UN agencies and international organisations; trying to save every single life; trying to bring every single child to school; trying to guarantee the minimum basic living conditions for Syrians.

This is something I will always be proud of. Some might consider that Realpolitik goes as far as making this irrelevant. Let me tell you that the basic condition – not only of humanity from my perspective, but also for the political future of Syria – is that there are some Syrians left. I am sorry, this is very hard to say, but our work of saving lives on the ground, guaranteeing that people have humanitarian aid, medical assistance, food, water – basic, basic living conditions – is first a humanitarian duty, and second it is also a major political asset, also to be a recognised, trusted, political actor for the parties. It is precious: so precious that to me it is invaluable.

Because we have not destroyed, because we help life, we can better help the Syrians rebuild the future of the country. And this is something that not only the international community, not only the region, but also and first of all, the Syrians recognise to the European Union. This is the core of the European Union's Strategy on Syria, adopted by the Council on 3 April, with conclusions endorsing my joint communication with the Commission. This is our answer to anyone who believes – as I was saying – that we are powerless because we are not shooting. It is exactly the contrary. The entire European Union is united behind the goal of a political solution to the war and the means to achieve it. It demonstrates what we can do in practice to end this war and ensure that lives are protected, rights respected, democratic aspirations and needs are met.

In the Strategy we outlined a clear set of objectives: seeking a political solution to the conflict within the UN framework; supporting the opposition – including the High Negotiation Committee – to develop their proposal for a meaningful and inclusive transition; and in parallel, as I said, working to save lives, to promote human rights, to strengthen civil society, the role of women, to promote accountability for war crimes – that is extremely important, and I will come back to that – and to support the resilience of the Syrian people.

The Strategy indicates the direction of our actions. It is not a philosophical paper; it is a road map for acting together. Two days after it was endorsed, we have begun to put it into practice: hosting the major international Ministerial conference on Syria in Brussels, together with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We brought together 80 delegations from countries and international organisations from the region and the entire world, raising more than nine billion euros until 2020, including EUR 5.6 billion for 2017 alone. There was a risk of the international community being disrupted – of having a sort of donors' fatigue when it comes to the support to Syrians, and I was glad to see that we managed to mobilise more resources than last year in London. This is important; it makes a difference to the lives of the people on the ground. But again, as I said, it makes a difference also for the UN and our support to the UN system – another political objective which is very dear in our hearts and minds in this period of time, and it strengthens the possibility for political work to be done in Geneva.

More than two thirds of this amount comes from the European Union and the Member States. So, once again, we are throwing a lifeline to millions of Syrians, inside the country and in the region, building in this way the basic conditions for the future of Syria, the survival of Syrians.

As you might remember, on the eve of the Brussels Conference, a terrible chemical attack hit Idlib's province, and I do not believe this was a complete coincidence. Normally, as the international community gathers to work for peace and show unity, and determination and commitment, the enemies of peace tried to derail its efforts. But that very same day, from Brussels, from the European Union, from the UN, from so many countries and organisations, we sent two powerful messages. First, we all agreed that those responsible for these crimes must be held accountable. And last week, exactly one week ago, on Europe's Day, 9 May, in New York, I was briefing the UN Security Council and sharing with them the fact that the European Union fully stands behind the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in its investigations: this is the right forum to document any responsibilities for the use of chemical weapons in Syria. The Brussels Conference also made a call for support to the new 'International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism', established by the UN General Assembly, which will assist in investigating and prosecuting war crimes cases in Syria. Accountability for us is key.

Second, in Brussels we all committed to work for a political solution agreed among the Syrian parties as the only just but also the only realistic way to end the war.

Accountability and the need to support a political solution and to be serious about that: these were also the main messages we heard from the representatives of the Syrian civil society – Syrian women – during the Brussels Conference. Together with the third word we heard a very powerful word from them: hudna, hudna, hudna. They were repeating it to us, and this means 'we need a ceasefire'. We need violence to decrease and peace to reach some areas of the country. For three days, around the Brussels Conference, over 40 Syrians from all parts of Syria and from the diaspora, representatives of civil society organisations with very different backgrounds, women and men, different ages, worked to agree on a set of common messages for the Conference. Their representatives delivered their messages to the ministers in the political session. We have immediately turned into practice the Strategy's recognition of the civil society's crucial role, and I know this Parliament is particularly supportive of that – rightly so. These are the people who can reach across the conflict lines, talk to each other, heal the wounds of over six years of war, to make reconciliation truly possible on the ground, locally. And the expertise they hold will also be essential to post-conflict reconstruction.

In fact, let me say the Syrians who came to Brussels from within and outside of Syria, different parts of the country, agreed very much with our determination to begin preparations for the day after the end of the conflict. Because too many times – too many times – the international community, and also Europe, was not prepared for winning the peace after a war had ended. It is a mistake that we cannot afford anymore; Syria and the Syrians cannot afford that mistake. Of course, reconstruction will only begin when a political transition will be under way, not before. This is in the hands of the Syrian talks in Geneva under the UN auspices that the European Union is accompanying day by day. But the European Union has already started to engage and to contribute to the post-agreement planning, in close cooperation with the United Nations and the World Bank. Also because this can be a very powerful tool, maybe one of the most powerful tools today, to support and accompany the political process, showing the peace dividend, being an incentive to the Syrian parties to find and implement an agreement.

The same logic marks our Syria Strategy: we do not try to bet on the future, but to prepare for it and contribute to shaping it, together with the UN, together with the powers of the region, but most of all, with the people of Syria. Because peace can only come from the Syrian people, from a political solution agreed by the Syrian parties.

This is the most complex and the most violent conflict in our times, and it is clear, I think, by now to all in the world that no regional or global power alone has the strength to solve it. We need forces to join along one line, which is a political solution agreed by the Syrian parties in Geneva under the UN auspices.

All different initiatives – and we wish that all of them manage to deliver and to be implemented, including the ones taken in Astana – now have the big responsibility to converge towards Geneva, to help the Syrians build peace and find their own path towards national reconciliation. And there are no shortcuts for that. We have seen it for six years: Geneva, the UN process, the multilateral framework, these intra-Syrian talks are and must remain the only way to transition.

As I said today, Staffan de Mistura has resumed the talks with a clear intention of entering into the substance of the transition, starting from the constitutional set-up of the country. The European Union stands there in Geneva, as well as the work we do in Brussels and in the region, to accompany the UN, their work, to accompany the Syrian people for a democratic, united and inclusive Syria to finally bring peace to the country and to our entire region.

Arnaud Danjean, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute Représentante, notre impuissance collective à mettre un terme à la tragédie syrienne n'est pas seulement une tragédie morale vis-à-vis des centaines de milliers de victimes, c'est aussi un échec diplomatique qui assombrit considérablement toute perspective de stabilité dans le voisinage de l'Europe.

C'est pourquoi aucun effort diplomatique ne doit être épargné pour contribuer à la recherche d'une solution. La stratégie que vous nous exposez est à bien des égards encore terriblement décalée par rapport à une réalité dont l'horreur ne semble pas connaître de limites. Au moins a-t-elle le mérite de rappeler quelques principes d'une solution. Des principes, rappelons-le, déjà égrenés depuis cinq ans et qui, espérons-le, arriveront un jour à maturité.

Bien sûr, l'Europe est loin d'être la seule à blâmer pour cet échec. D'autres portent des responsabilités encore plus accablantes. Le régime d'abord, qui joue depuis le début la politique du pire, mais qui a encore des appuis et une réalité, pas seulement à Moscou et à Téhéran. Des groupes djihadistes, qui prospèrent sur le chaos et sèment une terreur d'ampleur inédite. Des puissances régionales irresponsables pour lesquelles la Syrie n'est qu'un terrain de manœuvres pour leurs propres ambitions. Et des grandes puissances qui ne semblent pas mesurer combien leurs visions soi-disant stratégiques sont en fait des petits calculs sordides à très court terme qui alimentent la crise et l'ont fait muter d'une guerre civile à une conflagration régionale durable.

L'Europe n'est malheureusement pas encore un acteur clé du règlement de ce conflit. Il faudrait sans doute avoir une approche plus réaliste des rapports de force, des ambitions peut-être plus modestes, mais en tout cas une volonté de tous les instants d'exercer toutes les influences possibles auprès de ceux qui ont une part du sort de la Syrie entre leurs mains.

Nos leviers humanitaires, financiers et politiques, que vous avez rappelés, doivent être concentrés sur des objectifs atteignables. Il ne peut y avoir d'autres priorités plus impérieuses à votre ordre du jour.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, today I will speak mainly about the future because we have to make every effort to ensure that there is a future for the people of Syria. We have to ensure that one of the main objectives of the EU Strategy on Syria is to facilitate a political solution, which should also include a UN monitoring and enforcement mechanism. Moreover, we have to make sure that the European Union plays the most effective and active role possible within the existing UN agreed negotiating framework. The European Union is the largest donor to the Syrian crisis and, through the last Brussels Conference, has committed itself to making a substantial post-conflict contribution to reconstruction.

Madam High Representative, we thus call on you to leverage this significant financial contribution in order to play the most immediate and important role in the negotiation process and to ensure that a fair and just political transition will come about as soon as possible for the Syrian people. We cannot leave this in the hands of an illegitimate regime that has slaughtered its own citizens for so many years. We cannot allow this to continue with the support of Syria's allies, Russia and Iran. We cannot let down the Syrian moderate opposition or the people of Syria. They are the ones to invest in and to protect if we want any kind of future for Syria – even more so now after the dreadful chemical attack in Khan Sheikhoun.

Civilians continue to suffer and to be targeted. Respect for the ceasefire has been violated many times, so we need to ensure that, finally, we have a ceasefire and, at the same time, that humanitarian workers will be allowed access.

It is also very important to ensure that the recent memorandum on the setting-up of the de-escalation zone, signed by Russia, Turkey and Iran, will not allow further targeting of the Syrian moderate opposition.

One key concept in all of this is 'early accountability'. It is fundamental now to bring justice, balance and moderation for any future government. Perpetrators should be brought to justice: they have to face criminal justice and be sanctioned by international law.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I say to the High Representative that we continue to describe the situation in Syria as being a civil war, but over the course of the past seven years the conflict has become increasingly a proxy war between the two main divisions of Islam. Despite paying lip service to the fight against ISIS, Russia continues to target the majority of its efforts against other Sunni groups that seek to overthrow the Assad Alawite regime. Turkey is still driven by Erdoğan's overriding aim of preventing the emergence of a Kurdish quasi-state on its Syrian border, regardless of the fact that the YPG forces have proved to be the most effective forces against ISIS and have received continuous support from Turkey's NATO allies, including the Americans.

Western efforts have, with the exception of the US strike against the Shayrat airbase in April, exclusively been focused on the fight against ISIS. The Assad regime, with Iranian support, is meanwhile at its strongest point since the conflict began, consolidating its territorial gains and confident that Russia's continuing military backing for it will give it sufficient protection. Such confidence was demonstrated by the horrendous chemical attack carried out in Idlib in April which killed 70 people. Such confidence has also resulted in other atrocious human rights abuses. Just yesterday the US State Department endorsed the findings of an Amnesty International report which claims that prisoners at the Saydnaya prison complex are being executed and buried and incinerated in mass graves.

In the Geneva UN talks, the departure of Assad is clearly the first point for moving forwards. I called in this House more than six years ago now for a no-fly zone, but all options must now be considered for the sake of defending civilians and their lives, of peace, including things such as transitional arrangements, territorial partitions and even amnesties, however unpalatable.

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

Udo Voigt (NI), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Tannock, woher nehmen Sie das Bewusstsein, dass die Nachrichten aus dem US-Außenministerium stimmen? Es war doch der amerikanische Außenminister Colin Powell, der während des Irakkriegs Lügen über Kriegsverbrechen verbreitet hat: Brutkastenmorde, er legte Fotos von Massenvernichtungswaffen vor, die überhaupt nicht existiert haben. Colin Powell sagt heute: Ich bereue, ich schlafe wie ein Baby, alle zwei Stunden wache ich auf und schreie. Wissen Sie das alles nicht?

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Mr President, I apologise, but my headphones were not working, so I did not catch the question. It will have to be repeated. I am sorry. Perhaps you could repeat it in a compressed, concise, telegraphic form.

El Presidente. – Le pido al señor Voigt que sea más breve en la pregunta que le haga al señor Tannock.

Udo Voigt (NI), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ja, in kurzer Form: Ich habe gefragt, woher Sie die Gewissheit nehmen, die Wahrheit vom amerikanischen Außenministerium zu hören? Denn Colin Powell, der damalige Außenminister der USA während des Irakkriegs, ist es doch gewesen, der uns auch gefälschte Bilder von Massenvernichtungswaffen, von den Brutkastenmorden in Kuwait und so weiter erzählt hat. Heute sagt er: Er bereut das und er schläft heute wie ein Baby und wacht nachts schreiend auf.

Charles Tannock (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – I do not think that I used the words ‘true facts’. I stated in my speech that the Syrian Assad regime has carried out atrocities. I will stand by that statement concerning the use of barrel bombs over civilian areas, with the killing of women and children deliberately by the regime. As for the probable use of chemical weapons, the fact that the previous administration under President Obama unfortunately refused to act on it as a red line has resulted in President Assad continuing to prosecute his war in an atrocious fashion. I do not deny that the other sides have also committed war crimes. There have been war crimes committed by all sides, but this is the most horrendous situation and I have no doubt about the guilt of the Assad regime.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, please allow me to start with a point of order. We started the debate 20 minutes late today, through no fault of the High Representative, but I think it would actually be normal and reasonable for you as President to inform Members. So that is just a kind request for the future.

I would like to say to the High Representative that the discussion on the EU-Syria strategy is very urgent. Yesterday, the US Government found a crematorium next to a military prison to hide mass killings, reminding us of the limitless brutalities perpetrated by the Assad regime and its allies and the immense suffering of innocent people in Syria. It also painfully reminds us of our own promises when we said never again. We must focus on justice and accountability, and peace for the people in Syria. I am afraid that we are not, as the EU – as you said in the last debate that we had – where we have to be with regard to Syria. Not at all. Nobody is.

At last there is a common position among Member States – better late than never – with this Syria strategy. Indeed we must demand a much stronger role towards a political solution that is negotiated under the leadership of the UN. We must leverage our role as a major humanitarian aid donor and as an expected contributor to the immense task of reconstruction to persuade those who kill and destroy to end this dead-end street, to stop sieges, detention, starvation as a war crime, to save the people, and also to make sure that our own interest is better safeguarded.

Besides the strategy, I would like to urge you again to do more to use the good contacts that you have developed in Tehran to persuade them to end the support for the Assad regime or face consequences. The same goes for those Member States, such as Italy, when there was an opportunity in the past, which have vetoed EU sanctions on Russia for their terrible support of the bombardment of innocent civilians. I believe there has to be accountability in the broadest sense and we still need more EU leadership because, in the vacuum that we leave, others take a role that will not benefit the interests of the Syrian people, nor our own.

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

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI), ερώτηση «γαλάζια κάρτα». – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ήθελα να ρωτήσω την κυρία συνάδελφο αν αυτά τα οποία ανέφερε σχετικά με τα κρεματόρια και τα λοιπά στη Συρία είναι αποκυήματα της φαντασίας της ή έχει αποδείξεις, για να μην λέμε στο Κοινοβούλιο διάφορα τέτοια χωρίς αποδείξεις.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – Sir, if you had listened you would have heard that I cited the US Government. It is your choice to believe it or not. But even without this latest report of the presence of crematoria, the suffering of the Syrian people speaks for itself. If you do not want to believe it, history will judge you harshly.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Mogherini, sabe que, em matéria de orientação geral, não tenho divergências de fundo com aquilo que são as posições que tem tomado em matéria de uma solução política e do apoio ao processo de conversações de Genebra e às negociações de Astana, mas, dito isto, estamos a falar da estratégia da União Europeia e creio que há muitos vazios por preencher na estratégia da União Europeia. Mesmo sendo apenas uma estratégia política que, como disse e concordo consigo, é muito, é o que faz falta.

Desde logo, na semana passada, soubemos das gravações quando houve um naufrágio, em 2013, no mar Mediterrâneo, onde morreram 268 pessoas, entre as quais 60 crianças, que foram deixadas à morte, literalmente, pelas autoridades italianas e maltesas, que não prestaram auxílio. Não ouvi da parte das autoridades e das instituições europeias uma palavra de condenação. E a questão é: onde é que estava a União Europeia aqui? Não estava. E deixaram-se morrer estas pessoas porque a União Europeia deixou de ter meios de ajuda humanitária, porque transformou a Frontex no patrulhamento, deixou que as vidas contassem menos e deixou que as fronteiras contassem mais no momento em que estas pessoas precisam de auxílio.

Uma outra questão tem a ver com a burocracia. Quando falamos da recolocação dos refugiados, porque é que demora tanto, porque é que é tão burocrático? Como é que é possível que dentro da União Europeia haja crianças sem papéis? Que conceção é esta de crianças sem papéis dentro da União Europeia?

Portanto, reduzir a burocracia está ao nosso alcance e finalmente, finalmente, Sr. Presidente, permita-me que termine, permitiu a toda a gente. Último ponto: disse e bem que a União Europeia não tem um papel direto militar na Síria mas tem um papel indireto. Pela terceira, quarta, quinta vez, as que forem preciso, digo: acabe-se com a venda de armas aos grupos terroristas por parte dos países europeus. Um embargo imediato, já, é o mínimo dos mínimos, porque só há paz se se acabar com a guerra e, para haver paz, não precisamos de armas europeias no território.

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Hohe Vertreterin Frau Mogherini! Sie haben darauf hingewiesen: Heute beginnt in Genf eine weitere Runde der Syrien-Friedensgespräche. Die Erwartungen, dass es diesmal zu einem Durchbruch kommt, sind dennoch weiterhin sehr gering. Allerdings gibt es die durch Russland initiierte Vereinbarung von Astana, gibt es Anlass zu vorsichtiger Hoffnung, denn die Vereinbarung sieht die Schaffung von sogenannten Deeskalationszonen vor. Die EU muss sich nun dafür einsetzen, dass zur Überwachung dieser Zonen der UN-Sicherheitsrat eingebunden wird, insbesondere mit dem Ziel, eine Blauhelmission dorthin zu entsenden.

Der Astana-Prozess kann gewiss eine hilfreiche Ergänzung für den Friedensprozess sein. Selbstverständlich muss aber die Oberhand für eine Friedenslösung bei den Vereinten Nationen bleiben. Es ist gut, dass die EU einen nationalen Aussöhnungsprozess in Syrien fördern will und dafür erwartet und einfordert, dass die Verantwortlichen für Kriegsverbrechen und Menschenrechtsverletzungen zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden. Daran müssen sich alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten politisch und finanziell beteiligen. Ich fordere die EU-Mitgliedstaaten auf, den im Dezember von der UN beschlossenen Mechanismus zur Untersuchung von Kriegsverbrechen in Syrien angemessen zu unterstützen. Aussöhnung und Rechenschaft für im Krieg begangene Verbrechen sind für eine friedliche Zukunft unerlässlich.

Ebenso rufe ich dazu auf, die syrische Zivilgesellschaft – sowohl in Syrien als auch im Exil – als vollwertige Akteure an der Zukunftsgestaltung ihres Landes zu beteiligen. Die EU sollte vor allem diejenigen stärken, die sich für Menschenrechte, die Gleichstellung der Frau und den Aufbau demokratischer Strukturen einsetzen. Ich begrüße es ausdrücklich, dass die EU weiterhin einen maßgeblichen Beitrag zur humanitären Hilfe in der Region leisten will – er ist dringend notwendig. Gleichfalls möchte ich aber auch betonen, dass geflüchtete Menschen aus Syrien großzügig in *resettlement*-Programmen in der EU Aufnahme finden, und dass wir legale Zugangswege für diese Opfer des Krieges schaffen und dass sie in angemessener Weise in Europa Schutz finden.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Alto rappresentante, i morti si contano o si pesano? Per me, per noi, si contano e basta, e il loro numero è inaccettabile nella sventurata terra siriana, un tempo culla di civiltà e di coesistenza tra religioni ed etnie, oggi un inferno di sangue, estremismo e violenza.

Tutti abbiamo appreso i tragici fatti di Khan Shaykhun, morti che piangiamo, violenze che condanniamo senza alcuna riserva, chiedendo un'inchiesta ONU indipendente che accerti le responsabilità perché i colpevoli devono pagare.

Purtroppo però noto che non tutti i morti sono pianti dai media nello stesso modo. Proprio ieri altre 23 vittime, di cui 12 donne, sono state trucidate dalle bombe della coalizione internazionale ai confini con l'Iraq. Si aggiungono ai 352 ufficiali dal 2014, forse sono anche di più, sospetto.

Tanti sono i disastri umanitari e siriani dimenticati. A Deir ez-Zor da quasi tre anni sono sotto assedio da parte di Daesh ben 120 000 civili intrappolati, che sopravvivono solo grazie ai lanci aerei ad alta quota delle Nazioni Unite. Nessuno li ricorda. Se quella zona fosse controllata dai miliziani, mi e vi chiedo, ci sarebbe forse maggiore attenzione?

Mentre a Ginevra si parla, la Siria brucia e ad Astana si decide. I negoziati ufficiali delle Nazioni Unite sembrano essere ridotti a un mero proforma. Al contrario, nella capitale kazaka viene sempre più definito il piano delle quattro zone di *de-escalation*, un piano grazie al quale le principali potenze globali e regionali si stanno confrontando sul posizionamento anche delle rispettive milizie satellite, spartendosi di fatto le rispettive zone di influenza nel martoriato scacchiere siriano. La verità è che ormai in questo complicatissimo scenario a tutti conviene quasi cristallizzare il conflitto, piuttosto che rischiare che sia solo uno a vincerlo.

Ma la vera domanda è: chi sarà a liberare Raqqa? Potranno farsi carico di questo immane e terribile compito, pur con i maggiori aiuti statunitensi, solamente i valorosi curdi dell'YPG che per anni hanno dovuto fronteggiare Daesh? Continueremo a tacere sulle pressioni turche, che continuano a considerarli un'organizzazione terroristica e dimostrano con minacce tutt'altro che velate la propria volontà di arrivare a uno scontro armato? Continueremo a tollerare che chi da anni sta pagando un prezzo altissimo in termini di vite, chi combatte questi miliziani pronti a farsi saltare in aria, possa essere aggredito da un paese candidato all'adesione?

Le chiedo inoltre una verifica attenta delle sanzioni anche sui beni *dual use*, perché, da quello che ci riferisce anche la Mezzaluna rossa presente sul campo, pompe idrauliche e medicine antitumorali incontrano difficoltà enormi per arrivare sul campo e sul terreno in Siria e a farne i conti, come sempre, è il popolo, non certo i *leader* di qualsivoglia natura e qualsivoglia posizione.

Fortunatamente, come Lei ha ricordato, non siamo un attore armato e non dobbiamo assolutamente diventarlo. Io condivido l'analisi, ciò ci rende più credibili nella transizione e nella ricostruzione, purtroppo è impossibile però implementare efficacemente un piano post-conflitto finché i vari contendenti continuano a disputarsi le spoglie di un paese ormai in macerie. Qui noi possiamo fare la differenza, con il nostro peso geopolitico e soprattutto geoeconomico e commerciale, verso gli attori regionali e non.

Questa brutale guerra per procura, perché di guerra per procura si tratta, deve finire. Il popolo siriano non può continuare a pagare colpe non sue e a piangere morti che sono tutti uguali, perché nessuno di loro è più uguale degli altri.

Mario Borghezio, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono convinto anch'io che l'Unione europea, se non fosse una ONG che si comporta come tale e ci viene a fare un discorso filosofico, sì, un discorso generico e filosofico e parla di diritti umani, di generi, delle donne, tutte cose molto interessanti, ma elude i problemi politici, diplomatici e soprattutto non ci dice cosa sta facendo l'Unione europea che avrebbe, come è stato detto poco fa, delle enormi potenzialità per influire, se fosse qualcosa di diverso da una ONG.

Lei, Alto rappresentante, ha molto sorvolato, per esempio, sugli accordi di Astana, che invece, prevedendo un'ipotesi di zone di *de-escalation*, quindi di normalizzazione e mantenimento delle tregue, sono utilissimi per la fase di transizione. Non ci ha detto nulla sul *summit* fra Trump e Lavrov, che è stato importantissimo perché la Siria è stata al centro del colloquio, ci dica cosa ne pensa. Noi vogliamo sapere qualcosa di più preciso su quello che è l'intervento, l'opinione, l'influenza di questa Unione europea, se non è una ONG, come tutto lascia pensare. Anche qui i colloqui, tra l'altro sull'ipotesi di creare zone di cuscinetto in Siria, come d'altronde aveva già proposto Tillerson.

Io penso che questi tentativi siano molto importanti, perché servono per avvicinare il cessate il fuoco, sono azioni diplomatiche su cui l'influenza e l'intervento dell'Unione europea potrebbero avere un aspetto concreto e importante, se veramente vogliamo agire verso la transizione alla tregua e alla pace, naturalmente con le conseguenze anche per i diritti umani che sono ovviamente una cosa importantissima.

Io credo che bisogna tener conto dello scenario complessivo, del fatto che gli Stati Uniti stanno favorendo una massiccia concentrazione di truppe dalla Giordania e questo, naturalmente, ha un rilievo molto importante perché l'intento è di evitare che le truppe Isis in rotta siano sostituite dalla galassia delle truppe ribelli filoislamiche.

D'altronde voglio dire, concludendo, che c'è un problema che mi pare che qui, in questi dibattiti, viene eluso, quello dei *foreign fighter* che stanno scappando. L'Isis li considera preziosissimi; quelli tornano in Europa e ce li troveremo in casa nostra e voi non dite niente. Siete degli irresponsabili!

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Mogherini, μιλήσατε για ανθρωπισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στη Συρία. Έλεος! Δεν ήταν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση που ενεργοποίησε το άρθρο 42 και έδωσε το ελεύθερο σε Βρετανία, Γαλλία και άλλους για να βομβαρδίσουν τη Συρία με χιλιάδες νεκρούς και πρόσφυγες; Φαίνεται τελικά ότι, αντί για ευλογία, κατάρα κυνηγάει τις χώρες που έχουν πηγές ενέργειας και δρόμους μεταφοράς της. Μέση Ανατολή, Βαλκάνια, Ουκρανία, μυρίζουν μπαρούτι. Σύνορα επαναχαράσσονται. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στρατιωτικοποιείται για να είναι, όπως λέει, «παγκόσμια παρούσα». Οι ανταγωνισμοί οξύνονται με κίνδυνο γενίκευσης συγκρούσεων, όπως στο Αιγαίο. Οι λαοί θυσιάζονται για συμφέροντα των μονοπωλίων, είτε με αντεργατικές πολιτικές, είτε σε πολέμους. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ – ΑΝΕΛ καλεί το ΝΑΤΟ στο Αιγαίο, αναβαθμίζει στρατιωτικές βάσεις Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών και ΝΑΤΟ, όπως η Σούδα, δηλαδή ορμητήρια επιθέσεων στους λαούς της περιοχής, όπως η πυραυλική επίθεση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών στη Συρία με δεκάδες νεκρούς. Μοναδικό συμφωνημένο θέμα για το Brexit είναι η διασφάλιση των βρετανικών βάσεων στην Κύπρο. Οι λαοί να απαντήσουν με τη συντονισμένη πάλη τους κατά των ιμπεριαλιστικών σχεδιασμών, απάντηση που θα ακουστεί δυνατά στις κινητοποιήσεις στις Βρυξέλλες, στη σύνοδο του ΝΑΤΟ στις 25 του Μάη.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute Représentante, je commencerai par faire référence à la conférence sur l'avenir de la Syrie qui a eu lieu le mois dernier à Bruxelles et dont la conclusion était très claire: il faut une transition politique solide et crédible. Et pour que cette crédibilité soit atteinte, nous avons besoin d'une justice transitionnelle et d'une lutte contre l'impunité qui soient situées au centre de la transition. C'est pourquoi j'ai proposé, il y a quelques mois, de travailler sur cette question au Parlement et je viens de rédiger un rapport sur la stratégie de l'Union pour punir les génocides, les crimes de guerre et les crimes contre l'humanité.

Je crois que la nécessité de poursuivre en justice les membres de Daesh mais aussi du régime syrien pour les crimes commis en Syrie est un axe qu'il faut suivre. Cette question doit d'ailleurs être traitée en urgence, car les preuves des meurtres, des viols, des tortures et des génocides commis contre les chrétiens, les Yézidis ou d'autres communautés sont en train de disparaître. Il faut donc récolter et préserver les preuves maintenant, sans quoi nous ne pourrions plus poursuivre les coupables en justice.

Je pense que l'Union a également un rôle à jouer au niveau diplomatique auprès du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies, pour qu'il réfère la situation en Irak et en Syrie à la Cour pénale internationale. Dans cette situation, la deuxième option serait de soutenir la création d'un tribunal international pour la Syrie, à laquelle j'ajoute une nouvelle fois l'Irak. Je crois que la seule option dont nous disposons est d'exclure toute attente et d'avancer dans ce sens.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Debateremos a estratégia da União Europeia para a Síria, mas há alguma? Ao ouvi-la, Senhora Mogherini, contentamo-nos em trabalhar para o pós-conflito.

Entretanto, a guerra prossegue. Dura há mais de seis anos, com mais de 400 mil mortos, 5 milhões de refugiados, 6 milhões de deslocados internamente. A Síria confronta-nos com mais do que a impotência da União Europeia, com a desumanidade da Humanidade.

Ainda nos últimos dias, vimos vídeos arrepiantes: cirurgias feitas na Síria, em campos de refugiados na vizinha Turquia, recolhendo órgãos em crianças ainda vivas para proveito das redes de traficantes, a crescer a milhares de detenções e desaparecimentos pelo regime e por grupos terroristas ativos no terreno, na Síria, ao uso de gás sarin e outras armas químicas, massacres civis, etc... A lista de horrores não tem fim, mas não comove nem move governos europeus.

Sra. Alta Representante, é no mínimo exigível que os Estados-Membros financiem adequadamente um mecanismo internacional imparcial e independente, estabelecido pela ONU, em dezembro de 2016, para investigar crimes de guerra cometidos por todas as partes no conflito sírio.

A justiça tem que ser prioridade, a impunidade é impedimento para a resolução do conflito e para qualquer perspectiva de paz duradoura no pós-guerra, como a Sra. Mogherini também o reconheceu.

Gostava de a ouvir também, Senhora Mogherini, dizer mais alto, confrontar os nossos Estados-Membros com a obrigação de acolherem vítimas e refugiados deste conflito, em vez de tentarem externalizar responsabilidades para países como a Turquia ou como a Líbia.

Não esquecemos que foi também a incapacidade dos nossos governos de atuar, coordenada e estrategicamente, que deixou as portas abertas à Rússia e ao Irão para apoiarem o regime criminoso de Assad, permitindo-lhe a ele e ao Daesh e aos outros grupos terroristas massacrar o povo sírio, com consequências diretas para a nossa segurança, para a segurança regional e global.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, after six years of unbearable suffering of the Syrian people, of violations of human rights and humanitarian law, possible genocide, Syria needs a lasting negotiated ceasefire. Unfortunately, after failures of ceasefire agreements until now, we have the right to be sceptical also about current initiative as elaborated in Astana for de-escalation zones. There are many loopholes and inconsequences there, and beneath the thin veil of diplomatic nitty-gritty there is the aim to support the murderous Assad regime. We need credible initiatives. Also we need an enhanced role of the EU with other NATO partners.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mevrouw Mogherini, we spreken hier vandaag over de grootste humanitaire crisis waarmee de wereld wordt geconfronteerd, een crisis die een grote invloed op de regio heeft. Zes miljoen kinderen zijn afhankelijk van humanitaire hulp. We spreken hier vandaag over de strategie van Europa, maar eerlijk gezegd heeft die te weinig om het lijf. *Too little, too late* als u het mij vraagt. U pleit voor politieke dialoog. We zijn een grote humanitaire donor. Dat klopt allemaal. Maar we rekenen heel erg hard op de Verenigde Naties. Hoe geloofwaardig is dat als de Verenigde Naties er niet in slagen om de laatste gifgasaanvallen te veroordelen? We moeten meer doen om de daders te berechten. Ik heb u niet gehoord over de Verenigde Staten. Ik heb u niet gehoord over Rusland. Als we spreken over een echte strategie voor Syrië, dan vraag ik u: mag het iets meer zijn? Mag het iets sneller gaan? Zodanig dat we die kinderen kunnen redden.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, δεν θα αναφερθώ πάλι ούτε στις αιτίες ούτε στις ιστορικές ευθύνες που έχουμε για την τραγική κατάσταση στη περιοχή. Αδυνατώ, όμως να επικαλεστώ και χρήσιμα συμπεράσματα από την στρατηγική της ΕΕ. Η αντιμετώπιση της προσφυγικής κρίσης αποκάλυψε στο μέγιστο βαθμό και το έλλειμα αλληλεγγύης και την απουσία πολιτικής βούλησης από την ΕΕ. Περιγράφω λοιπόν το ελάχιστο πλαίσιο το οποίο θα δικαιολογεί τον ρόλο και τον λόγο εμπλοκής της ΕΕ. Πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε ότι τη λύση και την προοπτική θα την διαμορφώσει ελεύθερα ο Συριακός λαός. Μετά από 6 χρόνια καταστροφικού πολέμου θα είναι απάνθρωπο αλλά και επικίνδυνο για τη σταθερότητα να επιτρέψουμε να εκβιαστεί οικονομικά και να υποστεί επιδρομή από τους «δημοκράτες» αναμορφωτές, à la Ιράκ. Πέρα από μεγαλοστομίες για επιστροφή προσφύγων, ας δώσουμε σε όσους παρέμειναν την αίσθηση ότι τουλάχιστον μπορούν να ελπίζουν σε ένα καλύτερο μέλλον από το καταστροφικό παρόν που τους επιφύλαξαν τα οικονομικά και γεωπολιτικά συμφέροντα στην περιοχή.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I would like to address two very specific demands on Syria to Ms Mogherini. First, when trying to reach a long-lasting political solution to that bloody conflict, the EU should never forget that it all started when the Assad regime brutally oppressed peaceful demonstrations of common people just claiming democracy and freedom for their country. Then of course it all went more complex, with many factions from the inside and from the outside trying to take advantage of the chaos and the war. But in the beginning, what ignited this terrible conflict was the criminal reaction of the Assad regime. Never forget that, and always stay by the side of those who want to honour the wishes of freedom of the ones who were repressed back in 2011 and thereafter.

And second, the EU should make sure that the many crimes against humanity committed by the Assad regime and its allies and by other non-state armed groups will not go unpunished. The creation of a Syrian war crimes tribunal will be needed in order to make justice but also in order to boost universal justice.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, it is Groundhog Day once again in the European Parliament. I look up to the public gallery and say ‘Welcome to another month of one of our sessions of hand-wringing!’

Madam High Representative, I do not need to take up too much of your time, as I have said these things before in response to the same tired old speeches that I am listening to today. Whilst the extremists thrive and the people of Syria continue to die, we continue to have these debates about regime change, the influence of President Putin and how much better Syria will be once we have brought in democracy.

Our track record in the region in terms of the decimation of civilian populations to ensure democracy is not too impressive, and I am sure the peoples of Libya, Iraq and Afghanistan would forgo the prospects of a democratically elected legislature in return for a roof over their heads, food in their mouths and the prospect of living beyond the next week.

Can we deal with the extremists in Syria before even more make their way to Yemen to further destabilise that benighted country? Can we forget about forcing regime change and help the Syrian people rediscover some normality, without us deciding what that normality should be?

I will now go outside and bang my head against the wall as I fear it will be far less painful than listening to this.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, les Occidentaux n'ont pas de stratégie. La politique européenne en Syrie est suicidaire. Votre position, à savoir ni Bachar Al-Assad, ni Daech, n'est pas tenable, Madame le Haut-commissaire.

Les Occidentaux poursuivent la stratégie pro-islamiste, qui consiste à jouer la carte de l'islamisme sunnite pour endiguer la Russie et le nationalisme arabe. Vous êtes plus soucieux de vous en prendre systématiquement à la Russie que de lutter contre le terrorisme islamique, que vous encouragez. Par conséquent, Madame le Haut-commissaire, aujourd'hui, le meilleur conseil que je puisse vous donner est le suivant: ne faites plus rien en Syrie.

Aujourd'hui, selon moi, le seul État capable de rétablir la paix et de montrer qu'il a une véritable capacité militaire, politique et opérationnelle, c'est la Syrie. Ce pays est aujourd'hui à l'origine de la solution que nous devons justement trouver pour apporter la paix au Proche-Orient.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κάνοντας μια μικρή έρευνα επάνω στις τρέχουσες εξελίξεις στη Συρία, βρήκα κάποια πολύ ενδιαφέροντα δεδομένα τα οποία πρέπει να τα αναφέρω στην ολομέλεια. Προφανώς καταδικάζουμε απερίφραστα το ισλαμικό χαλιφάτο και φαίνεται πως σε ένα-δύο χρόνια η απειλή αυτή θα έχει εξαλειφθεί. Η Δύση όμως επέλεξε να στραφεί εναντίον της νόμιμης κυβέρνησης της Συρίας, να εξοπλίσει και να χρηματοδοτήσει την αντιπολίτευση, δηλαδή τις συμμορίες των τρομοκρατών που παραπλανητικά χρησιμοποιούσαν την προμετωπίδα του «δήθεν» ελεύθερου συριακού στρατού. Σήμερα, οι συμμορίες αυτές εντάσσονται στη Χαγιάτ Ταχρίρ αλ Σαμ. Αυτή είναι η νέα ονομασία του μετώπου της αλ Νούσρα, δηλαδή της αλ Κάιντα στη Συρία. Ούτε οι ΗΠΑ, ούτε ο Καναδάς έχουν εντάξει ακόμα στη λίστα των τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων την Ταχρίρ αλ Σαμ, πράγμα που με κάνει να αναρωτιέμαι για τα πραγματικά κίνητρά τους, ειδικότερα δε αν συνυπολογίσουμε και τη χθεσινή εισβολή βρετανικών και αμερικανικών δυνάμεων στο έδαφος της Συρίας. Καλώ λοιπόν το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να καταδικάσει κάθε υποστήριξη σε οποιαδήποτε τρομοκρατική οργάνωση και να ξεκινήσει άμεσα συνομιλίες με τη νόμιμη κυβέρνηση της Συρίας, με μοναδικό σκοπό την επιστροφή της ειρήνης στην πολύπαθη αυτή χώρα και όχι την προώθηση γεωπολιτικών συμφερόντων.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora alta representante, señorías, en el devastador conflicto de Siria yo creo que es importante distinguir los efectos de las causas. Y en los efectos, se ha dicho que la Unión Europea es una unión egoísta. Sinceramente, este es un conflicto cuya responsabilidad compete al conjunto de la comunidad internacional, y la Unión Europea ha aportado la mayor contribución -primero, en la conferencia de Londres; ahora, en la conferencia de Bruselas- y ha venido sosteniendo a los países de la región: el Líbano, Irak, Egipto, Turquía, etcétera. Sinceramente no se puede decir, salvo algunas excepciones, que la Unión Europea sea una unión egoísta. Ahora, evidentemente, hay que ir a las causas del conflicto, y es evidente que la Unión Europea tiene que jugar un papel en una paz en Siria que sea estable y que sea justa.

Algunos colegas se han referido al Acuerdo de Astaná, que es un acuerdo que se ha establecido entre Rusia, entre Turquía y entre Irán y, que yo sepa, señora alta representante, es un acuerdo que no cuenta con el consentimiento de las partes. Yo creo que el único camino es el que nos ha señalado la alta representante: apoyar los esfuerzos del secretario general de las Naciones Unidas, poner fin al conflicto, poner realmente un gobierno de coalición, hacer una modificación constitucional, acabar con el Estado Islámico y establecer una hoja de ruta para un proceso electoral.

Ahora, la cuestión importante, señor presidente, y termino con esto, es determinar si, como parecía después de la llegada del presidente Trump a los Estados Unidos, se va a mantener Al-Asad en el poder con el apoyo de Rusia, sus vetos en el Consejo de Seguridad, sus intereses en la zona de Irán, o no. Yo creo, señor presidente, que, sinceramente, la permanencia de Al-Asad en la presidencia de la República impediría, como nos ha dicho la alta representante, una Siria democrática, unida y fuerte.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, High Representative, the chilling statistics of those killed and maimed in Syria are well known. We now need to focus on solutions. Therefore I welcome the strategy as a first step. However, as with everything else, implementation will be the key to success, and this will hinge on a number of key points. How will we ensure the Astana deal does not provide a carte blanche for targeting the moderate opposition? What will we do to push the UN monitoring of both the agreement and humanitarian access already vetoed by Assad? I recognise that many colleagues have mentioned the de-escalation zones and that halting violence is a positive step, but if we do not want to replicate the December ceasefire, which ended in last month's chemical attack, we need to address the points I have just mentioned.

Furthermore, I would say it is critical that the lessons we learned in Iraq are implemented to avoid repeating the mistakes made there. Leaders who kill and maim have to face justice – there are no compromises about that at all. However, uprooting an entire administration will lead to yet another failed state. Those without blood on their hands should be allowed to contribute to rebuilding future Syria. Whatever shape the future governance of Syria takes, if it is not inclusive, it is set to fail. We need to break the cycle of sectarian violence and exclusion. All groups, clans and sects needed to commit to a peace deserve a political representation.

Finally, in this strategy, what will you do, High Representative, to add bite to our bark? How do you hope to overcome the blockages in the Council on sanctions against some of the key players involved and bring about pressure on the international community?

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Situationen i Syrien er dybt tragisk og ser ud til at fortsætte, så længe der ikke kan blive fundet en god basis for en fremtidig fred.

Derfor mener jeg, at EU umiddelbart og akut bør fokusere på stabiliteten i nabolandene. Der er to nabolande, som i særlig grad er sårbare og udsatte, nemlig Libanon og Jordan. Begge lande har taget imod en meget, meget stor andel af dem, der er flygtet fra situationen i Syrien, og begge lande er under et enormt pres for at håndtere de menneskelige ulykker og store logistiske udfordringer, der følger med. Derfor bør vores indsats lige nu og her fokuseres meget på og sørge for, at ustabiliteten i regionen ikke spredt sig yderligere. Og så må vi selvfølgelig håbe på, at de igangværende forhandlinger leder frem til en mere stabil og en fredelig situation i selve Syrien.

Hvad det angår tror jeg, det er vigtigt, når vi snakker om situationen i selve Syrien, at vi da også kigger fremad. Der er en klar udfordring i, at vi lige i øjeblikket ser alle, der kæmper mod Assad-regimet, som potentielle allierede. Vi skal huske, at der også er store radikaliserede elementer blandt folk både i Assad-regimet, i ISIS, og også i nogle af de oprørsgrupper, der bekæmper såvel regimet som Islamisk Stat. Derfor er det vigtigt, at vi, når vi går fremad og ser på den mulige fred, der skal følge i Syrien, så bekæmper radikaliserede elementer på alle fronter og ikke stirrer os blinde på den ene eller den anden side i konflikten.

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). – Danes se je, kot poročajo, brez velikih pričakovanj začel šesti krog ženevskih pogajanj o Siriji, ki ste jih, gospa Mogherini, pomagali začeti. Za tiste, ki bolj verjamemo v politične rešitve in aktivno diplomacijo kot v stopnjevanje vojaških aktivnosti, je dogajanje v Ženevi, potem ko so pogajanja v Astani pod pokroviteljstvom Rusije, Turčije in Irana vendarle pripeljala do delnega pozitivnega rezultata, razglasitve varnih območij, pozitivno znamenje.

Bilo bi narobe, če bi dokumenti, ki jih v zvezi s tragedijo v Siriji sprejemamo v Evropskem parlamentu, bili samo nekakšna kronika dogajanja, brez vizije, predlogov in načrtov za lastno akcijo, ki bi vodile v ustavitev vojne in nujno obnovo uničene države.

Še slabše bi bilo, če bi Siriji namesto rešitev, mednarodne solidarnosti in sodelovanja, ponudili status bojišča hladne vojne. Iz udobnih sedežev Evropskega parlamenta včasih imam ta občutek, da si tudi tukaj želimo nekaj takega.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Mogherini, εγώ προσωπικά – και νομίζω, λογικά, ότι και εσείς – έχω κουραστεί να ακούω περιγραφή των βασάνων του συριακού λαού, ή ακόμα και περιγραφή των εγκλημάτων εις βάρος του συριακού λαού. Τείνει να γίνει ένα είδος θεατρικής αναπαράστασης, την ώρα που δεν μπορούμε, εδώ και μια εξάετία, να βρούμε λύσεις που να φέρουν την ειρήνη σ' αυτή τη χώρα. Εγώ σας καλώ να συνεχίσετε τις προσπάθειες, έτσι ώστε να δούμε αν στο άμεσο μέλλον έρχεται η ειρήνη σ' αυτόν τον τόπο, και θα έρθει και η ώρα του καταλογισμού των ευθυνών και η ώρα να πάνε στη φυλακή όσοι ευθύνονται, αν καταφέρουμε να τους φέρουμε ενώπιον της δικαιοσύνης, γι' αυτή τη μεγάλη τραγωδία. Γιατί, τελικά, η Συρία έχει μετατραπεί σε μια αρένα όπου πολεμούν ξένοι για τα δικά τους εθνικά συμφέροντα. Δεν έχετε άλλο ρόλο, πέρα απ' αυτόν που περιγράφατε, να συνεχίσετε τις προσπάθειές σας, να δούμε αν μπορούμε να βρούμε λύση σ' αυτό το πολύ τραγικό πρόβλημα που είναι στη γειτονιά μας.

Bodil Valero, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Tack så mycket. I min hemstad bor många kurder, och de har under alla de år som konflikten har pågått gett mig information om sin verklighet. Den informationen har varit svår att få via kommissionen eller rådet.

De har gett den till mig från dag ett av konflikten till idag. Hur de först försökte hålla sig utanför konflikten. Hur de försökte hjälpa internflyktingar som strömmade in i landet. Hur hjälpsändningarna inte kom fram. Att de inte fick representera sig själva i fredsförhandlingarna. Att de mitt i alla svårigheter byggt upp en form av demokratiskt styrd autonomi, där alla grupper inkluderas. Hur de tvingades in i kriget mot Daesh. Hur de under hela denna tid motarbetats av Turkiet, som ju också bombar dem. Med mera, med mera.

Jag undrar varför vi i princip aldrig pratar om det som sker i Rojava när vi diskuterar Syrien här. Vi kan inte fortsätta att bara hänvisa till att styret i Rojava en gång i tiden ansågs vara en del av PKK – var en del av PKK. Men vi kan inte hänvisa till det idag. Vi har en helt ny verklighet som vi måste förhålla oss till. Tack!

Udo Voigt (NI). Herr Präsident! Wir müssen feststellen, dass in Absprache mit Syrien, Iran, Türkei und Russland am letzten Samstag in Syrien vier Schutzzonen eingerichtet worden sind. Ich habe Syrien 2015 und 2016 besucht und in den letzten zwölf Monaten dürfen – müssen – wir eigentlich zur Kenntnis nehmen, dass der Friede in weiten Teilen Syriens zurückgekehrt ist. Von Latakia bis Damaskus, von Aleppo bis Palmyra und Homs herrscht heute Frieden. Die Regierungstruppen haben insgesamt über 1 000 Städte, Dörfer und Gemeinden zurückerobert.

Wie wäre es denn, einmal einen neuen Ansatz der EU zu wählen, einen Umsiedlungsplan, nur umgekehrt? Jetzt die Millionen Flüchtlinge aufzufordern, zurückzugehen in ihre Heimat, und die Länder mit einer Quotenregelung zu versehen, die viele Flüchtlinge haben, und für jeden Flüchtling, der nicht zurückgeht, eine entsprechende Sonderzahlung vorzusehen, damit man dort in Syrien den Menschen beim Wiederaufbau hilft, statt ständig Waffen in diese Gebiete zu liefern?

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, first of all I would like to join the previous speakers in expressing my distress over the massive destruction and human suffering in Syria, including the recent chemical attack and the ongoing bombing and starving of civilians. That is why I absolutely have no understanding for what my colleague, Mr Voigt, just said about the current situation in Syria.

I welcome the Syria strategy presented by the High Representative and Vice-President, because it calls for a comprehensive political solution in Syria through stronger EU involvement and reconstruction efforts. As suggested by the High Representative, once a political settlement has been achieved, the EU could offer vital support during the transition process by assisting a newly-formed government in drafting a new constitution and organising free and fair elections. The experience of Iraq has shown how easily power vacuums are filled by extremists. This is why we need to start thinking of reconstruction and provide long-term support in building governance structures and economic development in close cooperation with local communities. Moreover, given the involvement of regional actors in the Syrian conflict and the ethnic and sectarian tensions in the Middle East, we ought to address conflicts in the wider region and include local actors.

An end to the fighting, humanitarian access and a political settlement must remain our utmost priorities, yet we cannot afford to neglect long-term planning. A broader and more strategic approach that takes local and regional factors into account is necessary to fight extremism and achieve political stability, and that is why, High Representative, you are on the right path. Thank you for your good work.

Eugen Freund (S&D). – Mr President, yesterday 35 Syrians were killed – innocent people: men, women and eight children – because a bomb from the coalition forces went astray. Just consider for a minute if these were your children, your relatives, your friends, wiped out, within a minute gone forever. It is horrifying because events like the one I have described happen every day – and not just this year, but for the last six years.

What are we doing to bring this to an end? I am afraid not enough. Sure, we help with humanitarian aid but, as for peace efforts, we are relying on the US, the UN and, more recently, on Russia. Does the European Union not have enough power – and I am talking about the political and economic clout – to pressure the proxy powers whose strategic interests are costing the lives of more and more innocent people in Syria?

Bas Belder (ECR). – Mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, u hebt het over een EU-strategie voor Syrië en de-escalatiezones. Ik hecht er altijd aan goed naar de feiten ter plaatse te kijken. Wat zien wij op het ogenblik? Een escalatie, een intensivering van de strijd. Er is geen enkel politiek vergelijk in zicht.

Ik heb daarom een aantal vragen aan u. Bent u uitgenodigd voor het overleg in Astana? Is er vooroverleg geweest tussen één van de spelers daar, namelijk kandidaat-lidstaat Turkije, en de Europese Unie? En wat te denken van de vaak verzegen maar funeste rol van de Iraanse Revolutionaire Garde in Syrië en de sjitische milities met al hun gruweldaden, te vergelijken met de soennitische gruweldaden van IS en Al Qaeda?

Mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, u was zo trots op en ingenomen met het akkoord met Iran. Hoe combineert u de toenadering tot Iran met de volstrekt destabiliserende rol van het land in de regio? In Israël en Jordanië zijn ze uiterst beducht voor de gevolgen van het in Astana gesloten akkoord en die zogenaamde de-escalatiezones. Vandaar een verheviging van de gevechtentol in Zuid-Syrië. En ik geef ze geen ongelijk. Hoe zwaar wegen Israëlische en Jordaanse veiligheidsbelangen voor u, voor de Europese Unie? Als je kijkt naar het gedrag van de EU-lidstaten, hoe kunnen we dan spreken van een EU-strategie? Ik vind het werkelijk onbegrijpelijk. Maar ja, feiten doen er hier niet meer toe, alleen wishful thinking, zelfverheffing en zelfverheerlijking.

Urmas Paet (ALDE). – Mr President, High Representative, the war in Syria is in its seventh year. Bombardments continue, innocent civilians are dying, people are being attacked by chemical weapons, children suffer, people lose their homes. Sure, we gather to raise money for humanitarian needs; we help the refugees and try to find ways to keep them from entering Europe; we concentrate on the post-conflict reconstruction of Syria. But the war is far from being over. The EU must find a way to contribute also to finding a solution to the conflict and not leave it only as a prerogative to Russia and Iran. That is why I strongly support the Syria strategy. The EU, as the largest donor, must have a say in the negotiations on the future of Syria. Also, we still need to strive for a solution under the auspices of the United Nations. The EU must actively contribute to the fight against ISIS, and all those responsible for the heinous crimes in Syria must be brought to justice.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL). – „Vycvičili a vyzbrojili jsme lidi, o kterých nic nevíme, a oni nám přešli k Islámskému státu“, prohlásil Donald Trump. Věčná škoda, že vážení politikové v čele Velké Británie, Francie a Německa, případně na unijní úrovni, nejsou schopni podobné sebereflexe jako prezident Spojených států.

Po podobných sankcích, které postupně vůči syrskému režimu Bašára al-Asada prosazujete, vážení kolegové, dosud nikde na světě nedošlo k pozitivní změně režimu. Sankce spojené s vojenskou intervencí způsobují rozklad v Somálsku i v Libyi. Dlouhodobá krize v Afghánistánu a dalších podobných zemích jsou plodem této nesmyslné politiky.

Dnešní situaci v Sýrii můžeme vyřešit pouze bezpodmínečnou podporou mírových rozhovorů, odstraněním nesmyslných sankcí a masivním programem podpory obnovení infrastruktury a bytového fondu. Ostatní návrhy neřeší ani současnou situaci, ani stabilizaci země, pane Beldere. Hlasujme společně pro mír a odmítněme další kolo kroků ve stylu tradičních koloniálních velmocí.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Verehrte Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, wir sollten für Frieden stimmen, aber für was für einen Frieden? Frieden der Souveränität der Nationen, der Einheit der Nationen, Frieden, der mit Menschenrechten zu tun hat, oder Friedhofsruhe – all das scheint mir nicht geklärt zu sein. Ich halte die Vorschläge der hohen Beauftragten für gut, dass wir fit sein sollten für die Bedingungen der Friedensstiftung, die auch mit den Aufbauplänen dort zu tun haben und manchem mehr. Ich glaube, das ist dringend notwendig, aber ich mache mir große Sorgen bezüglich der geostrategischen Entwicklung.

Ich habe den Eindruck, dass die Tatsache, dass Russland durch die Bombardierung Aleppos de facto den Friedensprozess von Genf unterbrochen hat, dazu geführt hat, dass Leute wie Herr Voigt jetzt von einer Friedhofsruhe reden können, wobei wir feststellen müssen, dass beispielsweise jetzt eine Konferenz in Astana stattfindet. Und dass wir eine geostrategische Linie von Teheran über das schiitische Bagdad haben können – Assad und Hisbollah –, in der Zusammenarbeit auch mit der Türkei, und dass weder die Vereinigten Staaten noch Europa mit am Verhandlungstisch sitzen.

Es beschäftigt mich schon in einer gewissen Weise, wie wir in diesem *proxy war*, der es ja ist, auf verschiedenen Ebenen unter Ausschluss der USA und auch Saudi-Arabiens in dieser Frage, auf Dauer eine wirkliche friedliche Lösung zuwege bringen können. Ich glaube, dass dieser Vormarsch von Russland, das die entscheidende Kraft dort sein wird, und die Tatsache, dass alle nach Astana laufen, aber wir de facto nicht da sind, ein großes Problem ist, mit dem wir uns auseinanderzusetzen haben.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Comissária, queria saudá-la e manifestar a minha concordância, no essencial, com a estratégia que aqui acabou de delinear até porque, francamente, não concebo outra e não ouvi outra no decorrer deste debate.

Ouvi várias críticas mas não houve aqui a apresentação de nenhuma verdadeira estratégia alternativa. O conflito sírio há muito tempo que deixou de ser um conflito estritamente nacional. É um conflito regional com verdadeira projeção mundial, porque apela à participação das principais potências. É um conflito que decorre de confrontações religiosas e de calculismos geopolíticos que estão na sua base e a União europeia deve investir, como a Sra. Alta Comissária aqui referiu, em dois aspetos que são fundamentais: por um lado, contribuir para o esforço de mediação política, em estreita articulação com aquilo que as Nações Unidas têm vindo a fazer e, em particular, o Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, e investir fortemente na ajuda humanitária, coisa que já temos vindo a fazer.

A circunstância de não sermos, como também referiu na sua intervenção, um interveniente militar ativo neste processo, concede-nos, neste momento, alguma vantagem neste processo, nesta fase do processo. Por isso, o que se espera e pede à União Europeia é precisamente isso, é que aposte fortemente na mediação política e aposte fortemente na ajuda humanitária, e as notícias que nos trouxe da Conferência de Bruxelas em relação à posição assumida pela União Europeia e por vários Estados europeus são notícias reconfortantes.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ta wojna była straszna od samego początku, ale obserwowaliśmy jej dynamikę, widzieliśmy, do czego prowadzi: do zniszczenia pokoju społecznego, destrukcji życia chrześcijańskiego, uruchomienia straszliwej fali imigracji w kierunku Europy (nie tylko zresztą z Syrii) i na koniec zaangażowania wielkich mocarstw. Dzisiaj mamy tak naprawdę do czynienia nie ze związkami Syrii z Rosją czy z Iranem, tylko z bezpośrednią obecnością Rosji, Iranu, Turcji w tym kraju. A to wszystko dzieje się w sytuacji, kiedy codziennie – jak wielu kolegów mówiło – cierpią tysiące ludzi. Trzeba jak najszybciej doprowadzić do zakończenia tej wojny. Jedyna właściwa strategia to wspieranie działań Staffana de Mistury i jak najszybsze osiągnięcie pragmatycznego pokoju.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Mr President, Madam High Representative, undoubtedly, the regime's forces and those of its allies are responsible for the systematic, widespread and gross violations and abuses of human rights and international humanitarian law. Sadly, this April, the Syrian regime conducted a chemical attack against civilians in Idlib province, where at least 70 civilians, many of them children, were killed, and hundreds more injured. Therefore, I call on the EU to continue its policy of imposing sanctions targeting the Damascus regime and its supporters as long as repression continues.

Only the wilfully blind would think that President Assad is part of the peace solution, when he has been the main source of violence and instability.

In addition, I call on the EU to continue to provide humanitarian support to Syria. But we have to be careful not to provide unconditional assistance to the Syrian Government.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, depois de ter organizado, armado, financiado e apoiado os grupos terroristas que levaram a guerra civil à Síria, a administração norte-americana, arrastando a União Europeia, decidiu mostrar, mais uma vez, que pretende impor o seu domínio mundial pela força das armas e com a ameaça da guerra.

Repetem-se, assim, acusações não comprovadas quanto à utilização de armas químicas. Não se permite sequer uma investigação idónea e imparcial que o próprio Governo sírio requereu, fazendo lembrar a invocação das armas de destruição maciça aquando da agressão ao Iraque e todo um rol de mentiras relativamente à Líbia.

Repete-se o desrespeito pela ONU, pela sua Carta, pelos seus princípios e regras de funcionamento; repete-se a violação do Direito Internacional com o bombardeamento de um Estado soberano, a ameaça de destruição de um país e o desrespeito pelos mais fundamentais direitos do povo sírio.

Deveria ser dever deste Parlamento condenar a guerra de agressão à Síria e ao seu povo e apelar à paz, a uma solução política que garanta o respeito pelo direito do povo sírio à sua soberania, independência e integridade territorial.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Úr, az immár hat esztendeje tartó háború nyomán jelenleg 13,5 millióan szorulnak humanitárius segítségre az országban, közülük több millióan belső menekültek, további 5 millió szíriai menekültet pedig a szomszéd államok és a távolabbi országok fogadtak be. A Szírián belüli humanitárius segélyezésben az Európai Unió és tagországai járnak az élen. Ezzel együtt elégtétellel mondhatom, hogy hazám, Magyarország szintén cselekvő részese ennek a támogatáspolitikának, különleges figyelmet fordítva az üldözött keresztény közösségek megsegítésére. Tartós politikai eredményre a térségben csupán akkor lehet számítani, ha a célul kitűzött békés megoldás érdekében az Egyesült Államoknak és Oroszországnak sikerül megegyezésre jutniuk és együttműködniük. Az érintett feleknek, Európának és az egész világnak közös érdeke, hogy az orosz-amerikai megállapodás létrejöjjön. Az Európai Parlament részvételével létrehozott uniós stratégia döntő fontosságú hozzájárulás lehet a régóta várt megoldáshoz és

megbékéléshez. Az Uniónak abban is meghatározó szerepet kell vállalnia, hogy az elűzött etnikai és vallási közösségek szülőföldjükre mielőbb hazatérjenek, és elkezdődjék a kivézett és romba döntött ország újjáépítése.

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση στη Συρία παραμένει τραγική. Η συμβολή της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της κυρίας Mogherini ειδικότερα στην επίτευξη μιας μόνιμης πολιτικής λύσης στη Συρία είναι καθοριστική. Το ζητούμενο είναι να επέλθει ειρήνη σ' αυτήν την ταλαιπωρημένη χώρα, ούτως ώστε να επανέλθει στην ομαλότητα και να μπορέσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να συντελέσει στην ανοικοδόμηση. Η Ευρώπη μπορεί να κάνει πολύ περισσότερα για μια Συρία ενωμένη, δημοκρατική, με πολιτική σταθερότητα και αυτή είναι ευθύνη, σε μεγαλύτερο βαθμό, του Συμβουλίου. Πρέπει να μπούμε μπροστά, να αναλάβουμε εμείς τις πρωτοβουλίες. Πρέπει η Ευρώπη να είναι, για ένα πρόβλημα το οποίο την απασχολεί, ο κυρίαρχος παίκτης πολύ περισσότερο από τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και τη Ρωσία. Και στα πλαίσια αυτών των πρωτοβουλιών πρέπει να αξιοποιηθεί το ακρότατο σημείο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η Κύπρος. Η Κύπρος είναι πολύ κοντά στη Συρία και πρέπει να είναι το πολιτικό και διπλωματικό ορμητήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Γι' αυτό πρέπει να γίνει μια διάσκεψη στην Κύπρο και την ίδια στιγμή να εγκατασταθεί εκεί επιτελείο σε σχέση με το συριακό. Έτσι θα στείλουμε και το ουσιαστικό μήνυμα ότι η Ευρώπη είναι εκεί, δεν επισκέπτεται και φεύγει μονάχα.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР). – Г-жо Комисар, ситуацията в Сирия изисква честна и трезва оценка, справедливо решение и международно съгласие. Сериата от преврати, наречена „арабски пролети“ не донесе пропагандираните цели, а именно демокрация и просперитет на държавите, а напротив – създаде хаос и разрушения, страдания, анклавни, управлявани от мракобесни главорези, силно разделени на религиозна основа вътре в исляма общества.

Има едно незаобиколимо условие за стабилизирането на Сирия и то е недопускането на фанатиците на власт. Не трябва да бъде допускана грешката и провалът от Ирак, когато беше разпадната държавата, на чиито развалини поклъна Ислямска държава.

Така наречената „умерена опозиция“ в никакъв случай не е надежден партньор в изграждането на Сирия и издигането ѝ от пепелищата на войната. Част от нея е под контрола на турски диктатор, друга част е под контрола на не по-малко бруталната Саудитска Арабия. Прочее, защо никой в тази зала не споменава за зловещата роля на Саудитска Арабия в кръвопролитията в Сирия? Оставам с впечатлението, че в залата цари срам и страх от това да бъдат посочени преките виновници за кървавата сирийска кланица – Саудитска Арабия, Катар и Турция. Може би милиардните сделки между държави – членки на ЕС и Саудитска Арабия са причината за това срамно и позорно мълчание, а това, колеги, е лицемерие.

В заключение, границите на Сирия трябва да бъдат безусловно гарантирани, домогванията на Рияд и Анкара до тези територии пресечени, а главорезите-фанатици унищожени.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 162, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).

Stanislav Polčák (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Já s celou řadou vašich tvrzení souhlasím, situace v Sýrii je skutečně velmi tragická už mnoho let.

Jen se vás chci zeptat, vy jste hovořil o tom, že potřebujeme příslušnou analýzu situace v Sýrii ve světle těch mnoha set tisíc životů, které tragédie v Sýrii stála. Nemyslíte si, že po těch několika letech bojů bychom už ty analýzy měli mít a měli bychom i stát před konkrétními návrhy řešení té situace?

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР), отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Благодаря Ви за въпроса, колега. Да, прав сте, анализът трябваше да бъде изготвен и представен от Европейската комисия тук. Но има няколко фактора в тази сирийска криза, които се премълчават и заобикалят, а това са именно ролята на Катар, на Саудитска Арабия и на Турция и те не трябва да бъдат изоставени и не трябва да бъдат negliжирани, защото по този начин няма да бъде намерено трайното решение. Това е моят отговор.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, the extremely complex conflict in Syria has created the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II. Daesh and other Jihadist groups have been party to cruel and brutal atrocities, and serious violations of human rights and humanitarian law have been committed by Assad and Western-funded rebel forces. No one side should be exempt from prosecution for war crimes. The use of chemical weapons must be investigated by a properly-resourced UN mechanism, regardless of who the perpetrator is. Such war crimes cannot go unpunished.

I welcome the fact that further peace talks are starting today. We should support the UN rapporteur on these peace talks because there is no military solution to Syria, and all the sides involved must engage in the peace process in a meaningful manner. The Kurdish forces and people deserve their own stand-alone seat in those negotiations through the PYD, and any establishment of zones must serve the innocent civilians of Syria and not geopolitical interests.

Lorenzo Cesa (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Alto rappresentante, siamo al settimo anno di guerra in Siria, siamo di fronte alla peggiore crisi umanitaria dopo la Seconda guerra mondiale. Ho visto su una mappa la dislocazione delle forze in campo e ci troviamo di fronte a un mosaico di differenti realtà, con conflitti etnici e territoriali che appaiono spesso inconciliabili.

La situazione, lo sappiamo, è drammatica ma non possiamo arrenderci. Occorre fare ogni sforzo per arrivare alla pace e per centrare questo obiettivo non possiamo affidarci ai paesi che sono oggi impegnati sul campo, che sono solo portatori del loro interessi. L'unica speranza è che il lavoro che si sta svolgendo oggi a Ginevra, da parte dell'ONU, da parte di Staffan De Mistura, vada a buon fine.

Signora Mogherini, l'unica cosa che si deve fare è sostenere con forza questo tentativo dell'ONU e, se non centriamo l'obiettivo della pace, la nostra azione come Europa potrà essere solo ed esclusivamente una: rafforzare il grande lavoro fin qui svolto in termini umanitari sia all'interno della Siria sia all'esterno, dove si trovano milioni di rifugiati.

Se, come tutti speriamo, a Ginevra si arriverà a una conclusione positiva, l'Europa avrà già le idee chiare su quello che si deve fare. Ho letto con attenzione la comunicazione da Lei presentata lo scorso 14 marzo, in cui sono descritti in maniera chiara i sei punti su cui l'Europa dovrà agire. Su questi sei punti, che ci ha ricordato poco fa, penso che non possa che esserci un sostegno forte e convinto di questo Parlamento, e speriamo che questo avvenga presto.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, Federica Mogherini, la verdad es que la guerra en Siria es el mayor fracaso de la comunidad internacional durante las últimas décadas, una guerra descorazonadora y vergonzosa para el conjunto de la comunidad internacional.

La Unión Europea ha estado dando cobertura y ayudando a todas las negociaciones multilaterales que, con el auspicio de Naciones Unidas, se han llevado durante los últimos años. Hoy, en Ginebra, debemos continuar haciéndolo, porque la negociación política es la única salida, con un triple objetivo: reconciliación nacional, transición democrática, gobernanza inclusiva; y, a la vez, justicia, y juzgar los crímenes de guerra que han sido cometidos por diferentes actores en Siria.

Para eso, ¿cuál es nuestra mayor palanca? Ser el mayor donante sobre el territorio —la alta representante ya lo ha indicado, lo ha subrayado: es nuestra mayor fortaleza para influir— y recordar que de telón de fondo tenemos un Oriente Medio con una pugna geopolítica de diferentes fuerzas y que tenemos que ser capaces de tener fuerza suficiente también en materia de seguridad y defensa para estabilizar y pacificar esta región que hoy está en llamas.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mówimy dziś o strategii Unii Europejskiej na rzecz Syrii.

Przypomnę, że Parlament pół roku temu przyjął rezolucję, w której w punkcie piętnastym, co zostało zapisane, domagamy się poszanowania praw mniejszości etnicznych i religijnych w Syrii, w tym chrześcijan. Wiemy, że sytuacja chrześcijan jest dramatyczna, stąd ze zdziwieniem odnotowuję, że w przedłożonej przez Radę strategii z ubiegłego miesiąca w ogóle nie zauważa się tego problemu.

W nakreślonych sześciu obszarach, gdzie m.in. zapewnia, że Unia nadal będzie wspierać syryjską opozycję, propagować demokrację i wolność słowa, Rada nie odnosi się do sytuacji chrześcijan w tym kraju, którzy są uprowadzani, torturowani i zabijani. A już chociażby z samej racji, że ojcami założycielami Unii Europejskiej byli chrześcijańscy demokraci – Schuman, De Gasperi, Adenauer – należałoby więcej uwagi i konkretnych działań koncentrować na tych zagadnieniach.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, tras años de guerra el conflicto sirio parece enquistado y la complejidad sobre el terreno es tal que cualquier iniciativa se encuentra con importantes obstáculos desde el principio. Ya se han mencionado el acuerdo alcanzado en Astaná a principios de este mes y las llamadas «*de-escalation zones*», pero es preciso conocer los detalles de este acuerdo, en el que los países de Occidente, por así decirlo, no hemos tenido papel alguno.

Cierto es que, considerando la experiencia de estos últimos años, son lógicas las dudas sobre la viabilidad de este acuerdo y la voluntad política de las partes para ejecutarlo. Incluso hay preocupación por que estas llamadas «zonas seguras» pueden ser aprovechadas para alterar el equilibrio del poder o el equilibrio demográfico, o incluso, para romper la unidad territorial siria. A mí me gustaría que, durante la nueva ronda de negociaciones de esta semana en Ginebra, se arroje un poco más de luz sobre esta iniciativa de Astaná, y que usted nos hable un poco de ella.

En cualquier caso, como también señala el señor De Mistura, es preciso aprovechar el momento actual y redoblar los esfuerzos para avanzar hacia un alto el fuego. Desde luego, el objetivo estratégico central es poner fin a la guerra, pero mientras este no se alcance -y no parece que esté cerca-, tenemos la obligación moral de seguir respondiendo a las necesidades humanitarias de la población.

Por ello, señora Mogherini, celebro el trabajo que, en este aspecto humanitario, la Unión y los Estados miembros están realizando, y también celebro los compromisos alcanzados en la conferencia de Bruselas del pasado abril.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Mr President, let me start by saying that we greatly appreciate the ongoing efforts of High Representative Mogherini to reach out to the key actors in the region with a view to resuming the political transition, post-conflict reconciliation and reconstruction of Syria. While it is important to discuss the future of Syria, the present does not give a lot of hope that the immense suffering of the Syrian people will end very soon.

Therefore let me ask the High Representative two questions. Firstly, the meeting between President Trump and President Erdogan is about to start as we speak. Whereas the US has decided to arm Syrian Kurdish forces in the upcoming offensive to take Raqqa, an ISIS stronghold, Turkey's Syria policy has become focused on the primary goal of preventing the rise of a Kurdish entity in northern Syria at all costs. Obviously, arming the Syrian Kurdish forces also has an impact on the internal situation in Turkey. The larger Kurdish issue can no longer be ignored. How is the EU helping to develop a comprehensive policy and to push for a Turkish-Kurdish peace deal on all fronts?

Secondly, and very briefly, Russia, Turkey and Iran recently signed a memorandum in which they also discussed de-escalation zones. Could you please give me your comments on that agreement?

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, strategija Europske unije za Siriju je dobrodošla, ali bojim se da je zakašnjela. Sukob je od prvog dana sve samo ne crno-bijel, a očito je da su u njega umiješane obavještajne zajednice više svjetskih sila. Tako je Sirija postala globalno igralište za testiranje moći i odmjeravanje snaga, a sad netko mora sanirati posljedice.

Jesam za to da se uključimo jer sirijski narod zaslužuje pomoć, ali se doista nadam da ćemo biti učinkovitiji nego dosad. Zapadni su se lideri od prvog dana otvoreno svrstali na stranu tzv. pobunjenika, pokušavajući ih predstaviti kao konstruktivnu oporbu Assadovu režimu. Ispalo je sasvim suprotno, da su oni sve samo ne miroljubiva i konstruktivna opozicija.

Nadam se da i u primjeni ove strategije nećemo počinuti takve teške pogreške jer Sirija ne može podnijeti nove neuspjele pokuse.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, a crucial moment in the Syrian war is approaching. The so-called capital of ISIS is about to fall, or rather the city of Raqqa is about to be liberated by forces supported by the international coalition. These troops, the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), have proved to be those effective feet on the ground that Western leaders hoped for. Despite Turkish condemnation, the United States last week decided to directly support the Kurdish part of SDF. The Arab part of the SDF has already received support, so the US decision should be seen as a calculated move to strengthen those in Syria who have proved to be reliable allies.

SDF is the armed forces of a multi-ethnic region that is trying to implement democracy. The ambition is to include all groups in the decision-making. Because of this, I encourage the Commission to study the developments of the Federation of Northern Syria (Rojava). I also encourage the Commission to work for an end to the blockade of the region. Let humanitarian aid in and give people a fair chance to continue their path towards democracy.

Boris Zala (S&D). – Mr President, today it is self-evident that European strategies towards Syria have failed. The EU was consistently sidelined in the UN-sponsored negotiations. We are constantly being surprised by the moves of others: the US, Turkey, Russia and Iran. Collectively the European countries are the largest humanitarian donor in Syria, but this does not translate into any real influence on the dynamics of the conflict. It is, of course, difficult for the EU to play geopolitics, even peacemaking, without real military weight.

The EU will never be the leading player in brokering a lasting ceasefire, let alone a political transition in Syria. Our best chance is to become an actor who opens up the political space and creates incentives for UN negotiations to succeed through confidence-building, financial support and future reconstruction, as well as through sanctions and measures to bring the perpetrators of war crimes to justice.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, first of all I would like to join those colleagues who welcome the strategy for Syria. In this horrifying conflict, the EU needs to step up its efforts and play a greater role in finding a lasting political solution. We need to be able to react promptly to changing realities on the ground and to challenges in the region. We should be acting in areas where we are able to make a real difference, be it through diplomatic support or post-agreement reconstruction and reconciliation in the region. We should step up our contribution to the political process under the UN-agreed framework and at the same time continue in our resilience and humanitarian support under the 'Whole Syria' approach.

I welcome the fact that the EU strategy is outlining EU readiness to help in transition processes and the reconstruction of Syria. This will be a hard and extremely complicated task. Therefore, we need to have a clear idea of how to do it. Contributing to a political solution to the Syrian crisis is by all means a great challenge – however, not the only one we are facing in the region. We have to remain sensitive to the stability of the neighbouring countries: Jordan or Lebanon, but also Turkey. In this respect I would like to appeal to the High Representative to carefully monitor developments in the region and be ready to follow the strategic goals outlined in this strategy.

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Alto rappresentante, Lei ha ragione a segnalarci la strategia dell'Unione europea in questa fase delicata, perché proprio quando tutto sembra cedere alla violenza della guerra senza fine, quando di volta in volta sembra decisivo e quasi esclusivo il ruolo di una singola potenza regionale, tanto più ritorna la forza della nostra iniziativa politica e diplomatica. E noi su questo dobbiamo tenere il passo fermo.

Mantenere innanzitutto gli impegni presi per l'azione umanitaria. È decisivo e fondamentale accompagnare ai nove miliardi che abbiamo investito, abbiamo deciso di prendere un impegno per il 2017, una continua e costruttiva azione sul campo; aiutare la Giordania e il Libano, che sono i paesi più esposti in questa vicenda e, infine, questo è il passaggio più politico che vorrei segnalare, tenere insieme Astana e Ginevra. Non dividerci, né qui né nell'azione diplomatica, ma considerare i due momenti come complementari di un'azione politica che deve portare al cessate il fuoco sul campo e consentire così poi l'azione politica necessaria per la ricostruzione politica, il futuro della Siria.

A me pare che questo sia il terreno su cui noi dobbiamo decidere la nostra iniziativa e la nostra azione e l'azione a cui Lei sta coraggiosamente tenendo fede come Unione europea.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, I would say to Mrs Mogherini that a strategy for Syria is needed and this is better late than never, as has already been said. But the problem is that the EU's role from the start of the Syrian conflict has been, let us say, hesitant, trying to avoid involvement in the conflict. Paradoxically, the Syrian war has now entered European homes. But now, as Mr Tannock has said, the Syrian conflict has turned from an internal war into an international proxy war. The void left by the non-involvement of the US and the EU has been filled by Russia, Iran, Turkey and local extremists. Without the full assistance of Russia and Iran, the Assad regime would probably have collapsed about two years ago. What is the price of non-involvement?

The second point: safe zones. There has been outcry in Syria from the beginning and up until today, and there are still five million people under siege or difficult to reach. We are eager to provide humanitarian aid and that is very good, but the question is how to reach the people without safe zones. Third, no effective conflict resolution or sustainable peace is possible without full accountability. War crimes must be investigated. Assad is out of any international agreement because of his war crimes, and his only destination can be the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Rada EU vytyčila letos v dubnu strategii EU pro Sýrii. Podle Rady je EU pevně přesvědčena, že konflikt nelze řešit vojensky. Stejně tak rezoluce 2254 Rady bezpečnosti OSN dává přednost politickému řešení.

Obě tyto rezoluce trpí nedostatkem odvahy. Rezoluce Rady bezpečnosti z obav před vetem Ruské federace, Rada EU se obává nařčení z radikalismu. Ano, dámy a pánové, nedopusťme, aby se nerozhodnost, obavy, neschopnost přijmout zodpovědnost staly součástí evropské zahraniční politiky.

Vztah EU k Sýrii připomíná bezradnost Evropy v době kosovské krize. Nebyla to Unie, kdo dokázal zastavit Miloševičovu etnickou čistku kosovských Albánců. Bylo to NATO a Spojené státy, které genocidu bombardováním v - Jugoslávii zastavily. Jakoby se situace opakovala. Primární roli řešit syrskou krizi EU doposud sehrát nedokáže. Spojené státy a jimi řízená koalice už našly dostatek odhodlání vojensky podporovat boj syrských Kurdů YPG a YPJ proti ISIS.

Hledání dnešního Javiera Solany pokračuje. Třeba se v EU vynoří a otevřeně podpoří statečný odpor Kurdů proti ISIS.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – gerbiamoji Aukštoji įgaliotine, mums gerai žinomos Europos Sąjungos ir apskritai tarptautinės bendruomenės pastangos sureguliuoti konfliktą Sirijoje. Tačiau laikas bėga, karas tęsiasi jau šešerius metus, o taikos Sirijoje nėra. Europos Sąjungos iniciatyvos, ypatingai civilių apsaugos, humanitarinės pagalbos Sirijos žmonėms srityje vertas pagarbos. Tačiau jos neišsprendžia konflikto. Londono ir Briuselio konferencijos – taip pat geros iniciatyvos, bet labiausiai reikia politinio sprendimo ir konflikto suregulavimo, reikia taikos Sirijoje.

Kaip mes, Europos Sąjunga, apskritai atrodome šiame geopolitiniame žaidime? Jūs tvirtinate, kad Europos Sąjunga turi galimybių vaidinti svarbesnį vaidmenį siekiant takaus konflikto suregulavimo šioje šalyje. Tai kodėl tų galimybių, jeigu jos yra, mes neišnaudojame. Šiandien čia jau buvo minėta apie Jūsų kontaktus Irane, kurie galėtų būti išnaudoti. Jeigu yra ta galimybė, išnaudokime ją. Balandžio pabaigoje Jūs lankėtės Maskvoje. Tikiuosi, kad ten buvo kalbėta ir apie Siriją. Apskritai, ar Rusija *de facto* dar dalyvauja Ženevos procese? Ar yra bent kokių vilčių, kad jie galėtų pakeisti savo poziciją dėl paramos Assad'ui? Tai yra klausimai, į kuriuos mes laukiame atsakymų.

Ačiū.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, u Siriji je u šest godina izgubljeno više od 400 tisuća života, a 11 milijuna napustilo je svoje domove. Šestogodišnji rat u potpunosti je promijenio živote svih stanovnika Sirije, no sirijski kršćani pritom su posebno ranjivi jer su suočeni s jednim jedinim izborom: prijeći na islam ili umrijeti, u otvorenoj namjeri islamskih terorista da kršćanstvo u potpunosti iskorijene iz tih prostora.

Od 1,25 milijuna kršćana koliko ih je u Siriji bilo prije početka rata, danas ih je ostalo manje od 500 tisuća. Sirija je šesta na listi zemalja u kojima je najopasnije biti kršćanin. Kršćani koji su preostali u toj zemlji laka su meta jer su geografski koncentrirani na nekoliko mjesta, a gotovo sve crkve u potpunosti su razorene.

No sirijski kršćani ne žele otići iz svoje domovine, oni žele ostati u svojim domovima, a mi ne smijemo dopustiti da kršćanstvo nestane s tih prostora. Sigurna i stabilna Sirija za sve svoje stanovnike – takva Sirija mora biti.

Zveket oružja, eksplozija bombi, stalni strah koji su sirijska svakodnevica u posljednjih nekoliko godina moraju pres-tati. Sirija je zaslužila mir i Europska unija može i mora učiniti više kako bi se mir postigao, posebice kako bi se zaštitili svi ljudski životi, a posebno oni koji su najugroženiji, a to su kršćani.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Myslím, že všichni si přejeme mír v Sýrii, a proto vítáme to, že EU má strategii. Otázkou zůstává, na kolik jsou cíle proklamované v této strategii realistické, jestliže velkou část syrského území stále ovládá Islámský stát a když Asadova a Putinova armáda místo džihádistů masakruje umírněnou opozici.

Strategie EU počítá s úkolem číslo jedna, s politickým řešením konfliktu. Pokud má toto řešení být reálné, pak musí dojít ke společnému postupu všech hlavních sil. Proto odmítám ruské veto proti rezoluci Rady bezpečnosti, která požaduje po Asadově režimu spolupráci s mezinárodními vyšetřovateli dubnového chemického útoku.

Dámy a pánové, domníváte se, že by Asad byl ochoten k jednání, kdyby USA nebombardovaly Asadovy ozbrojené složky? Obávám se, že Asad by nebyl ochoten ani dnes ještě k jednání.

Já oceňuji to, že EU zaměřila svoji pozornost do budoucnosti. Především na humanitární pomoc a také na vzdělávání. V Turecku, Jordánsku a Libanonu totiž žije 1,5 milionu syrských dětí a ty potřebují vzdělávání. Jsem tedy ráda, že EU poskytuje pomoc na vzdělání těchto dětí a myslí na budoucnost Sýrie.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, Rethink Rebuild based in Manchester is one of many grassroots Syrian civil society support groups from 17 different countries who are asking for urgent and robust action to address the situation at its root, namely through civilian protection. Here is their recommendation for you:

‘We are tired of the endless political negotiations, which we know will fail because of Assad and his allies’ contempt for such processes and for international law more generally. We are frustrated that endless amounts of humanitarian aid are being doled out to Syria, whilst we have not been able to end the humanitarian crisis itself. We therefore call upon the international community to implement immediate and enforceable measures with a defined scope and the purpose of civilian protection, and in compliance with international humanitarian law to address the root issue in Syria, namely, civilian protection from the Assad and Russian killing machine. Whatever route the international community chooses to follow, it must put this at the heart of its policy, and a failure to do so will only mean that the resulting humanitarian refugee and terrorism crises will continue. #safelyinsyria

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι πράγματι τραγική η κατάσταση στη Συρία, με χιλιάδες θύματα και εκατομμύρια πρόσφυγες. Δεν ακούσαμε όμως μια πραγματική στρατηγική απ’ την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που θα οδηγήσει στην ομαλότητα, που θα βάλει πραγματικά την Ευρώπη να παίξει σημαντικότερο ρόλο. Αντ’ αυτού, παρατηρούμε ότι η Ευρώπη έχει αφήσει τη Σαουδική Αραβία, το Κατάρ και την Τουρκία κυριολεκτικά να αλωνίζουν. Την Τουρκία, η οποία συνεχώς κάνει λαθρεμπόριο πετρελαίου με το ISIS. Την Τουρκία η οποία εξοπλίζει το ISIS. Δεν είδαμε να υπάρχουν δράσεις πραγματικά για το χτύπημα του ISIS. Αντίθετα, αφήνουμε την Τουρκία να διαλύει τους Κούρδους, τη στιγμή που είναι αναγκαίο να δημιουργηθεί ένα κουρδικό κράτος στην περιοχή. Πιστεύουμε ότι πρέπει να υπάρξει μεγαλύτερη εμπλοκή του ΟΗΕ στην ειρηνευτική διαδικασία και να αξιοποιηθεί και η Ελλάδα και η Κύπρος, που διατηρούν ιστορικές σχέσεις με την περιοχή και ιδίως με τη Συρία.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le président, Madame la Haute Représentante, j’étais il y a un peu plus de six mois en visite dans un camp de réfugiés syriens en Turquie. J’ai pu mesurer le travail qui était fait à la fois par l’ONU et, surtout, par les ONG, qui permettaient à ces Syriens réfugiés de vivre dans des conditions presque acceptables.

Mais les Syriens avec lesquels nous avons pu discuter n’avaient qu’une envie: retourner dans leur pays. Et je crois effectivement que l’aide humanitaire est une bonne chose, mais qu’aujourd’hui, il faut aller beaucoup plus loin. Il faut essayer de trouver une solution politique parce qu’on a rarement vu des conflits qui se réglaient par la guerre. Je crois beaucoup à la solution politique.

C’est compliqué, c’est vrai, car dans ce secteur-là, il y a les Russes, les Américains, l’Iran et la Turquie avec la question kurde également. C’est compliqué mais je crois que vous êtes sur la bonne voie et qu’il faut effectivement tout mettre en œuvre pour cette solution politique.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ως στρατηγικός εταίρος και χρηματοδότης οφείλει να εμπλακεί αποφασιστικά στις ειρηνευτικές διαδικασίες στη Συρία. Η εμπλοκή όμως αυτή θα πρέπει να είναι ειλικρινής και αμερόληπτη. Δεν είναι δυνατόν να υποστηρίζει αναφανδόν τη συριακή αντιπολίτευση και να έχει την απαίτηση να θεωρηθεί ως σωστός και αντικειμενικός εταίρος από την κυβέρνηση Άσαντ. Επίσης, σε μια πολυεθνική σύγκρουση στη Συρία δεν μπορεί να αναζητά εγκληματίες πολέμου μόνο στην κυβερνητική πλευρά. Εξάλλου, η εμπλοκή της πρέπει να είναι μέσα στα όρια της λογικής. Δεν μπορεί να ζητά αυτή τη στιγμή τη δημιουργία ζωνών απαγορεύσεως πτήσεως και ασφαλών ζωνών στο έδαφος, τη στιγμή κατά την οποία διεξάγονται ακόμη χερσαίες και αεροπορικές επιχειρήσεις προκειμένου να ηττηθεί ο ISIS. Για να έχει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αποφασιστική και επιτυχή εμπλοκή στη Συρία πρέπει να ακολουθήσει μία πολιτική απαλλαγμένη από αγκυλώσεις και εξυπηρέτηση σκοπιμοτήτων και πρέπει να αποφασίσει να εμπλακεί η ίδια και να μην αφήνει άλλους να εκτελούν έργα για λογαριασμό της.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Mr President, first of all I thank the High Representative for her statement. As many colleagues have already said, we need to end the conflict in Syria urgently. As you might have heard, in the northern region of Syria, in Rojava canton, there is a democratic regional self-administration, the Federation of Northern Syria. Kurds, Syriacs, Yazidis, Turkmen and Arabs are cooperating peacefully in this region, making a model for the whole country.

High Representative, there is a great need for humanitarian aid in this Federation of Northern Syria. Unfortunately, the KDP is still blocking the area. The situation is worsening. Therefore, I urge you to do whatever you can to stop this blockade and to send humanitarian aid to this region. We need better political cooperation between the European Union and the Federation of Northern Syria. We really need to fully cooperate with a real democracy in the region. Therefore, High Representative, I call upon you to normalise the relations with the Federation as soon as possible.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la guerra in Siria continua ad avere conseguenze devastanti e tragiche. Dall'inizio del conflitto sarebbero circa 500 000 i morti e oltre 5 milioni i rifugiati, un disastro di proporzioni bibliche.

Ma all'orrore non c'è mai fine. È di queste ore l'accusa lanciata dagli Stati Uniti secondo cui a Saydnaya, a pochi chilometri dalla capitale siriana, sarebbe stato individuato un carcere provvisto addirittura di forno crematorio per lasciare senza tracce i crimini commessi.

In questo contesto va considerata con favore la strategia messa in campo dall'Unione europea che prevede, tra le altre cose, il perseguimento dei responsabili per i crimini di guerra e l'assistenza umanitaria alla popolazione civile. La situazione in Siria è gravissima e nel contempo complessa per l'effetto del sovrapporsi di varie tensioni. L'Unione europea è la potenza mondiale che senza dubbio ha i maggiori interessi a una stabilizzazione dell'intera area mediterranea ed è anche per questo che non può non svolgere un ruolo di primo piano nel processo di pacificazione.

Grazie, Alto rappresentante Mogherini per le proposte fatte e per quanto sta coraggiosamente facendo.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, the appalling consequences of the Syrian conflict that erupted six years ago amount to possibly the worst humanitarian tragedy in recent world history. The continuing horrific actions taking place, from violence by terrorists to military actions against civilians, including those in hospitals, have long made us feel helpless and desperate. However, we should be hopeful that one day soon IS will be thrown out of Raqqa by the American-backed coalition forces. We should be fully prepared for that moment so that when the time comes we can stand as strong guarantors of a genuinely inclusive political transition, and as reliable partners in the reconstruction of a stable Syrian society. As the largest humanitarian and financial donor, we are in a good position to demand a strong say in the peace negotiations and in the reconstruction of the country.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν ανεχόμαστε τα εγκλήματα του συριακού καθεστώτος αλλά δεν ανεχόμαστε τα εγκλήματα κανενός στη Συρία. Κυρία Mogherini, θα συμφωνήσετε μαζί μου, δεν υπάρχουν καλοί και κακοί δολοφόνοι ανυπεράσπιστων ανθρώπων. Το ισλαμικό κράτος ήταν και παραμένει η κυριότερη πηγή των αποτρόπαιων εγκλημάτων στη Συρία και ο κυριότερος σύμμαχος της διεθνούς συμμαχίας εναντίον του ισλαμικού κράτους είναι, και αποδείχτηκε στην πράξη, το κουρδικό YPG, αλλά η Τουρκία αντιδρά και το ονομάζει «τρομοκράτες» και το βομβαρδίζει. Οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες επέλεξαν ήδη το YPG ως τον δυνητικό τους σύμμαχο εναντίον του ισλαμικού κράτους. Εμείς που βρισκόμαστε; Θα καθορίζει η Τουρκία την πολιτική μας; Και τελειώνω με ένα ερώτημα: πόσο πιο αποτελεσματικό θα ήταν αν υπήρχε κοινή πολιτική άμυνας και ασφάλειας, με κοινές αμυντικές δομές.

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I will start with a 'good summary', as I think our colleague Marietje Schaake put it.

First, the European Union is united on a Syria strategy with clear objectives and indicators for action, and I am glad to see that Parliament is no exception in the European unity that has at last been achieved with regard to the direction of our actions to bring the Syrian crisis to an end.

Second, and still quoting our colleague, we can now use all our means of leverage – and there are many in different fields – to support, in the best possible way, the only solution we see, which is a political solution under UN auspices. And let us be very clear on what our means of leverage are.

First, the humanitarian one. Humanitarian aid, I must make clear, is never linked to political considerations. Our humanitarian support goes to anyone who needs to be helped, anywhere in Syria, with no political consideration whatsoever. Some of you referred, for instance, to the World Food Programme air-dropping food aid. That is happening thanks to European Union support, so all the aid you are seeing, all the children you are seeing saved, all the aid, food and medical equipment you see being delivered, is because of European Union work. We are not an aid delivery agency but we are the ones that make it possible for the UN agencies to do the work on the ground. So our role as a credible humanitarian donor, I believe, gives us the credibility vis-à-vis the Syrian civil population that allows us to play a sound political role in support of the UN process.

The second means of leverage we have is reconstruction. Some of you argue, or question whether, it is too early to reflect on reconstruction for the future of Syria. Some of you say it is too late, some of you say it is too early. The important thing is to have clear ideas of what you need to do at every stage of the story, which unfortunately is a very bad story.

There is a powerful element in our starting to look at the possibilities for reconstruction. First, because it offers a positive scenario, a peace dividend, and encourages the various parties to compromise in Geneva, because they know that if they agree on a political solution, if the political transition starts, if we go towards a democratic transition with inclusive governance and reconciliation, there will be someone in the international community – starting with the European Union but not us alone – who, on the basis of that political agreement, will be ready to work on the rebirth of the country. This scenario encourages the Syrians – and they need a horizon of hope – and puts pressure on the Syrian parties talking in Geneva, because what the Syrian people want is to make peace. And if we fuel this request for peace among the Syrian population with the perspective of normal life returning to the country, and accountability and reconciliation, then this will also create a little bit more space for the political talks in Geneva to take place, entering into the substance of what is going to be the future set up of Syria. As I said, it should be a united, democratic, diverse, secular and reconciled country. United – not fragmented or split into areas of influence.

The third element that Marietje Schaake mentioned was our leverage with Iran. Many of you mentioned Russia and the United States, and I will come to that in a moment. I believe that the European Union is best positioned in the world probably to talk with one of the main actors in this crisis. Now I will not elaborate here on the assessment of the role of Iran in the crisis because I think you know that very well, but if you want to make peace you have to talk to those who are making war, and we are among the few that have good, constructive conversations with Iran – in some cases trust-based, and always very frank, conversations.

Do not imagine that we are not doing this. We are, on a daily basis, and this is what we have been doing with the regional initiative. Why is it so important, if it is not getting headlines? Why have we chosen the regional approach? Because it is Syrians who have to have the courage for the transition and the compromise and the solution, the political solution. And we need to build the conditions in the region for all the different actors, from Saudi Arabia to Iran, from Turkey to Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, Jordan and Lebanon, and others, to be able to live with whatever agreement the Syrian parties come to in Geneva. Otherwise we will start again and again and again.

This is exactly the exercise we are engaged in, accompanying the work of the United Nations – and, believe me, if we use our leverage and we use our power and we put our leverage and our power at the service of the UN mediation, this is not giving up our role. This is serving our interests to the best; this is playing our role to the best because, for the European Union, the multilateral UN way is the way to resolve conflicts.

I have always thought that we were all on the same page on this, and that particularly at this moment it is essential for the European Union to help, support and feed into the UN multilateral efforts to achieve peace. Any agreement found will not be sustained or sustainable if it is not embedded in a multilateral, global UN framework. This is the work we are doing.

To turn to Russia: first of all, some of you asked for my comments on the Astana process. I believe it is useful. I believe the agreement that was reached recently on de-escalation zones is good, but we have seen agreements of this kind before and we know very well that the point is the implementation. The point is the real de-escalation of violence on the ground. The point is real humanitarian access in all parts of Syria. That is the key.

And that is why we are insisting on the need for the guarantors of the Astana process to guarantee the implementation of the agreement. They have a mechanism and they have a timetable that is also closely connected with the timetable of the talks in Geneva. We encourage the three guarantors of the Astana process to work to implement the agreement and also to create the strongest possible link between the military de-escalation efforts agreed in Astana and the political intra-Syrian talks led by the UN in Geneva. It is very clear to us, and I believe also to the UN Security Council Members – all of them – that the political, intra-Syrian negotiations should take place in Geneva under the UN leadership.

Some of you also asked me about the position of Russia, and the position of the US. Let me tell you very clearly. I met Foreign Minister Lavrov, as some of you mentioned, a few weeks ago in Moscow, and this work on Syria was the main point. We also discussed the situation in Ukraine as you can imagine. With Rex Tillerson the constant cooperation and coordination we have is producing similar approaches that you see in messaging and action. He called me on the day of Lavrov's visit to Washington precisely to debrief me about the visit. I can tell you, sometimes we pay less attention than they do to what we are doing, and I find that quite a paradox.

Last week I was in the UN Security Council, and the US Permanent Representative to the UN, Nikki Haley, referred to the European Union's key role in the Syria crisis, mentioning especially the means of leverage we have in terms of reconstruction and reconciliation. When Rex Tillerson was in Moscow, look at the press conference Lavrov held with him: Lavrov mentioned the Brussels conference and the role of the European Union in this. Sometimes I have the feeling that we give the work we are doing less recognition than it gets from some of our interlocutors on the global scene. We should be more self-confident about what we are doing, and recognise it a little bit more. Our role is not only humanitarian, but it is based on this good humanitarian work we are doing.

I shall finish by saying I believe that the region is, and will continue to be, the key. I will be in the region again at the end of this week, in Jordan for a regional forum. I see a lot of potential there to try and accompany the various Syrian parties in what are, in some cases, local processes that can open small bridges or small spaces for attempts at reconciliation. In Europe we know very well that no end of war comes easily. We have lived through wars on our territory that required not only a lot of mediation, a lot of reconciliation, a lot of transitional justice and a lot of accountability, but also a lot of reconstruction – physical reconstruction and also the reconstruction of the social fabric of trust among communities.

This will be one of the most challenging efforts we will have to make, to support the possibility of different kinds of Syrians feeling at home in the Syria of the future and trusting their neighbours, whoever they are.

We will move now to another debate that certainly touches on some of these issues, but I think that the European Union will also have to play the card, when the time comes, of reconstructing – or accompanying the Syrians as they try to reconstruct – the social fabric, and as they manage, we hope, to give rebirth to their country in a united manner.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

President. – I have received seven motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 123(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 18 May 2017.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

11. Kristittyjen tilanne Lähi-idässä (keskustelu)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla situazione dei Cristiani in Medio Oriente [2017/2686(RSP)].

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, on Palm Sunday, as you well remember, two Coptic churches were attacked in Egypt as worshippers gathered for mass. Forty-five people were killed and hundreds were wounded. Daesh terrorists claimed responsibility for the attack, because in their minds there is no room for the peaceful coexistence of different faiths.

I will start with just one of the terrible attacks on Christians in the Middle East and mention the response that this madness provoked, which was one of the best responses I have ever seen to one of these attacks. Just a week later, on Easter Sunday in Jordan, tens of Muslim youths stood guard to protect churches and Christian believers to make sure that they could celebrate their holiest festivity in peace and respect. I believe that these young people of Muslim faith, these young Jordanians, are Daesh's worst nightmare. They show the real face of the Middle East and they honour hundreds of years of peaceful coexistence of different religious faiths in the Middle East. You will remember well the message that His Majesty the King of Jordan delivered in this very Chamber exactly along these lines.

When Pope Francis embarked on his historic visit to Egypt last month, he described Christians, Muslims and people of all faiths as fellow travellers. For thousands of years people of different religions have been fellow travellers in the Middle East, in Europe and in the rest of the world. At a time when freedom of religion or belief is coming under attack in many parts of our world, we have a duty first of all to preserve this diversity here in Europe as well. Religious or ethnic groups – Christians and others – are being forced to flee from lands they have inhabited for centuries. We can, and must, preserve the space for people of different backgrounds to be fellow travellers, sharing their land and their lives. Christianity was born in the Middle East. It belongs to the Middle East. Yet we know that entire Christian communities have been forced to leave their home countries and their region. The phenomenon is not new, but what is new is the

trend that is now more worrying than ever. This is not only causing great human suffering to Christians as well as to many other minorities in the region but, if the Middle East loses its incredible diversity – that is a problem in itself – it would also lose its greatest richness. For this reason, the European Union is engaged on a daily basis to protect all minorities and every person's human rights with concrete actions in several fields. I will mention a few of them.

First, we systematically raise freedom of religion and belief at different levels of our political dialogues, including in our human rights dialogues with countries in the Middle East. Together with a number of partner countries, we have developed what we call our partnership priorities in order to promote common interests. The protection of human rights is always part of our own priorities. In the second field of action we always condemn violence against religious or belief minorities with public statements and with private demarches. Public advocacy is not always sufficient, but it reminds all these community groups that they are not alone in this struggle. In the third field of action we work to ensure that freedom of religion and belief remains prominently on the global agenda and specifically on the UN agenda, featuring a strong human rights approach. In the fourth field of action the EU Special Representative, Stavros Lambrinidis, is doing an amazing job and keeps raising these issues in all his official visits and dialogues – most recently to Egypt, just to mention one country.

In May 2016, as a follow-up to the European Parliament's resolution on the systematic mass murder of religious minorities by Daesh, we appointed Mr Figel' as the first Special Envoy for the promotion of freedom of religion or belief outside the European Union. In the fifth field of action we are seeking the broadest engagement of relevant regional actors and international organisations. Preserving diversity is, first and foremost, a Middle Eastern interest, so we will not stop working to protect all minorities. But we are not alone in this task and we look for cooperation with our partners.

Sixth, we are providing very concrete financial support to local communities and minorities through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights. The 2016 global call for proposals addressed the rights of persons belonging to minorities, and the new call on freedom of religion or belief will be launched in 2017, aiming at supporting local and international civil society organisations in promoting mutual tolerance and understanding. We are also providing support to Christians in countries where they are facing a precarious situation. In Iraq, for example, we are making sure that our projects for stabilisation also deliver on the needs of Christian communities.

Last, but certainly not least, we are fighting terrorism through security cooperation, with our work to end the conflicts in our region, and by addressing the social, economic and cultural roots of radicalisation. In this work we also have a duty to get the narrative right and also to represent the best face of the Middle East: the face of diversity, the face of those Muslim young people protecting Christian churches. We must give voice, if I can quote Pope Francis in Italian:

...‘non solo alla inciviltà del conflitto, ma anche alla civiltà dell’incontro’.

The narrative is important: to dismantle the narrative of those who believe that there is no space for living together either in the Middle East or elsewhere. Even in Syria – we were discussing this a few minutes ago – in the middle of the most violent conflict of our times, we hear stories of Christian and Muslim neighbours helping each other to make it through the war. The different religious groups and minorities – identities, groups – in Syria will have the major responsibility of trying to bridge the differences, the hate, and the difficulty of starting to live together again once the conflict is over.

There is still room for hope. A future of diversity for the Middle East is possible, and we believe that this is work which we can do together with our partners, both globally and in the region. That is the commitment of our European Union: protecting and offering the perspective of diversity and unity.

Presidente. – I servizi della Presidenza mi informano che siamo in grandissimo ritardo sulla tabella di marcia, dopo questo dibattito dovranno svolgersene altri cinque e quindi non è possibile, per questo dibattito, utilizzare le «blue card».

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, quand on parle des chrétiens du Moyen-Orient, on pense tout d'abord – M^{me} la haute représentante aussi – aux coptes d'Égypte. C'est vrai, leur situation est inquiétante. Cette communauté a été sauvagement frappée par une série d'attentats. Il faut bien entendu que leur sécurité soit renforcée et les autorités égyptiennes font des efforts dans ce sens-là.

Je crois qu'il faut inscrire cette problématique dans un contexte plus large de persécution des chrétiens au Moyen-Orient et c'est la raison pour laquelle notre groupe politique a demandé à avoir ce débat, et non pour parler uniquement des coptes. Il faut savoir que la proclamation du califat par le groupe connu sous le nom de Daech, ou ISIS, fait non seulement partie de la guerre entre chiites et sunnites, mais est aussi dirigée contre les chrétiens. C'est un fait, Daech vise systématiquement les chrétiens et on a utilisé à bon droit le terme de génocide parce qu'il s'agit justement d'une volonté de détruire les communautés chrétiennes.

Comme M^{me} la haute représentante l'a également dit, la disparition des chrétiens au Moyen-Orient serait un drame qui marquerait la fin de la différence et des sociétés diverses. Je crois que nous sommes tout à fait d'accord et je pense qu'il faut absolument que nous l'empêchions. L'Union européenne peut agir sur plusieurs fronts, notamment en luttant contre l'instrumentalisation de la religion dans les conflits.

Nous devons être intransigeants sur le respect et la mise en œuvre des dispositions du droit international en matière de liberté religieuse, mais, pour ce faire, il faut reconnaître la nature de ce conflit.

Arne Lietz, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Hohe Beauftragte! Ich bin als Christ in der sozialistischen Diktatur in einem oppositionellen Pfarrhaushalt groß geworden. Dabei habe ich selbst in Familie und Freundeskreis erlebt, was es bedeutet, wenn ein politisches System in die Persönlichkeits- und Freiheitsrechte von Menschen eingreift und diese deswegen sogar das Land verlassen. Ich begrüße es, dass wir uns heute hier mit der Lage der Christen im Nahen Osten befassen. Allerdings möchte ich diese Debatte als Chance nehmen, um die Freiheit aller Religionen im Nahen Osten und in anderen Teilen der Welt einzufordern.

Hierbei möchte ich auf drei Punkte eingehen. Punkt eins: Die Religionsfreiheit ist eine unabdingbare Voraussetzung für die demokratische Entwicklung im Nahen Osten. Angesichts der religiösen Pluralität im Nahen Osten ist die Achtung der Religionsfreiheit unverzichtbar für ein friedliches Zusammenleben, so wie es die Hohe Beauftragte gerade gesagt hat. Ich fordere die EU auf, gegenüber Ländern wie Saudi-Arabien und Katar für die Rechte von Nicht- und Andersgläubigen einzutreten, die dort leider mit Füßen getreten werden. Auch in Ägypten bleibt die Lage der koptischen Christen prekär. Die Kriege in Syrien und Irak haben zum Exodus besonders von Christen und Jesiden geführt. Diese Beispiele stehen im Kontrast zu Tunesien, wo sich die neugewählte Regierung für religiöse Toleranz ausgesprochen hat. Dafür verdient sie die Unterstützung der Europäischen Union.

Zweitens: Bildung und interreligiöser Dialog müssen gestärkt werden. Ein wichtiger Aspekt der internationalen Unterstützung wurde von Papst Franziskus bei seinem letzten Besuch in Ägypten deutlich gemacht. Er betonte, dass Bildung und auch religiöse Bildung gestärkt werden müssten, um den interreligiösen Dialog zu fördern und zum friedlichen Zusammenleben beizutragen. In diesem Bereich kann und sollte die EU sich auch mehr engagieren.

Drittens: Das Recht einer oder keiner Religion anzugehören, ist universell und muss Maßstab der EU-Außenpolitik sein. Artikel 18 der Allgemeinen Erklärung der Menschenrechte legt diese Universalität der Religionsfreiheit fest. In diesem Haus gibt es dazu einen breiten Konsens. Auf meine Initiative haben der Kollege Rainer Wieland ich 2015 einen Aufruf zum aktiven Handeln gegen die weltweite Verfolgung religiöser Minderheiten und für die Verteidigung der Religionsfreiheit als Menschenrecht veröffentlicht. Diesen Beschluss haben Mitglieder dieses Parlamentes aus 28 Ländern unterstützt.

Als Letztes möchte ich das Beispiel der Verleihung des letzten Sacharow-Preises erwähnen. Das Europäische Parlament hat zwei Vertreterinnen der jesidischen Minderheiten im Irak und in Syrien hier eindeutig unterstützt.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I have a long association with the Coptic Christians in Egypt through its large diaspora community living in London. The attacks of last month against two Christian churches in Egypt were the latest in a series of atrocities. These remind us not only of the continued security risk that Egypt faces from Al-Qaeda, particularly in the Sinai, but also of the wider plight that Christians as communities face across the entire Middle East.

There are around 30 million Christians living in the region, the largest numbers based in Egypt, Lebanon and Syria. The Syrian civil war has tragically seen tens of thousands of Christians displaced and fleeing for their lives as Isis has deliberately targeted them both there and in neighbouring Iraq where, on a visit two years ago, I met a number of Assyrian Christian IDPs. I would like to take this opportunity to praise the efforts of the KRG in providing shelter for Christian refugees housed within its territory.

Whilst I of course also welcome the support from EU Member States that has been given and offered to Christian refugees from the Middle East, I believe that it is important that we recognise that such expulsions of Christians is precisely the aim of groups like Isis, who wish to see a Middle East free of all non-Sunni Muslim religious minorities. Our efforts should therefore concentrate on establishing safe haven autonomous regions within the Middle East, such as in the Nineveh Plains in Iraq, and supporting communities to rebuild their lives and defend themselves in the places that their civilisation has been rooted for over two millennia. With some five million refugees and IDPs uprooted from their homes due to the conflicts in Iraq and Syria, it is easy for the plight of the Middle East Christians to be forgotten.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Mevrouw Mogherini, ik wil u graag bedanken voor de boodschap van hoop die u hebt gebracht in het bijzonder moeilijke debat dat we vandaag weer moeten voeren. U spreekt een boodschap van hoop uit, niet alleen voor de christenen, maar voor alle religieuze groeperingen die vandaag het slachtoffer zijn van vervolging, discriminatie, geweld en moorden.

Wat de door u aangehaalde punten betreft, moeten we blijven hameren op godsdienstvrijheid en als Europa de kar trekken voor de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten wereldwijd. Dat zijn de dingen die we als Europa, als Europese Unie, moeten blijven doen. Daar moeten we op inzetten. Vandaar dat ik heel blij ben met de punten die u hebt opgesomd. Voorts wil ik beklemtonen dat we moeten inzetten op het bestraffen van de daders. Zolang we straffeloosheid laten bestaan, zullen discriminatie en geweld blijven voortduren. Ook daar moeten we als Europa op inzetten. Het is een teken van echt respect voor de mensenrechten dat je de daders van discriminatie en moorden tot de orde roept.

Tot slot, mevrouw Mogherini, weet u dat wij als liberalen heel veel belang hechten aan vrede en stabiliteit in de regio. Ik weet niet hoe vaak ik hier met u het debat al heb gevoerd over het Midden-Oosten, over Israël en Palestina. Wel, aanstaande donderdag zullen wij een belangrijke resolutie ter stemming voorleggen. De onderhandelingen daarover vinden morgenochtend plaats en we zullen ons met alle partijen heel hard inzetten om bij Israël en Palestina nog eens voor die tweestatenoplossing te pleiten. Als we die stap zetten, zal het geweld volgens mij afnemen en zal er misschien vrede komen, waardoor ook de religieuze minderheden in vrede naast elkaar kunnen leven. U hebt alleszins onze steun om verder te gaan en in de rest van de wereld voor de mensenrechten te blijven pleiten.

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Ve východní části Maghrebu a Mašreku je situace všech minorit, ať už náboženských nebo národnostních, v posledních letech velmi složitá.

Většina těchto zemí je osídlena již více než 8 000 let a vždy v průběhu válečných konfliktů utrpělo obyvatelstvo, ať už na venkově či ve městech, velké škody. Přesto se zde po staletí vyvíjely v symbióze a ve vzájemném dotýkání desítky různých náboženství a etnických skupin. V posledních letech s nástupem radikálního islámu se situace všech menšin výrazně zhoršila. Každý, kdo neodpovídá představám radikálních hnutí, např. Islámského státu, může být podle jeho vládnoucích činitelů zavražděn, mučen, znásilněn nebo jinak zotročen. Často jde o nucenou konverzi.

Největší z těchto ohrožených skupin jsou křesťanští Koptové. V některých částech Egypta se prosazování těchto myšlenek ujaly tradičně odbojné kočovné kmeny a tato situace vedle životní nejistoty křesťanů i menšinových islámských směrů ohrožuje stabilizaci ekonomiky země. Kroky egyptské i jiných vlád proti tomuto nebezpečí bychom proto měli podpořit.

Bodil Valero, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Precis som redan har sagts har ju konflikter, förföljelse och diskriminering drivit tusentals kristna, men också andra religiösa minoriteter, från sina hem, och många har tvingats söka skydd i EU.

Även om de kristna har levt i Mellanöstern i över 2 000 år, så är de nu bara tre till fyra procent av regionens befolkning. Det är en minskning från 20 procent för hundra år sedan.

I Sverige lever idag cirka 120 000 personer från den etno-kristna gruppen assyrier/syrianer/kaldéer med ursprung från Turkiet, Syrien, Irak och Libanon. Många kom redan under 70-talet, men ett stort antal har anlänt nyligen.

Men medan diaspororna i Europa växer är de kristnas fortsatta existens i Mellanöstern allvarligt hotad. Men krigen i närområdet kommer någon dag trots allt att ta slut, och då måste vi ha beredskap att ge stöd till en återuppbyggnad och möjlighet till alla dem som vill återvända till sina hem att göra det.

Men för att det ska vara möjligt måste alla religiösa och etniska minoritetsgrupper få både rätt och möjlighet att leva i sina historiska och traditionella hemländer i värdighet, jämlikhet och trygghet, och åtnjuta sina demokratiska, mänskliga och politiska rättigheter.

Fru Mogherini berättade redan om allt som vi gör, och det är väldigt bra. Men vi kan också vara en stor bidragande del i att främja den politiska dialogen. Främst kanske genom att erkänna de många etniska och religiösa grupper som härstammar från och lever i området, men också att låta dem göra sin röst hörd i politiska förhandlingar och diskussioner om deras hemländers framtid och återuppbyggnad. Tack!

Margot Parker, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, Madam High Representative, this is not the first time that I have stood in this Chamber to draw attention to the terrible suffering of Christian communities throughout the Middle East. It would appear that, far from major moves being made to alleviate that suffering, it is doomed to continue.

Only this Easter, speculation increased over whether or not Christianity had a future in the Middle East. These are ancient communities, existing since the earliest foundations of the faith, and it is a daunting prospect that we could let Asian communities wither in the face of the growing radical Islamism throughout the region.

Whilst the bombings of the Coptic Church in Egypt by Islamic State were a tragedy, the support by the Egyptian Government is a model that should be emulated throughout the region. The attack was not just on a community but on all Egyptians. We must continue to draw attention to the situation of Christians and to make sure that more is done to prevent the destruction of these ancient communities.

Franz Obermayr, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Ich bin sehr froh, dass wir heute mit Frau Mogherini die dramatische Situation der Christen im Nahen Osten erörtern können. Unmittelbarer Anstoß für mich, diesen Tagesordnungspunkt zu beantragen, waren die schrecklichen Terroranschläge gegen koptische Christen zu Ostern in Ägypten. Aber auch in diesem Zusammenhang müssen wir uns die Frage stellen, warum im 21. Jahrhundert – nach rund 2 000 Jahren – die Christen im Nahen Osten dieser schrecklichen Verfolgung ausgesetzt sind.

Es sind nicht nur IS, Al-Qaida, Al-Nusra – bestens gefördert übrigens von Saudi-Arabien –, die hier verantwortlich sind. Wir können festhalten, dass ein immer fanatischer werdender, aggressiver Islam auch seinen Teil dazu beiträgt. Das kann man auch an Organisationen wie der Muslimbruderschaft festmachen. Denn die Scharia toleriert letztlich keine christliche Minderheit und schon gar nicht die Religionsausübung derselben. Trotzdem hofieren auch das Europäische Parlament und die Kommission europäische Ableger der Muslimbrüder wie zum Beispiel die Organisationen ENORB oder FEMYSO. Man gibt Geld – 85 000 Euro für eine Broschüre für islamische Jugendorganisationen oder gar 450 000 Euro für ein Scharia-Projekt in Irland. Und man lädt auch hier im Haus eine Ex-FEMYSO-Präsidentin in den LIBE-Ausschuss ein, um sie zum Thema Islamophobie reden zu lassen. Man hätte sehen können, dass deren Facebook-Konto vor Kontakten zu Hamas und radikalen Muslimbrüdern strotzte.

Was werden sich bei so viel Ignoranz wohl unsere assyrischen, aramäischen und koptischen verfolgten Christen denken? Man muss sich auch wirklich fragen: Ist der Westen wirklich klar im Kopf? Die Christen im Orient fühlen sich von Europa letztlich im Stich gelassen, brauchen aber mehr denn je unsere materielle, aber auch ideelle Unterstützung.

Bitte handeln wir rasch! Beten allein wird wohl zu wenig sein.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Madame la Présidente, libérer, protéger, reconstruire: ces trois objectifs devraient être les nôtres sur la question des chrétiens d'Orient, que nous abordons aujourd'hui.

Libérer les chrétiens d'Orient de la gangrène qui les menace directement. Nous ne pouvons pas tout faire, mais nous pouvons demander qu'ils disposent enfin de la liberté de religion, de la suppression du délit de blasphème dans les États musulmans avec lesquels nous avons des relations diplomatiques et de la suppression de la mention de la religion sur les documents d'identité.

Protéger, car sans une paix durable pour les peuples du Proche et du Moyen-Orient, nous savons que nous serons peut-être, un jour, les prochaines victimes. Envoyons des observateurs internationaux ou facilitons leur envoi.

Reconstruire, enfin, car ces peuples et ces communautés n'aspirent pas à migrer chez nous. Elles n'aspirent pas à quitter leur terre mais, bien au contraire, à y rester ou à y retourner lorsqu'elles ont été contraintes de la quitter.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante, señorías, más de 200 millones de personas son perseguidas por su fe religiosa —cristianos— en todo el mundo.

El año pasado —el año 2016— fue un año nefasto en el que murieron 90 000 cristianos. Es evidente que con la autoproclamación del Califato y del Estado Islámico este hecho lamentable se ha hecho mucho más visible y las imágenes de veintiún cristianos coptos en las playas de Libia, en el año 2015, dieron la vuelta al mundo. En diciembre de 2016, hubo otro atentado en El Cairo, donde murieron veinticinco personas y más de cuarenta y tantas fueron heridas. La alta representante nos ha recordado los atentados del Domingo de Ramos.

Y es cierto que hay una disminución dramática de la presencia de cristianos en la región. En el año 2003, en Irak había un millón de cristianos; hoy, hay solamente 300 000. En el conjunto de Oriente Medio —se ha recordado por alguna de las personas que han intervenido, que me han precedido en el uso de la palabra—, la población en Oriente Medio de cristianos era del 9 %; hoy, es menos del 2,9 %.

Por lo tanto, ante este cuadro, señora presidenta, tenemos que reaccionar y tenemos que, desde luego, mantener —como ha dicho la alta representante— este tema en lo más alto de la agenda. Y, desde luego, tenemos que movilizar todos los recursos —que son muchos, como nos ha expuesto la alta representante— para tratar de garantizar el derecho de las minorías étnicas y religiosas.

Termino, señora presidenta, diciendo que hay que apoyar también proyectos como el del obispo de Kirkuk, que ha creado una universidad con todas las confesiones religiosas donde están todos los refugiados de Mosul.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Alta Comissária, a existência de comunidades cristãs no Médio Oriente remonta ao próprio momento da origem do cristianismo. Aliás, foi em muitas dessas comunidades que se operou a primeira aproximação entre a religião cristã e o pensamento filosófico clássico.

Os cristãos que representavam há um século cerca de 20% estão hoje reduzidos a 3 ou 4% da população da região. Especialmente nos últimos 15 anos, os cristãos no Médio Oriente têm sido alvo de discriminação, perseguição e violência que redundam muitas vezes no exílio ou na morte.

Os ataques terroristas levados a cabo contra as minorias religiosas nesta zona do globo não são novos, nem sequer exclusivos da religião cristã. Os muçulmanos que professam outras concepções do islamismo são, aliás, as principais vítimas de algum tipo de extremismo islâmico. Lá, como cá, o terrorismo usa de uma violência atroz, amedronta, desumaniza e, por fim, mata.

Nos territórios ocupados pelo Estado Islâmico a comunidade cristã é sujeita a humilhações e a pressões absolutamente aviltantes visando a sua conversão ao Islão. As populações são chacinadas, as mulheres são violadas e transformadas em escravas sexuais. Fora destes territórios são levados a cabo ataques terroristas que matam crentes no local sagrado de culto. Todos nos recordamos, como já aqui foi referido, dos recentes ataques terroristas no Egipto, duas explosões no domingo de ramos, uma dentro de uma igreja, outra à porta de um outro local de culto católico, 45 mortos e mais de 100 feridos.

A guerra entre sunitas e xiitas, a crescente influência do Islão nas instituições políticas e a desestruturação do Estado decorrente da guerra no Iraque contribuíram para um cenário de radicalização que põe em causa a integridade das minorias religiosas. A Europa deve empenhar-se absolutamente em prestar todo o apoio a estas comunidades cristãs que são tão violentamente perseguidas no Médio Oriente.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR). – Madam President, as we just heard, 15 years ago there were about 2.3 to 2.5 million Christians in Iraq, and today there are about 200 000. In Lebanon we have one million Christian refugees from Syria. This is an official number, the unofficial number is twice as many. Two-thirds of Christians have left Syria. Are they safe in Lebanon? Hardly. Their future is uncertain, to say the least.

All in all last year, as we also heard today, about 80 000 or 90 000 Christians were murdered throughout the world. The number was down by half in comparison with the previous years. A success? I would not say so. All these numbers are terrifying.

So why is the reaction of the EU and the entire Western world so inadequate? One would think it is the West that should defend Christians because Christianity is a vital part of our civilisation. Without Christianity, we would not have existed. It is our sacred duty, as Christians, to defend Christians. If we do not defend them, no one will. So why are we not doing so?

One of the reasons lies in deep anti-Christian prejudices. In Europe, Christians have been an object of increasing discrimination, and one would hardly expect that this hostility to European Christians could result in a full-bodied defence of Christians elsewhere. The fact that this meek reaction by Europe can be explained does not make it less shameful.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Madam President, five months ago we awarded the Sakharov Prize to Nadia Murad to draw attention to the religious minority of the Yazidis, which has been the subject of a genocidal campaign by Daesh militants, but the senseless and heartless brutality of Daesh continues. The slaughter of Christians in Egypt, which we are debating today, once again disfigures the face of humanity, as Pope Francis correctly warned this week.

Ms Mogherini, I thank you for the strong comments you made today. I support you and hope your actions will be successful. Respect for fundamental and human rights is the core value of the European Union. Any violation of these rights, whether within or outside the EU, affects the democratic principles upon which our society is founded. All minorities, religious, ethnic or sexual, deserve our unstinting protection.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich danke zunächst den Fraktionen, dass sie meinem Antrag zugestimmt haben, sodass wir das Thema Christenverfolgung heute hier auf der Tagesordnung haben.

Das Thema ist wichtig, weil es groß ist. Weltweit werden über 200 Millionen Christen wegen ihres christlichen Glaubens verfolgt. Nebenbei: Die EU hat letztes Jahr einen Sondergesandten ernannt für die Glaubens- und Religionsfreiheit, der genau hierfür zuständig ist. Ich frage mich also, wo der ist, und ich wundere mich, dass er ausdrücklich auf Betreiben der sogenannten Christdemokraten heute nicht hier ist.

Aber die wichtige Frage ist: Wollen wir Christen helfen? Und wenn wir helfen wollen, dann wie? Wir können nicht alle Flüchtlinge der Welt bei uns aufnehmen, wir müssen also auswählen. Und deswegen fordere ich: Wenn wir schon auswählen müssen, dann lassen Sie uns Christen bevorzugt aufnehmen!

Mireille D'Ornano (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, au début du vingtième siècle, un quart des habitants du Moyen-Orient étaient chrétiens. Ils sont aujourd'hui 3 %. Nous ne pourrions plus dire que nous ne savions pas. Bien sûr, les forces irakiennes et coalisées progressent et remportent des succès en libérant des territoires irakiens conquis par le groupe «État islamique» – au moment où nous parlons, Daech ne détient plus que 10 % de la ville de Mossoul –, mais ces succès militaires ne doivent pas faire oublier la réalité.

Les chrétiens de Karacoché ont certes célébré Pâques 2017 dans leur ville, symboliquement. Pourtant, la plupart des populations de la région ne veulent pas ou ne peuvent plus revenir chez elles. En Iraq, où je me suis rendue l'année passée, les chrétiens ont été victimes de menées génocidaires et continuent de quitter leur pays. Aussi, si nous devons accueillir les chrétiens en souffrance, il est également de notre devoir de les aider, notamment dans la plaine de Ninive, à reconstruire leur ville. En effet, l'État irakien est davantage préoccupé par ses arrière-pensées stratégiques dans le cadre du conflit sunnite-chiite que par le sort des chrétiens.

Face à la barbarie, l'Europe a l'occasion de parler d'une seule voix pour interpellier les consciences avant qu'il ne soit trop tard.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι διώξεις, οι προπηλακισμοί, οι δολοφονίες και ο βίαιος εξισλαμισμός των Χριστιανών που ζουν στη Μέση Ανατολή μπορούν να συγκριθούν με τη μαρτυρική περίοδο των πρώτων χρόνων του Χριστιανισμού. Συντελείται μια, κυριολεκτικά, γενοκτονία εναντίον των Χριστιανών, οι οποίοι οδηγούνται σε εξαφάνιση από το δημογραφικό, πολιτισμικό και θρησκευτικό χάρτη των Αγίων Τόπων. Σε επίσκεψή μου στη Μααλούλα της Συρίας έγινα αυτόπτης μάρτυρας της καταστροφής ανεκτίμητων κειμηλίων που προκάλεσαν ισλαμιστές στην ιστορική Μονή της Αγίας Θέκλας. Να σημειώσω ότι Χριστιανοί και μνημεία βίωσαν την ισλαμική βαρβαρότητα ενώ δεν πειράχτηκε κανένας μουσουλμάνος. Στα σκλαβοπάζαρα του ISIS, μια νεαρή Χριστιανή ή Γεζιντι, 10 έως 20 ετών, πωλείται για περίπου 150 δολάρια, ενώ νεαρές από 1 έως 9 ετών πωλούνται για 200 δολάρια. Όσοι μάχονται για την πολυπολιτισμικότητα και τα ανοιχτά σύνορα, ας αναρωτηθούν πόσο αξίζει η ανθρωπινή αξιοπρέπεια και η πίστη. Δεν χρειάζεται να με κατηγορήσει κανείς ως ισλαμοφοβικό και μη ανεκτικό. Προτιμώ να μην δέχομαι τη σφαγή και τον εξευτελισμό των χριστιανών από τους ισλαμιστές, παρά την πολιτική ορθότητα που προωθείται. Στη Μέση Ανατολή οδηγούνται σε αφανισμό οι χριστιανοί. Σειρά θα έχει τώρα και η Ευρώπη.

Michèle Alliot-Marie (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute Représentante, en ce qui concerne les chrétiens d'Orient, l'Union européenne doit dépasser les discours de bonnes intentions et les généralités polies sur les droits de l'homme.

Nous ne pouvons laisser Daech redessiner le Moyen-Orient et éradiquer les minorités chrétiennes.

Lorsque des musulmans sont attaqués dans le monde, les pays musulmans réagissent. Lorsque des juifs sont attaqués, Israël réagit. L'Europe, qui a des racines chrétiennes – que cela plaise ou non – doit, elle aussi, se faire entendre. Que va-t-elle dire alors que des chrétiens sont obligés de quitter les régions qui sont leurs terres d'ancrage traditionnel? Qu'allons-nous faire pour leur permettre de rester ou de revenir? Certes, l'Union européenne peut s'appuyer sur les autorités religieuses et sur des gouvernements locaux lorsqu'ils sont ouverts mais il faut aller plus loin. L'enjeu n'est pas simplement le respect des droits de l'homme, mais aussi la tolérance l'équilibre, la sécurité du Moyen-Orient et, à partir du Moyen-Orient, du monde entier. Il faut donc aujourd'hui agir concrètement. Madame la Haute Représentante, des moyens existent, mais au-delà des discours ou de certaines initiatives sur les droits de l'homme, qu'allez-vous réellement mettre en œuvre dans les domaines judiciaire, diplomatique, coercitif voire militaire pour permettre aux gens de rester ou de revenir chez eux?

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante, hoy queremos no solo denunciar, sino subrayar la discriminación institucionalizada y la persecución que minorías cristianas están padeciendo en muchos países de Oriente Medio. Pero también querríamos recordar que eso también lo están padeciendo en algunos que son considerados aliados cercanos.

En Egipto, la minoría copta ha estado denunciando que no recibe seguridad, no se le proporciona seguridad suficiente. Como sabemos, ha habido terribles atentados sobre sus iglesias durante los últimos meses. En los países del Golfo, en varios países importantes del Golfo, la visibilidad del cristianismo está prohibida. Tajantemente prohibida. Y muchos cristianos, hoy, son en el Golfo migrantes, trabajadores migrantes especialmente vulnerables.

Tenemos que utilizar todas nuestras herramientas -también las diplomáticas- para proteger a esas comunidades, pero recordando que son muchas, muchas las minorías discriminadas: yazidíes, chiíes en algunos países, kurdos, turcomanos. Son muchos, y algunos grupos suníes. La tolerancia es para todos.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Spreken over de situatie van christenen in het Midden-Oosten roept vandaag vooral de klemmende vraag op of er voor hen nog een plaats en een toekomst is in de Arabische wereld. Of gaat de leus van verdrijving van joden en christenen, die na de liederen van de zaterdag op muren in Arabische steden wordt gekalkt, zich in de 21e eeuw daadwerkelijk voltrekken?

De gesel van islamistisch terrorisme waaronder christenen in het Midden-Oosten gebukt gaan, zwiept vandaag even goed over het Europese continent. Alleen al vanuit welbegrepen eigenbelang zou de Europese Unie zich duidelijk moeten opwerpen als de beschermer van christenen en andere minderheden in het Midden-Oosten. Dat betekent ook concrete steun verlenen aan hervormingsgezinde krachten. Het onderwijs binnen de moslimgemeenschap is daarbij heel belangrijk, want naar de woorden van een ervaringsdeskundige is totalitarisme op basis van het islamitische geloof de ergste onder alle regeringssystemen.

Ik roep de EU en de lidstaten daarom op zich naar vermogen in te zetten voor een toekomst van christenen in het Midden-Oosten. Hun toekomst is immers nauw verbonden met het Europa van de toekomst.

Илхан Ключук (ALDE). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, г-жо Могерини, колеги, свидетели сме на насилствен и системен процес на изтласкване на религиозните малцинства от Близкия изток. С тревога наблюдаваме как радикални групировки в Сирия и Ирак подлагат жени и деца на жестоки гонения, подтисничество и дискриминация. Стотици семейства в Близкия изток са принудени всеки ден да взимат съдбоносни решения за това дали да напуснат родината си, да изоставят вярата си или да се разделят с живота си.

Основният репресивен орган е Ислямска държава, която целенасочено руши градове, религиозни храмове и светини. Уви, това не са исторически факти от друга епоха, а реални картини от последните шест години.

В тази връзка призовавам Европейския съюз да вземе спешни мерки, за да защити всички религиозни малцинства в Близкия изток. Силно вярвам, че мирното съжителство на християни и мюсюлмани и всички религиозни малцинства в Близкия изток е основата, върху която Европейският съюз трябва да гради мира и сигурността в региона.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il vicepresidente degli Stati Uniti Pence, parlando a un'associazione evangelica, ha condannato l'Isis colpevole di genocidio contro i cristiani e dice «è tempo che il mondo li chiami col suo nome» e ha citato Trump, il quale li chiama per nome, «terroristi radicali islamici».

Ora, una domanda sorge spontanea: come mai gli alti esponenti, a cominciare dall'Alto rappresentante, non hanno nemmeno il coraggio di chiamarli per nome questi «genocidiari»? Io spero che nella replica, se c'è stata disattenzione o omissione, l'Alto rappresentante corregga questo grave errore. Noi dobbiamo avere il coraggio di chiamare i colpevoli di questo genocidio, a pezzetti, perché è una cosa che avviene sotto i nostri occhi, una cosa che colpisce i nostri fratelli di sangue e anche di religione.

Stamattina abbiamo accolto con grandi salamelecchi un alto esponente dell'Unione africana, eppure il 70 per cento dei cristiani morti non è in Medio Oriente, è in Africa, ma nessuno, dopo tanti salamelecchi, ha ritenuto doveroso richiamare l'attenzione di quest'alta autorità politica africana.

Ci vuole più coraggio, signori dell'Unione europea!

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Madam President, the terrorist attacks against the Coptic community in Egypt are part of an attempted genocide. In the words of Isis stated a few weeks ago, Christians and their holy sites are legitimate targets in a war against infidels and tyrants. If this total contempt for human dignity does not end the discussion about whether the Christians can live under Jihadi Salafists as long as they pay a penalty tax, I do not know if anything will, because the threat against Christians in Egypt is fully in line with the barbaric acts of Isis in other parts of the Middle East.

Last February, a majority of this Parliament passed a resolution that defines the persecution of Christians in Iraq and Syria as genocide. This is, of course, important, but in view of the constant threats against Christians, it is imperative that further steps are taken. The Commission must act for a legally-binding genocide recognition in the UN Security Council.

Efforts for legal action against the perpetrators must be intensified. Respect for freedom of religion must be a top priority. Middle East governments – terrorist groups alike – should always know: violation of the universal right to believe and worship will be punished. Justice will prevail.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D). – Is-sitwazzjoni tal-Kristjani fil-Lvant Nofsani hija ta' thassib serju.

Il-komunitajiet Kristjani li ilhom stabbiliti fil-Lvant Nofsani qeghdin jiffaccjaw pressjoni dejjem akbar li qed tirrizulta fi spostament sinifikanti ta' persuni f'xi pajjiżi jew tnaqqis ta' Kristjani fir-reġjun shih.

L-isplużjonijiet li saru f'Hadd il-Palm f'żewġ knejjes Koptiċi kienu biss wiehed minn hafna attakki kontra l-Kristjani tar-reġjun, bl-ghan li tiżdied it-tensjoni bejn ir-religjonijiet, tiżdied il-mibeghda bejn il-komunitajiet.

Il-Kristjani ġew attakkati minhabba r-religjon u t-twemmin tagħhom għal għexieren ta' snin. Spiċċaw vittmi ta' gruppi terroristiċi u reġimi awtoritarji, ta' diskriminazzjoni soċjali, qgħad u faqar, u dan kollu għax jixtiequ jipprattikaw ir-religjon tagħhom b'mod miftuħ u b'mod liberu.

Dan huwa l-kontra l-valuri tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Irridu niddefendu l-pluralizmu religjuż.

L-Unjoni Ewropea trid tkun aktar b'saħħitha u tikkundanna kull forma ta' intolleranza u vjolenza kontra l-persuni minhabba r-religjon tagħhom.

Il-Kunsill tal-Affarijiet Barranin li jmiss irid jindirizza dil-kwistjoni issa u mhux iktar tard.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Madam President, Madam High Representative, colleagues, the situation of the Christians in the Middle East is alarming, as many of us here are saying, especially in Syria and Iraq. The Christians, as the indigenous people of the region, creating a much-needed balance between religion and ethnic groups, are expelled or killed, or persecuted. With No Christians left, the European Union loses a reliable and perspective partner for reconstructing the Middle East. Madam High Representative, it should be our foremost priority to protect people who are culturally and civilisation-wise close to Europeans. We should support these groups, both in the humanitarian and political ways – but not only in Syria and Iraq, but also in the southern region of Turkey and other countries in the Middle East. It is a shame we let these atrocities happen, but thank you very much for the things you expressed in your statement at the beginning about the ways we support the minorities and the groups there.

Another example is the Palestinian Authority. Churches under their authority are not able to register, even though they fulfil all requirements set by the law. The Palestinian Authorities simply refuse them. I have these examples; I can bring them. Madam High Representative, I call upon you to discuss these matters with the Palestinian authorities.

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, massacres, assassinats, persécutions, exactions, humiliations, viols, enlèvements, monastères et églises détruites, spoliations, expulsions, exode... L'histoire des chrétiens d'Orient est tragique et leur quotidien un vrai calvaire.

Le 16 avril dernier, chrétiens d'Occident et chrétiens d'Orient fêtaient Pâques. Malheureusement, l'écho des cloches d'Orient répondant au son des clochers de nos églises s'affaiblit et si les chancelleries occidentales persistent à se cantonner aux seules protestations d'usage, bientôt cet écho s'éteindra.

Les récents attentats contre les coptes d'Égypte nous le rappellent. Les chrétiens d'Orient sont la cible de groupes islamistes qui entendent épurer le Moyen-Orient de leur présence. Les communautés chrétiennes orientales, parmi les plus anciennes du monde, sont aujourd'hui en sursis, alors même qu'elles sont établies depuis plusieurs siècles, bien avant les conquêtes arabo-musulmanes.

Au début du vingtième siècle, près d'un habitant du Moyen-Orient sur quatre était chrétien. Aujourd'hui, les communautés chrétiennes représentent 3 à 4 % de la population du Moyen-Orient. Ils ne sont plus que 11 millions, une goutte d'eau parmi une population composée de 320 millions de musulmans.

Au prétexte d'exporter la démocratie à coups de bombes de l'Iraq à la Libye, nos gouvernements ont permis l'émergence de groupes djihadistes. Il est urgent que les pays occidentaux adoptent une politique internationale réaliste. Ce n'est pas rendre service aux chrétiens d'Orient que de diaboliser les gouvernements syrien et russe tout en négociant avec la Turquie et en se prostituant avec les parrains du djihadisme international, les pétromonarchies du Golfe.

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, what we are talking about today is not a question of religiosity. The elimination of Christians from the Middle East is much more of a human rights and security issue. In Egypt the Coptic community enjoys great support from President Sisi, but even so it is extremely difficult to counter jihadism. In Iraq, however, the Christians will clearly disappear within a very short time. Even if Isis is on the defensive, there is no guarantee of security at all. The EU is doing a lot to provide aid, but individual Member States also have their homework. If the international community misses the opportunity to help Christians return to their homes, tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of families may decide to leave Iraq for ever. EU financial support, including development and ECHO programmes, is inaccessible to religious minorities and historical churches. The result is that affected communities are left out of the EU's humanitarian projects. Through the activities of AFET and DEVE, we must continue efforts to involve the relevant organisations as partners in the European Union aid and reconstruction projects. European politicians, let's wake up, really wake up. We have been given a chance, so we should use it.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Mogherini! Solidaryzuję się z Pani słowami. Gratuluję! Dobrze, że o tym debatujemy. Unia Europejska, czy Europa w ogóle, ma rzeczywiście chrześcijańskie korzenie, ale jednocześnie jesteśmy kontynentem, jesteśmy wspólnotą wysoce tolerancyjną: przyjmujemy imigrantów różnych wyznań, w tym także muzułmanów, pozwalamy im swoją religię tutaj kultywować, i powinniśmy tego samego oczekiwać od państw Bliskiego Wschodu.

Uważam, że powinniśmy dołożyć wszelkich starań, żeby nie dopuścić do dechrystianizacji tego regionu. I z tego punktu widzenia chciałem poprzeć, co powiedział pan poseł Legutko: Liban jest przykładem państwa, gdzie koegzystują chrześcijaństwo i muzułmanie. Liban ma w tej chwili niemal taką samą liczbę imigrantów co regularnych obywateli. Zwróćmy uwagę temu państwu, pomóżmy, bo myślę, że chrześcijaństwo na Bliskim Wschodzie mają prawo oczekiwać od nas pomocy, a my jesteśmy do niej zobligowani.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru formand! Den kristne-jødiske kulturarv i dette område går årtusinder tilbage, og der er tale om en kultur, der har domineret Mellemøsten i længere tid end de kulturer, der i øjeblikket udgør majoriteten. Derfor er det en dobbelt katastrofe, at de sekteriske konflikter, som hærger områderne, særligt Irak og Syrien, men også andre steder, betyder, at de kristne og andre minoriteter i områderne kommer under dobbelt pres, nemlig både det generelle pres, som disse krige og konflikter fører til, og i særdeleshed også det pres, at det er tydeligt, at minoritetsgrupperne er særligt udsatte for religiøse forfølgelser, for udryddelser, for andre forbrydelser mod menneskeheden.

Derfor har vi også som EU en forpligtelse til at sørge for at beskytte de mennesker, der kommer under dette pres, og måske i et særlig omfang tage hensyn til kristne i flygtningelejre og andre steder, når EU-lande vælger kvoteflygtninge. Der er ingen tvivl om, at dette er et problem, som skal tages alvorligt, og som skal håndteres øjeblikkeligt, hvis der fortsat skal være en kristen kulturarv i disse lande.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, en estos momentos, los cristianos y otras minorías son objeto de especial persecución en algunos puntos de Oriente Medio y África. De especial gravedad es la actividad de Dáesh, y recuerdo que nuestra Resolución de febrero de 2016 calificó de genocidio los actos perpetrados por el Dáesh contra estas minorías y solicitó que la comunidad internacional pusiera en marcha los mecanismos necesarios para que el Tribunal Penal Internacional pudiera depurar las responsabilidades penales correspondientes. Hoy, sobre la cualificación de este asunto como genocidio no la he oído hablar, señora Mogherini.

Paralelamente, tenemos que seguir ayudando a estas minorías perseguidas, ayuda que puede significar, en muchos casos, acogerlos en nuestros territorios y, en otros —allí donde lo permitieran las circunstancias—, tendremos que apoyar las iniciativas que faciliten a estos desplazados o perseguidos el regreso a sus lugares de origen, como desean muchos de ellos.

Yo celebro el anuncio ayer por el ministro español de Exteriores de que, a finales de este mes, tendrá lugar en Madrid la segunda Conferencia Internacional sobre víctimas de violencia étnica y religiosa en Oriente Medio, donde se abordarán algunas de estas cuestiones. Tampoco le he oído una mención de este punto a usted, señora Mogherini.

La violencia contra las minorías religiosas —y los cristianos en especial— no tiene sentido alguno desde ningún punto de vista, tampoco desde ninguna religión.

Y voy a citar yo también al papa Francisco, recientemente en El Cairo: «A Dios solo le agrada la fe profesada con la vida, porque el único extremismo que se le permite a los creyentes es la caridad».

Y termino. El pensamiento cristiano está muy unido a esta Unión Europea. Por tanto, en estos momentos, lo que no podemos permitirnos tampoco es que desde la Unión Europea fallemos a los cristianos.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, colega Millán Mon, seria bom que os líderes europeus que se dizem cristãos ouvissem e tirassem consequências da mensagem do Papa Francisco, que, sendo religiosa, é também política.

A viagem que fez ao Egipto, no rescaldo do ataque a duas igrejas coptas, foi poderosa nesse esforço de entendimento ecuménico, de solidariedade, de paz, de combate à violência extrema. E ainda esta semana, em Fátima, o Papa relembrou a importância do diálogo e da convivência entre cristãos, muçulmanos e outras confissões religiosas para a salvação da humanidade.

Quem se diz cristão mais obrigação tem de entender que a defesa das comunidades cristãs e outras minorias religiosas no Médio Oriente só pode ser assegurada se a Europa liderar a comunidade internacional na garantia de proteção eficaz para que essas minorias pré-islâmicas possam regressar aos territórios ancestrais que já foram libertados, como Sinjar, ou à medida que vão sendo libertados, como agora em Mossul e em redor de Mossul. É fundamental, portanto, apoiar prioritariamente a reconstrução dessas zonas libertadas, o que até este momento não foi feito.

Por outro lado, é preciso derrotarmos e contrariar a islamofobia e o antissemitismo que a extrema-direita populista semeia na Europa, porque sem os nossos muçulmanos não venceremos a ameaça terrorista e o extremismo violento.

President. – There is a request for a blue card, but I am not taking blue cards because of our time constraints, and that was already announced by the previous Chair.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Według danych „Open Doors” rok 2016 był najgorszym rokiem w ostatnim ćwierćwieczu, jeżeli chodzi o prześladowania chrześcijan w świecie. Według innych danych cztery z pięciu osób zabijanych z powodu wyznania to chrześcijanie. Z dziesięciu państw, które odnotowują najgorsze prześladowania chrześcijan, dziewięć to państwa islamskie.

Wszystkie te dane, i wiele innych, wskazują na to, że w gruncie rzeczy mamy do czynienia z systematyczną czystką etniczno-religijną i ludobójstwem. Mimo to pochrześcijański Zachód i pochrześcijańska Europa niechętnie zajmują się tym tematem. Zachodni politycy unikają wskazywania chrześcijan jako ofiar, szczególnych ofiar, prześladowań. Wolą mówić, tak jak pani Mogherini, o różnorodności lub, jak niektórzy koledzy, o wolności religijnej, o tolerancji. Także Parlament – tak elokwentny, jeżeli chodzi o imigrantów islamskich do Europy – niechętnie zajmuje się tym tematem. Wystarczy przypomnieć dzisiejszą poranną debatę. Trudno nie wiązać tego z faktem, że w części Europy – również i w części Europy – chrześcijanie spotykają się z rosnącą niechęcią i dyskryminacją.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Madam President, we must be very aware that, often, Christians in the Middle East have suffered the most from internal conflicts to which they were not a party. On the contrary, they have tended to have a mediating, reconciliatory role – so they have been caught between a rock and a hard place.

One of my visitors from Erbil told me that the EU needs to have an honest debate about whether the international community really wants Christians to survive in the region from which Christianity emerged. If Christians were not humans, they would have been defined long ago as an endangered species and taken under international protection, but now their numbers are decreasing with dramatic speed.

We heard about 'de-Christianisation of the Middle East', and probably Christians will not survive another major conflict in the area. The question is whether there will be any Christians in liberated Mosul, or living in the Nineveh plains.

I have two proposals to the Commission. Firstly, the EU and international organisations cannot provide aid directly to religion-based groups, so we need to change the rules, because churches can provide most direct help to people in real need. And secondly, the EU can make a difference: as a large provider of humanitarian aid, our red line should be to set as criteria for local authorities that humanitarian aid must reach all groups and minorities without discrimination, and that Christians and members of other minority religions will be guaranteed a return to their homes and equal rights.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, a kopt keresztények elleni, virágvasárnapi véres merénylet nyomán Henri Boulad jezsuita atya nem csupán a radikális politikai iszlám fölött mondott ítéletet, hanem – mások mellett – a demokratikus Nyugatot is vád alá helyezte, amely „az iszlamistákkal közösen megalkotta a hazug iszlamofóbia fogalmát, hogy minden iszlámmal kapcsolatos kritikát elhallgattasson”. Boulad atya azokat az európai vezetőket is váddal illeti, akik „a multikulturális ideológia, a vadglobalizmus és a féktelen nyitottság nevében hozzájárulnak egy értékes kulturális és civilizációs múlt összeomlásához”. Üdvözlöm az Európai Parlamentnek a közel-keleti kereszténység helyzetéről szóló, mai vitáját. A végveszélybe jutott szíriai és iraki keresztény Testvéreink jogos elvárása, hogy ne feledkezzünk meg róluk, ne hagyjuk sorsukra őket. Európa ébredő lelkiismeretének megnyilatkozása ez az esemény.

Hasonlóképpen az Unió, illetve a Külügyi Szolgálat fokozott kiállását jelenti a vallási-etnikai tisztogatást és brutális népiirtást elszenvedő keresztény közösségek tagjainak százezrei mellett. Ebben a küzdelemben külön is illesse köszönet és elismerés az üldözött keresztényeket védelmező Open Doors jogvédő szervezetet, valamint a védelmükre kelt Európai Néppártot, nem utolsósorban pedig a megsegítésük céljából létrehozott magyarországi kormányhivatalt.

Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE). – Madam President, Madam Mogherini, according to reports, persecution of Christians has risen worldwide for three years in a row. In total more than 200 million Christians live in countries where they are subject to hostility, which ranges from constant pressure, social discrimination and harassment to physical violence, imprisonment and death. Christians are now killed in more countries than ever before and are persecuted in more countries than any other religious group.

For those of us who have been following the story of Christian persecution, this news does not come as a surprise. Instead, it serves as a sad confirmation of what we have been witnessing over the past few years. In the Middle East, Christians' homes and churches have been destroyed, their cross torn down and smashed, and bibles burned to ashes. But the worst stories are those of decapitations, mass executions and torture.

We must ask ourselves, how long will we allow Christians to be the most persecuted people in the world? Until there are none left in the Middle East? Until they are wiped out in other parts of the world?

It is time to act. The EU must come to the aid of those who are suffering persecution because of their Christian faith – and we can certainly do more. I urge you, Madam High Representative, to keep the issue of the persecution of Christians high on your agenda.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει καμία αμφιβολία ότι η κατάσταση στη Μέση Ανατολή είναι εφιαλτική. Στο λίκνο του Χριστιανισμού, στην κοιτίδα του Χριστιανισμού, εκεί που βρίσκονται οι αρχαιότερες χριστιανικές κοινότητες υπάρχει αυτή τη στιγμή ένας οδοστρωτήρας προς εξαφάνισή τους. Και αν σήμερα εμείς μιλούμε για την καταστροφή του Χριστιανισμού στη Μέση Ανατολή, πρέπει να μιλήσουμε ξεκάθαρα ότι πρόκειται για μια κατ' εξοχήν γενοκτονία των Χριστιανών και αν πράγματι, αγαπητή κυρία Mogherini, μας ρωτήσει εμάς εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο κάποιος Χριστιανός της Μέσης Ανατολής τι κάνουμε σήμερα για να παρεμποδίσουμε τον αφανισμό του ποια θα είναι η απάντησή μας; Ποια θα είναι η απάντησή μας όταν από 28% οι Χριστιανοί στη Μέση Ανατολή έγιναν 5% σήμερα; Ποια είναι η απάντησή μας για την καταστροφή του θρησκευτικού χριστιανικού πολιτισμού, σήμερα, το 2017 στην Κύπρο από την Τουρκία, από μια κατοχική δύναμη. Και όταν μιλάμε για γενοκτονίες, η πρωταθλήτρια των χριστιανικών γενοκτονιών ήταν η Τουρκία. Γενοκτονία Αρμενίων, γενοκτονία Ποντίων, γενοκτονία Ελλήνων, γενοκτονία με άλλη μορφή στην Κύπρο όπου καταστρέφεται ο θρησκευτικός χριστιανικός πολιτισμός και θα ήθελα πάρα πολύ, κυρία Mogherini, με την απεριόριστη εκτίμηση και σεβασμό που σας έχω, να μου πείτε εάν στον κύριο Τσελικ, τον οποίον προσφάτως συναντήσατε του είπατε ότι δεν επιτρέπεται μία χώρα όπως η Τουρκία να συνεχίζει να τρομοκρατεί Χριστιανούς στην περιοχή. Να τρομοκρατεί τους Έλληνες της Κύπρου, να τρομοκρατεί την Ελλάδα, να τρομοκρατεί ουσιαστικά τα κατεχόμενα όπου βρίσκεται και καταστρέφει τα θρησκευτικά μνημεία. Τελειώνοντας, θα ήθελα να σας παρακαλέσω την επόμενη φορά που θα συναντηθείτε με τον κύριο Τσελικ να του πείτε τι γίνονται όλοι εκείνοι οι θρησκευτικοί χριστιανικοί λεηλατηθέντες, κλαπέντες θησαυροί που έγιναν από την Τουρκία. Θέλουμε απάντηση και θα ζητήσω να πραγματοποιηθεί ένα ταμείο για τους χριστιανικούς θρησκευτικούς θησαυρούς.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Mogherini, estou consigo e apoio completamente a sua mensagem de esperança para todos os grupos religiosos que são vítimas de terrorismo. Condeno com veemência os atentados e os ataques contra os cristãos orientais, para ser correta devemos dizer orientais cristãos, contra todas as minorias religiosas, mas não esqueçamos que estes ataques são contra toda a comunidade, contra todo o povo egípcio, contra todos nós.

A população egípcia uniu-se em torno destes ataques e nós estamos aqui a dividir. Eu nem queria acreditar quando ouvi hoje neste plenário colegas que se dizem cristãos dizer coisas como «se temos que salvar alguém, salvemos os cristãos primeiro», ou «matar cristãos é uma morte dupla». Eu, sinceramente, pergunto-me: serei só eu a ver uma profunda contradição nestas declarações? Voltámos ao tempo das Cruzadas? É porque dignidade, humanidade e direitos humanos é o que nos deve unir e o terrorismo é a questão essencial de tudo isto.

É verdade, há milhares e milhares de cristãos a sofrer e a morrer no Médio Oriente, mas também há milhões de muçulmanos a sofrer e a morrer no Médio Oriente. Devemos estar com todos e com todas.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Napadi na kristjane in cerkve na Bližnjem vzhodu, ki jih v imenu nestrpnosti izvajajo skrajneži, so nesprejemljivi, zato jih moramo obsoditi ter se jim upreti.

Na Bližnjem vzhodu smo že vrsto let priča preganjanju in zatiranju kristjanov, kar ima za posledico izginjanje krščanskih skupnosti s tisočletno tradicijo v številnih državah, med njimi tudi v Egiptu, Siriji, Turčiji, Iraku in Iranu.

Nestrpnost do kristjanov pa narašča tudi v Evropski uniji. Čeprav je svoboda veroizpovedi ustavna pravica, so verniki, predvsem kristjani, pogosto tarča posmeha, žaljenja in nasilja.

Po podatkih Vatikana naj bi v letu 2016 življenje izgubilo okoli 90 tisoč kristjanov. Gre za zastrašujoč podatek, ki kristjane uvršča na vrh najbolj preganjanih verskih skupnosti na svetu.

Poleg ozaveščanja o resnosti položaja kristjanov na Bližnjem vzhodu je naloga Evropske unije tudi dejavnejša vključitev v krajih, kjer se dogajajo tragedije.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mondo occidentale sembra si sia abituato alla persecuzione dei cristiani in Medio Oriente, come se si trattasse di una tragedia inevitabile che si può solo accettare. Molte delle antiche comunità cristiane sono ridotte al lumicino, messe in fuga da decenni di guerre, dal dilagare della povertà, dall'instabilità economica e politica e dalle persecuzioni.

Il problema, tuttavia, non riguarda solo i cristiani. Come ha avuto modo di dire Papa Francesco, tante persone innocenti sono duramente provate, sia cristiane, sia musulmane, sia appartenenti a minoranze come gli yazidi. Il tema è di più ampio respiro e riguarda l'intolleranza religiosa, che non fa differenza di credo quando si tratta di fondamentalismi. Un'intolleranza che va affrontata attraverso una strada del dialogo e della riconciliazione per costruire un futuro di rispetto, di sicurezza e di pace, lontano da ogni forma di guerra.

Ma non possiamo solo denunciare come stiamo facendo oggi, dobbiamo assumerci la responsabilità di rompere il velo della rassegnazione rispetto a quelle persecuzioni che toccano tutti noi, come cittadini del mondo e come europei, prima ancora che come cristiani.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodo predsjednice, kršćani su jedna od najugroženijih zajednica na Bliskom istoku. Sustavno protjerivanje, paljenje crkava, teroristički napadi na njihove zajednice i zatiranje njihova postojanja na tim prostorima događaju se već godinama pred našim očima. Mi stalno na to upozoravamo, stalno o tome raspravljamo, ali sigurnost bliskoistočnih kršćana nekako uvijek završi daleko iza nekih drugih prioriteta i partikularnih interesa.

Mislim da se konačno moramo suočiti s činjenicom da je položaj kršćana na Bliskom istoku puno gori nego što je bio prije Arapskog proljeća i rata u Iraku i Siriji.

Ja jesam za to da se mi borimo za svoje interese, ali da pritom vodimo računa da cijele regije diljem svijeta ne guramo u kaos. Kolateralna žrtva tog kaosa su i bliskoistočni kršćani. Ako im želimo dobro, moramo djelovati, a ne samo upozoravati.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρακολουθώ με πολλή προσοχή τα ειλικρινή δάκρυα όλων μας για τον αφανισμό των Χριστιανών στη γη των πατέρων τους. Η διατήρηση των πολιτισμών στην κοιτίδα τους θα έπρεπε να αποτελεί πρωταρχικό στόχο της πολυθρύλητης παγκοσμιοποίησης. Αλλά από τη χλιδή του Στρασβούργου, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, τα δάκρυά μας δεν αποτελούν απάντηση. Αυτό που πρέπει να κάνουμε δυστυχώς είναι αυτό που έπρεπε να είχαμε ήδη κάνει. Είμαι από τους πρώτους σ' αυτή την αίθουσα, αν όχι ο πρώτος, που έχει πει ότι η περίφημη «αραβική άνοιξη» θα μετατρεπόταν γρήγορα σε κύριο βαρύ αραβικό χειμώνα, αλλά κανείς δεν άκουγε. Δεν προλάβαμε τα γεγονότα. Αφήσαμε να εξελιχθούν. Κράτη μέλη έπαιξαν ρόλο στην κήρυξη των πολέμων και στη συνέχισή τους. Τώρα λοιπόν επαναλαμβάνω ότι, δυστυχώς, τα δάκρυά μας δεν αρκούν, ούτε τα ακούν, ούτε τα αισθάνονται.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Já věřím, že paní vysoká představitelka slyší naše volání po efektivní pomoci křesťanům. Křesťanům, kteří jsou nejvíce pronásledovanou náboženskou skupinou, tak jak to zde všichni potvrzujeme.

Střední východ je jejich domovem a oni nechtějí odcházet, ale jsou vyháněni, zabíjeni. Přitom oni samotní zde žijí 2 000 let. Jsou vzdělanou a mírumilovnou skupinou obyvatelů. Co pro ně můžeme udělat? V roce 2015 nás žádali biskupové, abychom jim pomohli, abychom je přijali zde v Evropě. ČR symbolicky přijala 90 iráckých křesťanů, ale to bylo opravdu jen symbolické gesto.

Myslím, že tady dnes zazněly konkrétní návrhy, a já prosím paní Mogheriniovou, aby udělala to, co zde zaznělo. Podpořme křesťany na Středním východě. Pomozme jim, aby mohli zůstat ve svých domovech.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μπροστά στα μάτια μας εξελίσσεται το ολοκαύτωμα των Χριστιανών στη Μέση Ανατολή, εκεί που γεννήθηκε η χριστιανοσύνη. Η πηγή των κακών, δεν θα το αναλύσουμε τώρα αλλά δεν μπορεί να εξαφανιστεί, είναι ενόσω υπάρχει Ισλαμικό Κράτος. Αποκεφαλισμοί, βιασμοί, απαγωγές, καταστροφή εκκλησιών και χριστιανικών μνημείων. Οι προσευχές μας και οι ευχές μας είναι για όλους τους Χριστιανούς αλλά και για όλους που δεν είναι Χριστιανοί στη Μέση Ανατολή, ειδικότερα όμως για τους Ορθόδοξους, τους Καθολικούς, τους Κόπτες και όλους τους υπόλοιπους. Κυρία Mogherini, θα το πω αργά για να μεταφραστεί σωστά: Σας μεταφέρω δημόσια την έκκληση του ποιμνίου δύο Ορθόδοξων μητροπολιτών οι οποίοι απήχθησαν πριν ακριβώς τρία χρόνια από το Χαλέπι. Αναφέρομαι στον Μητροπολίτη Παύλο και στον Μητροπολίτη Γιοχάνα. Το ποίμνιο θέλει να ξέρει αν γνωρίζετε κάτι για την τύχη τους.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, it is very good that we are having this debate, firstly because for too long we have seen destruction and execution, the destroying of the Christian heritage and people in the Middle East, and we are really the only ones they can turn to. It is especially important that we send out a message to our fellow Christian brothers and sisters that the European Union is going to stand behind them.

I was very encouraged by words of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Ms Mogherini, which are important to these people not only psychologically but also in a practical sense.

The fact that four out of five people killed because of their religion are Christian tells its own tale, and we have a powerful role to play, especially in terms of humanitarian aid, development aid, etcetera. It should be a condition of aid that religious tolerance will be practised in these areas, and especially that there will be due regard for Christians. Many of us in Europe are Christian: are we are going to stand up for Christians in the Middle East?

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση των Χριστιανών στη Μέση Ανατολή είναι εφιαλτική. Το είδαμε πρόσφατα και στις επιθέσεις των τζιχαντιστών κατά της Εκκλησίας των Κοπτών στην Αίγυπτο. Οι τζιχαντιστές σφάζουν τους χριστιανικούς πληθυσμούς στη Συρία και αλλού κάνοντας ενός είδους θρησκευτική κάθαρση. Στα μουσουλμανικά κράτη οι διώξεις είναι συστηματικές και προγραμματισμένες. Στην ουσία πρόκειται για ενός είδους διαφορετική εθνοκάθαρση, για μια γενοκτονία. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να είναι πιο αποφασιστική για την προστασία των χριστιανικών πληθυσμών και να λάβει μέτρα για την ασφαλή επιστροφή στις εστίες τους. Απ' την άλλη μεριά, παρατηρούμε ότι η Σαουδική Αραβία απαιτεί να λειτο-υργήσουν στην Ευρώπη τζαμιά, όταν αυτή η ίδια δεν επιτρέπει να λειτουργούν χριστιανικές εκκλησίες στο έδαφός της και ιδίως στη Μέκκα. Οφείλουμε λοιπόν να γίνουμε πιο αποφασιστικοί για να προλάβουμε πραγματικά αυτό το ολοκαύτωμα των χριστιανικών πληθυσμών στη Μέση Ανατολή.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, ak by som chcela len vymenovať teroristické útoky a prečítať mená nevinných, ktorí boli zavraždení islamistickými militantami len preto, že boli pokrstení a chodili do kostola, nestačil by mi čas. Štáty, v ktorých sa tieto vraždy dejú, dostali za posledných desať rokov miliardy eur rozvojovej a humanitárnej pomoci. Len nedávny útok na Koptov v Egypte dokazuje, že situácia kresťanov zostala od zavraždenia mosulského arcibiskupa Rahha v roku 2008 rovnako zúfalá.

Naša podpora rozvoja nepriniesla žiadnu zmenu, naša pomoc kresťanom nepomohla. Naďalej sú denne vraždení, zastrešovaní, unášaní a sú im odopierané ich základné práva. Pri všetkej úcte k pani Mogherini sa nazdávam, že vonkajšia činnosť EÚ tu zlyháva. A v mene občanov, ktorých tu zastupujem, žiadam o nápravu.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Federica Mogherini, Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, normalmente in quest'Aula parlo in inglese ma mi consentirete, per concludere questo importante dibattito che abbiamo avuto questa sera, non l'unica volta che ne abbiamo parlato, di parlare nella mia lingua che è anche una delle grandi lingue della comunità cristiana nel mondo. Credo che il latino non sia contemplato tra le traduzioni, quindi mi attengo all'italiano.

Essendo nata e cresciuta a Roma, a poche centinaia di metri dal Vaticano, credo che possiate capire molto bene l'importanza che per me ha questo dibattito questa sera e credo che possiate avere piena fiducia nella determinazione, nell'impegno e nell'energia che personalmente metto nel lavoro di cui abbiamo parlato stasera.

Vorrei riferirmi soltanto a tre punti a conclusione di questo dibattito. Primo, l'Unione europea ha e mantiene i diritti umani, tutti i diritti umani, al centro della propria politica estera. Non è lo stesso per tutti gli attori internazionali, in questo momento in particolare, ma per noi è un faro della nostra azione nel mondo.

Secondo, per noi la libertà di religione e di culto è un diritto fondamentale che va garantito, protetto e promosso per tutte le religioni e in tutte le aree del mondo. Questo è vero per i cristiani in Medio Oriente, questo è anche vero per i cristiani altrove nel mondo, alcuni ricordavano giustamente le persecuzioni e gli attacchi alle comunità cristiane in altre aree del mondo, altrettanto preoccupanti, legate a diversi tipi di dinamiche, ma vorrei anche ricordare, come alcuni colleghi hanno fatto questa sera, la necessità di proteggere tutte le comunità e tutte le religioni anche nella nostra Europa.

Vorrei in questo senso appoggiare coloro che ricordavano la necessità di prevenire e contrastare l'islamofobia, in particolare in Europa citando Papa Francesco, che ci ha ricordato che l'Europa ha il dovere di riscoprire la sua capacità di integrare e richiamando sempre, accanto alle radici cristiane dell'Europa, il fatto che ne abbiamo altre di radici e che le une possono vivere sempre accanto alle altre, in rispetto, in tolleranza e in protezione reciproca.

Terzo punto: la situazione dei cristiani in Medio Oriente non è solo una questione di diritti umani, non è neanche solo una questione di tolleranza, è una questione innanzitutto di preservare la diversità, la diversità di una regione, la diversità di una cultura, la diversità di una storia. Da questo punto di vista condivido ciò che dicevano alcuni colleghi durante il dibattito, è una questione di politica ed è una questione di sicurezza, perché la sparizione delle comunità cristiane dal Medio Oriente comporterebbe una modifica stessa della natura delle società del Medio Oriente, con una deriva molto preoccupante sia dal punto di vista politico sia dal punto di vista securitario.

Per questo l'Unione europea lavora ogni giorno con gli strumenti che vi ho ricordato all'inizio del nostro dibattito per proteggere i diritti dei cristiani in Medio Oriente, così come per proteggere i diritti di tutti a professare la propria religione in ogni parte del mondo.

Vorrei, concludendo, ringraziare ancora questo Parlamento per il dibattito e anche molti Stati membri che si stanno facendo promotori di iniziative in questo senso. Alcuni colleghi spagnoli ricordavano la conferenza che la prossima settimana si terrà a Madrid, importante in questo senso, ne abbiamo parlato proprio ieri con il ministro spagnolo.

Credo che sia importante in questo essere uniti, uniti intorno a dei principi fondamentali che, credo, abbiamo condiviso tutti e continuare ad agire con molta determinazione e con molta razionalità.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit. – Les chrétiens d'Orient ne sont pas seulement les garants de l'héritage des premiers chrétiens, ils le sont aussi de l'avenir du Moyen-Orient. C'est leur présence qui permet une cohabitation paisible entre sunnites et chiïtes. Cette présence est mise à mal par des milices islamistes, dont l'autoproclamé État islamique et l'ex-Front al-Nosra font partie, mais pas seulement.

Des États membres de l'UE, en armant certains de ces groupes, ont contribué à la disparition progressive des chrétiens d'Orient de leur terre d'origine. Et l'Union européenne, en donnant légitimité et crédibilité à l'opposition islamiste syrienne dans l'espoir irraisonné d'obtenir le départ de Bachar el-Assad, en porte aussi la lourde responsabilité.

J'en appelle à votre cohérence: l'Union européenne ne peut pas, sans se dédire, louer le développement d'un multiculturalisme et d'une diversité pour elle-même le matin et favoriser leur disparition là où ils existent déjà depuis de nombreux siècles, l'après-midi.

C'est pourquoi, je me réjouis du changement, bien que tardif, de la position de M^{me} Mogherini sur l'avenir politique jugé acceptable pour la Syrie. En rompant avec l'exigence jusqu'au-boutiste du départ de Bachar el-Assad, elle admet à demi-mot que le soutien à une opposition islamiste était une erreur. Reste à condamner celle-ci.

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Szíria napjainkban már nem különböző vallások békés együttélésének jelképe, bár évszázadokig az volt. Nemrég volt szerencsém meghallgatni Jacques Mourad atya történetét, aki 15 évig szolgált priorként a szíriai Al-Qaryataynben található 5. században alapított kolostorban. Ez a hely évszázadokig volt a keresztény és muszlim közösség békés együttélésének iskolapéldája. Évente együtt emlékeztek Szent Eliánra, a kolostor védőszentjére, aki inkább mártírhálált halt, mint hogy hitét megtagadja. Mindez már a múlt. 15 éves egyház- és közösségépítő munka után Jacques Mourad atyát elrabolták az ISIS harcosai, a kolostort feldúlták, a szent sírját pedig kifosztották. Az atya négy hónapig volt az ISIS fogságában, egy kis mellékhelyiség szolgált cellájaként. Naponta bántalmazták a legváltózatossabb pszichikai terror eszközeivel, de hitét, mosolyát nem adta fel. A legnehezebb órákban látomása volt, ami azt üzent: „Jössz a fény felé!”. Ez a fény ragyog előtte most is, szabadulása után, amikor személyesen viszi a napi szinten életveszélyben lévő szíriai keresztény közösségek hírért szerte a világban. Azért tartottam fontosnak ezt a történetet, mert jól mutatja, hogy a közel-keleti keresztények fenyegetettsége nem egy régi legenda, nem régmúlt történelem része, hanem napjainkban, szemünk előtt zajlik. A világban hitükért üldözöttek közül minden öt áldozatból négy keresztény. Minden rendelkezésünkre álló eszközzel fel kell lépünk a közel-keleti keresztény közösségek védelmében!

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan.* – „Hoće li kršćanstvo na Bliskom istoku nestati?“, pitanje je koje se sve češće postavlja. Nekad su kršćani činili 20 % populacije Bliskog Istoka, dok je ta brojka danas opala na svega 4 %. Situacija je daleko najgora u Iraku i Siriji, no situacija za kršćane nije puno bolja niti u ostalim zemljama Bliskog Istoka. U Egiptu danas živi gotovo 80 % svih bliskoistočnih kršćana, a egipatski kršćani ove su godine imali krvavi Uskrs.

Dok je islamski militarizam glavni i najveći uzrok progona kršćana u većini pretežito muslimanskih zemalja, svoju ulogu ovdje igra i jačanje arapskog nacionalizma koji pojačava diskriminaciju nad kršćanima, a uvođenje zakona o bogohuljenju dodatno otežava vjerske slobode.

Dok govorimo o žalosnim brojkama, ne mogu se oteti dojmu kako se položaj kršćana na Bliskom Istoku koristi tek kao puka statistika u različitim političkim raspravama pri čemu se više raspravlja o utvrđivanju krivnje negoli o konkretnim rješenima kako bliskoistočnim kršćanima pomoći.

Csaba Sógor (PPE), *írásban.* – Teljesen egyértelmű, hogy a keresztény közösségek ma a világ számos pontján súlyos üldöztetésnek vannak kitéve. A Közel-Kelet az egyik ilyen pontja a világnak, ahol az elmúlt években sorra kaptak lángra a keresztény templomok, és egyre erősebb a térség legnagyobb kisebbségével szembeni erőszak. Történik mindez papíron szekuláris államok fennhatósága alatt, amelyek az Európai Unió szövetségesei az Iszlám Állam elleni harcban.

Egyre többen gondolják azt a térségben, hogy ezek az államok nem törekednek rá, hogy megakadályozzák az ott évezredek óta élő keresztények elleni erőszakot. A helyzet nagyon súlyos, szakértők szerint a kereszténység kétezer év folytonos jelenlét után akár teljesen el is tűnhet arról a vidékről, ahol kialakult. Én azt gondolom, hogy a zsidó-keresztény alapokon nyugvó Európának felelőssége van ebben a kérdésben és nem lehet közömbös akkor, amikor ezekkel a jelenségekkel találkozunk. Itt már nem a vallás szabad gyakorlásáról beszélünk, hanem teljes közösségek vallási alapú üldözéséről és súlyos erőszakról.

12. Dadaabin pakolaisleiri (keskustelu)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the Dadaab refugee camp (2017/2687(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, dear colleagues, honourable Members of the European Parliament, thank you for taking this timely initiative to discuss the Dadaab refugee camp situation. You know the facts. In May 2016 the Kenyan Government announced its decision to close down the camp in the near future, citing security concerns and the need to end the protracted refugee situation. On 13 November the Government announced that the closure would be delayed by six months on humanitarian grounds. According to the announcement, priority was to be given to relocating non-Somali refugees to other camps – and this process has started – and to reintegrating Kenyans living in the camp.

To date over 23 000 refugees have been returned from Dadaab to Somalia. This year, however, on 9 February, the Kenyan High Court declared the Government's decision to close the camp null and void and described the repatriation of refugees as unconstitutional and discriminatory. Yet the Kenyan Government has not officially changed its proposed closure date, 31 May 2017. That is 16 days away. The Government has recognised that the voluntary repatriation process must be implemented in accordance with the tripartite agreement between Kenya, Somalia and the UNCHR. When we consider the situation in Dadaab, we must also bear in mind the existing context in the whole of Africa, especially in Somalia. Despite some positive political developments during the past year, a renewed drought is bringing the country to its knees. Famine is looming. 6.7 million people, half of the total population, are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance. 683 000 people have been internally displaced because of the drought. As a result, humanitarian partners are now preparing for a possible influx of Somali refugees to neighbouring countries. We must also be aware that the EU adheres to the principle that returns must be voluntary, dignified and sustainable. Given the current context, that is a real challenge, a very huge challenge, and there may be further instability ahead for a country and a region already on the brink.

We must collectively commend the host communities of Dadaab, the people of Kenya and their Government for offering sanctuary to people fleeing violence, conflict and hunger. That is the message which I personally conveyed to the Kenyan Government and authorities when I visited Dadaab last year. The Government of Kenya is a driver of regional initiatives and has shown willingness to find a collective solution to this issue, in line with international standards and principles. That point was made in the Mogadishu Declaration of 22 February 2017, jointly endorsed by the region's presidents, and also at the IGAD Summit, held in Nairobi on 25 March this year, on sustainable solutions for Somali refugees.

The EU has already welcomed the Nairobi declaration. I would like to reiterate the importance of rapid implementation of the commitments underlying it. Investment in development has to be increased and better coordinated, but that is not enough. Policies need to be changed, especially for job access and for living outside the camps, as well as creating conditions in Somalia allowing people to go home. I am glad to know that the spirit of the Nairobi declaration is reflected in the resolution of this Parliament.

Dear colleagues, another positive milestone was the London Somalia Conference on 11 May 2017, just two weeks ago. The agreement on a security pact and the new Partnership for Somalia was an important step forward. The European Union has announced an additional EUR 200 million for the period up to 2020. The EU trust fund is also providing EUR 50 million in Somalia to support the voluntary return of Somali refugees. Of course, as the European Union we remain engaged in providing humanitarian assistance in the Dadaab camp and Somalia, in parallel with development support to foster conditions conducive to return including security and access to basic services in Somalia.

The Commission itself has supported humanitarian assistance to refugees in Kenya with nearly EUR 130 million since 1996 and EUR 12.7 million this year alone. At the same time the EU has intensified programmes aimed at strengthening state building and stabilising Somalia. In addition, in response to the security threats coming from terrorists in Somalia, we are supporting various projects to counter violent extremists with an overall budget of EUR 18 million.

As I said, the EU acknowledges the generosity that Kenya and other countries in the region have shown to Somali refugees. We hope that the Kenyan Government will continue to provide protection and asylum to refugees until they can voluntarily return home.

We all need to collectively support the country doing this and to do so in a way that benefits both the refugees and the host communities in Dadaab. We also need to make every effort to help consolidate peace in Somalia.

That is the only way to resolve the protracted refugee crisis in the region.

I am grateful, as the Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid, that Parliament is continuing to support the common efforts to bring about a sustainable and lasting solution to the regional refugee crisis.

I welcome the resolution tabled, which seeks to further support these measures.

Thank you so much for your attention to this statement. I am looking forward to our in-depth discussions that will help us to see together how to evaluate the situation in the Dadaab camp.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Mariya Gabriel, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, la population du camp de Dadaab approche maintenant les 266 000 personnes: 95 % sont originaires de Somalie et 60 % sont mineures. Cette population ne cesse de s'accroître depuis maintenant trois décennies. Cette situation n'est tenable ni pour le gouvernement du Kenya, ni pour les pays avoisinants et encore moins pour toutes les personnes qui y habitent.

La fermeture du camp est une décision souveraine. Oui, j'en suis sûre, elle est motivée par un souci de protection de la population des menaces terroristes d'Al-Chabab. Toutefois, nous ne pouvons pas abandonner les réfugiés somaliens à leur sort, cela ne résoudra en rien la situation actuelle et n'aura pour effet que de déstabiliser davantage la région et de renforcer les groupes terroristes qui prônent la radicalisation.

Je tiens à saluer l'action de l'Union, qui a alloué 286 millions d'euros pour la période 2014–2020 par le biais du Fonds européen de développement et du Fonds fiduciaire européen pour l'Afrique.

Aujourd'hui, en tant qu'Union, nous devons assumer notre rôle de médiateur et, surtout, nous devons motiver une réponse régionale urgente avec trois priorités: tout d'abord, le retour et la réintégration des réfugiés dans l'esprit de l'accord tripartite signé entre le Haut-Commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés, le Kenya et la Somalie. Ensuite, la mise en place de mesures pour la stabilisation de la situation en Somalie, toujours avec une approche qui, en dépassant la réponse d'urgence, vise le développement économique et humain durable des populations. Enfin, le renforcement du dialogue politique entre tous les pays de la région, les organisations subrégionales et l'Union africaine.

La sécurité, la lutte contre le terrorisme et la radicalisation sont des défis que nous devons relever conjointement, en tant que partenaires. Nous devons apporter des réponses concrètes et rapides qui soient à la hauteur des dangers qui guettent la région: famine, sécheresse et guerre. Il est crucial que notre action vise à trouver des solutions aux principales causes déstabilisatrices et ainsi à assurer la résilience économique, politique et humaine des populations et des États.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, comisario, yo tengo que felicitarle por su permanente compromiso con causas tan desesperadas como la de Dadaab.

Lo cierto es que la Unión Europea está contribuyendo —económicamente, desde luego— al sostenimiento mínimo de los refugiados somalíes, aunque es evidente que nada es suficiente y la llamada del secretario general de las Naciones Unidas así lo demuestra.

Dinero, somos capaces de donar. Podemos hacer intervención diplomática; fomentar, como decía mi colega, una solución regional; darle un papel a la Unión Africana.

Lo cierto es que la Unión Europea no está muy bien situada para dar lecciones a Kenia, que es un país que ha demostrado una enorme generosidad con los refugiados, a pesar de las dificultades que el propio país tiene. Y lo cierto también es que el Cuerno de África se encuentra en una situación muy peligrosa, derivada no solamente de los riesgos del terrorismo, sino de la hambruna y también la sequía.

¿Cómo podemos hacer para ser más eficaces en la ayuda que esos seres humanos necesitan? Porque aunque se cierre el campo, las personas no se van a disolver: las personas se multiplican. ¿Cómo podemos ser más eficaces? Es el elemento que tenemos que encontrar.

Probablemente una mayor implicación en las soluciones de fondo hacia Somalia, y un apoyo más concreto a las autoridades de Kenia para que sean capaces de hacer ese realojamiento que, por el momento, parece directamente un infierno.

Para los refugiados, regreso voluntario a Somalia... Parece casi una broma hablar de regreso voluntario a un lugar en el que no les espera más que la desesperación.

En todo caso, me parece muy positivo que el Parlamento Europeo se posicione sobre esta cuestión y que Dadaab esté en nuestros debates, y yo le animo a seguir insistiendo en la línea que usted desarrolla, comisario Stylianides.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, le camp de Dadaab, créé en 1991 au moment du début de la guerre civile en Somalie, est le plus grand camp de réfugiés du monde. Il accueille aujourd'hui plus de la moitié des 486 000 réfugiés présents au Kenya. Ils sont très majoritairement Somaliens et, dans une moindre mesure, Sud-Soudanais.

Le pays paie sa présence en Somalie dans la lutte contre les Chabab et subit des représailles, comme en septembre 2013, avec les 172 morts du centre commercial Westgate à Nairobi et, plus récemment, les 148 morts de l'université de Garissa, en 2015. La peur et le rejet montent dans la population kényane.

Comme ailleurs, les réfugiés semblent de plus en plus devenir un enjeu électoral. On assiste à un chantage récurrent à la fermeture des camps et les retours forcés se multiplient malgré la dangerosité et la dégradation de la situation en Somalie et bien que 86 % des Somaliens s'y refusent.

On parle de lutte contre les causes profondes de la migration, mais cela passe d'abord par la solidarité, alors que les réponses proposées sont de plus en plus militaires et sécuritaires. Pire, le HCR n'a récolté que 15 % des 215 millions de dollars dont il a besoin pour prendre en charge les réfugiés du Kenya, alors que la sécheresse ne cesse d'aggraver la situation sanitaire. Nous allons vers une catastrophe humanitaire sans précédent. Il y a urgence.

La communauté internationale prend une lourde responsabilité et les politiques européennes ne sont pas à la hauteur du drame qui se joue ici. L'aide humanitaire est totalement insuffisante.

Heidi Hautala, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, many of us remember when the first ships carrying Somalis started to come in the early 1990s. It is unimaginable that some people who then found refuge and life in Europe have colleagues and family members who ended up in Dadaab and in a smaller camp called Kakuma, which I visited some years ago. Some of these people have been living there for 25 years without any perspective on life outside the camp. Happily, of course, the camp has formed some good relations with the local communities and I think this is something that has to be supported, but the surrounding communities also need investment in development so that they can prosper and live beside the camp.

I think that it is very important to note the promising cooperation of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development of the region (IGAD). They recently had a summit, which was also mentioned in our resolution, and have admirably agreed to facilitate a voluntary return back home. We should in no way support any kind of forced returns to a situation which climate change is worsening, and where famine is threatening people's lives – the Commissioner mentioned internally displaced people – and so we also need, as Europeans, to take our responsibility for resettlement of some of the people living in the camp.

James Carver, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, Kenya has accepted refugees at Dadaab since 1992. The tripartite agreement between Kenya, Somalia and the UNHCR has led to some repatriation, thus we have been content to ignore this issue. In that time Kenya has suffered many terrorist-related attacks, not least at the Westgate Shopping Centre attributed to Al-Shabab recruitment in Dadaab. These camps should provide temporary safe havens and not dump victims of war and droughts. Dadaab represents all that is wrong with the way that we deal with displaced persons. Ludicrously, in a separate debate this week we will vote to condemn one of the only stabilising states in this region. Ethiopia has provided troops, material and money to overcome the anarchy in Somalia, but it is always inconvenient in this place to look at the bigger picture. Thus we find ourselves bemoaning the plights of displaced people, the inadequacies of African governments, and at the same time, undermine yet another country in this troubled region.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Prawie trzydzieści lat kryzysu humanitarnego w Somalii to także ponad dwa miliony przesiedlonych Somalijszyków, z których większość znalazła schronienie w sąsiednich krajach Rogu Afryki, w tym w Kenii, a konkretnie w Dadaab. Porozumienie trójstronne między UNHCR, Somalią i Kenią daje pewną możliwość powrotów ze względu na poprawę sytuacji politycznej, stabilności i bezpieczeństwa w Somalii, której niewątpliwie daleko do doskonałości, ale która zmusza ludzi do powrotu do ich kraju pochodzenia.

Władze Kenii argumentują zamknięcie obozu panującą tam sytuacją i rekrutowaniem przez organizacje terrorystyczne nowych członków wśród osób, które zamieszkują obóz. Jest to pewien argument za tym, co ma się zdarzyć w maju. Mimo że decyzja kenijskiego sądu oraz nakaz zamknięcia kompleksu był niezgodny z konstytucją i miał dyskryminujący charakter, sytuacja w Dadaab bardzo trafnie ilustruje złożoność powiązań między problemami uchodźstwa oraz wyzwaniem w zakresie zarządzania granicami budowania stabilności.

Sądzę, że globalny i regionalny plan działania z Nairobi uchwalony w marcu tego roku jest ważną deklaracją mówiącą o tym, że uchodźcy, którzy zdecydują się pozostać w państwie przyjmującym, powinni mieć dostęp do zatrudnienia i usług, a także możliwość przemieszczania się. Należy podkreślić, że powroty do Somalii, jeżeli już są, muszą się odbywać zgodnie z międzynarodowymi standardami, czyli dobrowolnie, bezpiecznie i z poszanowaniem praw człowieka. Unia powinna przeznaczyć na ten cel środki z funduszu powierniczego dla Afryki, a także wspierać przy jego pomocy projekty oddolne, które poprawią jakość i dostępność podstawowych usług.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, il y a deux mois, grâce au soutien du Haut-commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés, j'ai eu l'occasion de visiter le camp de réfugiés de Dadaab, créé dans les années 90 et qui comptait alors 90 000 places. Aujourd'hui, il accueille plus de 260 000 réfugiés.

L'Afrique de l'Est vit aujourd'hui une crise humanitaire des plus alarmantes due à la sécheresse, dont l'épicentre est, une nouvelle fois, en Somalie. Les Somaliens sont les plus représentés dans le camp, puisqu'ils constituent plus de 90 % de sa population. En 2011, la sécheresse avait déjà provoqué la mort de 260 000 personnes. Il faut agir de toute urgence.

Le sommet de l'IGAD a permis de reconnaître le rôle et la générosité des pays voisins qui assument la protection internationale des réfugiés, en dépit de leurs propres difficultés socio-économiques, environnementales et de sécurité nationale. Toutefois, j'en appelle désormais à un partage mondial de la responsabilité que supporte cette région.

La résolution d'aujourd'hui va dans ce sens. Elle demande à l'Europe d'accepter sa part des relocalisations, comme le font le Canada et l'Australie. Elle soutient les retours volontaires, mais reconnaît que ces retours sont difficiles dans le contexte actuel de la sécheresse. Elle sait que Dadaab ne pourra fermer ses portes et demande donc une augmentation de l'aide. Elle réclame également plus d'aide au développement pour la région et les communautés locales, qui portent aujourd'hui le fardeau de cette migration, mais elle demande également que le fonds fiduciaire de l'Union pour l'Afrique soit correctement alimenté et efficace.

D'une manière générale, la résolution demande un plus grand partage des charges mais aussi des solutions durables en matière de développement social, économique et environnemental.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente: el campo de Dadaab, en Kenia, donde tratan de sobrevivir casi 250 000 somalíes; los 50 000 refugiados y refugiadas de la guerra de Mali que están en Mauritania; las 250 000 personas de Sudán refugiadas en los campos de Chad; o el pueblo saharauí, que lleva cuarenta años en los campamentos de Argelia... son solo algunos ejemplos de los cientos de campos que hay en África.

Pero la Unión Europea ha pervertido los fondos de cooperación y los condiciona a que los gobiernos de los países receptores se plieguen a las demandas de la «Europa fortaleza». Los fondos de cooperación ahora los dedican, por ejemplo, a construir centros de detención en Níger o a financiar ejércitos de determinados países africanos para que apliquen las políticas migratorias que marca Bruselas, políticas para que quienes huyen de la guerra, la pobreza o la explotación, se queden en esos campos sin condiciones dignas o se queden en sus países sufriendo la barbarie. Políticas para que nadie llegue a Europa.

África acoge a cuatro millones y medio de personas con el estatuto de refugiado. Aquí, en cambio, no han querido cumplir el objetivo absolutamente insuficiente de reubicar a 160 000 personas en los distintos países de la Unión Europea.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come molti hanno ricordato Dadaab è stato istituito già nel 1991 come soluzione temporanea per coloro che cercano rifugio da persecuzioni, violenza e instabilità nella regione dell'Africa orientale, inclusa dalla guerra civile in Somalia. È il più grande campo rifugiati del mondo, secondo l'ONU, con 245 000 persone, il 60 per cento dei quali sono sotto i 18 anni, senza istruzione né lavoro.

Purtroppo la questione dei rifugiati somali a Dadaab è diventata oggetto di campagna elettorale per il presidente Kenyatta, al grido dello slogan di combattere il terrorismo. Abbiamo accolto e accettato, ovviamente, il giudizio della Corte suprema di Nairobi che afferma che tale decisione, di chiudere il campo di Dadaab, è nulla, ma purtroppo il governo a sua volta ha fatto appello e non può, a nostro avviso, dire semplicemente a centinaia di migliaia di persone di tornare alla guerra, alla fame e alla povertà estrema da cui sono fuggiti. Ricordiamo che la convenzione delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati vieta il rimpatrio in aree dove la loro vita e la loro libertà sono minacciate e questo è il caso certamente della Somalia, vessata da siccità, carestia, colera e violenza.

Come buone pratiche da copiare c'è quella invece dell'Uganda con la sua strategia di «autoaffidamento», in cui i rifugiati possono lavorare liberamente e muoversi. Queste sono le buone pratiche da copiare, non certo la chiusura indiscriminata portata avanti dall'attuale governo.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi spesso ci preoccupiamo, ancora nel dibattito di stamane sulla ricollocazione, di come affrontare e accogliere in Europa i rifugiati e i richiedenti asilo in fuga dalle loro terre dilaniate da conflitti e dalle conseguenti situazioni di povertà.

In realtà ci preoccupiamo solo, ma non facciamo quasi nulla per avere una politica comune europea dell'immigrazione. Accanto a ciò abbiamo, nello stesso tempo, difficoltà a vedere che la crisi umanitaria dei rifugiati non è soltanto un fenomeno situato alle porte dell'Europa e nell'area del Mediterraneo, ma è una situazione di carattere globale. Sono presenti milioni di rifugiati e sfollati fuori dal contesto europeo che non possiamo ignorare.

Il campo rifugiati di Dadaab è l'esempio evidente di ciò di cui stiamo parlando ed è anche per noi, Commissario, un banco di prova sulle nostre capacità di intervento e di accompagnamento dell'accordo tra Kenya, Somalia e UNHCR.

Cosa deve guidarci in questa nostra azione europea? Due direttrici di marcia che considero fondamentali: la prima riguarda la salvaguardia del principio del diritto internazionale umanitario. La seconda, abbiamo l'esigenza di un diverso approccio della politica di cooperazione capace di intervenire sulle condizioni di conflitto e di povertà. Non fare ciò significa pagare con gli interessi questa nostra assenza.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il campo profughi di Dadaab, il più grande al mondo, compie quest'anno 26 anni. Un campo che avrebbe dovuto fornire un'accoglienza temporanea soprattutto ai rifugiati somali e che, invece, si è trasformato in un ghetto permanente di 260 000 persone. Almeno due generazioni sono nate e cresciute in quello che è un simbolo della miseria sociale dei profughi in Africa, del fallimento delle politiche di sviluppo e di pacificazione di quell'area e dell'incapacità, anche, di gestire globalmente il fenomeno migratorio.

Etiopi, eritrei, sudanesi, sud-sudanesi, somali, sono loro gli abitanti senza diritti di questa metropoli, costretti a vivere una vita «non-vita», perché privati di un futuro e di una speranza. Sulla loro pelle le autorità e la comunità internazionale prendono decisioni che la stessa Corte Suprema ha definito essere un atto di persecuzione di massa, illegale e quindi incostituzionale. È vero, il campo di Dadaab è un *hub* di miseria, di illegalità e di soprusi, soprattutto nei confronti di donne, bambini e gruppi vulnerabili.

Tuttavia, è difficile prevedere le sorti di questi profughi nel caso si ritrovassero all'improvviso senza un tetto. È una responsabilità collettiva mettere fine all'instabilità politica della regione, creare finalmente i presupposti per una politica di sviluppo sostenibile e ripensare le nostre politiche migratorie, sapendo che cogliendone le sfide ma anche le opportunità, senza pace e stabilità e in mancanza di un approccio olistico al fenomeno migratorio, non ci sarà un futuro per nessun profugo né all'interno di un campo né nei loro paesi di origine.

Maria Noichl (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte an allererster Stelle Kenia Dank sagen, dass es sich – obwohl das Lager natürlich nicht optimal ist, das ist klar – wirklich mit großer Gastfreundschaft gezeigt hat. Ich war vor sechs Monaten selber vor Ort. Ich habe Dadaab besucht, ich habe mit den Ortsverantwortlichen, der einheimischen Bevölkerung, dem Bürgermeister und auch mit Bewohnern im Lager Gespräche geführt. Es war für mich einerseits beschämend, die Situation im Lager zu sehen, die natürlich sehr hoffnungslos wirkt, aber andererseits war es auch beschämend zu erleben, dass die Menschen nichts haben und trotzdem teilen. Die Menschen wurden in diesem großen Lager wirklich gut aufgenommen.

Ich möchte drei Gedanken hier in den Raum stellen: Unsere Hilfe, die wir leisten muss in Zukunft effektiver eingesetzt werden. Nicht mehr für kurzfristige Lager, sondern wirklich für langfristige Integration, für Hilfe, für Fluchtursachenbekämpfung, für Klimaschutz und so weiter und so fort. Wir brauchen ganz dringend natürlich jetzt Hilfe vor Ort, aber in Zukunft langfristig effektiver eingesetzte finanzielle Mittel.

Wir müssen dringend Perspektiven schaffen – Perspektiven für diese Menschen. Fahren Sie einmal hin, schauen Sie sich das an! Ich denke, die Hoffungslosigkeit und die Perspektivlosigkeit ist schlimmer als der Hunger. Und wir müssen für Europa lernen. Für Europa habe ich in Dadaab gelernt, dass Übergangslösungen von Lager oder von Ghettos keine Lösungen sind. In Dadaab wird jetzt gesprochen, wir müssen die Menschen irgendwie integrieren. Ja, man hat 25 Jahre gewartet und nicht integriert. Jetzt ist das Problem aufgestaut wie eine Integrationswelle, der wir jetzt gar nicht mehr Herr werden. Das heißt: Wir müssen helfen, so gut wir können, und wir müssen lernen.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I have visited Kenya twice in the past few months, meeting EU officials and the British Embassy, and I know the resolution is right to emphasise the impact of climate change in the East Africa region and the human displacement and famine it has caused, in combination with the enduring conflict and human rights abuses. These large-scale international processes require regional and international responses, and the EU can and must play a role. Kenyan authorities have done much to host these refugees over 25 years, and the international community, including the EU, must step up its efforts. 60% of the camp's residents are women and children, and we must do more to ensure access to education while they are in the camps and for those who voluntarily return to Somalia or seek asylum. More must be done to provide mental health support, and the needs of women and girls must be taken into account. President Trump's cuts in US funding to the region will not help, and neither will Brexit, as the UK's special relationship with Kenya has allowed the country to punch above its weight at EU level, especially helping in the fight against Al-Shabab on the border. Security and a compassionate response must go hand in hand.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αυτή τη στιγμή στην Κένυα βρίσκονται πάνω από 500.000 πρόσφυγες. Απ' αυτούς, 245.000 πρόσφυγες στοιβάζονται κυριολεκτικά στις πέντε ζώνες του προσφυγικού καταυλισμού του Dadaab. Προέρχονται κυρίως από τη Σομαλία. Το Dadaab είναι ένα στρατόπεδο, ένας χώρος προσφυγικής συγκέντρωσης, που ξεκίνησε το 1991 και είναι γνωστές οι προσπάθειες που έκανε η τζιχαντιστική οργάνωση αλ Σαμπάντ να δημιουργήσει προβλήματα στην περιοχή και να πετύχει ουσιαστικά τη διάλυση του στρατοπέδου. Σήμερα, η κατάσταση στο Dadaab είναι απελπιστική. Χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες στοιβάζονται και πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για να στηρίξουμε την ύπαρξή τους εκεί, να στηρίξουμε αυτό το στρατόπεδο, να δώσουμε βοήθεια στην Κένυα, η οποία πραγματικά σ' αυτή τη φάση αντιμετωπίζει επίσης προβλήματα, μια και έχουμε έντονη ξηρασία στην περιοχή. Ταυτόχρονα, πρέπει, όσοι πρόσφυγες επιθυμούν, να διευκολυνθούν να επιστρέψουν στη Σομαλία. Στη Σομαλία η οποία πρέπει πραγματικά να σταθεροποιηθεί, μια και σήμερα τουλάχιστον 25.000 άτομα κινδυνεύουν να πεθάνουν από χολέρα.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, there is no doubt that we have had a very useful exchange, and I thank all the honourable Members for their interventions.

From this debate, I can conclude that we all share a common interest in using EU diplomatic power and EU instruments to their full potential in support of the Somali refugee crisis. We will continue to make the best use of all the instruments available to us in humanitarian relief, stabilisation and development assistance, as well as political dialogue with specific support to human rights and democracy.

Personally, as Commissioner for humanitarian aid and crisis management, I must highlight once again the importance of adhering to international law and norms with regard to returns. They must be voluntary, dignified and sustainable. For me it is quite important to be very focused on these three preconditions – voluntary, dignified and sustainable.

The vast majority of the crises in Africa are man-made and entirely avoidable. The extreme climate conditions exacerbate the effects of chronic conflict and instability. Uganda and some other countries in the region which have shown openness towards hundreds of thousands of refugees from South Sudan and the DRC, among others, are to be commended. I am intending to attend, as Commissioner, the solidarity conference to be convened in Uganda next month under the auspices of the Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres. I am going there to express the EU's support and solidarity but, most importantly, to discuss and push for efforts to address the root causes of all those crises – not only the symptoms, because for me it is quite important to focus on the root causes. Otherwise it is quite difficult to find solutions because, if we deal only with the symptoms, unfortunately the situation there continues as business as usual. This is totally unacceptable, especially for vulnerable people.

Thank you very much for your attention and for this very good debate, focusing on the Dadaab refugee camp.

Przewodniczący. – Otrzymałem pięć projektów rezolucji złożonych zgodnie z art 123 ust. 2 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 18 maja 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Dadaabi pagulaslaager loodi 1991. aastal ajutise laagrina Somaalia põgenikele. Täna sel päeval on laagris 260 000 inimest, kellest 95% on somaallased. Arvestades praegust olukorda Somaalias, kus on nii julgeolekuprobleemid kui ka aina halvenevad elutingimused põua ja näljahäda tõttu, ei peaks Dadaabi pagulaslaagrist inimesi sinna tagasi saatma. Seda eriti olukorras, kus laagris on inimesi, kes ei ole kunagi Somaalias käinud, vaid on juba selles laagris sündinud. Naasmine Somaaliasse peab olema rangelt vabatahtlik ja vastavuses rahvusvaheliste nõuetega. EL peab selle olukorra lahendamisele kaasa aitama ja saab seda teha, püüdes aidata kaasa pagulaste ümberpaigutamisele teistesse riikidesse ning panustades poliitilise lahenduse leidmisse selles piirkonnas.

13. HLBTI-henkilöitä koskevien neuvoston suuntaviivojen täytäntöönpano erityisesti Tšetšeniassa esiintyvän homoseksuaalisten (tai sellaisina pidettyjen) miesten vainon suhteen (keskustelu)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel Unii do Spraw Zagranicznych i Polityki Bezpieczeństwa przez Sorayę Post, Tanję Fajon, Elenę Valenciano, Knuta Fleckensteina, Piera Antonia Panzeriego, w imieniu grupy S&D, Ulrikę Lunacek, Rebeccę Harms, Heidi Hautalę, w imieniu grupy Verts/ALE, Dennisa de Jonga, Malin Björk, Eleonorę Forenzę, Marisę Matias, Helmuta Scholza, Stefana Ecka, Cornelię Ernst, Merję Kyllönen, Rinę Ronję Kari, Marinę Albiol Guzmán, Gabriele Zimmer, w imieniu grupy GUE/NGL, Marietje Schaake, w imieniu grupy ALDE oraz Iana Duncana, w imieniu grupy ECR w sprawie wdrażania wytycznych Rady dotyczących osób LGBTI, szczególnie w odniesieniu do prześladowania mężczyzn (uważanych za) gejów w Czeczenii (Rosja) (O-000039/2017 - B8-0219/2017) (2017/2688 (RSP)).

Soraya Post, author. – Mr President, since February we have been receiving incredible and terrible reports from the Russian province Chechnya. The reports of the horrible acts towards gay men make devastating reading. Government officials claim there are no homosexuals in Chechnya. But at the same time they round up gay men, real or perceived, and torture them into giving up the names of gay friends or lovers. Families are forced to pay large amounts to get them free – money that is said to ‘trickle up’ in the police and government hierarchy.

The Government’s anti-gay campaign cuts into the heart of families. I have received reports about honour killings: families have murdered their own children in shame of their being gay. This is what happens when politicians act as if human rights were only for a few – when they dehumanise whole groups of people.

Right now, the European Union is the global stronghold protecting the idea of equality of human rights for all. This demands of us the special duty to protect LGBTI persons, and creates a need for humanitarian protection visas. Our question to the European External Action Service is about how they can ensure implementation of our LGBTI guidelines.

Last Thursday, five gay activists were detained in Moscow when they wanted to deliver a petition demanding an investigation into the ongoing crimes in Chechnya. More than two million people have signed it, more people than live in Chechnya. Today we must stand with those two million. We must stand with the LGBTI communities of the world and, right now and most pressingly, with the LGBTI people in Chechnya and Russia.

(Applause)

Ulrike Lunacek, *author*. – Mr President, tomorrow is the International Day Against Homophobia, and that is why I am wearing this rainbow here – to remind everyone who is listening, who is speaking here and who is listening to us – that this is a day where everybody should stand up, like we are doing in this Parliament, against homophobia, transphobia, against all kinds of violence against LGBTI people wherever it occurs, in Europe and on other continents. And as Soraya Post has already explained, this is a specific debate on what has been reported happening in Chechnya, in the Russian Federation, in the last couple of weeks. Arbitrary detentions, torture of hundreds of men, either really gay or perceived to be gay, and three of them at least have also been killed. They have been demanded to disclose the identity of other LGBTI people. This is a life of fear that nobody on this planet should be allowed to live, and nobody who protects the perpetrators should not be brought to justice.

It is clear that we demand in this resolution – and I have to say the resolution we prepared is one of six groups in this Parliament, I really appreciate that there is broad support – we demand from the Russian Federation and the Chechnya regime to protect LGBTI people and also to speak out and say this is not against any religious traditions; this is something – being lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex – that has existed all over the planet in all times and all epochs, in all religions, in all cultures everywhere, and exists and should not be worked against. So now we also ask the External Action Service to see that the guidelines that we have are really implemented all over this planet in order to make sure that LGBTI human rights defenders are helped by the European diplomats, and lots is done in that; we already have many good reports by that. I also appreciate that the EAS is having the building illuminated on tomorrow's International Day Against Homophobia in the rainbow flags, and this is important to show visibility and to struggle for equal rights for everybody.

(Applause)

Malin Björk, *författare*. – Herr talman! Tack så mycket. Det var nog många av oss som hade svårt att ta in rapporterna om hot och våld, tortyr och till och med mord, av homosexuella män i Tjetjenien. En sådan extrem förföljelse, den är helt enkelt svår att ta in.

Alla vi som är hbtq-personer har naturligtvis upplevt homofobi, men en sådan extrem form av våld som vi har sett i de här rapporterna, det är som tur är ovanligt.

Men homofobi dödar, och den dödar också här i Europa. Den dödade alla de som befann sig på den där gayklubben i Orlando. Och vi vet att homotransfobin förtrycker unga och vuxna i vårt samhälle.

Våldet och förföljelsen av bögar i Tjetjenien är den yttersta konsekvensen av vad all den här homofobin kan resultera i – extremt och dödligt våld.

När vi ställs inför det måste vi alla agera. Därför kräver vi att Europeiska unionen agerar, att medlemsstaterna agerar, att man agerar tillsammans med Europarådet, att man agerar tillsammans med oberoende experter som ska få tillgång till och måste undersöka precis vad som har hänt, och de som är ansvariga ska ställas inför rätta. Inget annat duger.

Det som gör så ont är också att det är just familjen och polisen, där man ska vara trygg – i sin familj och i förhållandet till polisen – som har utsatt och varit delaktiga i att förfölja och skada, och till och med mörda, homosexuella män.

Homofobi – det är så unket, det är så patriarkaliskt, det är en sådan unken inställning till nationen, till folket, till kön, till kärlek, till kvinnor, till män och till könsidentiteter. Vi måste göra oss av med det.

Homofobin är djupt rotad, inte bara i Tjetjenien, utan också hos oss. Vi har allt att göra, vi har allt att vinna för att bygga öppnare samhällen – mer värdiga samhällen som står upp för allas mänskliga rättigheter. Jag förväntar mig inget annat än det.

Petras Auštrevičius, *author*. – Mr President, colleagues, Mr Commissioner, the brutal anti-gay campaign in the authoritarian Chechnya of Kadyrov is yet another example of how little, if anything, human rights mean in this part of Russia today. The ongoing terror against and prosecution of opposition, human rights activists and journalists has now been extended into targeting the LGBTI minority. Unfortunately, the crimes in Chechnya are not an isolated campaign. It is only a common denominator representing the state of human rights in Russia as a whole. Let us recall that in March this year Russia has adopted a backwards legislation decriminalising domestic violence, and now we are witnessing this. We, the European Union, must make sure that our policy towards Russia reflects seriously the crimes against the LGBTI minority in Chechnya. It should be clear from the very start that it is unacceptable. Homophobia belongs to the shameful past.

(Applause)

Mark Demesmaeker, Auteur. – Morgen, 17 mei, wappert in mijn land, Vlaanderen, op vele plaatsen de regenboogvlag. Ook bijvoorbeeld aan de gevel van mijn stadhuis en zelfs aan die van het Vlaams Parlement. Ik ben daar trots op. De LGBTI-gemeenschap is bij ons gelukkig vrijgevochten. Maar ook wij blijven waakzaam voor homofobie.

Op de internationale dag tegen homofobie valt weinig te vieren. Wereldwijd groeit de onverdraagzaamheid, zien we vervolgingen en zelfs de doodstraf voor wie “anders” en toch zichzelf wil zijn. Wat de voorbije dagen in Tsjetsjenië is gebeurd, heeft ons geschokt. Het is nog winter in de Kaukasus. Misschien letterlijk maar zeker figuurlijk. De vervolging van minstens honderd Tsjetsjenen omdat ze homo zijn, de folteringen, moord en eenzame opsluiting in martelkampen zijn weerzinwekkend en onaanvaardbaar en kunnen alleen in de scherpste bewoordingen worden veroordeeld. De reacties van president Kadirov als zijn er in zijn land geen homo's tonen de kilheid van de samenleving en de onwil van het regime aan. Niemand kan zich beschermd voelen wanneer de overheid een heksenjacht opent.

En Kremlin-baas Poetin? Niets nieuws onder de zon. Hij ontkent. Hij steunt de Tsjetsjeense regering onverbloemd en treedt zelf repressief op tegen holebi-sympathisanten in Moskou en Sint-Petersburg. Het Kremlin speelt zo opnieuw een uiterst bedenkelijke rol.

Een recent rapport van de Raad van Europa wijst trouwens op de onwil van Rusland om ook maar enige inspanning te leveren om de situatie in Tsjetsjenië op het gebied van de mensenrechten positief bij te sturen.

De gruwelijke feiten vragen een onderzoek. De daders moeten worden vervolgd en de slachtoffers moeten compensaties ontvangen. Maar niemand gelooft dat Rusland een ernstig onderzoek zal instellen. Een onafhankelijk internationaal onderzoek dringt zich op.

En dus is de vraag aan de Commissie wat ze zal doen om onze eigen LGBTI-richtsnoeren uit te voeren. Er zal meer nodig zijn dan het uitspreken van ongerustheid. Alle slachtoffers van de vervolging, alle manifestanten moeten onmiddellijk worden vrijgelaten en de betrokken autoriteiten moeten hun internationale verplichtingen nakomen. Een meedoogenloos regime begrijpt alleen duidelijke taal. Die verwacht ik straks ook van de commissaris.

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, no one should be discriminated against or attacked for who they love. This principle has become an integral part of our concept of equality, human rights and fundamental freedoms. This is obviously a European value and we believe it should be a universal value. Just to remind you, in 2013 the European Union adopted guidelines to promote and protect the enjoyment of full human rights by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons.

The EU's diplomatic efforts in this area revolve around four priorities: first, eliminating discriminatory laws and policies and ensuring decriminalisation, including the death penalty; second, promoting equality and non-discrimination at work, in healthcare and education; third, combating state or individual violence against LGBTI persons; and fourth, supporting and protecting human rights defenders. Depending on the situation, the European Union acts on the issue through quiet diplomacy, public statements and by raising LGBTI rights in the political and human rights dialogues with third countries. The European Union also provides support to civil society via the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

Today, as the authors have already said, we are here to discuss some very serious allegations of crimes against gay men in Chechnya. The persecution of gay men, leading to kidnappings, torture and killings is the latest amongst some very worrying developments in Chechnya. We have seen the Chechen authorities implicitly justifying the violence and the Russian federal authorities downplaying it, dismissing the reports as exaggerations and fake news. Unfortunately, so far the Russian authorities have taken no effective action to stop the violence and protect the victims.

The European Union, with its Member States, other like-minded countries and many international human rights organisations, has condemned the brutal campaign against LGBTI individuals and called for a full investigation into these events. Just yesterday the EU Foreign Ministers discussed the situation in the Foreign Affairs Council to evaluate the most effective way to help the victims of the alleged abuse. High Representative Federica Mogherini also raised our serious concerns on this issue directly with Minister Lavrov when she saw him in Moscow on 24 April. She stressed the need to put an immediate stop to the crackdown against gay men in Chechnya and to investigate these horrific reports. Unfortunately, Minister Lavrov's response – later also repeated in the press conference – was that the Russian authorities

so far had no proof that the alleged persecutions had actually happened. While in Moscow, the High Representative also had the opportunity to discuss the issue with civil society representatives and journalists. It is indeed alarming that the journalists who uncovered the violence have in turn become the target of direct threats from the leadership in Chechnya and have been forced to flee Chechnya.

This is, unfortunately, the situation on the ground. We have asked EU ambassadors in Moscow to do their utmost to help the men who have been a target, particularly those who currently still fear for their own safety and security. Some Member States are willing to help. Whatever they do will be done quietly and without fanfare in order to protect the victims. In any case, we will continue to call on the international authorities for an effective and thorough investigation into the reports of abductions and killing of gay men in Chechnya. This is indispensable so that anyone found guilty of complicity in such crimes is brought to justice. This is our strong conviction.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I really want to join my colleagues in sharing the outrage for the real emergency that we are witnessing with – you said it, Ulrike – hundreds of men that have been arrested and detained in Chechnya just because they are perceived to be gay, and tortured to disclose their alleged gay friends. The systematic witch-hunt of human beings just because of their sexual orientation goes beyond discrimination: it is persecution, it is terrifying and unacceptable, and we cannot be silent and turn our eyes.

In the EU we should stand united and act together, and I welcome that our President has immediately taken action and a firm stand against those crimes, and I support further action by the European Commission. All Member States should call for the immediate release of those that are still detained illegally and to assist the victims. The Russian Federation should openly denounce those crimes and thoroughly investigate them in respect of international law.

There must be zero-tolerance against impunity, and all perpetrators should be brought to justice. The EU should condemn any intimidation towards human rights defenders who reported the violence against LGBTI in Russia. As a member of the United Nations and the Council of Europe, Russia should respect that all human beings are equal and no one has the right to persecute an individual or a group just because they are different or are perceived to be different.

In our times, hate, homophobia, violence, discrimination, can never be justified in the name of religious values. We have to continue – Mr President, I will conclude – to join forces to build a culture of tolerance, and I have co-signed this resolution wholeheartedly.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente. «Querías quedarte inconsciente para que te dejaran en paz, pero no. Te electrocutaban veinte o treinta segundos; te desvanecías, paraban. Te recuperabas y vuelta a empezar. Tras días con las heridas abiertas, la gente comenzaba a oler a carne podrida».

Este es el terrorífico testimonio de un joven checheno que consiguió escapar de uno de los campos de concentración para gais que existen en Chechenia. Ser homosexual en Chechenia, como en otros lugares del mundo, por cierto, significa, en el peor de los casos, tu muerte, y en el mejor de los casos, vivir con miedo, clandestinamente y perseguido. ¿Qué se puede esperar de un Gobierno checheno que dice que no hay problemas con la homosexualidad en Chechenia, porque en Chechenia no hay homosexuales?

Formalmente, Chechenia es parte de la Federación de Rusia, pero el Kremlin mira para otro lado y deja hacer. Formalmente, Rusia es parte del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, que prohíbe la tortura y la discriminación por cualquier motivo. Formalmente, y moralmente, la Unión Europea debe ser activa en la defensa y protección de los derechos LGTBI en sus relaciones con terceros países.

Defender a estas personas, señor comisario, debe estar en la mesa en nuestras relaciones con Rusia. No podemos permitirnos mirar también para otro lado, porque estas personas, estas personas que sufren persecución, no tienen más que nuestra voz, en muchos casos, para ser defendidos.

Fredrick Federley, för ALDE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att tacka kommissionen för ett tydligt uttalande som står väldigt fast vid de europeiska värderingarna. Jag vill också tacka mina kollegor här inne för en väldigt tydlig markering. Att vi kan få till stånd en sådan pass bred och stark resolution är oerhört viktigt när vi nu ska rösta om det, för att visa gentemot Ryssland och gentemot Tjetjenien att vi inte accepterar detta beteende.

Precis som kollegan Corazza Bildt nu sa måste vi se till att de personer som hålls i fångenskap måste släppas å det snaraste. De personer som har drivits ut ur Tjetjenien måste få en möjlighet att komma hem till sina familjer. Det upprop som gått genom Tjetjenien att rensa Tjetjenien från homosexuella innan Ramadan börjar måste vi se till att få upphävt. Man har ombetts att antingen ta livet av sina egna söner, eller så kommer man se till att göra det inom Tjetjeniens ramar.

Samtidigt ska vi komma ihåg att det här hänger ju samman med den politik som Putin har fört gentemot hbtq-personer under en väldigt, väldigt lång tid. Nu låter han Tjetjenien bli en experimentverkstad gentemot och attackera mänskliga rättigheter. Detta måste vi se till att markera mot så tydligt som vi bara kan. Tack!

Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Wenn Kadyrow behauptet, es gebe keine Homosexuellen in Tschetschenien, dann ist das so wahr wie die Behauptung, dass die Erde eine Scheibe sei, oder Eva der Rippe von Adam entstamme. Aber das Leben ist anders: Die Erde ist rund, und es gibt eben nicht nur Adam und Eva, sondern viel mehr – ob nun schwul, lesbisch, bisexuell, Transgender oder intersexuell. Das ist weder ein Defizit noch ein Makel, sondern ein wundervolles Geschenk der menschlichen Natur, das es durch uns zu verteidigen gilt.

Deshalb fordern wir als allererstes: Hetzreden gegen Homosexuelle müssen aufhören – zuallererst, wenn sie von Regierungen kommen. Und wer wie in Tschetschenien Menschen, weil sie homosexuell sind, verhaftet, foltert und in den Tod treibt, der macht sich schwerster Verbrechen schuldig. Und wer tatenlos zusieht, ebenso. Unsere Forderung ist, dass alle Gefangenen, die wegen sexueller Orientierung inhaftiert wurden, daher freigelassen werden müssen.

Auch müssen die Zwangssterilisierung und die geschlechtszuordnenden Zwangsoperationen überall abgeschafft werden, auch in unseren Mitgliedstaaten. Solchen Leuten gilt es übrigens auch, Asyl zu gewähren, wenn sie in ihren Ländern verfolgt werden. Das gehört zur Wahrung von Menschenrechten hier in der EU.

Rebecca Harms, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Die erste Nachricht, die ich über das Pogrom im Netz gelesen hatte, lautete: Sie haben ihn vor die Tür geworfen und gesagt, man möge ihn töten. Das war der Satz, den viele gelesen haben. Er ist zuerst auf VKontakte veröffentlicht worden. Ich glaube, dass wir uns mit diesem Pogrom beschäftigt haben, dass wir aufgerüttelt worden sind durch die Nachrichten aus Tschetschenien, das ist sehr gut. Gleichzeitig bin ich auch sehr pessimistisch. Ich glaube auf der einen Seite, dass es richtig ist, dass Angela Merkel oder Federica Mogherini dieses Pogrom auch öffentlich angesprochen haben. Es ist gut, dass Präsident Putin dadurch unter Druck gekommen ist und eine Untersuchung angekündigt hat. Wir können wahrscheinlich ein weiteres Pogrom im Moment abwenden, aber wir beenden damit nicht die systematische Unterdrückung, Verfolgung, Gewalt gegen Schwule und andere sexuelle Minderheiten in diesen Ländern.

Deswegen möchte ich an dieser Stelle sagen: Aufmerksamkeit für die Situation ist richtig, aber das, was die skandinavischen Länder gemacht haben, nämlich einfache Einreisemöglichkeiten für Schwule aus Russland zu schaffen und Asylverfahren zu ermöglichen, das muss die Europäische Union sehr schnell vorantreiben.

Margot Parker, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, Commissioner, reports emerging from Chechnya are extremely worrying. It is incomprehensible that in a modern civilised state, anyone's liberty – and indeed their health and life – would be under threat based on their sexuality. It would appear that the Chechnya government has slipped back towards barbarism, and my thoughts are with the families of those who have lost loved ones in this awful persecution.

Russia has in recent years been under much criticism and scrutiny for their attitudes towards homosexuality, but the Republic of Chechnya has gone to new extremes. The federal government must show the world that this will not be tolerated and do more to investigate and stamp out any and all of those persecutions in Chechnya.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Ve čtvrtek budeme hlasovat o společné rezoluci o hrubém porušování lidských práv ze strany režimu čečenského prezidenta Ramzana Kadirova vůči homosexuálům v Čečensku. Je to užitečná rezoluce, která odsuzuje stalinské metody dnešním režimem používané, včetně budování detenčních koncentračních zařízení pro nepohodlné menšiny.

Já se však ptám, dámy a pánové, proč dlouhodobě nevěnujeme pozornost situaci, která v Čečensku nastala poté, co ruská armáda brutálně potlačila snahu Čečenců po samostatnosti? Na tuto neděli připravila v Bruselu exilová vláda Čečenské republiky Ičkeria konferenci k 20. výročí podepsání mírové smlouvy z května 1997. Tato smlouva podepsaná v Kremlu prezidentem Jelcinem a prezidentem Maschadovem byla brutálně pošlapána Ruskem po nástupu prezidenta Putina.

Ministryně zahraničních věcí Čečenské republiky Ičkeria Aminat Sajeva označila tuto nevyhlášenou válku vůči Čečensku za brutální a ostudnou. Tato válka zabila více než sto tisíc lidí. Rusko zničilo čečenskou ekonomii a infrastrukturu. Ruská armáda pomocí bombardování a dělostřelectva způsobila totální destrukci čečenských měst a vesnic. Rusko porušilo všechny principy mezinárodního práva včetně používání chemických zbraní.

A znovu se ptám, dámy a pánové, proč všechna tato fakta nereflektujeme?

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, giovedì scorso è stato rilasciato Yuri Guaiana, un difensore per i diritti umani italiano arrestato il giorno prima dalle autorità russe mentre stava consegnando una petizione contro il trattamento degli omosessuali in Cecenia.

Ciò che sta accadendo in questa regione russa, ovvero l'arresto forzato, la reclusione e le torture nei confronti di omosessuali è un'inaccettabile violazione di molteplici diritti umani. Non solo alle persone coinvolte non viene garantito un trattamento paritario rispetto a qualsiasi altro cittadino, ma siamo anche testimoni di un'emergenza che viola la libertà di queste persone, sottoponendole a violenze e torture solo per il loro orientamento sessuale.

In Cecenia la situazione è resa ancor più preoccupante dal fatto che esiste un vero e proprio apparato organizzativo e repressivo, comprensivo di infrastrutture e personale, volto all'identificazione, alla cattura e alla tortura di persone sospettate di essere omosessuali. L'obiettivo ultimo di tale apparato è la conversione dei prigionieri.

Non so se c'è piena consapevolezza, ma è indubbio che la reazione della comunità internazionale non sia stata adeguata. L'attore coinvolto non è certo un interlocutore facile, ma noi dobbiamo assolutamente denunciare tutto questo per evitare future degenerazioni.

Concludendo vorrei però portare l'attenzione anche sulle linee guida proposte dal Consiglio. Ritengo che il documento ci chiami ad un esame di coscienza, un'azione anche e soprattutto all'interno dell'Unione europea. Noi stiamo denunciando un caso estremo come quello della Cecenia, che è giusto e doveroso denunciare, ma anche all'interno dei nostri confini le persone della comunità LGBTI sono soggette a discriminazioni che troppo spesso non trovano giustificazioni legate alla cultura, alla tradizione e alla religione. Anche su questo dobbiamo mostrarci coerenti.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Herr talman! Sedan två månader tillbaka har vi bevittnat fruktansvärda brott mot homosexuella män i det allt mer islamistiska Tjetjenien. Förra veckan kastades en 17 år gammal pojke ner från en balkong för att dö efter att hans familj upptäckt att han var homosexuell.

De här hedersmorden, herr talman, sker ofta på myndigheternas direkta uppmaning, och det vi bevittnar i Tjetjenien är en systematisk utrensning av människor baserat på sexuell läggning, vilket är helt i strid med fundamentala humanistiska principer.

Nu är det så att vi i denna union i EU måste stå upp för och vara en fristad för de här utsatta personerna. Tillsammans i EU måste vi sätta press på Putin att agera mot den Tjetjenska regimens fruktansvärda uppmaningar till hedersmord. För det är det det är frågan om.

Vi kan inte fortsätta att blunda för de förfärliga brott som pågår i vårt omedelbara närområde. Vi äger frågan och vi måste ta ansvar nu.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che uno degli aspetti più gravi di questa vicenda siano le dichiarazioni del governo ceceno sull'inesistenza di persone omosessuali, di persone gay, sul proprio territorio. Credo che già solo questa dichiarazione, al di là della necessità di indagare esattamente su quale sia la portata delle discriminazioni, quando non delle torture che sono state denunciate, parli da sé di una cultura fondata sulla negazione del riconoscimento delle persone LGBTQI.

Penso sia assolutamente doveroso da parte nostra non solo prendere parola, come faremo domani attraverso l'approvazione di una risoluzione, ma anche operando all'interno dell'Unione europea perché non sia più possibile alcuna negazione politica, culturale, materiale e simbolica dei diritti delle persone LGBTQI.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I want to join the thanks to the Commissioner for a very powerful intervention on how the European Union is using all its possibilities to condemn these atrocities that we have been hearing about during the last two months.

This horrible persecution is, on one hand, linked to the emphasis on what they call traditional values – and believe me, according to traditional values, homosexuality is something that should not exist. This is also linked, indirectly at least, to the decriminalisation of domestic violence in Russia some time ago, because 'family' means the 'traditional family' and what happens inside the family is something that should not be touched. In this extreme way, we have seen honour killings which are tolerated by the state, even induced by the state, and we have to be very strong.

In Chechnya the situation overall is very bad. Human rights defenders are persecuted against, and the Committee Against Torture saw their offices burnt down by security forces not long ago.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Čez deset dni nastopi muslimanski mesec ramadan. Za večino muslimanov po svetu praznik, čas za razmišljanje o življenju. Za homoseksualce v Čečeniji pa mesec groze in razmišljanja o smrti.

Kajti čečenski predsednik Kadirov želi dejansko do ramadana zaključiti s čistko. Če gejev ne bo pospravila čečenska vlada, jih bodo pospravili kar njihovi sorodniki. Izpovedi pobeglih gejev iz tako rekoč koncentracijskega taborišča so grozljive. Ne želim si predstavljati, kaj ti moški v resnici prestajajo, in ne želim si predstavljati, kako bo, če bo čečenska oblast te zavržne metode vpeljala še za lezbijke, invalide ali druge predstavnike manjšin.

Zahtevam pa, da visoka predstavnica od ruskih oblasti, kot ste dejali, nemudoma zahteva podatke in izsledke o preiskavi. Rusija ni naredila še nič. Pričakujem tudi, da bomo dali Kadirovu jasno vedeti, da geji v Čečeniji so bili, so in bodo. Z izjavami o njihovem neobstoju pa predsednik dejansko sramoti pred mednarodno skupnostjo, rojake pa potiska v srednji vek.

Ukrepi so zapisani, zdaj bodo pomembni rezultati in če jih ne bo, lahko začnejo rasti zgodbe iztrebljanj iz druge svetovne vojne. Širjenje nacizma in drugih ideologij namreč ni pogojeno z državnimi mejami.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's. Net als waarschijnlijk jullie allemaal was ik zwaar geschokt toen ik de beelden uit Tsjetsjenië te zien kreeg. Meteen toen ik het nieuws hoorde, kwamen mij de beelden uit de Tweede Wereldoorlog voor ogen. Mannen waarvan men vermoedt dat ze homoseksueel zijn, opsluiten in kampen. Ze trachten te verbeteren. En als ze dan vrijgelaten worden – als ze al vrijgelaten worden –, dreigen ze vermoord te worden door hun eigen familie. Dat gebeurt op een boogscheut van Europa, anno 2017, aan de vooravond van de internationale dag tegen homofobie en aan de vooravond van de Gay Pride in Brussel. Zaterdag viert de internationale gemeenschap immers feest in Brussel, al is er eigenlijk geen reden tot feesten.

Mijnheer de commissaris, ik ben blij met uw sterke verklaring. We moeten de druk opvoeren. Dat is heel belangrijk. We moet de schuldigen straffen. Ook dat is belangrijk. Ten slotte moeten we zorgen voor de bescherming van homoseksuelen. Dat betekent: nadenken over visa en over de manier waarop we hen kunnen beschermen. Dat staat nu prioritair op ons programma. Ik dank u.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I am glad, colleagues, that we have been able to achieve such a degree of cross-party unity across this House on this really crucial issue. But remember, we have got the easy job. We have a massive debt of gratitude to civil society and the NGOs and journalists who brought this to our attention at all – people who are really struggling in their daily lives against shocking persecution. Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the International Crisis Group, vital NGOs who do vital work need further support; journalists at Novaya Gazeta; and indeed the brave citizens who are struggling on a daily basis.

The situation in Chechnya is the subject of this motion, but it is an example of a growing trend, and it is something I have been reflecting on a great deal in the light of the Brexit vote in the UK. There is a trend in politics to create scapegoats – to ‘other’ – to store up hate, and it is a growing trend in politics – and progress is reversible. It is one thing that we must always be on our guard against. There are powerful forces who, with some success in many cases, are undermining and misrepresenting human rights at a time when the EU must be the voice – the antidote – to promote those values and to be the voice for minorities within the wider world. We have a job to do, and many people are relying upon us. I endorse the motion and thank everyone for their support.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die Lage in Tschetschenien ist seit vielen Jahren besorgniserregend. Wie keine andere Region der russischen Föderation sorgt Tschetschenien für einen beständigen Zustrom an Asylsuchenden. Das ist ein Zeichen, dass hier Menschenrechte kontinuierlich systematisch und in provokativer Weise verletzt werden. Die Nachricht darüber, wie der Sicherheitsapparat in krimineller Weise mit Schwulen oder als schwul wahrgenommen Männern umgeht, war selbst für hartgesottene Beobachter der Situation in Tschetschenien schockierend.

Es ist wichtig, dass sich unser Haus umgehend mit diesen Vorgängen beschäftigt, und die klare Position der Kommission ist ausdrücklich hervorzuheben. Es ist ein deutliches und klares Zeichen, dass wir so etwas nicht hinnehmen, und es ist ein Zeichen des Ausdrucks unserer Besorgnis, dass die Diskriminierung von LGBTI-Personen und latente Homophobie letztlich immer so enden, wie das ihn Tschetschenien passiert ist. Es ist positiv, dass die russische Föderationsregierung Aufklärung versprochen hat. Aber was getan wird, ist in keiner Weise ausreichend. Wir brauchen wirkliche Aufklärung.

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, demain nous célébrons la Journée mondiale contre l'homophobie et, au même moment, la Tchétchénie mène une chasse aux homosexuels. Être homosexuel, là-bas, c'est risquer la mort ou l'exil.

Il est inadmissible de rester muet face à cette situation, à ceux qui entravent les valeurs des droits de l'homme. Nous sommes les porte-paroles des victimes de persécutions. Nous appelons à la libération immédiate des prisonniers, à une réelle protection de toutes les personnes qui ont dénoncé ces actes odieux et à une enquête sérieuse menée par les organisations internationales de défense des droits de l'homme.

L'Europe doit faire preuve de courage face à ce qui se passe en Tchétchénie, pays membre de la Fédération de Russie de M. Poutine. L'année prochaine, cette même fédération doit accueillir la Coupe du monde de football. Pendant que certains joueront au foot, d'autres seront massacrés.

Ce soir, j'appelle donc au boycott de cette Coupe du monde tant que les droits fondamentaux ne seront pas respectés en Russie et dans ses États satellites.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, en 2013, – vous l'avez rappelé Monsieur le Commissaire – nous avons salué l'adoption par le Conseil des lignes directrices concernant les personnes LGBTI. Grâce à elles, nous pensions disposer des outils nécessaires pour lutter contre l'homophobie et pourtant, quatre ans plus tard – il faut le reconnaître –, des personnes LGBTI continuent en Europe à être victimes de discrimination, de violences et d'humiliations.

Le constat est mauvais aussi à l'extérieur de l'Union puisqu'une loi homophobe a été votée en Russie il y a quatre ans et que le climat, déjà délétère, s'est encore dégradé pour les personnes LGBTI de ce pays. Cette loi, c'est la négation de l'autre, de sa différence, et c'est ce climat de haine qui a abouti à l'arrestation d'une centaine de personnes en avril en Tchétchénie et à leur détention dans des conditions absolument monstrueuses.

Il faut passer à l'acte, des vies humaines sont en jeu. Tous les États membres doivent offrir un sanctuaire à ces personnes qui ne sont pas en sécurité en Russie et les ambassades européennes doivent leur délivrer des visas pour qu'elles puissent venir demander l'asile au sein de l'Union européenne.

En outre, les autorités russes doivent faire toute la lumière sur ces événements d'avril et tenter de respecter ainsi leurs engagements en faveur des droits de l'homme.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, what is happening in Chechnya right now is the extremest form of escalation of a backlash that we are actually seeing all over Europe and all over the world right now. The reports of torture, of persecution, of imprisonment and even of killings are absolutely shocking, but the precondition for these kinds of dehumanisation are one thing, and that is denial – denial that we even exist, that gay men, lesbian women, bi-trans and inter people exist, and when the Chechnyan President declares that there are no gay men in Chechnya, he does exactly that. He denies our existence and he erases our existence, and this is why we cannot just stand aside; we will have to speak up.

The European Union will have to speak up and defend the rights of those that are being denied their existence in Chechnya, and not only tomorrow but all the time, because we exist and we can be proud to exist.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, «... alle botte con i tubi di gomma si resiste, ti mordi le mani fino a sanguinare ma poi ce la puoi fare. L'elettricità è un'altra cosa, vedi che iniziano a girare la manovella e sai che arriverà, e quando arriva il tuo corpo inizia a tremare. Sai cos'è perché ci sei già passato, ma non capisci più cosa succede, urli di dolore che ti scoppia la gola, ti senti cadere. E poi ricomincia.» Questa è la testimonianza di Andrej, un ragazzo ceceno, arrestato e torturato in Cecenia come altre centinaia.

La Cecenia è un porto franco in cui vige il regime di terrore di Ramzan Kadyrov, intoccabile perché utile a Putin e alla Russia di Putin, dove qualche giorno fa sono stati arrestati quattro militanti, di cui un europeo. Kadyrov è intoccabile e quindi con potere di vita e di morte sugli abitanti della Cecenia, soprattutto, a quanto pare, sugli abitanti gay, torturati, seviziati, minacciati e poi lasciati alle famiglie per finire il lavoro; un delitto d'onore, si dice, lo chiamano così, siamo nel 2017.

Signor Presidente, credo che questi fatti ci pongano alcune domande su cosa siamo e su cosa vogliamo fare. Cos'è l'Europa se non si indigna per quello che sta succedendo a pochi chilometri di distanza da noi? Cos'è l'Europa se non si mobilita per tutte le persone, soprattutto quelle discriminate, che devono sentirsi ancora in pericolo di vita? Cos'è l'Europa se non difende la vita?

Credo che oggi l'Europa sia davanti a un bivio, girare la testa dall'altra parte o usare tutto il suo potere per mettere la Russia e la Cecenia davanti alle loro responsabilità. Con i paesi che non rispettano i diritti umani noi non possiamo più avere nulla a che fare.

Vede, Presidente, credo che sopportare le violenze contro le minoranze religiose, sopportare le violazioni che subiscono le donne in molte parti del mondo, sopportare i migranti che muoiono in mare e i gay torturati in Cecenia, sopportare tutto questo sia un attacco all'idea stessa di Europa e agli attacchi si deve rispondere in modo fermo e deciso.

Seb Dance (S&D). – Mr President, I am very grateful to the Commissioner for his explanation of the work that has been done on behalf of the European Union. Of course, we are only here, as colleagues have pointed out, because of the hard work of civil society in highlighting this.

The appalling examples of denial that we have seen from the Chechen and Russian authorities do no justice to the people who are suffering, but we do know now, because of the hard work of NGOs, because of the hard work of organisations like Novaya Gazeta and the journalists who face recrimination and death, that this is occurring. I am a gay man and I am able to be here with other gay men, other lesbians, other LGBTI people and do the work that we do, because I know I am not going to be dragged from my seat by the authorities. I know I am not going to be beaten up by the canal and left for dead and then that be denied by the police and indeed by my own government – they are here to protect me.

I do not know if there is anybody here watching in Chechnya or in Russia, but you are not the problem if you are LGBTI; you are not the illness. It is the people who are doing this to you that are the problem and it is this organisation, the international community, who will stand to defend you.

(Applause)

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, 'I will never allow the tyranny of a majority to oppress a minority', said MEP Michael Cashman as he cut up his Visa card in this very Chamber in the lead up to the Sochi 2014 Olympics, when Putin was making anti-LGBTI laws. And three years on, we can see that we must never be complacent. The reported persecution of gay, or allegedly gay, men in Chechnya is shocking, and the international community must act resolutely to end it. Mr Putin apparently said that he would support an investigation after Angela Merkel pressed him on it. But Russian authorities still continue to dismiss reports as rumours. So the EU must increase the pressure. The human rights defender Yuri Gualaia was arrested trying to deliver a petition with two million signatures, demanding justice for LGBTI people in Chechnya. He was later released because of international pressure.

All too often in this Chamber we find ourselves defending human rights defenders. Yes, the EU is a key protector of human rights in the world, and all of us, as parliamentarians and citizens, must join in support of the effort to ensure those who fight for human rights have the support they need.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, the human rights situation in Russia is more and more worrying. It seems that at least 100 men have been detained in Chechnya, Russia, on suspicion of being gay and have suffered severe torture and humiliation in unofficial prisons. At least three men have been reported killed. Many remain detained in prisons where they face torture and inhumane treatment in horrific conditions.

Regional authorities have denied the allegations and are responding by inciting further hatred against perceived homosexuals. National Russian authorities continue to ignore this fact. The EU must act now. I support the question, as I believe the European External Action Service should inform us of the type of action they have taken in the specific case of Chechnya. It is vital to raise this matter with the relevant Russian authorities to ensure legal and physical protection for the victims and full respect for citizens' human rights.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la liberté d'être homosexuel est un droit, mais pas en Tchétchénie. Le président Kadyrov a décidé d'exterminer tous les homosexuels de son territoire d'ici au 26 mai et, au passage, certains opposants politiques qui ont osé contester son pouvoir.

Plusieurs sources fiables ont démontré l'existence d'un camp semblable à un camp de concentration, où des dizaines de gays sont emmenés, enfermés, torturés et, pour certains, tués. Les parents sont forcés par la police de tuer leurs enfants homosexuels pour éviter l'incarcération de toute la famille. Les autorités appellent cela «laver l'honneur par le sang». Quand on demande aux hauts responsables tchétchènes des informations sur cette purge sanglante, ils répondent que c'est totalement impossible car l'homosexualité n'existe pas en Tchétchénie. Une réponse qui pourrait prêter à sourire si elle ne donnait pas autant envie de vomir.

Toutes ces victimes potentielles ou avérées n'ont plus que nous pour espérer survivre. Nos valeurs européennes nous interdisent de rester aveugles et sourds à un tel drame. Nous devons proposer des visas d'urgence, comme le propose le Canada.

Le temps n'est plus à la parole, il est aux actes.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já chci poděkovat všem, kteří v této debatě vystoupili, protože zde zněl jeden jasný hlas, který odsuzuje situaci v Čechách, odsuzuje situaci sexuálních menšin, lidí, kteří nejenže jsou diskriminováni, ale v tuto chvíli jsou ohroženi na životě a na zdraví.

Jsem také rád, že pan komisař o té věci hovořil. Měli bychom řešit konkrétní věci. Je dobře, že dochází k diplomatické ofenzivě ze strany EU, a já jsem velmi skeptický k tomu, že cynický Putinův režim něco reálně vyšetří a reálně změní situaci homosexuálů v Rusku a konkrétně v Čechách.

Myslím si proto, že je správně, že tu zaznělo, že je třeba poskytnout těmto lidem víza, otevřít jim náruč, umožnit jim, aby získali azyl, protože je jasné, že splňují mezinárodní právní podmínky pro získání azylu v zemích EU, a také podpořit nezávislé novináře, kteří v Rusku o těchto věcech informují.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le notizie che arrivano dalla Cecenia e dalla Russia sono gravissime. Si parla di torture e violenze sistematiche, detenzione illegale di centinaia di uomini gay o presunti tali, si parla di vere e proprie esecuzioni, di campi per la rieducazione. Tutto questo è medievale, ci riporta alle fasi più buie della storia dell'umanità e, da ultimo, l'arresto di diversi attivisti a Mosca, tra cui Yuri Guaiana.

Le istituzioni europee e gli Stati membri intervengano a tutela della comunità LGBTI con tutti gli strumenti a disposizione, i visti e anche quelli di inchiesta, le pressioni sulle autorità russe affinché questo orrore si fermi. Domani è la Giornata internazionale contro l'omotransfobia, cose come questa dimostrano quanto ce ne sia bisogno. Abbiamo saputo che anche in Italia qualcuno, in occasione del *pride* di Reggio Emilia, organizzerà una processione «di riparazione». È a questo odio che bisogna riparare, non certo all'amore libero ed eguale.

Onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, questa è una battaglia di tutti perché riguarda i diritti fondamentali delle persone che abbiamo messo alla base della nostra Unione.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la ley antipropaganda gay de Putin de 2013 ha derivado en la caza de hombres homosexuales de Kadirov hoy.

Señor Stylianides, estamos de acuerdo: no es suficiente adoptar otra resolución condenando los abusos y las violaciones de derechos humanos en Rusia.

En la víspera del Día Internacional contra la Homofobia, les pido que apoyemos la demanda recién presentada por organizaciones LGBTI ante la Corte Penal Internacional. Hagamos que este tribunal juzgue al presidente de Chechenia por genocidio contra los homosexuales. No puede haber impunidad para quienes persiguen y torturan a seres humanos ni tampoco para sus cómplices, por muy poderosos que sean.

El día 1 de julio en Madrid, en el World Pride, seremos millones los que pediremos igualdad efectiva y despenalización de la homosexualidad en el mundo. Están todos invitados.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la situazione che ci viene riportata dalla Cecenia è una situazione estremamente grave e preoccupante.

L'inchiesta nata dalle denunce della *Novaya Gazeta* ha fatto emergere accuse pesantissime, che riguardano anche le condizioni terribili di detenzione delle persone omosessuali, torture, umiliazioni, percosse generiche, più volte perpetrate, e si parla addirittura di casi veri e propri di omicidio, per non parlare di persecuzioni e pressioni anche nei confronti dei loro nuclei familiari, che sono altrettanto in pericolo se non agiscono per tutelare «l'onore».

Le frasi del portavoce di Ramzan Kadyrov, presidente della Cecenia, così come quelle di Kheda Saratova, membro del Consiglio dei diritti umani ceceno, sono inaccettabili da ogni punto di vista, sono indegne di chiunque ricopra un incarico elettivo, di chiunque ricopra un incarico di governo.

Pretendiamo il pieno impegno, totale, da parte delle autorità russe per fare luce su quello che sta accadendo e una piena e convinta azione per sostenere e proteggere le vittime, così come i loro familiari che devono essere trasferiti e messi in condizioni di sicurezza. Questo è quello che, come minimo, come Unione europea dobbiamo pretendere.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, dear colleagues, thank you so much for your intervention and thank you so much by showing this unity for this very important issue. We all share the concern about what is happening in Chechnya. We all agree that this issue is completely unacceptable, and I personally believe that it is a shame, because we have to discuss this issue in the 21st century. The violence against the LGBTI community has given visibility to the disastrous situation of human rights in this Russian republic. We will keep working with Member States to support the victims and put pressure on the Russian authorities to stop the violence and ensure justice for the victims.

Please be aware that some of our common efforts will require patience and confidentiality. We are all trying to help, definitely, but we cannot go public about everything that is being done. In some cases being effective is more important than being outspoken, for the sake of the people involved. I would like to say this because I know some cases on the ground.

May I close by signalling once again my appreciation of Parliament's role in keeping this issue on the agenda. We have to continue the struggle in order to show our willingness, our strong conviction about the rights of the LGBTI community.

President. – Thank you, Commissioner, especially for your words about our duty and our role as the European Parliament.

Otrzymałem sześć projektów rezolucji złożonych zgodnie z art. 128 ust. 5 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 18 maja 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Kati Piri (S&D), schriftelijk. – De autoriteiten in de Zuid-Russische republiek Tsjetsjenië hebben een heksenjacht geopend op homoseksuelen mannen, waarbij meer dan honderd mannen zijn opgesloten omwille van hun seksuele geaardheid. Eenmaal in detentie zijn ze mishandeld. Volgens verschillende rapporten van onder andere Human Rights Watch zijn er inmiddels zelfs vier doden gevallen. Dat de leider van de republiek, Ramzan Kadirov, ontkent dat homoseksualiteit in die regio voorkomt, is treurig en tegelijkertijd zeer verwerpelijk. Het is dan ook van belang dat er zo spoedig mogelijk een onafhankelijk onderzoek wordt ingesteld naar dergelijke wanpraktijken. Mochten Kadirov en Poetin geen of onvoldoende actie ondernemen, dan is het aan de internationale gemeenschap om de politieke druk op te voeren. Ieder mens moet kunnen uitkomen voor wie hij/zij is, en van wie hij/zij houdt. Dat vormt een kernpunt van onze waarden. Het is aan ons om daarvoor te blijven strijden, waar dan ook ter wereld.

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), par écrit. – Nous avons tous pris la mesure de l'horreur de la situation en Tchétchénie où les personnes LGBT sont victimes de tortures, de violences, de traitements inhumains et cruels. Sous la pression internationale, M. Poutine a soutenu une enquête ouverte par le parquet général russe, mais ne nous félicitons pas trop vite. Le parquet n'a reçu à ce jour aucune plainte de victime, et pour cause! Il faudrait garantir la sécurité des personnes LGBT, qui sont dans une situation de vulnérabilité extrême, et qui ne peuvent pas témoigner par peur de dévoiler leur identité. Ils ont peur de l'État, mais aussi de leurs familles, car les autorités tchétchènes n'ont reculé devant rien ; appelant même les habitants à tuer les homosexuels de leur famille afin de laver leur honneur.

Je salue le courage des ONG locales qui ont mis en place une ligne téléphonique d'urgence et ont organisé des évacuations vers d'autres provinces russes ou l'étranger. À notre tour d'être à la hauteur. L'Union doit faire pression sur Vladimir Poutine et Ramzan Kadyrov pour que cette situation, une violation extrême des droits humains, cesse. Quant aux États, ils doivent délivrer des visas d'urgence à ceux qui fuient la Tchétchénie.

14. Moldovan tilanne (keskustelu)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie sytuacji w Mołdawii (2017/2689(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of my dear colleague, Commissioner Hahn, thank you for this opportunity to exchange views on the situation in Moldova. Both Federica Mogherini and Johannes Hahn are very closely monitoring the situation, with particular focus on the reforms and political developments. In our partnership with Moldova, we have always tried to support change when it could bring tangible benefits to the people of Moldova. Let me recall that in the very first lines of our Association Agreement, the European Union and Moldova commit to some common principles. Among them are the rule of law, good governance and cooperation between neighbours.

These are not only EU values, they are European values that are part of our common heritage and are shared by all Members of the Council of Europe. The Council conclusions of 15 February 2016 already include a broad set of reforms that we believe will help Moldova meet its full potential, making both its democracy and its economy stronger. On 13 March, we published our first association implementation report, which has identified issues to be addressed as a matter of priority.

On 31 March, the Association Council was the opportunity to discuss progress in reforms in all fields. We have to acknowledge that the government and the parliament have taken many legislative steps, particularly last year. The reform process has finally been restarted after political instability had brought it to a deadlock. Some efforts have been made in the banking sector and have contributed to restoring macro-financial stability and donors' assistance. An agreement with the International Monetary Fund was reached in November 2016, thanks to which we could resume our budget support based on a thorough assessment of whether the conditions foreseen by the existing assistance programmes to Moldova had been fulfilled. It also allowed us to propose a macro-financial assistance operation for Moldova.

In the justice and energy sectors, in the fight against corruption, as well as the public administration reforms, some legislative and regulatory steps have been already taken. However, many of the country's key problems still persist: the politicisation of state institutions, corruption, lack of independence of the judiciary, much-delayed investigations on banking fraud.

As you all know, on 5 May, the parliament adopted two draft laws at first reading that might lead to important changes in the Moldovan political system. One, as tabled by the Democratic Party, would change the electoral system from proportional to uninominal, and a second, as proposed by President Dodon, in favour of a mixed electoral system, half proportional and half uninominal. These two proposals have now been merged. A new draft was produced on the basis of President Dodon's proposals for review by the Venice Commission. It is expected that the Venice Commission, which has just visited Moldova, will give its opinion by mid-June.

Let us be very clear on this proposed reform. It is not up to the European Union to decide upon an independent country's voting system. This should be up to the people of Moldova – and we mean all of them, not only the parties in power. Any change to the electoral system should be based on a broad consensus amongst political forces, on the broadest consensus among all political forces and within society.

A new electoral law can have a significant impact on the quality of a country's democracy, for better or worse. The Council of Europe has an important advisory role when it comes to democratic reforms, so we can only hope that Moldova will listen carefully to the opinion of the Venice Commission.

On our side, our economic support is aimed at accompanying reforms that can benefit the citizens of Moldova. With the Association Agreement, we have set out together with our Moldovan friends, the goals of our partnership. Our financial support is intended precisely to favour the implementation of the Association Agreement.

As far as the macro-financial assistance is concerned, the adoption of the decision does not mean its immediate implementation. Each disbursement, including the first one, is conditional on the implementation of policy measures set out in the related memorandum of understanding.

Real accountability for elected officials is essential to the credibility of all democratic institutions. Moldova has so far taken some steps towards a stronger democracy. The European Union will work to help Moldova stay on the path of a democracy that truly delivers on its citizens' needs.

Thank you so much for your attention, and I look forward to hearing your interventions and your suggestions about the situation in Moldova.

Cristian Dan Preda, în numele grupului PPE. – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, sunt împotriva acordării unui ajutor financiar Moldovei pentru că nu știm unde s-ar duce acești bani. La Chișinău toată lumea știe că s-a furat un miliard, dar nimeni nu e responsabil pentru că justiția nu funcționează. De fapt, nu cetățenii ar profita de pe urma ajutorului european, ci elitele cleptocrate.

Singurul argument prezentat de Chișinău în favoarea acordării acestui ajutor e că guvernul ar fi proeuropean. Fals. Guvernul nu este controlat de Parlament, ci de un oligarh, domnul Plahotniuc, care cumpără deputați la bucată, în primul rând comuniști.

Domnul Plahotniuc s-a înțeles de curând cu președintele țării, Dodon, care e un personaj aparte. E singurul socialist din lume aflat la stânga comuniștilor și complet aservit intereselor Moscovei. Ei vor să introducă un sistem electoral care să ducă la un sistem bipartizan astfel încât partidul domnului Plahotniuc și partidul domnului Dodon să controleze jocul.

Din coaliția proeuropeană de la Chișinău a rămas un oligarh care cooperează cu o slugă a lui Putin. Asta e realitatea de la fața locului. În aceste condiții și cum libertatea presei e călcată în picioare, cum statul de drept e o vorbă goală, nu putem trimite bani pentru a fi tocați de aceste elite cletocrate.

Există o vorbă românească: dacă te-ai ars cu ciorbă, suflă și-n iaurt. Asta trebuie să facem în acest moment.

Andi Cristea, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, if the Republic of Moldova is on the agenda of our plenary session today it is because this country is at the top of the European Parliament's priorities and Moldova has the support and commitment of all political groups across this Parliament on its European path.

I want to acknowledge the reform efforts and ambitions of the Moldovan people and the authorities and to convey a strong signal of support and encouragement at this important time, especially in relation to the positive impact of the current process of political association and economic integration. It is clear that, although some areas require additional efforts, overall there has been substantial progress since the start of the executive mandate.

This week, this House will approve its mandate for the start of negotiations with the Council and the Commission for EU macro-financial assistance to the Republic of Moldova. This assistance will be a sign of recognition of the renewed commitment to moving forward with necessary reforms and to addressing the country's challenges by the current executive. In this regard I wish to underline that we will be applying rigorous, clear and strict conditionality criteria on disbursement, and this conditionality will be attached to the disbursement of each tranche, including the first one.

This Parliament has been most effective and successful when it has acted with full consensus on its line vis-à-vis the Republic of Moldova. The divisions and tensions amongst political parties in Chișinău are more and more reflected within the European Parliament and its political groups. I want to be very clear. I want to be crystal clear. This is not a positive development. As the European Parliament we can only be effective if we are united and not politicised, if we have a strong, objective and institutional line instead of expressing our positions through the prism of our respective political partners in Chișinău. And I want to personally thank all colleagues for their fair and constructive approach in this crucial period. I would like in particular to mention Cristian Preda and Petrus Auštrevičius.

We are, of course, following closely the ongoing process of electoral reform. Next week the EU-Moldova Parliamentary Committee and the Euronest Parliamentary Assembly will meet in Chișinău. This will be an opportunity for the European Parliament to meet its Moldovan counterpart while we await the opinion of the Venice Commission on the draft law.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, media and political pluralism, quality journalism, combating corruption and Russian propaganda are the best ways to ensure the European direction of Moldova. A clear signal should be sent by us to Chișinău, and as soon as possible, that urgent action in all these areas is needed and is a prerequisite for our further financial support to that country. Unfortunately, the situation is very grave and there is much disinformation in that country, taking into account the fatigue of society, and its disbelief in the authorities. We have to take our responsibility to really enhance the democratic consolidation of Moldova.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, as a standing co-rapporteur on implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, I will speak in a very frank and sincere way. I do so, as I feel very high responsibility for where Moldova is heading to, as it soon might become crucial and hardly reversible. Today, it is time to pronounce: quo vadis Moldova? Being a rapporteur, I must admit I am lately not that sure of how seriously a status of EU associated partner is perceived by the Moldovan authorities. This partnership is not at all abstract. It means certain obligations and deliverables, not only yet another credit line being opened. By partnership we expect first and foremost that a certain European-style political culture is to prevail in Moldova.

In Europe, free and independent media is in the interest of everyone, as openness and difference of opinions is a catalyst of change and public discourse. In Europe the election laws are designed to ensure fair competition of people's minds, and not to create privileges for some and eliminate others. In Europe, justice is what everyone has the right to; there must be no place for selective trials behind the closed doors.

I therefore want to appeal to the Moldovan Government as follows: do not be misled with the wrong assumption that Brussels is big, blind, far away and always ready to sign another cheque. Instead of calling yourself a European coalition name, come up with the real deeds, real change handled in a European way. We expect from you, Moldova.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, Leider sind Sie dem Europäischen Parlament ungeachtet Ihres heutigen Hinweises die Auflösung eines Widerspruchs schuldig geblieben. Sie wollen Moldau den Zugang zu Mitteln der EU wieder ermöglichen, aber weder der „Bankenskandal“ noch die Aussagen des Staatspräsidenten über ein Versickern von Geldern in den Taschen korrupter Eliten sind aufgeklärt, und auch an der Korruption, dem Amtsmissbrauch, der Willkürjustiz hat sich bislang nichts geändert.

Ich war immer wieder in Moldau und fordere seit langem, dass das Europäische Parlament beginnt, die Realitäten und deren Wurzeln zu diskutieren, mit denen wir uns in der Ostnachbarschaft konfrontiert sehen. Moldau ist das Ergebnis eines Transformationsprozesses, bei dem anpassungsfähige Oligarchen wie Plahotniuc den Stichworten auch aus Mitgliedstaaten der EU oder der Russischen Föderation folgten, studierten und zugleich weiterentwickelten, was man von Parteien wie z. B. Popolo della Libertà in Bezug auf eigenen Machterhalt lernen kann. Das Problem beginnt also durchaus auch in EU-Hauptstädten und endet nur bisher in Chişinău.

Wir sind übrigens mitten in einem Lehrstück für diese Plahotniucs, denn unsere Diskussion erfolgt im Kontext der Absage des Trilogs zur Makrofinanzhilfe für Moldau. Als wären wir in Chişinău, wurde einfach von außen in institutionelle Abläufe eingegriffen. EVP und S&D stellen hinsichtlich Moldau keine Alternativen dar, denn beide haben ihre Beteiligungen an der moldauischen Regierung.

Das Europäische Parlament muss sich aus dieser Verfilzung von Interessen befreien. Deshalb haben wir klare Forderungen in Richtung Moldau gestellt: präzise und umsetzbare Konditionalitäten für EU-Gelder, präzise Benennung der von Moldau zu erbringenden Leistungen und kein Verstecken des Europäischen Parlaments hinter großen Begriffswelten, sofortige Beendigung der Prozesse gegen jegliche politische Opponenten.

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich will vorausschicken, dass ich es sehr gut finde, dass wir diese Debatte, die wir hier heute führen, in einer Woche dann in Chişinău fortsetzen können, da wir sowohl mit der Delegation da sind und auch ein Vorstandstreffen der parlamentarischen Versammlung [EURONEST] haben. Das gibt uns wirklich eine Möglichkeit, weiter zu diskutieren.

Ich möchte als erstes auf das eingehen, was in Deutschland Wellen geschlagen hat und auch in anderen EU-Ländern und in Brüssel angekommen ist, nämlich ein Zitat von Präsident Dodon, der gesagt hat, dass die Hälfte der Gelder, die über einen Zeitraum von sieben Jahren aus Brüssel nach Moldawien gegangen sind, in dunklen Kanälen versickert und nicht bestimmungsgerecht verwendet worden sei. Mir ist aufgefallen, dass Präsident Dodon zwar in diesen Jahren auch an der Regierung beteiligt war, dass er trotzdem bis heute aber nicht in der Lage gewesen ist, Einzelheiten über das Versickern dieses Geldes in Brüssel auf den Tisch zu legen. Deswegen finde ich, müssen wir wirklich darüber nachdenken, ob wir weiter Geld in ein Land geben, dessen Präsident uns mitteilt, dass Geld dort in dunklen Kanälen versickert, und dessen Präsident eben auch zeitweise dann für das Versickern dieses Geldes mitverantwortlich gewesen ist.

Ich glaube, dass die Europäische Union in diesen Transformationsländern, in den Ländern, die sich im Rahmen unserer Partnerschaft auf den Weg Richtung Westen gemacht haben, tatsächlich sehr stark verantwortlich gemacht wird von den Bürgern für die Bekämpfung der Korruption. Herr Dodon hat uns jetzt eigentlich eingeladen, da auch nochmal strenger vorzugehen. Er kommt uns eigentlich in dieser Auseinandersetzung entgegen, und vielleicht können wir das ja dann auch in Chişinău vertiefen.

Ich würde allen Rednern Recht geben, die sagen: Es hat Fortschritte bei der Gesetzgebung in Chișinău gegeben. Aber zwischen Gesetzgebung und Umsetzung bei einer Justizreform, da liegen Welten. Dasselbe gilt für die Verwaltungsreform. Dasselbe geht auch für alle Strukturen, die man geschaffen hat zur Bekämpfung der Korruption. Aber wie gesagt: in Chișinău dann mehr.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Moldova rimane uno dei paesi europei più poveri e corrotti. Tra il 2000 e il 2015 tutti conoscete le famose proteste antigovernative conseguenti allo scandalo bancario, che ha visto la perdita di un miliardo di dollari da parte delle tre banche moldove più importanti, definito da alcuni il «furto del secolo».

Tale malcontento fortissimo nei confronti del governo ha portato a una reazione scomposta, con una riduzione della libertà di espressione, l'attacco alle opposizioni e, in qualche modo, una soppressione di quelle voci che chiedono invece maggiore trasparenza e libertà.

Addirittura nell'aprile 2017 il governo ha adottato in prima lettura una nuova legge che permetterebbe l'utilizzo delle forze armate per contrastare le proteste pubbliche quando si reputi necessario. In attesa del parere della commissione di Venezia sulla futura legge elettorale, dobbiamo denunciare ancora una volta il grande potere nelle mani dell'oligarca Plahotniuc, il quale riesce di fatto a indirizzare, alcuni dicono a controllare, governo, sistema giudiziario, gli organi anticorruzione e i media. Un paese quasi in ostaggio.

Noi, come primo e principale partner della Moldova, dobbiamo utilizzare gli strumenti in nostro potere per reagire. I cento milioni di euro di aiuti devono essere una leva politica che non può essere erogata fino a che non ci sarà un serio impegno contro la corruzione e fino a che non ci sarà un cambio di passo contro la stessa. Non possiamo pagare sulla fiducia.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja nie tylko byłem niedawno w Mołdawii, ale byłem tam kilka razy. Miałem krewnych w wyższych sferach mołdawskich i mogę powiedzieć, że ta mentalność rumuńska jest taka, że pieniądze im się po prostu należą.

Jak byłem teraz Mołdawii, to ludzie uważali, że jedynym ratunkiem jest Putin, który zaprowadzi odrobinę porządku. Natomiast każde pieniądze dawane przez Unię rozplywają się i nie idą tam, dokąd powinny. Próba przekupywania ludzi pieniędzmi kończy się z reguły smutno, bo najpierw się ludzi przekupuje, potem się grozi, że im się tych pieniędzy nie da, co powoduje, że ludzie przestają lubić Unię Europejską i trudno się im dziwić.

Generalnie rzecz biorąc, rzecz jest w moralności. To, co trzeba zrobić, to nie dawać pieniędzy, tylko dawać pieniądze tym, którzy się przyczyniają do rozwoju dobrobytu gospodarczego Mołdawii, czyli nie politykom.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, Moldova este un stat european. Este foarte importantă din punct de vedere geopolitic și se vede acest lucru din eforturile Federației Ruse de a-și impune acolo punctul de vedere.

În ultima vreme, guvernele Moldovei au făcut eforturi pentru a se apropia de Uniune. Politicienii au opinii diferite, către Uniune sau către Federația Rusă. Este datoria noastră să încurajăm vocile proeuropene.

Trebuie să continuăm implementarea Acordului, trebuie să continuăm în același timp și monitorizarea. Legea electorală trebuie să fie în concordanță cu realitățile sociale din Moldova.

Este adevărat că există riscuri importante când se acordă un ajutor financiar unui stat care are probleme cu sistemul juridic, judiciar, cu corupția, în general cu statul de drept. În același timp, vocile europene trebuie încurajate. Neacordarea acestui ajutor ar încuraja vocile către Rusia.

Eu cred că acest ajutor trebuie acordat, însă trebuie monitorizată foarte atent utilizarea lui.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, infelizmente, temos verificado que, nalguns países do Leste europeu, à tragédia que o comunismo inquestionavelmente constituiu, sucedeu outro tipo de tragédias e é o caso da Moldávia. Mas faço minhas as palavras do orador que me precedeu: a Moldávia é um país europeu, é o país mais pobre da Europa. Desde o início do século XXI, porém, a economia moldava cresceu significativamente e o próprio Banco Mundial prevê que, depois de um ligeiro interregno, esse crescimento volte a verificar-se.

A Moldávia assinou com União Europeia um acordo de associação e livre comércio que lhe abre as portas a um mercado de quinhentos milhões de pessoas e, posteriormente, acordou a isenção de vistos para a circulação da sua população no espaço Schengen. Três milhões e meio de moldavos podem, agora, circular livremente pelo espaço europeu e podem estabelecer, de forma facilitada, relações comerciais com os países da União Europeia.

Apesar de tudo isso, nos últimos tempos, prevaleceram posições políticas que põem em causa esta aproximação à União Europeia e vão no sentido de favorecer de novo uma ligação à Rússia. A isso não será alheio, naturalmente, o facto de os russos pressionarem fortemente a população moldava.

Nos últimos anos e à medida que as relações com a União Europeia se estreitavam, a Rússia alarmou essa população que, apesar de tudo, depende consideravelmente desse país, não só em termos económicos como sociais. Embargou as importações de vinho, carne, fruta e vegetais moldavos e ameaçou alargar a interdição a outros produtos, aumentou os preços do fornecimento energético, ameaçou colocar restrições aos vistos dos milhares de moldavos que trabalham na Rússia.

Estamos, pois, hoje num momento decisivo para o futuro deste país que, repito, é o mais pobre da Europa, sem deixar de ser um país que faz parte da nossa civilização europeia e, por isso, apesar de todos os problemas, apesar de todos os erros cometidos, não creio que a União Europeia deva desistir de continuar a incentivar a Moldávia a promover a consolidação da democracia, a resolver os problemas graves que já aqui foram enunciados e a realizar as reformas indispensáveis ao seu desenvolvimento económico e social. O pior que poderia suceder a um país como este seria, sem dúvida, que a União Europeia desistisse dele. Estou certo que isso não vai acontecer.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Mulțumesc, în țări cu democrații solide sistemul de vot uninominal mixt funcționează. Dar, în Moldova, unde 5% sunt foarte bogați și restul populației este săracă, chiar foarte săracă, în baza acestui sistem cei bogați își vor cumpăra țara și parlamentul sau parlamentul și țara. La asta se adaugă propaganda zilnică și dezincriminarea și dezinformarea propagandei făcute de propaganda rusă și, de asemenea, de presa care aparține oligarhului Plahotniuc, ceea ce duce la dezinformarea și manipularea electoratului sau a multora dintre alegători.

Uniunea a investit masiv în Moldova. Din 2014 se călătorește fără vize, am construit străzi, școli, grădinițe, am finanțat și finanțăm în continuare sistemul de administrație publică, reformarea administrației și multe alte domenii și suntem fericiți să o facem în continuare.

Finanțarea trebuie, însă, condiționată de reforme reale pentru că asta vrea și populația, vrea să continue și vrem și noi să continue reformele în sensul de independența justiției, lupta împotriva corupției, dar în mod real, nu pe vorbe, ci pe fapte, independența procurorului general, combaterea spălării banilor sau, până la urmă, aflarea și recuperarea acelui miliard furat.

Toate astea trebuie să se întâmple, dar, repet, Moldova este o țară europeană și avem datoria de a o obține lângă noi și nu de a o lăsa să se ducă către Federația Ru...

(Președintele a întrerupt discursul vorbitorului.)

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, dezbateră de astăzi este una care ne pune foarte multe întrebări, nouă, Uniunii Europene, dacă dorim în continuare să susținem parcursul european al Republicii Moldova. Nu este vorba de Guvern, el poate fi criticat, merită criticat, reformele sunt uneori temporizate, alteori ambigue, dar este cert că guvernul de la Chișinău a dovedit o voință foarte clară în aspirația sa europeană.

Eu nu am să vorbesc nici despre oligarhi, nici despre clasa politică, nu cred că trebuie să facem o dezbatere în alb și negru pentru că Uniunea Europeană esențial trebuie să dea o șansă cetățenilor Republicii Moldova și nu clasei politice. Dacă vrem ca acest popor să aibă o șansă europeană trebuie să îl susținem, să fim riguroși în controlul administrării banilor. Nu trebuie suspendate aceste sume pentru că ele sunt imperios necesare.

Cred că moldovenii și populația Moldovei, oricât ar fi de simplă, oricât de ușor ar fi manipulată, merită această șansă pentru că sunt cu toții cetățeni europeni și noi, când am decis că trebuie să fie alături de noi, am înțeles și am respectat lucrul acesta.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Seveda lahko na Moldavijo gledamo z različnimi očali, odvisno, ali skozi očala opozicije ali s strani nevladnih organizacij. Zadnje dni seveda tudi od nevladnega sektorja dobivamo zelo resna in zaskrbljujoča poročila o stanju v Moldaviji, zlasti glede predvidenih reform, pa ne govorimo o ekonomskih gospodarskih reformah, ki so seveda pomembne za moldavsko perspektivo, ampak predvsem o napovedanih spremembah ustave, spremembah volilnega sistema, ki pa lahko seveda bistveno spremenijo sliko in tudi politični ustroj Moldavije v prihodnosti.

Strinjam se s predhodniki, ki opozarjajo na to, da seveda je Moldaviji potrebno tudi finančno pomagati in jo podpreti v njenih finančnih in gospodarskih reformah. Pri tem pa seveda moramo izraziti resno, resno tudi zaskrbljenost in pa nadzor nad stanjem v pravosodju, na področju svobode medijev in tudi seveda na nek način nadzora nad lastništvom medijev in pa tudi volilnega sistema. Tudi zadnje predsedniške volitve so pokazale kar nekaj odstopanj od standardov, ki jih zagovarjamo v Evropski uniji.

Zato sem prepričan, da je prostora za izboljšave še dovolj in mislim, da Moldavija si zasluži tudi našo pomoč, naše sodelovanje, in pri tem seveda moramo biti zelo strogi in odločni tudi pri zahtevi za nadzor in pa ugotavljanje, kam je izginil denar iz evropskih in pa tudi iz njihovih lastnih skladov.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Kilka lat temu Mołdawia wydawała się liderem w regionie, otwartym na reformy, drogę do Unii, sprawnie wprowadzającym liberalizację wizową, która przyniosła obopólne korzyści. Jak każda młoda demokracja Mołdawia przeżywa chwile dobre, wielkie, jak i doświadcza zagrożeń, popełnia błędy. Istotą odpowiedzialnej polityki jest potęgować szanse rozwojowe i zmniejszać zagrożenia. Dziś niestety widać chmurę zagrożeń dla swobody funkcjonowania organizacji pozarządowych i niezależności mediów, dla sprawności rządu w osiągnięciu reformatorskich celów, dla przejrzystości i zdecydowania w walce z korupcją i zagrożeniem oligarchizacją, dla niezależności sądownictwa, dla modelu ordynacji wyborczej, jego jasności i uczciwości.

Z troską o Mołdawię chcę powiedzieć: wróćcie w pełni na drogę, która prowadzi do Unii Europejskiej i wartości. Mam nadzieję, że ostatni spór o ordynację wyborczą rozwiąże się nie autorytarnie, tylko w zgodzie z wartościami. Wierzę, że przed drugim czytaniem ordynacji wyborczej zostaną dokładnie przeanalizowane i wdrożone uwagi Komisji Weneckiej i że to drugie czytanie będzie się odbywało na zasadzie konsensusu społecznego ze wszystkimi siłami. Trzymam kciuki za silną, mądrą i europejską Mołdawię.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Domnule comisar, stimați colegi, un coleg de al nostru, domnul Auštrevičius, se întreba *quo vadis*, încotro Republica Moldova?

Ar trebui să îi spunem domului Auštrevičius, cu toată stima pentru domnia sa, că noi, Uniunea Europeană și Parlamentul European trebuie să susținem această țară să meargă spre Uniunea Europeană, spre valorile europene și nu spre Est, spre Uniunea Economică Euroasiatică unde vrea s-o ducă domnul Dodon, un președinte de țară care s-ar putea să intre în istorie de partea cenușie, în partea închisă a istoriei acestei țări, ca un șef de stat care, în general, susține lucruri împotriva propriului popor, împotriva propriilor cetățeni.

Locul Republicii Moldova este alături de țările Uniunii Europene. Nu putem stopa finanțarea adresată Republicii Moldova, a asistenței financiare adresate Republicii Moldova, pentru că în acest mod Uniunea Europeană își pierde singurul mod în care poate să influențeze drumul ...

(Președintele a întrerupt discursul vorbitorului.)

Илхан Ключюк (ALDE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, Молдова е част от Източното партньорство и в това си качество има за цел да засили политическото си асоцииране и икономическата си интеграция с Европейския съюз. За съжаление обаче страната продължава да среща сериозни проблеми по пътя си към Европейския съюз.

Различните политически формации в страната продължават да не намират работещи и дългосрочни решения на важните проблеми, а ширещата се корупция и ограничаване на свободата на медиите ерозира държавността. Нарастващото гражданско недоволство и конфронтации между проруските и проевропейските политически сили будят сериозни притеснения за сигурността на страната.

Ето защо призовавам властите в Молдова да се фокусират върху значимите и спешни реформи, посочени в Споразумението за асоцииране от 2014 година. Европейският съюз може да продължава да осигурява финансова и политическа помощ на Молдова, но само при положение, че властите в страната се обвържат трайно с демократичните ценности.

Молдова е важен фактор за стабилността и благополучието на черноморския регион и ние трябва да насърчим и защитим демократичните реформи, основните права и свободи на гражданите в страната и европейското бъдеще на страната.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, Молдова е европейска страна и в последните години направи важни крачки към сближаване с Европейския съюз, изразено в подписването на споразумения за асоцииране и безвизов режим със страните от Съюза.

Но в същото време в страната започнаха да текат процеси, които я отдалечават от демократичните практики, не без силното влияние на Русия. Свободата на медиите започна да се ограничава чрез концентрация на собственост и в резултат на това политическият плюрализъм намаля. Правилно призовавам реформата на изборното законодателство да бъде базирана на необходимото публично обсъждане, заедно с всички политически партии и с гражданското общество, и да бъде чута думата на Венецианската комисия и на Съвета на Европа.

Като докладчик на групата на ЕНП за отпускане на макрофинансовата помощ за Молдова смятам, че не е уместно да се отпуска помощ без никакви условия за реформи и засилване на демократичния капацитет на страната.

Молдова трябва да деполитизира назначенията в държавната администрация, да води ефективна борба с корупцията и разследване на банковите измами, където изчезнаха много публични средства, да даде гаранции за спазване на човешките права и свободи, както и гаранции за независими и плюралистични медии.

Искам да призова Европейската комисия още по-силно да помогнем за това всички молдовски региони и особено тези в южна Молдова, като Гагаузия и Тараклия, където анти-ЕС и проруските настроения са все още много силни, но те са базирани просто на незнание и на създаването на алтернативна реалност чрез пропаганда.

Та моля, г-н Комисар, да засилим нашата комуникационна положителна стратегия за Европейския съюз във всички региони на Молдова, особено в южна Молдова.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Vă mulțumesc, domnule președinte, Uniunea Europeană dorește să ajute cetățenii Republicii Moldova. Pentru asta am alocat 746 milioane EUR fonduri europene, bani din bugetul Uniunii Europene pentru cei șapte ani, 2014–2020.

Mai mult decât atât, în bugetul Uniunii Europene pe anul următor, ca raportor general pentru buget, am spus: cele trei state din vecinătatea estică a Uniunii Europene care au semnat acorduri de asociere cu Uniunea Europeană trebuie să constituie o prioritate pentru bugetul Uniunii Europene.

În plus, suntem pregătiți să acordăm anul acesta încă 100 milioane EUR Republicii Moldova, dar nu putem face asta decât cu îndeplinirea unor condiționalități extrem de clare: combaterea corupției, combaterea spălării banilor, întărirea justiției și buna funcționare a statului de drept. Acestea sunt reforme pe care cetățenii Republicii Moldova le așteaptă. Mai mult de 65% din cetățenii Republicii Moldova consideră că, din păcate, țara lor se îndreaptă într-o direcție greșită.

De aceea, în timp ce noi acordăm fonduri Republicii Moldova, trebuie să ne asigurăm că statul se reformează, că se modernizează, că corespunde așteptărilor cetățenilor Republicii Moldova.

Există, de asemenea, rapoarte ale Curții de Conturi a Uniunii Europene care spun că fondurile europene alocate Republicii Moldova pot fi folosite mai bine.

Domnule comisar Stylianides, legat de reforma sistemului electoral din Republica Moldova ați spus foarte clar: Comisia de la Veneția este autoritatea supremă care să evalueze propunerile de reformă. Eu spun următorul lucru: autoritățile de la Chișinău trebuie să respecte și să implementeze avizul Comisiei de la Veneția. Dacă nu, noi nu vom putea...

(Președintele a întrerupt discursul vorbitorului.)

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal debatu, která tu proběhla. Pane komisaři, na jedné straně já stejně jako vy chci podporovat přiblížování Moldavska k EU. Je to náš politický zájem, to je třeba si otevřeně říci. Je třeba podporovat vazby na Evropu a tím oslabovat vliv Ruska v této zemi. Na druhou stranu, během té debaty tady jasně padla některá fakta, která mě znepokojují. Chování prezidenta Igora Dodona, který je výrazně proruský, který prosazuje některé reformy a např. chce také změnit vlajku Moldavska. Jsou zde věci, jako je samotná vláda, která je výrazně v rukou oligarchů. Je zde jedna miliarda EUR, která se ztratila.

Tedy já jsem pro podporu, jsem i pro finanční podporu, ale prosím velmi obezřetně. Musíme mít jistotu, že opravdu tamní vláda provádí konkrétní reformy, ty reformy vyhodnocovat a pak můžeme uvolnit určité peníze. Jsem pro podporu proevropské opozice, kterou vede paní Maja Sandu, to je podle mě záruka. Tito lidé by mohli navrátit Moldavsko na cestě do Evropy.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you, dear colleagues, for a stimulating debate. I think that we all agree Moldova has made a courageous choice to undertake an ambitious and far-reaching reform agenda. Unfortunately the reform efforts have not yet led to comprehensive implementation, to the tangible results Moldovan citizens have the right to expect. These efforts have to be continuously sustained, and I can assure you that the EU stands ready to continue providing its support to the Moldovan reform path.

That is the reason why we have been preparing an annual action plan for 2017 as well as a new EU multiannual programme 2017–2020 — the so-called single support framework — that will focus on jointly-agreed priorities with a view to strengthening the European visibility and leveraging the impact on the citizens. We have every interest in supporting Moldova in its reform efforts, but ultimately it is above all up to the Moldovan authorities and citizens to own the reform process and to carry out the reforms they deem necessary.

Federica Mogherini and Johannes Hahn will continue to keep you fully apprised of developments in Moldova, and of course we count on your support to our efforts towards Moldova a success story.

(Applause)

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Dominique Martin (ENF), par écrit. – Le 4 mai 2017, la commission du commerce international du Parlement européen (INTA) a soutenu la proposition de la Commission européenne d'octroyer 100 millions d'euros à la Moldavie. Cette somme s'ajoute aux 561 millions d'euros déjà versés pour la période 2007–2013 et qui, pourtant, n'ont pas eu l'effet escompté: une fraude bancaire révélée en 2014 a impliqué plusieurs dirigeants moldaves, dont l'ancien Premier ministre Vlad Filat, qui se seraient fait verser 1 milliard d'euros par trois banques (Savings Bank, Unibank et Banca Sociala). Manifestement, les services responsables de la Commission n'ont pas su éviter cette fraude. Alors que ces fonds pourraient être utiles ailleurs en Europe, nous nous inquiétons que des fonds européens transitent par le Fonds Monétaire International (FMI) et la Banque mondiale, qui définissent de surcroît le programme d'action.

Soucieux de l'indépendance de l'Europe, nous appelons la Commission à refuser toute ingérence d'organisations mondiales basées aux États-Unis.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *în scris*. – Acordarea asistenței financiare pentru Republica Moldova nu trebuie blocată! Aceste fonduri nu sunt pentru politicieni, sunt pentru oameni. Trebuie să ieșim din logica politică și să începem să înțelegem miza acestui ajutor. Vorbim despre capacitatea Uniunii Europene de a înțelege că este timpul să fie pragmatică în relația cu Republica Moldova și să demonstreze că suntem aici pentru a sprijini parcursul acestei țări către dezvoltare, democrație și un viitor european. Fără un astfel de ajutor, partizanii unei îndepărtări a Republicii Moldova de parcursul european vor avea de câștigat și vor folosi acest prilej pentru a critica din nou Uniunea Europeană.

Evident că asistența trebuie să fie acompaniată de reforme importante și structurale care să îmbunătățească viața de zi cu zi a cetățenilor din Republica Moldova, dar nu putem introduce criterii politice în acest sens. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să redevină pro-activă în relația cu Republica Moldova, trebuie să se implice direct la fața locului, să arate beneficiile viitorului european, să fie disponibilă pentru a îndruma decidenții politici pro-europeni în direcția corectă pentru cetățenii pe care îi reprezintă, dar mai ales trebuie să nu uite că acest efort este în primul rând pentru oameni, indiferent de opțiunea lor politică.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Mołdawia od wielu lat podejmuje kroki w kierunku integracji europejskiej. Obywatele Mołdawii, będącej jednym z najbiedniejszych krajów Europy, domagają się poprawy jakości życia oraz przyspieszenia tempa przemian politycznych w kraju. Chociaż Mołdawia została włączona do Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa już w 2004 roku, a 10 lat później, w roku 2014 podpisała z Unią Europejską umowę stowarzyszeniową, to wiele kluczowych problemów w Mołdawii wciąż pozostaje nierozwiązanych. Od polityków opozycyjnych i przedstawicieli niezależnych mediów płyną poważne sygnały, że w Mołdawii nie są szanowane zasady demokracji. Kraj ma problem z zachowaniem integralności terytorialnej w związku z toczącymi się sporami o terytorium Naddniestrza. W związku z koniecznością importu energii elektrycznej przez Mołdawię z terenów Naddniestrza lub Donbasu skutkuje to uzależnieniem od dostaw energii z nieprzewidywalnych, niekontrolowanych źródeł. W połączeniu z niemal całkowitym zdominowaniem mołdawskiego systemu zaopatrzenia gazowego przez rosyjski Gazprom istnieje obawa, że Mołdawia narażona jest na szantaż energetyczny ze strony Rosji. Wpływy rosyjskie ujawniają się także w sektorze medialnym, gdzie większość programów pochodzi z rosyjskich stacji i emituje materiały o antyeuropejskim charakterze. Aby Mołdawia mogła wykonać zdecydowany krok w stronę Europy, konieczne jest powstrzymanie korupcji blokującej gospodarczy rozwój kraju. Najpierw jednak obywatele i rząd muszą jasno zadeklarować pełne poparcie dla europejskich, demokratycznych wartości i stosować je w życiu publicznym Mołdawii.

15. Vuosikertomus 2014 toissijaisuus- ja suhteellisuusperiaatteista (keskustelu)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Sajjad Karim im Namen des Rechtsausschusses über den Jahresbericht 2014 über die Anwendung der Grundsätze der Subsidiarität und der Verhältnismäßigkeit (2015/2283(INI)) (A8-0114/2017).

Sajjad Karim, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, may I start first of all by recognising the tremendous confidence that colleagues have placed in me by supporting my rapporteurship on a continued basis for this file. It is greatly appreciated, bearing in mind the changing political dynamics within the European Union. May I also give due recognition to Commissioner Frans Timmermans for his attitude towards this file and, in particular, for taking on the mantle of 'Europe only where necessary'.

I would like to start by thanking all of my shadow rapporteurs involved in this report who have contributed to the final text, and for allowing it to reach this particular stage with relative ease. It was adopted with a large majority in committee.

I will try to summarise the key points within the report as quickly and efficiently as possible. As is always the case with this annual report, which I have taken the lead on for some years now, it aims to strengthen the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. As laid out in the Treaty of Lisbon, they are guiding principles of the European Union and should always be respected fully. 2014 saw a decrease in the number of reasoned opinions issued by national parliaments, but my report notes that this could be put down to a significant decline in the number of proposals from the Commission. It also draws attention to the fact that justifications of subsidiarity and proportionality by the Commission have, on many occasions, been deemed incomplete or non-existent by some national parliaments. As a result, I have asked the Commission in my report to improve its explanatory statements with a factually-substantiated analysis of its

proposals on subsidiarity and proportionality grounds.

The report refers to the Impact Assessment Board too, as it considered just 32% of impact assessments in 2015 unsatisfactory in relation to analysis of subsidiarity and proportionality. This is the same figure as the year before, which to me shows that in this area there is a need for improvement. The key change in this year's report is that it calls for reasoned opinions to also consider proportionality and not just subsidiarity. I am passionate about that, as determining whether or not legislation is proportionate is often neglected, but it is equally important. This would require a revision of the Treaties, but in my opinion it is a necessity and a greater step towards reducing the democratic deficit.

I am pleased that groups supported my recommendation for an evaluation of the number of national parliaments required for a yellow card to be triggered. I think it is a good idea for the status quo to be questioned once in a while, and for us to step back and consider whether the thresholds are appropriate. Furthermore, I have called for proportionality tests to be able to discard proposals with disproportionate burdens on competitiveness and SMEs. This is crucial for business back home, regardless of the Member State, if they are to remain competitive.

There are also proposals for an extension of the time limit for national parliaments to submit opinions which could be carried out by secondary legislation and subsequently incorporated into the next treaty revision. I think it is important to take into account the fact that there are instances where national parliaments simply cannot present a reasoned opinion in the timeframe – in cases of a natural disaster, for example.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am here in this debate on behalf of my dear colleague First Vice-President Frans Timmermans. First of all, and on behalf of the Vice-President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Karim, for his excellent report on the Commission's report for 2014 on subsidiarity and proportionality.

Subsidiarity and proportionality must be at the heart of the European democratic process. They are key to our objective of being big on the big things and small on the small things. The Commission has committed itself to give real effect to the principle of subsidiarity. We want to work with the national parliaments and EU institutions to ensure that every proposal complies with that principle. Last year Parliament, the Council and the Commission signed the interinstitutional agreement on better lawmaking. The Commission is pleased that all the institutions have committed to ensuring that subsidiarity must remain a key element throughout the legislative procedure.

Turning to some of the suggestions in the Karim report, the report calls on the Commission to reflect on its relations with national parliaments in general and specifically as regards subsidiarity scrutiny. The Juncker Commission pledged to forge a new partnership with national parliaments. Halfway through the Commission mandate, Members of the Commission have had more than 550 meetings with national parliaments – 550 meetings. These meetings give members of the Commission a possibility to explain what we do and why we do it. They also allow us to listen to the concerns of national parliaments and their citizens. The Commission will continue engaging with national parliaments for the rest of its mandate, for our mandate.

The report also calls on the Commission to reflect on possible changes to the subsidiarity control mechanisms, for instance through a political agreement between the institutions. The Commission is always open to discussing new ways of working together, but we must do it while respecting the existing treaties and the institutional balance which is laid down therein.

I am much more in favour of pragmatic workable approaches where possible and where they respect the treaties. An example of a pragmatic approach also supported in the report is the idea that national parliaments should be able to invite the Commission to table a proposal for new or attendant legislation, the so-called 'green card mechanism'.

The Commission supports this initiative, and is pleased it has already become the practice without setting up new institutional and administrative structures. For instance, 18 parliamentary chambers in 2015 submitted an initiative on food waste to the Commission. Some of the suggestions in the initiative on Food donation, data collection and monitoring were reflected in the Circular Economy package adopted in December 2015. This example shows that national parliaments can play a constructive role and that the Commission is ready to discuss constructive suggestions from national parliaments.

Let me conclude by reassuring all Members that the Commission will make sure that subsidiarity and proportionality remain at the heart of the European democratic process.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski, autor projektu opinii Komisji Spraw Konstytucyjnych. – Panie Przewodniczący! Koleżanki i koledzy! Bardzo serdecznie dziękuję panu posłowi Karimowi za bogate i pełne rekomendacji sprawozdanie. Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych podziela większość jego diagnoz i rekomendacji.

Rzeczywiście istotą rzeczy jest to, byśmy uczynili zasadę pomocniczości i powiązaną z nią zasadę proporcjonalności bardziej skutecznymi niż dotąd. Potrzebne zatem jest przyjęcie rekomendacji, wydłużenie ośmiotygodniowego terminu dla parlamentów narodowych na wyrażenie opinii, rozważenie zielonej, a także czerwonej kartki, dlatego że żółta kartka jest w kryzysie, jest rzadko stosowana, a nawet wtedy, kiedy jest stosowana, Komisja nie zawsze odpowiada na argumenty parlamentów narodowych.

Kluczowy jest realny dialog polityczny i pan komisarz ma rację, deklarując skuteczne stosowanie tej inicjatywy, ale to oznacza także gotowość do tego, by Komisja faktycznie wycofywała się wtedy, kiedy w dialogu z nią parlamenty narodowe mają rację.

Tadeusz Zwiefka, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Przede wszystkim chciałem po raz kolejny podziękować koledze Karimowi. To jest przykład zawsze doskonałej współpracy, pokazujący, że spokojnie i bez specjalnych emocji, ale za to bardzo konkretnie możemy uzyskać produkt finalny, który rzeczywiście stanowi krok do przodu w trudnej kwestii współpracy Parlamentu Europejskiego z parlamentami narodowymi.

My zawsze bardzo chętnie podkreślamy, że ta współpraca jest niezbędna, że powinniśmy ją pogłębiać, że parlamenty narodowe powinny być bardziej włączane w proces legislacyjny. To są dobre zobowiązania. Praktyka niestety jest nieco inna, i tego dotyczą sugestie zawarte w sprawozdaniu kolegi Karima, przyjętym bardzo dużą większością w Komisji Prawnej.

Cieszę się z informacji, którą przekazał pan komisarz, dotyczącej konsultacji przeprowadzonych przez członków kolegium z parlamentami narodowymi oraz zapowiedzi kolejnych konsultacji, dlatego że wyniki tych konsultacji powinny znaleźć swój wyraz w rzeczywistej zmianie relacji pomiędzy tym, co czynimy na poziomie wspólnotowym a tym co w efekcie jest wdrażane w państwach członkowskich, bowiem to państwa członkowskie wdrażają uchwalane przez nas prawo. I im szybciej i głębiej będą zaangażowane parlamenty, tym szybciej i skuteczniej będą przekładać (przynajmniej jeśli idzie o dyrektywy) przepisy, które my tutaj tworzymy, na forum krajowe. Dlatego bardzo serdecznie dziękuję za te zapowiedzi oraz za dotychczasowe wystąpienia, gdyż idą one w kierunku, który jest przez moją grupę polityczną bardzo pożądany.

Mady Delvaux, au nom du groupe S&D. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais d'abord remercier Monsieur Karim – notre rapporteur sur le rapport 2014 sur la subsidiarité et la proportionnalité – non seulement pour la qualité de son rapport, mais aussi pour sa disponibilité et son ouverture qui ont permis de trouver un large accord entre partis politiques.

La subsidiarité et la proportionnalité sont des principes fondamentaux de l'Union européenne – tout le monde en convient. Mais parfois, sur certains sujets, il peut être difficile de définir le niveau approprié d'action entre l'Union et les États membres. C'est pourquoi nous saluons les mesures de l'accord «Mieux légiférer» adopté en mai 2015, qui prévoit des explications plus détaillées sur la subsidiarité et la proportionnalité, ce qui devrait améliorer la qualité des échanges.

Les deux principes doivent toutefois être appliqués de façon équilibrée. Il convient de trouver un équilibre entre l'efficacité de l'action de l'Union, d'une part, et les sensibilités nationales, d'autre part. La subsidiarité ne doit pas servir de prétexte pour empêcher des avancées de l'Union européenne; elle doit également respecter les particularités des États membres.

Il convient aussi de trouver un équilibre entre une démarche descendante et une démarche ascendante. Il ne s'agit pas de remettre en question le droit d'initiative de la Commission européenne, ni les prérogatives du Conseil des ministres et du Parlement européen en tant que colégislateurs, mais il est important d'associer les parlements nationaux, en tant qu'émanation de l'opinion publique de leur État membre, à l'élaboration des politiques communes. En fait, les parlements nationaux ont déjà beaucoup de possibilités pour faire entendre leur voix. Au niveau national, en donnant leur point de vue à leurs ministres, qui siègent au Conseil des ministres, mais aussi en répondant aux consultations publiques ouvertes par les institutions européennes ou en donnant leur avis sur les livres blancs et les livres verts, soit individuellement, soit lors des réunions interparlementaires.

Nous pouvons aller plus loin et envisager l'introduction d'un carton vert. Aujourd'hui, les parlements nationaux ont la possibilité de s'opposer à une mesure législative au moyen du carton jaune, ce qui donne souvent à penser que l'Union européenne est une menace pour les États membres. Le carton vert, en revanche, permettrait aux parlements nationaux de suggérer des initiatives à la Commission, ce qui ferait d'eux des acteurs engagés et proactifs de la construction européenne et l'amélioration de son fonctionnement.

En conclusion, ce rapport est positif et je suis ravie de pouvoir le soutenir.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Wielce szanowni państwo! Oczywiście przyłączam się do tych podziękowań dla pana Karima, bowiem zasady pomocniczości i proporcjonalności to dwie zasady, które skutecznie bronią Unii Europejskiej przed wszechwładzą administracji brukselskiej.

Bardzo się cieszę z tego, co powiedział pan komisarz, że zrobi wszystko, żeby te zasady były w Unii przestrzegane. Niestety w praktyce głos parlamentów narodowych bywa często ignorowany. Tak było między innymi z żółtą kartką, kiedy jedenaście państw zgłosiło swoje wątpliwości co do dyrektywy o delegowaniu pracowników, a odpowiedź Komisji na wątpliwości co do zgodności tych propozycji z zasadą pomocniczości była zdecydowanie powierzchowna i nieadekwatna do skali zastrzeżeń.

Silniejsze włączenie parlamentów narodowych spowoduje, że to, co my tutaj uchwalamy, będzie lepsze, bardziej zrozumiałe i szybciej implementowane w poszczególnych krajach Unii.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I must say that as a fan of better regulation I read the report with some interest. While I am not an ALDE shadow, I can fully subscribe to it. I also endorse the recommendations that my distinguished colleague, Karim, has put forward. To be honest, I do have doubts about the last one, which is to say the extension of the consultation period. It has pros and cons, and it is a question of personal preferences, but I would say that while one can envisage it, I can also see certain downsides.

What I would like to underline is that in the report – and this is a well-known fact and I will be concrete by referring to paragraphs 7 and 8 – we talk about the justification of subsidiarity and proportionality being incomplete or, indeed, non-existent. At least that is the complaint of the Member States. But there is also the well-known figure that the Impact Assessment Board considers 32% of the impact assessments reviewed in 2014 on these issues to be unsatisfactory, and our rapporteur says that these rates have not improved. Well, I must say that not only have they not improved, but down the line there has been no progress, and I think that every single impact assessment has to be thorough on this. We cannot speak of better regulation unless this figure is zero or close to zero. So this is one point I would like to underline.

The second point is – and this is also mentioned in the report – that we rightly want to have greater involvement of the national parliaments. But, at the same time, I think that in 2014 only 15 chambers had utilised the potential. The rapporteur's explanation is that this is maybe because of mandates reaching their end, but the fact is that we need also to place more emphasis and – let us say – pressure on the national parliaments.

Final remark: I agree with the green card, but I would love the European Parliament also to have a green card in the future.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση για την εφαρμογή των αρχών της επικουρικότητας και της αναλογικότητας το έτος 2014 έρχεται με μεγάλη καθυστέρηση και εξαντλείται σε τυπικότητες σχετικές με τη συμμετοχή των εθνικών κοινοβουλίων στη νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι βασικές αυτές αρχές του δικαίου της Ένωσης παραβιάζονται όμως, μέσω των προγραμμάτων λιτότητας που επιβάλλονται στα υπερχρεωμένα κράτη μέλη όπως η Ελλάδα. Η επικουρικότητα παραβιάζεται επειδή τα προγράμματα αυτά δεν αρκούνται στη διατύπωση δημοσιονομικών στόχων, αφήνοντας τον τρόπο επίτευξής τους στο ενδιαφερόμενο κράτος μέλος, αλλά υπαγορεύουν και τα μέσα επίτευξής των στόχων και μάλιστα σε πεδία εκτός της δημοσιονομικής διαχείρισης, όπως η απορρύθμιση της αγοράς εργασίας. Και η αναλογικότητα

παραβιάζεται επειδή επιβάλλεται υπέρμετρη δόση λιτότητας, με αποτέλεσμα να προκαλείται ύφεση και ανεργία με καταστρεπτικές κοινωνικές συνέπειες. Η Ένωση πρέπει να αλλάξει πορεία και να εφαρμόσει έμπρακτα τις αρχές της.

Marie-Christine Boutonnet, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, le rapport de mon collègue Karim contient les observations suivantes: «quelques parlements ont souligné que, dans certaines propositions législatives de la Commission, la justification de la subsidiarité et de la proportionnalité est incomplète, voire inexistante».

Ce constat est le même que dans les 20e, 19e et 18e rapports. Dans celui-ci, une différence seulement: plus d'inquiétude, plus de préoccupation, mais une simple observation.

Depuis 2010, absolument rien n'a changé. Malgré les interpellations des parlements nationaux, la Commission, avec l'assentiment de ce Parlement, continue de traiter avec indifférence et mépris ce principe pourtant reconnu comme fondamental par le Conseil européen dans sa déclaration d'Édimbourg de 1992.

Ce type de rapport ne présente donc aucun intérêt, hormis celui de donner des gages purement fictifs d'amélioration de ce principe. Preuve est encore faite que ce Parlement n'a que peu d'intérêt pour le respect des compétences des États membres et, par là même, des peuples européens et de la démocratie.

J'appelle donc les parlements nationaux à user pleinement des moyens mis à leur disposition par le protocole numéro 2, à s'investir davantage dans le COSAC et à utiliser tous les moyens politiques appropriés afin de faire respecter ce principe de subsidiarité.

Enfin, les citoyens nationaux doivent interpellier leurs parlementaires sur ce sujet fondamental. Ils ne doivent pas oublier que l'Union européenne appartient aux États membres et aux parlements nationaux, et qu'elle est donc leur propriété.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte kurz die Gelegenheit nutzen: Wir sind sehr spät in der Zeit. Wir haben bei dem *catch-the-eye*-Verfahren allerdings später noch nicht so viele Wortmeldungen. Ich will aber ausdrücklich sagen, dass das *catch-the-eye*-Verfahren nicht dafür da ist, dass man sich vorsorglich für alle *catch-the-eye* meldet und dann bei der Debatte munter eintrifft, wie es gerade so ist. Also das *catch-the-eye*-Verfahren ist hauptsächlich für diejenigen, die keine Redezeit haben und die Debatte verfolgen. Das werde ich im Folgenden berücksichtigen.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Výslednou podobu zprávy považuji za dobrý výsledek diskuse ve Výboru pro právní záležitosti a budu hlasovat pro její přijetí.

Mám za to, že princip subsidiarity a princip proporcionality by měly především zajistit efektivní správu věcí veřejných v EU. Tato jejich role je nezastupitelná, ale zároveň jsem toho názoru, že nejsou tím zásadním nástrojem, jehož prostřednictvím bychom mohli zvyšovat důvěru občanů v evropskou integraci.

Subsidiarita bývá spojována také s voláním po posílení role národních parlamentů. To se ale nesmí dít za cenu oslabování role EP. Voláme-li po dodržování subsidiarity, mohli bychom také začít sami u sebe. I EP je vázán dělbou pravomocí mezi EU a členské státy, nicméně i zde někdy probíhají diskuse na témata, která EU nepřislúší.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zasady pomocniczości i proporcjonalności stanowią integralny element kształtowania polityki Unii Europejskiej. Pozwalają na określenie, kiedy Unia ma kompetencje do tworzenia prawa oraz przyczyniają się do podejmowania decyzji w myśl zasady „jak najbliżej obywateli”. Innymi słowy pozwalają stwierdzić, kiedy prawdziwy postęp można osiągnąć tylko na szczeblu europejskim, a kiedy kraj sam sobie poradzi z zaistniałym problemem.

Tegoroczne sprawozdanie w sprawie pomocniczości i proporcjonalności wykazało, że w 2014 roku Komisja otrzymała od parlamentów państw członkowskich 21 uzasadnionych opinii dotyczących 15 wniosków, co stanowi spadek o 76 % w stosunku do liczby dokumentów otrzymanych w 2013 roku. W poprzednich latach odnotowywaliśmy zatem dużo większe zaangażowanie parlamentów narodowych w europejski proces legislacyjny. Ta znacząco niższa liczba uzasadnionych opinii nie świadczy jednak o utracie zainteresowania zasadą pomocniczości przez parlamenty państw członkowskich, ale o spadku całkowitej liczby wniosków złożonych przez Komisję Europejską pod koniec jej kadencji. W latach 2012 i 2013 próg wymagany do wszczęcia procedury tzw. żółtej kartki osiągnano każdego roku, podczas gdy w 2014 ani razu nie wszczęto procedury żółtej czy też pomarańczowej kartki. Przyjęty 19 maja 2015 roku pakiet środków na rzecz lepszego stanowienia prawa, by przepisy Unii Europejskiej lepiej służyły jej obywatelom, ocenimy jednak

dopiero w przyszłorocznym sprawozdaniu. Mechanizm kontroli zasady pomocniczości ma kluczowe znaczenie dla współpracy między instytucjami europejskimi i krajowymi.

Na koniec pragnę pogratulować sprawozdawcy bardzo dobrze przygotowanego i bardzo wyważonego dokumentu.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Dank u wel, voorzitter. Subsidiariteit en proportionaliteit zijn twee belangrijke beginselen in de Europese Unie die te allen tijde gewaarborgd moeten worden. Het verslag bevat hiervoor een aantal zeer goede elementen, zoals de vraag naar meer uitgebreide en feitelijk onderbouwde analyses van wetsvoorstellen in termen van subsidiariteit en proportionaliteit.

Waar ik wel een probleem mee heb is het pleidooi voor – ik citeer – “meer en niet minder Europa om de interne en externe uitdagingen te kunnen aangaan”. Ik denk dat de Brexit en de opkomst van extreme partijen aantonen dat Europa meer in een andere richting moet gaan, dat we naar een Europa moeten gaan met draagvlak bij de burgers. Daarom vind ik het jammer dat niet de weg wordt gebaad voor een rode kaart die de nationale en regionale parlementen de mogelijkheid moet geven om wetsvoorstellen definitief ongedaan te maken. Dank u wel.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, le rapport annuel 2014 sur la subsidiarité et la proportionnalité est un modèle de langue de bois. Il salue, par exemple, dès son point numéro 1, «le souci permanent de respecter ces deux principes» alors que dans les faits, ils sont sans cesse violés.

Cette triste réalité transparaît dans le point numéro 8, qui avoue piteusement que, dans 32 % des cas, l'analyse par la Commission des principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité est insuffisante.

D'autres passages indiquent que la procédure du carton jaune, qui permet aux parlements nationaux de protester contre une initiative de la Commission, est presque entièrement inefficace.

Le rapport ne propose aucune réelle solution pour améliorer le respect de la volonté des parlements nationaux. Le mécanisme du carton vert, dont il suggère la création, ne résoudra rien car il préserve intégralement le pouvoir discrétionnaire de la Commission. Seule la consécration d'un pouvoir de veto, reconnu à chaque État membre, serait de nature à respecter la souveraineté nationale, mais le rapport ne l'envisage pas réellement, car l'Union européenne est à cent lieues de l'Europe des nations, que j'appelle de mes vœux.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, принципът на субсидиарност има за цел да доближи Европейския съюз до гражданите, като гарантира, че се предприемат действия на местно равнище, когато това е необходимо. Това се отнася до всички институции на Съюза и има особено практическо значение в рамките на законодателните процедури.

Именно днес е особено важно да създаваме солидно европейско законодателство по въпросите, по които Европейският съюз може да постигне истински напредък и да даде добавена стойност. В тази връзка Европейската комисия трябва да подобри обяснителните меморандуми на своите законодателни предложения, като винаги представя подробен, изчерпателен и фактически обоснован анализ на предложенията си от гледна точка на субсидиарността и пропорционалността, което би подпомогнало националните парламенти при разглеждане на тези предложения.

Националните парламенти в ролята си на представители на европейските граждани на национално равнище също трябва да засилят своята важна роля в преодоляването на различията между европейските институции и обществеността. Националните парламенти могат да търсят начини да играят по-положителна и проактивна роля по европейските въпроси. Ето защо идеята за използване на процедурата за „зелен картон“, съгласно която националните парламенти биха могли да задействат европейските законодателни процеси и по този начин да изпълняват гравитна роля в европейското законотворчество, е добро решение.

В заключение искам да подчертая, че принципите на субсидиарност и на пропорционалност са неразделна част от формулирането на политики и установяването на това дали действията на Европейския съюз могат да постигнат целите на политиките по-добре, отколкото националните или регионални инициативи.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já jsem tuto zprávu podrobně prostudoval, protože jsem byl v ČR na národní úrovni odpovědný za legislativu, tak mě samozřejmě z profesního zájmu zajímá, co tato zpráva obsahuje.

Chci konstatovat, že pro mě je toto důležitá zpráva. Subsidiarita a proporcionalita nejsou pouze jen nějaké technické termíny, ale tyto termíny jasně ukazují, jaký má být rozsah EU, její legislativy, co všechno máme evropskými právními předpisy upravovat. Já musím ve svém volebním okrsku v ČR vysvětlovat občanům, proč určitou věc upravuje evropské právo, proč je vhodnější, aby ji upravovalo evropské právo, a nikoli např. pouze práva národní. Proto mě mrzí, že tyto velmi důležité zprávy přicházejí na stůl Parlamentu relativně pozdě. Projednáváme zprávu z roku 2014 a těžko ty důsledky, které ta zpráva přináší, můžeme tedy rychle aplikovat do praxe.

Jinak stejně jako moji kolegové musím říci, že jsem sledoval, že dochází k poklesu odůvodněných stanovisek jednotlivých národních parlamentů. Budu doufat, že je to dáno tím, že jsme měli v roce 2014 méně legislativy a že tedy neklesá zájem národních parlamentů o to zasahovat do přijímání evropského práva, evropských právních předpisů.

Co je důležité a na to prosím dbejme, je to, že národní parlamenty často argumentují tím, že odůvodnění jednotlivých směrnic není dostatečné, že to odůvodnění, zda subsidiarita a proporcionalita je splněna, není dostatečné. Z toho by si Komise měla vzít ponaučení.

Der Präsident. – Beim nun folgenden *Catch-the-eye-Verfahren* ist die einzige Wortmeldung, die ich berücksichtigen werde, die von Herrn Kollegen Hayes.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Brian Hayes (PPE). – Mr President, I want to congratulate Mr Karim for his report. I think how we address the question of subsidiarity and proportionality is a really important issue. This Commission has done an awful lot more than previous Commissions in addressing the question of better regulation.

I think the inclusion of impact assessments is absolutely essential. I would like to see more impact assessments done on a Member State by Member State level and that requires, of course, the Commission to work with the authorities in those Member States to produce the evidence.

I think we would have a much greater involvement of national parliaments if we saw a specific impact assessment Member State by Member State, rather than a generic impact assessment across the 28 Member States of the European Union.

I also think the idea of a green card is a good idea. I think it sends a very positive signal towards the institutions to do much more, and I would agree with other colleagues that we, in this Parliament, should adopt that procedure. We cannot criticise other Member State parliaments when we ourselves encroach on their space, and I think we regularly do that in reports and initiatives which have nothing to do with EU law and everything to do with national law.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχω ζητήσει με τη διαδικασία *catch-the-eye* να μιλήσω στο θέμα αυτό. Ήδη έχω δώσει σχετικό σημείωμα στη γραμματεία εδώ και τέσσερις ώρες. Πριν λίγο, όταν ήρθα, έκανα σήμα στη γραμματεία και ξαναεπιβεβαίωσα ότι ήθελα να μιλήσω. Δεν καταλαβαίνω για ποιο λόγο δεν παίρνω τον λόγο στο *catch-the-eye* στο θέμα αυτό.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Marias! Ich habe angedeutet, dass wir sehr spät in der Zeit sind. Ich bin nicht verpflichtet, den ursprünglichen Slot auch voll auszunutzen, und genau darin, wie Sie sagen, liegt das Problem. Sie haben sich vor vier Stunden angemeldet – das *catch-the-eye-Verfahren* ist eigentlich dazu da, dass man sich während der Debatte zu Wort meldet und ich persönlich habe jedenfalls die Praxis, dass ich die Kollegen, die während der gesamten Debatte da sind, berücksichtigt. Ich habe gesehen, wann Sie hereingekommen sind. Der Kollege Hayes war am Anfang der Debatte da und hat sich zu Wort gemeldet. Sie waren nicht zum Anfang der Debatte da – wir drei haben das gesehen –, und deshalb werden Sie nicht berücksichtigt. Es spricht jetzt Herr Kommissar Stylianides. Ich nehme keine weitere Wortmeldung zur Geschäftsordnung an.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you so much for this interesting debate and, of course, for your comments, for your suggestions and for your questions on this very important topic. As I already said, I am here on behalf of Vice-President Frans Timmermans, my dear colleague, and I would like you to know that all Commissioners remain at your service to discuss the subsidiarity and proportionality aspects of proposals tabled by the Commission. Once again I wish to thank the rapporteur, and all the Members involved, for this excellent report. Thank you very much for your attention.

Sajjad Karim, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I will indeed be brief: you have indulged me more than enough earlier in proceedings today and I am obliged to you for that. I wish merely to finish off by saying the following: that this is not, and never was intended to be, a navel-gazing exercise. This is about the future of democracy in Europe, throughout Europe, for each and every one of our citizens. I only wish that we had had proper procedures in place many, many years before. It is quite clear that our national governments cherry-pick when it comes to Europe. When we provide something good and positive, they claim it for themselves and they say they have delivered this. When we deal with something that is a tricky proposition to sell before constituents, they automatically say: ‘this is from Europe and nothing to do with us’. And when you have that level of verging-on-almost-dishonesty in our political system, is it any wonder that today we find ourselves where we are?

Just on a personal basis, I have led on this file with the confidence of colleagues now for many, many years here in this House. I rather suspect this will be the last time that I do so, because of the particular dynamics in terms of the UK situation, and it is a matter of great personal regret for me that, based upon the lack of truly democratic transparency for our citizens, my country finds itself in this particular situation today. But of course, I wish all of my colleagues well. I will watch from afar as this Union deepens and strengthens, I hope, always remembering that at some stage I tried to play a constructive role whilst I was here.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Karim, für Ihre Worte. Ich bin sicher, dass es nicht das letzte Mal war, dass Sie hier gesprochen haben.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 17. Mai 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Mireille D’Ornano (ENF), *par écrit*. – Les principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité sont au fondement de la construction européenne. L’article 5, paragraphe 2 du TUE ainsi que le protocole n° 2 sur l’application de ces principes prévoient un certain nombre de mécanismes de contrôle.

Le rapport initial proposait l’instauration d’un nouveau mécanisme de carton rouge des parlements nationaux. Il a été défendu par ma collègue Marie-Christine Boutonnet lors des débats en commission JURI. Un carton vert permettrait quant à lui aux parlements nationaux de proposer le rejet ou la modification d’un texte législatif.

J’avais, pour ma part, défendu le carton vert dans mon rapport titulaire pour avis, en commission ENVI, sur la proportionnalité et la subsidiarité. Ce carton vert permettrait une participation constructive des parlements nationaux. Malheureusement, mon rapport a été rejeté par la plupart des députés de la commission ENVI, sur des considérations partisans.

Je regrette cette attitude, a fortiori sur une question institutionnelle aussi sérieuse. La situation n’a pas évolué, puisque ce rapport précise que 32 % des analyses d’impact révèlent une application insuffisante du principe de subsidiarité.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), *por escrito*. – El informe que se pretende aprobar es un informe de propia iniciativa (INI) que realiza la comisión JURI para valorar el informe que lanzó la Comisión Europea sobre la aplicación del principio de subsidiariedad y proporcionalidad en el año 2014. Dicho informe muestra que en 2014 la Comisión registró una notable disminución del número de dictámenes. Sin embargo, esta reducción debe considerarse en el contexto de una disminución del número de propuestas presentadas por la Comisión al final de su mandato y no como indicación de un interés decreciente de los Parlamentos nacionales en materia de subsidiariedad.

El informe aprobado en la comisión JURI es un buen acuerdo. Es un texto equilibrado que pone el acento en la importancia de garantizar una correcta aplicación de estos principios, que son fundamentales para el correcto funcionamiento de la UE y deben ser el punto de partida para la elaboración de las políticas europeas. Ambos principios están recogidos en el artículo 5 del Tratado de la Unión Europea, consagrándose como principios esenciales en el marco del proceso de toma de decisiones europeas. Estos principios son un instrumento que permite dotar de legitimidad democrática y eficiencia a las acciones desarrolladas por la UE.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Θεωρούμε τη συζήτηση για την αρχή της επικουρικότητας και της αναλογικότητας πολλή σημαντική. Σε σχέση με την αρχή της επικουρικότητας επισημαίνουμε ότι αποτελεί σημαντική αρχή που συμβάλει ούτως ώστε οι αποφάσεις της ΕΕ να λαμβάνονται εγγύτερα στους πολίτες. Κατά αυτόν το τρόπο οι αρχές της τοπικής και περιφερειακής αυτοδιοίκησης όπως και τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια πρέπει να διαδραματίσουν σημαντικό ρόλο στην ίδια τη λειτουργία της ΕΕ. Με τον τρόπο αυτό ενισχύεται η δημοκρατική λειτουργία του ευρωπαϊκού εγχειρήματος και ενισχύεται η τάση αποκέντρωσης των εξουσιών. Τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια με το σχετικό πρωτόκολλο της Συνθήκης της Λισσαβόνας αποκτούν τα γνωστά δικαιώματα της κίτρινης και πορτοκαλί κάρτας τα οποία, εάν και δεν τα ασκούν συχνά, εντούτοις αποτελούν δικαιώματα που μετατρέπουν τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια σε σημαντικούς παίκτες στο πεδίο του ενωσιακού γίγνεσθαι. Επιπλέον, με την πρόταση για τη λεγόμενη πράσινη κάρτα, τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια θα μπορούσαν να εμπλακούν και στη διαδικασία άσκησης νομοθετικής πρωτοβουλίας ζητώντας κατά αυτόν τον τρόπο από την Επιτροπή να αναλάβει συγκεκριμένη νομοθετική δράση στα πεδία για τα οποία τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια θα κρίνουν κάθε φορά κατά πόσο χρειάζεται εμπλοκή της ίδιας της Ένωσης.

16. FinTech: teknologian vaikutus rahoitusalan tulevaisuuteen (keskustelu)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Cora van Nieuwenhuizen im Namen des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung über Finanztechnologie: Einfluss der Technologie auf die Zukunft des Finanzsektors (2016/2243(INI)) (A8-0176/2017).

Cora van Nieuwenhuizen, rapporteur. – Mr President, new technologies are rapidly changing the nature of the financial infrastructure around the globe. This presents massive opportunities for Europe and it is now up to us, the policymakers, to make the right choices and create a conducive environment so that Europe can benefit to the full extent.

FinTech is often used to refer to a specific scenario of start-ups disrupting finance with innovation. This definition is not the one used in our report because it would exclude a large number of relevant actors. Instead FinTech may be understood as finance enabled by new technologies covering the whole range of financial services, products and infrastructure. It also includes InsureTech, the use of new technologies in insurance, and RegTech, the application of new technologies for regulatory compliance.

The current rise of FinTech comes after the origination of a number of different technological developments within a short time span, namely artificial intelligence, cloud computing and distributed ledger technology. These provide new opportunities for disruptions like mobile payments, open banking, crowdfunding, crypto currencies and robo advice. FinTech can lead to significant benefits such as cost reductions, efficiency gains, and more transparency. It can also be an effective tool for financial inclusion, opening up high-level services for those who could not afford them before. Furthermore, FinTech can enable cross-border financial flows and infrastructure through alternative lending and investment channels.

The FinTech revolution that we are currently experiencing is global. In recent years, global FinTech investments have soared. The bulk of these investments was made in the United States, and Asia and Israel are also gearing up in this respect. The US, China and Israel host more than half of the top ten largest FinTech companies. If Europe wants to remain competitive, rapid innovation should be the norm, not the exception. This is not only important for Europe's financial infrastructure, but also for the real economy, with consumers and businesses benefiting from improved financial services.

Notwithstanding all the benefits, FinTech also confronts us with essential questions of a regulatory, societal nature. Consumer protection and the stability of the financial system should be key concerns in this regard. Together with the competitiveness of the European economy, they make for the core priorities of this report. The report does not intend to give technical solutions. However, it does intend to pose the right questions. That should be a first step in the process of creating a forward-looking European policy in the area of financial technologies.

The intention of this report is not to propose specific legislative actions. We must be cautious with creating new rules because much is still unclear about future developments of financial technologies. A better point of departure is investigating where current legislation causes uncertainties or barriers and identifying where additional action is necessary. Doing this purposefully requires a holistic approach, as technological developments in our digitising society call for breaking silos. FinTech actors are already breaking silos themselves. They often offer products in a diverse multi-party conjunction.

I have some minutes left at the end and will use the time then. I am sure that a lot of the things that I want to say will be said by my colleagues, the shadow rapporteurs.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you and congratulate the rapporteur, Ms van Nieuwenhuizen, for the report on FinTech, which is both timely and comprehensive on the issues it raises. Technological innovation on finance is advancing. In terms of expenditure, the financial sector is by far the largest IT sector of our economy. An estimated one-fifth of all IT expenditure globally takes place within the financial sector.

The Commission is looking to promote a thriving and globally competitive European financial sector as part of the Digital Single Market. Both individual consumers and firms stand to benefit from FinTech opportunities, through a greater access to financial services, more choice and a more competitive landscape. When we look to the development of the Capital Markets Union, we must look at how digitalisation can contribute to this goal. FinTech affects all financial sectors and all its components, involving companies both large and small. I would like to highlight four areas that are reflected in your report and that we will also raise in our ongoing public consultation on FinTech.

First, FinTech can be an important driver to expand access to financial services for both consumers and businesses. For providers of financial services it can facilitate access to new and broader customer bases. It can also be an important tool for financial inclusion, while we must not overlook those that are not digitally connected. It can increase efficiency and reduce operating costs – means of generation and distribution of services – and also in terms of meeting regulatory and compliance requirements. Technological innovation can enhance the single market, overcoming obstacles such as location or distance, and enhancing competition by lowering barriers to entry.

Data integrity and security are also essential to ensure market confidence. The report notes that cybersecurity should be a top priority. The WannaCry ransomware cyber-attack in recent days demonstrates why cybersecurity is so important. On this occasion the financial sector was not specifically targeted, but an innovative financial tool – in this case, Bitcoin – was used as a conduit for the requested ransom. We must recognise that, aside from offering advantages and opportunities, technological innovations may also present new tools, enabling the use of our financial system for illicit purposes.

This is why the Commission proposed to include virtual currency exchanges and custodian wallet providers as obliged entities in the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. Requiring these entities to identify their customers is an important step towards tackling the anonymous use of these instruments for illicit purposes. Maintaining security is a constant objective and we must ensure that our efforts to preserve security go hand-in-hand with technological developments.

The appearance of new services and technologies may raise questions about how to apply the regulatory framework in ways which permit benefits to be reaped, while at the same time ensuring that any use risks are appropriately mitigated. Technology-enabled finance requires new skills, new expertise and, possibly, new approaches and attitudes, not only for firms but also for customers, regulators and supervisors. Only if regulators and supervisors are familiar with those new technologies and business models can they identify both the risks and opportunities they present.

When deciding on the appropriate response to the challenge of rapidly evolving digital technology we should avoid seeking to capture today's technology in rules and regulations that may become obsolete tomorrow. A considered approach is called for and this is why we have set up a taskforce of experts drawn from different parts of the Commission who are studying the digitalisation of finance attentively.

Our approach is guided by three overarching principles, which are also reflected in your report, namely: technological neutrality – the same activity should be subject to the same regulation irrespective of the technology used,

regulations should not give preference to one technology over another; proportionality – regulations should reflect the business model size, significance, complexity and, ultimately, the risk; and integrity in terms of transparency, security or the use of data. These are just some of areas I would like to highlight from your report.

In conclusion, we remain attentive to developments, identifying actions which promote and encourage innovation in financial services and ensuring that Europe remains an attractive and dynamic environment for financial services.

Dita Charanzová, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Mr President, I can only agree. FinTech is having a transformative impact on how we live and work. FinTech is all about consumer benefits and empowerment. In fact, consumers are the driving force behind the rise of FinTechs, thanks to the increased accessibility, cost reductions and transparency. At the same time, for businesses, Fin Tech means the benefits of efficiency gains, better data management and tailored services for each client. Even governments are able to take advantage of alternative funding pathways to grant funding support for cultural institutions and other civil projects. In total, this is good for everyone – consumers, citizens and businesses alike. But for all this to work, consumers need confidence and trust in this digital revolution. We need a solid cyber security system to be put in place, along with safeguards and effective measures against potential risks and the complex challenges of the financial world.

Brian Hayes, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, as the EPP shadow rapporteur for this file, I want to congratulate the rapporteur for the excellent work done. The rapporteur has involved people in this process from the start. I also want to say that this is one of the most important debates this Parliament will have, because this is the first time, when this report is adopted tomorrow, that any institution of the European Union has actually got a report on the table.

I am aware that the Commission is in a consultative phase right now in terms of the future regulatory environment, and I would ask them to study carefully, as the Commissioner said, what we have produced in this report. We see this as an opportunity, not just for businesses here within the European Union but – much more importantly – for customers. This is about getting the best deal possible for customers. It is about moving into new space, and also about transforming how we deliver financial services.

A key issue for our group, the European People's Party, was the question of financial stability. We want to make sure that as we go forward we do not lose the very important steps that have been taken in the last decade or so in terms of financial stability. That is an important issue. Europe is lagging behind. The great majority of the large FinTech businesses have been established in the United States, in China and Israel – not in Europe. We are behind other parts of the world, notwithstanding the fact that in places like my own constituency of Dublin, in the Netherlands, in France and in Germany and elsewhere, and London especially, we have seen fantastic hubs being developed.

We need the right regulatory environment, and that is about the regulators working with innovators to make sure that we can do that. Sand boxing was an idea that we have produced in our report. We think that there is further merit in that. We have said many things when it comes to data security. We believe that those issues need to be resolved. We also believe it is important for the digital market economy – the digital single economy – that we make sure this transformation occurs right the way across all of the institutions here in the European Union. This is about a new opportunity for Europe, seizing the opportunity that is there for the digital single market and making sure that our businesses in the European Union, big and small, can flourish and grow within this transformative space.

Cătălin Sorin Ivan, în numele grupului S&D. – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, în primul rând vreau să o felicit pe doamna raportoare pentru acest raport foarte curajos care abordează o temă nouă, nemișcutată până acum în Parlamentul European; de asemenea, domnului vicepreședinte Dombrovskis pentru că a participat la nenumărate întâlniri pe care le-am avut în Parlamentul European cu cei din FinTech pentru a încerca să identificăm cum este mai bine să abordăm acest subiect bazându-ne pe reguli stricte, pe un cadru legislativ foarte clar delimitat sau lăsând mai degrabă flexibilitate celor care vor să inoveze, celor care vor să investească în acest domeniu nou.

Este o provocare să gândești cum va arăta FinTech în viitor din moment ce inclusiv companiile care activează în acest domeniu nu își fac planuri de afaceri pe o perioadă mai lungă de șase luni de zile pentru că nu știi exact cum va arăta piața în acel moment.

Dintre subiectele importante pe care le-am abordat s-a remarcat faptul că mulți au dorit să se poziționeze fie de partea băncilor, fie de partea intermediarilor, ceea ce nu este cazul. Vorbim despre viitor, vorbim despre cum va arăta economia în viitor, vorbim despre progres, despre inovare, despre faptul că deja Europa este în urma altor zone de pe glob, cum ar fi Statele Unite sau Asia. Trebuie să acordăm mai mult credit inovării în Europa și trebuie să sprijinim companiile care investesc în cercetare și inovare.

De asemenea, este o oportunitate foarte mare pe care FinTech o acordă cetățenilor europeni, faptul că avem mai multă transparență, faptul că prețurile de transfer și prețurile pentru serviciile bancare se duc în jos făcând accesul la aceste servicii bancare mult mai facil pentru o categorie mult mai largă de populație vine în sprijinul luptei pe care o ducem cu inegalitatea socială, cu lupta împotriva sărăciei, cu lupta împotriva șomajului.

Eu cred că FinTech are un impact pozitiv. Sigur, sunt câteva provocări cum ar fi siguranța datelor cetățenilor. De asemenea, este foarte important ca acest domeniu să nu distorsioneze foarte mult piețele. Am vorbit cu cei de la Banca Centrală Europeană și fac teste să vadă cum viitoarele monede virtuale vor influența economia europeană.

Eu cred că suntem la început de drum. Cred că este un pas foarte curajos pe care l-am făcut în această perioadă și felicitări doamnei raportoare încă o dată și sunt foarte optimist că FinTech va face parte din viața noastră de zi cu zi și va avea un impact pozitiv asupra economiei europene.

Marisa Matias, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhor Presidente, Cara Cora, desde o início desta discussão, exprimimos as nossas preocupações sobre a abordagem do relatório e o facto de o mesmo relatório trabalhar sobre a premissa de que o interesse das instituições financeiras é o benefício dos consumidores e não o seu próprio lucro. Esta premissa que, no limite, dispensaria qualquer regulação não é, obviamente, realista e conduz a grandes equívocos.

Não é verdade que o FINTEC produza necessariamente melhor finança, produtos mais adequados e muito menos mais transparência ou melhor regulação. É por isso que esta é uma área em que é urgentemente necessária regulação pública. Este relatório não nos dá os passos fortes, claros e concretos que eram necessários.

Estamos satisfeitos com o facto de terem sido introduzidas algumas preocupações, como a proteção dos consumidores, mas parece-me que era necessário introduzir mais elementos para além dos travões à atividade em si, totalmente ausentes do relatório. Direitos de privacidade e de segurança, supervisão e proteção de dados deveriam ter sido melhor acautelados e o spam não solicitado deveria ter sido banido.

Este relatório fica, infelizmente, na nossa perspetiva, aquém da sua responsabilidade regulatória e é por essa razão que não poderemos votar a favor. De qualquer das formas, agradeço o esforço de incorporação de todos os pedidos que fizemos em relação à matéria que referi anteriormente. Não é possível estarmos de acordo. Continuaremos a trabalhar juntas, seguramente, em outras áreas.

David Coburn, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, finance flows like water. It will always find the path of least resistance and be drawn by economic gravity towards locations with a critical mass. We all benefit from having access to finance, but some voices in the EU are determined to put barriers in the way of its flow. We hear the new French President and his ‘macaroons’ want to draw bankers from London and that the EU wants to stop London clearing euros. These, ladies and gentlemen, are not realistic threats. There is so much hot air from Mr Macron that he could power a Montgolfier. He was able to rise silently with vacuous grace, as he was plucked from the French establishment from among his merchant banking chums, to save them – temporarily, may I say – from Madam Le Pen’s French Revolution. The EU should recognise that even a Socialist utopia like the EU is a properly functioning financial market. London’s pre-eminence in global finance could service this EU more easily from outside the Socialist paradise. The UK has all the attributes that could make it the EU’s best friend, but instead we are told by Macron that voting for Brexit is a crime, that the UK must be made an example of, so that no country considers leaving. He may be taking his orders from the German Chancellor, but what sort of club is the EU that can openly...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich muss etwas zu meinem Vorredner sagen: Ich nehme an, er hat die falsche Rede mit – das war eine Themenverfehlung. Wir reden im Moment über FinTech, das sind Tätigkeiten im Finanzsektor, die mittels neuer Technologie erbracht werden und sich auf den gesamten Finanzsektor ausdehnen. Die FinTech-Revolution hat ein globales Ausmaß erreicht, und die Vorteile sind Kostensenkungen, Effizienzgewinne und höhere Transparenz. Wir haben natürlich auch mögliche Risiken im Verbraucherschutz, in der Stabilität des Finanzsystems. Mehr als die Hälfte der zehn größten FinTech-Unternehmen sind in den USA, China und Israel ansässig. Um wettbewerbsfähig zu bleiben, muss Europa daher derartige rasche Innovationen fördern. Wir müssen sie unterstützen. Wir benötigen einen europäischen Rahmen dafür. Wir haben schon Gesetze – z. B. die Datenschutzgrundverordnung, die *payment services directive* und MiFID, die sich auf die Entwicklung im FinTech-Bereich auswirken.

Mit dem Bericht wird daher eine Überprüfung beabsichtigt, wie sich die bestehenden Legislativmaßnahmen auf die FinTech-Entwicklung auswirken, wo geltende Gesetze Unsicherheiten und Hindernisse hervorbringen und weitere Maßnahmen notwendig sind. Daher fordern wir von der Kommission einen FinTech-Aktionsplan, damit ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort)

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, d’autres l’ont dit avant moi dans ce débat, les «FinTech» introduisent une révolution prometteuse. Elles révolutionnent l’univers des sciences, des services financiers, notamment celui des prestations bancaires dont elles modifient toutes les facettes, qu’il s’agisse des moyens de paiement, de l’attribution des crédits ou encore de la gestion de l’épargne.

Cette révolution venue des États-Unis, qui concentrent encore 80 % des capitaux investis, représente un potentiel de croissance considérable pour l’Europe et introduit dans beaucoup de cas des progrès appréciés des consommateurs, des investisseurs mais aussi des entreprises, des gouvernements, voire des banques centrales.

En témoignent par exemple le recours accru au financement participatif, qui permet de diversifier l’accès aux capitaux, la numérisation des services publics, qui peut aider à mieux collecter l’impôt et à empêcher la fraude fiscale, ou encore l’usage de technologies *blockchain*, qui garantit l’intégrité de l’historique des transactions.

Mais, comme toute avancée technologique, elle nécessite un encadrement et cet encadrement s’avère nécessaire pour accompagner l’innovation en évitant les dérives. Il mérite d’ores et déjà d’être pensé autour de trois principes.

Tout d'abord, la préservation de la stabilité financière face aux cyberattaques – dont l'actualité n'a pas besoin d'être rappelée – et au manque d'informations mises à disposition des régulateurs par les «FinTech» sur leurs activités susceptibles de limiter la prévention des risques systémiques.

Ensuite, la protection des consommateurs exposés à des ventes frauduleuses, comme dans le cas des escroqueries aux transactions en ligne, liées au développement des plateformes connectées, au pillage, sinon au vol des données personnelles.

Enfin, l'incitation à la création d'emplois, car si l'écosystème des «FinTech» repose sur l'essor de jeunes pousses qui recrutent, l'automatisation des services financiers pourrait aussi bouleverser des myriades de métiers.

Trois propositions...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, progresul tehnologic în sectorul financiar este rapid și impresionant. Fie că vorbim de serviciile bancare online sau vorbim de monede virtuale, fie că vorbim de noile vulnerabilități create în acest domeniu.

Statele membre au început să adopte reglementări cu privire la FinTech și este momentul să ne întrebăm dacă aceste reglementări pe plan național nu creează un risc nou pentru fragmentarea piețelor financiare.

Iată de ce cred că avem în față un raport excelent și o felicit pe raportoare și voi susține propunerea făcută în acest raport pentru ca Comisia Europeană să adopte un plan de acțiune care să vină să completeze de fapt strategiile pe care le avem atât pentru piața unică digitală cât și pentru Uniunea Europeană a piețelor de capital.

Încă o dată, mulțumesc tuturor celor care au lucrat la acest raport.

Eva Maydell (PPE). – Mr President, I can bet that three years ago when we came into this house very few of us – or maybe none – believed that we would be able to transfer a significant amount of money, such as EUR 6 000, to any international account for free, without any taxes. Well, one of Europe's largest European fintech companies already offers this service. One could even execute a transfer just within a few hours around the globe for a very fixed and clear price of EUR 6. It's absolutely impressive where technology has brought us in the past couple of years.

When working on the rules for the financial sector, we have to know that FinTech stands for faster, cheaper, consumer-friendly and much more convenient financial services that are enabled by technology. However, at the same time, the biggest barriers for such services to flourish is regulatory uncertainty. This is why I believe it is our job as policymakers to create a comprehensive and coherent single market for fintech, and this is what we are calling for in this report, but at the same time we look forward to a very timely and concrete legislative proposal and action plan from the Commission.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, the fintech revolution is one that is having, and will continue to have, significant positive effects on our economies. It will make finance safer and better for consumers and will help us to find cost efficiencies and improve the quality of our financial services. This is an area that I have particular interest in, as it is one that I see has huge potential for innovative solutions across the entire economy in terms of making payments, financing investments and managing data.

The innovations we are seeing today are already allowing us to manage our personal finances easily, transfer money across borders and buy and sell shares – all on our phones. These represent enormous technological developments compared to just a few short years ago. Financing businesses, and SMEs in particular, has proven difficult in recent times, particularly in the years since the economic downturn. Fintech innovations such as peer-to-peer lending can bring significant, new options to startups. Peer-to-peer lending can provide much-needed capital investments to our SMEs at competitive lending rates.

There are obviously regulatory questions that come up in this discussion, however, and so I think that the support is timely. It is important this sector is regulated properly, but we should be careful not to over-regulate and stifle the innovation we are seeing today.

The question of cybersecurity also comes into focus, especially after the last weekend, and I welcome the proposal by Microsoft for a global gathering on cybersecurity. Overall, this is a very positive development.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η επίδραση της τεχνολογίας στο μέλλον του χρηματοοικονομικού τομέα είναι καθοριστική. Για τον λόγο αυτό, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να καθορίσει ένα πλαίσιο λειτουργίας, το οποίο να διασφαλίζει την τεχνολογική ουδετερότητα, την αναλογικότητα, καθώς και την πρόσβαση των νεοεισερχόμενων στην αγορά. Ταυτόχρονα, το πλαίσιο λειτουργίας πρέπει να υπηρετεί τους καταναλωτές, αλλά και τους επενδυτές, μειώνοντας τα κόστη της παροχής χρηματοοικονομικών υπηρεσιών. Επίσης, το ζήτημα της ασφάλειας είναι καθοριστικό, ιδίως όταν αφορά τα κεντρικά αποθετήρια τίτλων σε μια εποχή όπου καθημερινά γινόμαστε μάρτυρες συνεχών κυβερνοεπιθέσεων. Βεβαίως όλα αυτά απαιτούν μια χρηματοοικονομική παιδεία και σχετικές δεξιότητες εκ μέρους όλων των εμπλεκόμενων. Άλλωστε μέχρι το 2020, όπως αναλύει και η έκθεση, η Ευρώπη θα έρδει αντιμετώπιση με την έλλειψη έως και 825.000 επαγγελματιών στον υπό συζήτηση τομέα.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, once again I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms van Nieuwenhuizen, for the excellent report. I have listened attentively to the comments of Members and I would like to thank them for a positive and constructive attitude. I see there is a lot of agreement on the importance of harnessing the potential of FinTech, about the need to strike the right balance between helping financial innovation contribute to dynamic and technology-driven economic growth while safeguarding the integrity of our financial system.

We will be assessing whether specific measures need to be presented, either to support technological innovation in finance, to address regulatory barriers to innovation or within the single market that may become evident, or to address specific risks that may be identified. Our work will be evidence-based, building on your report, the results of our own public consultation, and our work with European supervisory authorities and international regulatory bodies such as the Financial Stability Board, the Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures (CPMI), and the International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO). I count on your continued support to move this critically important regulatory agenda forward.

Cora van Nieuwenhuizen, rapporteur. – Mr President, I can be very brief. I would like to thank Vice-President Dombrovskis, the shadow rapporteur colleagues, and all the other colleagues who have shown so much interest in FinTech. The main goal was to put FinTech at the top of the political agenda and I think we succeeded in that. I think we have provided the Commission with some building blocks for their Action Plan and, listening to the Vice-President, I think they will take note of that.

I would ask everybody who is watching this debate at home to please participate in the consultation of the Commission, so that when they present the Action Plan all concerns can be taken on board. I would like to thank you all again and I am looking forward to working with you in the future on all the actions that will follow on from these recommendations.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin van Nieuwenhuizen! Ich bedanke mich bei Ihnen, Herr Kommissar, bei Frau Kollegin Berès und bei Herrn Kollegen Ivan, die beide von Anfang bis Ende der Debatte da waren.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 17. Mai 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Der FinTech-Bericht unterstreicht die Bedeutung innovativer Lösungen in der Finanztechnologie, die dem Finanzsektor und insbesondere den Finanzdienstleistern zugutekommen. FinTech-Lösungen werden dazu beitragen, die Betriebskosten für den Finanzsektor zu senken und die Kundenerfahrung zu erhöhen. FinTech-Produkte sind wichtig für die Zukunft des Finanzsektors, und eine gemeinsame europäische FinTech-Strategie kann Europa dabei helfen, ein internationaler Knotenpunkt für FinTech-Technologie zu werden, um Probleme der Interoperabilität zu lösen, regulatorische Überschneidungen und Marktbarrieren zu überwachen und zu vermeiden und eine gemeinsame Strategie gegen Cyberkriminalität zu entwickeln.

Ich begrüße in diesem Zusammenhang die kooperative Haltung der Berichterstatterin, glaube jedoch nicht, dass es im Auftrag der EZB liegt, mit einem virtuellen Euro zu experimentieren, denn Ziel der Blockchain-Technologie ist es, eine dezentralisierte Alternative zu den zentralisierten Zentralbanken zu schaffen. Die Berichterstatterin stimmte dieser Argumentation zu und ließ die Empfehlung fallen. Wir müssen offen für Innovationen sein, auch für diejenigen, die auf dem Markt der Zahlungsmethoden und Währungen Innovationen bringen.

Auch begrüße ich die Änderungen in Bezug auf den regulatorischen Sandbox-Ansatz. Ein solcher Ansatz würde eine Vielzahl von Marktteilnehmern zusammenbringen und den Mitgliedstaaten ermöglichen, Elemente aus bestehenden und funktionierenden Regulierungsrahmen in anderen Mitgliedstaaten zu kopieren, d. h. von Best Practices zu lernen.

Ivana Maletić (PPE), napisan. – Često se zapitamo jesmo li spremni za budućnost? Možemo li Europu pozicionirati kao globalnog lidera? Koji su koraci za to? Inovacije, nove tehnologije, digitalizacija poslovanja samo su neki od odgovora. Važan doprinos ubrzanju poslovanja i širenju mogućnosti za poduzetnike i potrošače daje nova, moderna financijska tehnologija koja je direktna poveznica s budućnošću – virtualnim valutama, robotiziranim savjetovanjem, mobilnim plaćanjem.

Za sve novo i za implementaciju novih financijskih tehnologija ključno je obrazovanje i informatičke vještine te informatička infrastruktura i povezanost. Važna poruka Republici Hrvatskoj i svim državama članicama je da je u priprema za budućnost ključno ulaganje u povećanje financijske i digitalne pismenosti stanovništva. Bez toga financijska tehnologija se ne može implementirati, a i donošenje dobrih odluka o korištenju novih usluga financijskog ulaganja nije moguće očekivati.

Sustave obrazovanja i znanosti moramo prilagoditi izazovima budućnosti i naše mlade pripremati za radna mjesta budućnosti. Na europskom tržištu će već 2020. nedostajati 825.000 informatičkih stručnjaka, a svi poslovi postaju visoko informatizirani. Moramo biti spremni za promjene na tržištu rada.

17. Seuraavan istunnon esityslista: ks. pöytäkirja

18. Istunnon päättäminen

Der Präsident. – Wir sind am Ende der heutigen Tagesordnung angelangt. Ich bedanke mich auch bei den Diensten, bei den Dolmetschern und all den anderen helfenden Menschen im Vorder- und Hintergrund und wünsche Ihnen eine gesegnete Nachtruhe und guten Nachhauseweg.

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.45 Uhr geschlossen.)

Menettelyistä käytettävät symbolit

*	Kuulemismenettely
***	Hyväksyntämenettely
***I	Tavallinen lainsäätämismenettely (ensimmäinen käsittely)
***II	Tavallinen lainsäätämismenettely (toinen käsittely)
***III	Tavallinen lainsäätämismenettely (kolmas käsittely)

(Menettely määräytyy säädösesityksen oikeusperustan mukaan.)

Valiokunnista käytettävät lyhenteet

AFET	Ulkoasiainvaliokunta
DEVE	Kehitysyhteistyövaliokunta
INTA	Kansainvälisen kaupan valiokunta
BUDG	Budjettivaliokunta
CONT	Talousarvion valvontavalio-
ECON	Talous- ja raha-asioiden valiokunta
EMPL	Työllisyyden ja sosiaaliasioiden valiokunta
ENVI	Ympäristön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunta
ITRE	Teollisuus-, tutkimus- ja energiavalio-
IMCO	Sisämarkkina- ja kuluttajansuojavalio-
TRAN	Liikenne- ja matkailuvaliokunta
REGI	Aluekehitysvaliokunta
AGRI	Maatalouden ja maaseudun kehittämisen valiokunta
PECH	Kalatalousvaliokunta
CULT	Kulttuuri- ja koulutusvaliokunta
JURI	Oikeudellisten asioiden valiokunta
LIBE	Kansalaisvapauksien sekä oikeus- ja sisäasioiden valiokunta
AFCO	Perussopimus-, työjärjestys- ja toimielinasioiden valiokunta
FEMM	Naisten oikeuksien ja sukupuolten tasa-arvon valiokunta
PETI	Vetoomusvaliokunta
DROI	Ihmisoikeuksien alivaliokunta
SEDE	Turvallisuus- ja puolustuspolitiikan alivaliokunta

Poliittisista ryhmistä käytettävät lyhenteet

PPE	Euroopan kansanpuolueen ryhmä (kristillisdemokraatit)
S&D	Euroopan parlamentin sosialistien ja demokraattien ryhmä
ECR	Euroopan konservatiivit ja reformistit
ALDE	Euroopan liberaalidemokraattien liiton ryhmä
GUE/NGL	Euroopan yhtyneen vasemmiston konfедераatioryhmä / Pohjoismaiden vihreä vasemmisto
Verts/ALE	Vihreät / Euroopan vapaa allianssi -ryhmä
EFDD	Vapauden ja suoran demokratian Eurooppa
ENF	Kansakuntien ja vapauden Eurooppa
NI	Sitoutumattomat