

C/2024/2816

26.4.2024.

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 13. LIPNJA 2017.

(C/2024/2816)

EUROPSKI PARLAMENT

ZASJEDANJE 2017. – 2018.

Dnevne sjednice od 12. do 15. lipnja 2017.

STRASBOURG

Sadržaj	Stranica
1. Otvaranje sjednice	4
2. Označivanje energetske učinkovitosti – Naknada za pogrešno označene proizvode povezane s energijom (rasprava)	4
3. Obvezujuće godišnje smanjenje emisija stakleničkih plinova kako bi se ispunile obveze u okviru Pariškog sporazuma (rasprava)	17
4. Obilježavanje 30. obljetnice Erasmusa	32
5. Glasovanje	36
5.1. Jačanje sudjelovanja partnera i vidljivost rezultata europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova (A8-0201/2017 - Daniel Buda) (glasovanje)	36
5.2. Troškovna učinkovitost Sedmog programa za istraživanja (A8-0194/2017 - Martina Dlabajová, Inés Ayala Sender) (glasovanje)	37
5.3. Apatridnost u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Aziji (A8-0182/2017 - Amjad Bashir) (glasovanje)	37
5.4. Prekogranična spajanja i podjele (A8-0190/2017 - Enrico Gasbarra) (glasovanje)	37
5.5. Sudjelovanje Unije u Partnerstvu za istraživanja i inovacije na mediteranskom području (PRIMA) (A8-0112/2017 - Sofia Sakorafa) (glasovanje)	37
5.6. Posebne mjere za pružanje dodatne potpore državama članicama pogođenima prirodnim katastrofama (A8-0070/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova) (glasovanje)	37
5.7. Označivanje energetske učinkovitosti (A8-0213/2016 - Dario Tamburrano) (glasovanje)	37

Sadržaj	Stranica
5.8. Europske prijestolnice kulture u razdoblju od 2020. do 2033. (A8-0061/2017 - Santiago Fisas Ayxelà) (glasovanje)	37
5.9. Procjena provedbe programa Obzor 2020. (A8-0209/2017 - Soledad Cabezón Ruiz) (glasovanje)	38
5.10. Temelji za kohezijsku politiku EU-a nakon 2020. (A8-0202/2017 - Kerstin Westphal) (glasovanje)	38
5.11. Stanje ribljih stokova i socioekonomski položaj sektora ribarstva na Sredozemlju (A8-0179/2017 - Marco Affronte) (glasovanje)	38
6. Obrazloženja glasovanja	38
6.1. Jačanje sudjelovanja partnera i vidljivost rezultata europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova (A8-0201/2017 - Daniel Buda)	38
6.2. Troškovna učinkovitost Sedmog programa za istraživanja (A8-0194/2017 - Martina Dlabajová, Inés Ayala Sender)	40
6.3. Apatridnost u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Aziji (A8-0182/2017 - Amjad Bashir)	40
6.4. Sudjelovanje Unije u Partnerstvu za istraživanja i inovacije na mediteranskom području (PRIMA) (A8-0112/2017 - Sofia Sakorafa)	41
6.5. Posebne mjere za pružanje dodatne potpore državama članicama pogođenima prirodnim katastrofama (A8-0070/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova)	42
6.6. Označavanje energetske učinkovitosti (A8-0213/2016 - Dario Tamburrano)	42
6.7. Procjena provedbe programa Obzor 2020. (A8-0209/2017 - Soledad Cabezón Ruiz)	43
6.8. Temelji za kohezijsku politiku EU-a nakon 2020. (A8-0202/2017 - Kerstin Westphal)	44
6.9. Stanje ribljih stokova i socioekonomski položaj sektora ribarstva na Sredozemlju (A8-0179/2017 - Marco Affronte)	46
7. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik	47
8. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	47
9. Dokument za razmatranje o produbljenju ekonomske i monetarne unije do 2025. (rasprava)	47
10. Glifosat i postupci izdavanja odobrenja (rasprava)	69
11. Stanje u Demokratskoj Republici Kongo (rasprava)	91
12. Humanitarno stanje u Jemenu (rasprava)	101
13. Ocjena provedbe smjernica EU-a o ljudskim pravima koje se odnose na slobodu izražavanja na internetu i izvan njega (rasprava)	109

Sadržaj	Stranica
14. Izvješće o Srbiji za 2016. (rasprava)	116
15. Sastav Parlamenta: vidi zapisnik	127
16. Izvješće o Kosovu za 2016. (rasprava)	127
17. Podnošenje dokumenata: vidjeti zapisnik	140
18. Dnevni red sljedeće dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	141
19. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice	141

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 13. LIPNJA 2017.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

1. Otvaranje sjednice

(Ședința a fost deschisă la ora 9.00)

2. Označivanje energetske učinkovitosti – Naknada za pogrešno označene proizvode povezane s energijom (rasprava)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră comună privind:

— raportul lui Dario Tamburrano, în numele Comisiei pentru industrie, cercetare și energie, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de stabilire a unui cadru pentru etichetarea în ceea ce privește eficiența energetică și de abrogare a Directivei 2010/30/UE (COM(2015)0341 – C8-0189/2015 – 2015/0149(COD)) (A8-0213/2016) și

— întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns oral referitoare la despăgubiri pentru etichetarea greșită a produselor energetice, adresată Comisiei de Martina Werner, în numele Grupului S&D, Dario Tamburrano, în numele Grupului EFDD, Michèle Rivasi, în numele Grupului Verts/ALE și Neoklis Sylikiotis, în numele Grupului GUE/NGL (O-00049/2017 – B8-0320/2017) (2017/2725(RSP)).

Dario Tamburrano, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi sono particolarmente emozionato e vi racconterò una storia inedita, almeno in quest’Aula. Questo regolamento porta infatti all’interno delle normative europee alcuni concetti relativi all’efficienza energetica delle apparecchiature elettriche e della loro potenziale interazione dinamica con le reti elettriche. Queste nozioni le andavo apprendendo dieci anni fa, quando esercitavo la professione odontoiatrica e, per pura passione divulgativa, traducevo in italiano saggi di sostenibilità ambientale. Mai avrei potuto immaginare di trovarmi qui un giorno a rappresentare milioni di cittadini e ad avere l’onore di traslare all’interno di una legislazione europea quelle che erano all’epoca alcune proposte sperimentali di Lester Brown e di altri.

Le *smart appliances* sono le apparecchiature, ad esempio le lavastoviglie e le lavatrici, programmabili dall’utente, affinché entrino in funzione nei momenti in cui l’energia elettrica è disponibile in quantità più abbondante e più economica. L’impiego diffuso delle *smart appliances* sarà in grado non solo di far risparmiare denaro agli utilizzatori, ma anche di fornire un contributo non indifferente al bilanciamento di un sistema elettrico alimentato da fonti rinnovabili in misura sempre più crescente.

Immaginate un cittadino produttore di energia eolica o fotovoltaica. Alcune apparecchiature nella sua casa potranno entrare in funzione e svolgere la loro attività quando l’autoproduzione sarà più abbondante. Immaginate il vecchio e antiquato scaldabagno elettrico, che per sua natura non è particolarmente efficiente in termini puramente termodinamici, ma se lo scaldabagno scalderà l’acqua quando l’energia elettrica sarà più economica e più abbondante, il calore accumulato sarà una forma di fonte energetica a basso costo.

Gli apparecchi intelligenti segnano un nuovo traguardo nell'efficienza energetica non solo di tipo quantitativo ma anche di tipo qualitativo, non solo di quanta energia si consuma, ma anche di quando essa viene utilizzata. Ecco perché sono emozionati, perché dietro questo testo vi è un piccolo pezzo di utopia che si va trasformando in realtà per 500 milioni di cittadini. La dimostrazione che si può credere in un'idea, per quanto possa sembrare lontana, e pezzo dopo pezzo, con la costanza e la determinazione, arrivare a realizzarla.

Questo regolamento, per la prima volta, dà infatti ai produttori la possibilità di indicare sull'etichetta la capacità di un'apparecchiatura di essere *energy smart*. Questa piccola cosa permette al nuovo regolamento sull'etichettatura di essere al passo con i tempi e di entrare a pieno titolo all'interno del nuovo modello energetico dinamico, decentrato e rinnovabile, che vogliamo perseguire con l'Unione dell'energia.

Un'Unione dell'energia che ha tra gli obiettivi dichiarati anche quello di avere il cittadino al suo centro. Ebbene, insieme alle nuove etichette nascerà un database in *open data* cui sarà possibile collegarsi direttamente attraverso un telefonino, un QR Code, un link o simili, presente sull'etichetta cartacea, e potrà fornire agli acquirenti, nelle 24 lingue dell'Unione, non solo una serie di informazioni impossibili da stipare su un pezzo di carta, ma consentirà anche di sviluppare applicazioni per smartphone che permetteranno a cittadini e imprese di fare confronti immediati fra diversi modelli e di scegliere quello che offre il miglior risultato in termini di investimento iniziale e risparmio nel tempo, non rispetto a una media generica ma in rapporto alle abitudini personali di utilizzo.

Ho elencato due cose per le quali mi sono battuto e delle quali sono orgoglioso, ce ne sarebbero anche altre. Tuttavia, se devo essere intellettualmente onesto, come è mia abitudine, sento anche il dovere di condividere con voi un cruccio. All'inizio di questo processo feci la promessa che mi sarei fatto guidare da tre parole chiave: *smart*, *paperless* e *trust*. Senza dubbio siamo di fronte a un regolamento *smart* e nel quale l'impiego e l'importanza del supporto cartaceo viene ridotta in favore di un più fruttuoso utilizzo delle tecnologie digitali di documenti e database on line.

È vero che questo regolamento indubbiamente rafforza le autorità nazionali di sorveglianza del mercato, ma avremmo voluto di più. Avremmo voluto che fosse previsto un indennizzo da parte dei fabbricanti nel caso si venga a scoprire un giorno che le prestazioni energetiche di un prodotto sono inferiori a quelle dichiarate. Il Parlamento lo voleva compatamente, ma purtroppo abbiamo trovato davanti un muro, il muro del Consiglio che lo ha impedito. Ha impedito che i cittadini dell'UE avessero lo stesso diritto del quale hanno ad esempio potuto godere i cittadini statunitensi frodati dalla Volkswagen, che sono stati rimborsati.

Abbiamo ottenuto però dalla Commissione europea, che ringrazio, un impegno scritto allegato a questo regolamento, a studiare le possibilità per cancellare questo assurdo vuoto legislativo, che riteniamo sia un vero scandalo. Sono certo che i cittadini europei si aspettino che venga posta fine a questa assurdità quanto prima sia possibile.

Martina Werner, Verfasserin. – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Das Energielabel ist eine europäische Erfolgsgeschichte. Es ist in jedem Haushalt vorhanden und den meisten Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern in der EU bekannt. Über 80 % der Bürgerinnen und Bürger kennen das Energielabel und nutzen es, wenn sie sich ein neues Gerät anschaffen. Elektrogeräte wie zum Beispiel Waschmaschinen, Kühlschränke oder Spülmaschinen sind in den letzten Jahren aufgrund des technologischen Fortschritts immer effizienter geworden, sodass die meisten inzwischen die beste, also die A+++-Klasse haben. Bei Waschmaschinen sind das schon 73 % aller Modelle in dieser Klasse, sodass kaum noch zwischen den besten Geräten unterschieden werden kann. Hinzu kommt, dass wir heute auch eine inkonsequente Klassifizierung der Effizienzklassen haben. Bei Staubsaugern ist A die beste, bei Waschmaschinen ist das die schlechteste Effizienzkategorie. Und das ist total irreführend für Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher.

Daher war eine Reform des Energielabels notwendig, um das große Durcheinander auf dem Markt mit irreführenden Energielabeln zu beenden. Das neue Energielabel mit einer einheitlichen Skala von A bis G für alle Produktgruppen wird es Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern wieder ermöglichen, tatsächlich Strom und auch Geld zu sparen. Durch aussagekräftige Energielabel kann jeder Haushalt jedes Jahr bis zu 500 EUR an Energiekosten sparen, und außerdem können dank des Energielabels europaweit jährlich 19 Terawattstunden Strom gespart werden. Das entspricht ungefähr der Leistung von vier Atomkraftwerken.

Darüber hinaus beinhaltet die Verordnung auch Maßnahmen für eine stärkere Marktüberwachung in den Mitgliedstaaten. Zum einen wird es in Zukunft eine öffentlich zugängliche Informationsseite für Verbraucher geben. Auf dieser Internetseite können Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher sich informieren, Geräte miteinander vergleichen, oder aber auch nachschauen, was die Symbole auf dem Energielabel eigentlich tatsächlich bedeuten.

Zum anderen erleichtert die Verordnung auch die Marktüberwachung in den Mitgliedstaaten. Heute ist es nämlich so, dass nationale Marktüberwachungsbehörden technische Dokumente bei den Herstellern immer erst anfragen müssen, bevor sie sie erhalten. In Zukunft werden ihnen sofort alle Dokumente auf einer geschützten Plattform zur Verfügung stehen, die sie für die Ausführung ihrer Kontrollaufgaben, die so wichtig sind, brauchen.

Für uns Sozialdemokraten war der Verbraucherschutz ganz wichtig. Wir haben auch bei den Verhandlungen dafür plädiert, dass Verbraucher für den Kauf von Elektrogeräten mit falscher Effizienzklasse auch tatsächlich entschädigt werden. Die Mitgliedstaaten haben sich hier aber leider überhaupt nicht kompromissfähig gezeigt. Das finde ich – wie mein Kollege Tamburrano gerade auch angesprochen hat – in Hinsicht auf die Abgasskandale sehr, sehr schade. Jetzt muss die EU-Kommission im Plenum dafür halt Rede und Antwort stehen zu dieser – aus meiner Sicht – Gesetzeslücke.

Claude Turmes, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident! Wir haben jetzt lange verhandelt, um einen Fehler von vor zehn Jahren wieder rückgängig zu machen. Erinnert euch daran, dass wir unter dem Druck der Konservativen hier im Haus vor zehn Jahren der Industrie auf den Leim gegangen sind. Die Industrie hat seinerzeit gesagt, dass man, anstatt A, B, C – also einfache, für die Bürger zu verstehende – Energieklassen zu haben, zu A+, A++, A+++ übergeht. Seinerzeit haben wir als Grüne davor gewarnt, dass das zu einer Abschwächung der Information für die Bürger führt. Und wir hatten Recht! Wir waren jetzt in einer Zeit, in der der letzte Kühlschrank, der überhaupt noch zugelassen war, in der Klasse A war. Das heißt, das ganze Labelling-Regime hatte keine Wirkung mehr. Das verbessern wir heute, und das ist auch die gute Nachricht. Das heißt, liebe Bürger draußen in ganz Europa: Ab sofort wieder klare Signale – A-Geräte kaufen bei Kühlschränken, Tiefkühlgeräten und so weiter.

Und wir haben eine Transparenzplattform eingeführt. Das heißt, wir werden es auch schaffen, dass wir an der Grenze von Europa effektive Kontrollen machen, wenn irgendwelche Ramschware versucht, nach Europa reinzukommen, um eigentlich die hochklassigen Produkte, die ja auch oft aus Europa kommen, zu schützen vor minderwertiger Qualität, die von außen kommt.

Das Ganze hat noch einen schwachen Punkt, und das ist die Frage: Wie gehen wir mit Öl- und Gasheizungen in der Zukunft um? Ich sehe, dass gerade Kollege Reul auch zu uns gestoßen ist. Herbert hat sehr erfolgreich dafür gekämpft, dass Öl und Gas quasi auf immer im Markt bleiben. Ich denke, wenn wir Klimaschutz ernst nehmen, dann muss auch irgendwann der Moment kommen, wo man in neuen Häusern sagt: Wir können es uns nicht mehr leisten, fossile Energieträger im Wärmebereich einzusetzen. Das hat auch mit der Diskussion morgen zu tun. Morgen reden wir über Trump, darüber, dass er aus Paris aussteigt. Wir können ja nicht an einem Tag sagen: „Trump ist unverantwortlich“, und dann nicht am anderen Tag quasi in Europa konsequent für Klimaschutz kämpfen.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης, *Συντάκτης*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η Ομάδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενωτικής Αριστεράς υποστήριξε εξ αρχής πως πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε ένα σύστημα ενεργειακής επισήμανσης ευνόητο στους καταναλωτές, το οποίο, όμως, να περιλαμβάνει και όλες τις απαραίτητες πληροφορίες. Χαιρετίζουμε, λοιπόν, τις προτάσεις που έχουν περιληφθεί στην τελική συμφωνία για διαγραφή των παραπλανητικών συμβόλων και μετάβαση σε ένα απλούστερο ενιαίο σύστημα επισήμανσης από «Α έως G». Η πρόταση για το σύστημα από «Α έως G», σε συνδυασμό με την πρόταση για ανακατάταξη των προϊόντων στην κλίμακα βάσει πιο αυστηρών κριτηρίων, κατά την άποψή μας θα συμβάλει καθοριστικά και στην προώθηση της καινοτομίας για αύξηση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης. Εξίσου σημαντική θεωρούμε την απόφαση για δημιουργία της νέας ψηφιακής βάσης δεδομένων για τα προϊόντα, στην οποία οι καταναλωτές θα έχουν δωρεάν πρόσβαση. Η βάση αυτή πρέπει να δίνει όσο το δυνατόν περισσότερες πληροφορίες για τα προϊόντα, αλλά και για τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών, ώστε να ενισχυθεί η διαφάνεια και να τεθεί επιτέλους φραγμός στην αισχροκέρδεια και στην παραπλάνηση των καταναλωτών από τις μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις. Οι καταναλωτές έχουν δικαίωμα να έχουν σαφέστερες ενδείξεις για την ενεργειακή απόδοση ενός προϊόντος.

Δυστυχώς, με τα χρονοδιαγράμματα που τίθενται, οι θετικές προτάσεις που περιλαμβάνονται στην τελική συμφωνία δεν θα προωθηθούν στο άμεσο μέλλον, αλλά μετά από 8-10 χρόνια. Το γεγονός αυτό είναι πολύ απογοητευτικό και αποτελεί σημαντικό λόγο για διαφάνεια της συμφωνίας. Τέλος, θα ήθελα να υπογραμμίσω πως απαιτούμε να δοθεί άμεσα αποζημίωση στους καταναλωτές που εξαπατήθηκαν αγοράζοντας προϊόντα με λανθασμένη ενεργειακή επισήμανση. Παρόλο που η πρόταση αυτή δεν περιλήφθηκε στην τελική συμφωνία, ωστόσο, απαιτείται να προωθηθεί άμεσα.

Κύριε Επίτροπε, χαιρετίζουμε τη δήλωση της Επιτροπής ότι θα διερευνηθεί η δυνατότητα χορήγησης αποζημίωσης στους καταναλωτές που εξαπατήθηκαν από τις ετικέτες ενεργειακής απόδοσης. Ωστόσο, αναμένουμε από την Επιτροπή να διευκρινίσει άμεσα περαιτέρω τα ακριβή μέτρα που προτίθεται να λάβει, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του χρονοδιαγράμματος για τις ενέργειες αυτές, προκειμένου να υλοποιήσει τις δεσμεύσεις της.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by welcoming the excellent agreement reached on the Energy Labelling Regulation between Parliament, the Council and the Commission at the last trilogue in March. We have on our table today a key file from the consumer perspective: the energy label is known and used by over 85% of consumers in Europe when they consider buying new household goods.

Energy labelling brings concrete monetary and energy savings. As a result of different measures taken in the context of the European Union's ecodesign and energy labelling policy, European households can save up to EUR 500 per year on their energy bills. Whilst these measures bring benefits at the level of individual households, they also do so at macroeconomic level by reducing Europe's energy bill through energy savings and by contributing to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In this way, they represent a direct contribution to the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

Furthermore, our industries are encouraged to develop increasingly energy efficient products strengthening Europe's competitiveness and our leading role in driving product energy performance standards at global level.

Focusing on energy efficiency first – whether it is for buildings, products or in industry – is more important than ever in order to ensure security of supply and a successful energy transition while promoting investment, growth and jobs. The revision of the framework legislation on energy efficiency for products was one of the first legislative initiatives of the Juncker Commission in the field of energy, adopted already in July 2015.

The agreement reached on the Energy Labelling Regulation represents a good balance between the interests of different parties. Let me briefly highlight what I consider are the key aspects of our agreement.

A pragmatic approach prevailed regarding the use of delegated acts for laying down product-specific labelling requirements. We now have a clear process for re-scaling the existing labels and returning to the more effective A-to-G scale, providing far better information to the consumer.

There will be a product registration database that will facilitate the work of national market surveillance authorities and will make it easier for consumers to compare the energy performance of many household appliances. Moreover, we have also succeeded in future-proofing the legislation by introducing provisions on software updates and smart appliances, and explicitly banning the use of defeat devices.

Finally, the label will be able to show information about, for example, durability or reparability, thereby further helping consumers to save money and at the same time contributing to the objectives of the circular economy.

With regard to the issue of consumer refunds in the case of non-compliant labels, and in response to the Oral Question tabled by Ms Werner, Ms Rivasi, Mr Tamburrano and Mr Sylikiotis, the Commission fully supports the principle of providing for financial compensation to consumers in the event of wrongly labelled energy-related products.

The Commission made a statement to that effect at the last trilogue in March which will be attached to the Minutes of today's vote. In this context, it has to be clear that the liability for a non-compliant label, and thus for providing compensation, lies with manufacturers – which are responsible for providing the correct label with their products – and not with retailers.

Therefore, horizontal consumer protection legislation may not provide the right legal framework, given that it generally does not address producers and covers the interaction of customers with their contractual partners. However, the Commission is currently developing legal proposals to strengthen enforcement of European Union harmonisation legislation for products. In this context, possible provisions on consumer compensation should the products they bought not comply with European Union harmonisation legislation, including energy labelling, are under close examination. The Commission aims to come forward with a final legal proposal on this before the end of the year.

Now, let me conclude by saying that, in the Commission's view, today's agreement will strengthen and future-proof the iconic European energy label. With the newly agreed rules for labelling, this framework will continue to deliver towards our 2030 energy efficiency objectives. On the basis of all these elements, I am confident that the vote in plenary later today will give a strong backing to this important agreement that we have achieved together.

Herbert Reul, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Das war ein mühsames Stück Arbeit, was wir da geleistet haben, und da hat sich das Projekt und das, was Vorschlag der Kommission war, auf der Strecke durchaus noch verändert – Kollege Turmes hat ja darauf hingewiesen –, und ich finde, das war gut so, dass wir auch an einigen Stellen korrigiert haben. Energie sparen wollen wir alle, und den Weg, das über die Information der Bürger zu machen, dass Verbraucher sich selber ein Urteil erlauben können und dann entscheiden, das Gerät zu kaufen, das weniger Energie verbraucht, halte ich für einen sehr klugen und richtigen Weg.

Die Geschichte ist bisher ja auch eine Erfolgsgeschichte gewesen. Es ging jetzt auch nicht um die Frage Ja oder Nein. Es ging um die Frage: Wie muss die Kennzeichnung aussehen? Müssen wir auf ein neues Bild setzen? Oder können wir in dem bisherigen Bild weiterarbeiten? Wir haben uns dann darauf verständigt, umzustellen, es einfacher zu machen, es eingängiger zu machen, weil die Auffassung überwog, dass die Bürger das besser verstehen als diese ++-Regulierungen.

Das Zweite war, dass wir aber auch die Wirksamkeit erhöhen wollen und dass in der Realisierung auch die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, aber auch die Industrie und die Händler damit umgehen können, und deswegen hat es unterschiedliche Zeitabläufe gegeben. Ich halte das für eine kluge Entscheidung – es ist sachgerecht. Wir haben versucht, den Aufwand für diejenigen, die umetikettieren müssen und die sich auf neue Situationen einstellen müssen, in einem überschaubaren Rahmen zu halten. Ich glaube, das ist eine pragmatische Lösung – es ist meistens gut, wenn man solche pragmatische Vorschläge macht. Aber längerfristig gesehen wird das den richtigen Weg gehen. Es macht bei Heizung, lieber Claude, überhaupt keinen Sinn, das jetzt sofort umzustellen, wenn man gerade eine solche Etikettierung gemacht hat. Also es ist in der Sache Unsinn, eine Entscheidung, welches Gerät welche Effizienz hat, heute zu treffen und morgen, am nächsten Tag, schon wieder neu zu treffen – also so kann man damit nicht umgehen.

Der kritischste Punkt bleibt für mich die Datenbank. Ich bin damit noch nicht ganz zufrieden. Es ist ein Kompromiss, insofern akzeptiere ich das. Es geht darum, dass Daten für Verbraucher zugänglich sind, dass Daten aber nicht für Konkurrenten von Unternehmen zu erreichen sind. Deshalb: Datenschutz gilt auch da, und nicht nur, wenn es uns passt, sondern Datenschutz auch für Unternehmen, die solche Produkte herstellen. Die haben ein Recht darauf, dass ihre industriellen Daten auch geheim bleiben.

Drittens: Bis heute habe ich nicht verstanden, warum die Kommission diese Daten braucht – die braucht sie überhaupt nicht! Wenn überhaupt, ist es für die Bürger interessant und für die Kontrolle derjenigen – das ist das allerwichtigste –, die prüfen, ob die Etikettierung richtig ist. Das ist alles gewährleistet und insofern eine gute Entscheidung.

Dan Nica, *în numele grupului S&D*. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar Cañete, subliniez importanța etichetării în materie de eficiență energetică a produselor pentru consumatori, pentru producători și pentru îndeplinirea obiectivelor Uniunii Europene în materie de eficiență energetică. Conform evaluării Comisiei, rezultatul etichetării și al standardelor reprezintă o economie de energie de aproximativ 175 de milioane de tone echivalent petrol până în 2020, iar, pentru consumatori, o economie de 465 de euro pe an la facturile de energie pentru uz casnic. În plus, măsurile de eficiență energetică vor crea venituri suplimentare de 55 de miliarde de euro pentru companiile europene.

Aș vrea să felicit echipa de negociere a Parlamentului European, deoarece avem nevoie de reguli mai clare privind etichetarea energetică, care să vină în sprijinul consumatorilor. Dintre principalele realizări subliniez revenirea la o etichetare mai clară și introducerea unei baze de date publice care conține toate etichetele de eficiență energetică, crescând astfel transparența și oferind consumatorilor un instrument mai bun pentru a compara eficiența energetică a aparatelor de uz casnic.

Din păcate, regulamentul nu reflectă, așa cum bine ați menționat, domnule comisar, protecția consumatorilor care suferă pierderi din cauza etichetării greșite. De aceea, susținem, ca grup politic, compensații pentru produsele cu impact energetic etichetate necorespunzător și solicităm mai multe clarificări din partea Comisiei privind compensarea consumatorilor în caz de neconformitate în ceea ce privește clasa energetică indicată pe etichetă, precum și calendarul și eventualele măsuri pe care le are în vedere în acest sens Comisia. Salut intenția pe care ați anunțat-o astăzi ca, până la sfârșitul anului, să veniți cu niște măsuri concrete.

Ashley Fox, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleagues and the rapporteur for their hard work and cooperation on this energy labelling file. Though discussions were rather slow at times, I am glad we did – at long last – reach an agreement. This new legislation will benefit consumers. They will see an end to the confusing system that includes an A, an A+, an A ++ and an A +++, and revert back to the original system, where A is, in fact, the most efficient product and G is the least. These new labels will prove provide clarity to consumers and will enable them to make more energy efficient and cost efficient choices.

On wrongly labelled products, we prefer to see this addressed as part of a wider review of consumer protection legislation. We have seen that abuses in the motor industry have impacted on consumer confidence, and therefore the introduction of a product database will add much-needed vigour to mass-market surveillance. My Group did have concerns about Mr Tamburrano's proposals for the product database and the burdens it would place on industry, particularly small manufacturers, but we are satisfied that obligations have been kept to the level where manufacturers only have to submit information necessary for market surveillance. The data will also be open source and allow app developers and retailers to incorporate the information in product searches and filters. This will help consumers to make better choices. Overall, my Group is happy and will support this report.

Lieve Wierinck, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Energie-efficiëntie is de beste en goedkoopste manier om onze klimaatdoelstellingen te halen. Met deze herzieningen nemen we de plussen van de labels weg, zodat de consument duidelijkheid krijgt over de prestaties van zijn toestel en sporen we hem aan om het meest zuinige product te kiezen. Tegelijk zal het de producenten stimuleren om nog zuinigere toestellen te ontwikkelen en te produceren. We kiezen voor een aanpak die bedrijven, van grote producenten tot kleine handelaars, overbodige lasten bespaart. We verdelen de verantwoordelijkheid voor het verspreiden en het aanbrengen van het label, zodat iedereen duidelijk weet wat zijn taak is. Maar mijn aandacht gaat vooral naar de consument. Betere informatie zorgt namelijk voor betere keuzes. Daarom maken we een databank waarin appontwikkelaars en vergelijkingswebsites alle gegevens vinden om consumenten een duidelijk overzicht te geven. Tegelijk is het belangrijk dat we die consument voldoende beschermen. Dat dat absoluut nodig is, hebben we ook gezien bij het Volkswagen-schandaal met de sjoemelsoftware. Dat betekent voor mij niet alleen dat je een garantie geeft van minimaal twee jaar, maar ook dat je kan garanderen dat wagens of toestellen niet meer verbruiken of vervuilen dan aangegeven. Als er foutief gelabeld is, moet de consument aanspraak kunnen maken op de juiste vervangingen of vergoedingen. Ik ben blij dat de Commissie bestudeert hoe we dit in onze wetgeving het beste kunnen aanpakken. Collega's, met dit dossier laten we zien dat Europa werkt voor de burger. Het is een goed ontworpen en doelgerichte maatregel die elke consument over zijn verbruik laat nadenken en die helpt de goede keuzes te maken. De consument gaat energie besparen, wat goed is voor ons milieu, en dus minder geld uitgeven, wat goed is voor zijn portemonnee.

Jaromír Kohlíček, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Energetická účinnost je tématem, o kterém mnoho lidí mluví, ale jen výjimečně najdeme někoho, kdo by přečetl alespoň jedno ze stovek vědeckých pojednání zveřejněných na toto téma v posledních letech.

Protože elektrických spotřebičů je řada skupin, je pro laickou veřejnost zpravidla velmi obtížné srovnat z hlediska energetické účinnosti na trhu nabízené výrobky. Nejjednodušší možností je zřejmě označení výrobků štítky, které naznačí zákazníkovi energetickou účinnost na vhodné zvolené stupnici. Současné značení je poněkud nepřehledné, a proto nejnovější nařízení navrhuje posunout celou stupnici, a tím jednoduše odlišit různé výrobky dané skupiny.

Desetiletý cyklus, ve kterém může proběhnout podobná změna, považuji za dostatečný. Jedinou nevýhodou této směrnice je odložení změny stupnice za několik let po datu přezkumu. Toto ustanovení výrazně znehodnocuje možný dopad na veřejnost, proto se skupina GUE/NGL při konečném hlasování o návrhu zdrží.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, finally we have an improvement. I have to say that already 10 years ago, when we did the first deal, we warned that a labelling system that goes from A+ to A++++ does not really help consumers understand what is energy efficiency and what is not. But, unfortunately, as happens in Europe sometimes, you need a compromise, you need to see that something is not working well, and then, finally, 10 years later we can improve the system, and that is good.

We have a clearer system now, we do not have the pluses anymore. We have a common database so that we can really check the improvements; so that we know, for sure, that not all the appliances later on will only have 'A', meaning there is no real choice for the consumer. But still, and there you see Europe again, we still move slowly sometimes, on boilers and heaters, because now the argument is: well, they just had to adjust to a label and that is why they need until 2030 before they can re-adjust their label.

Really? So now we think that industry needs 15 years to adjust to a label that works for consumers? That is really the lobby of the right. It is not in the interest of the consumers. It is in the interest of the industry, mainly the German industry, in this case. A pretty sad part of this deal, but in the end we are improving. It is a step forward, but please, let us not always fall for the industry's argument because if we listen to them we will only have labels in 2050.

Roger Helmer, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, can I say to Mr Eickhout that if we listen to industry perhaps we will have jobs and prosperity.

The European Union has hardly covered itself in glory with respect to energy efficiency regulation. Certainly the things we did with kettles and vacuum cleaners attracted ridicule in the UK, and I suspect across the rest of Europe, and tended to bring the European project into considerable disrepute. The problem we face is that we are constantly tinkering with regulations, and the effect of that is to confuse consumers and to create problems for industry. But in my party we reflect on the fact that we shall very soon be out of the European Union and shall be free to make our own rules – and frankly, if the rest of the European Union, the other 27, wish to tie themselves up in absurd red tape, 'Go for it' is what I say.

Angelo Ciocca, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa Europa si dimostra, ancora una volta, peggio della Prima Repubblica italiana. Non vi è bastato distruggere le produzioni e i posti di lavoro del settore elettrodomestico in questi anni. In sette anni abbiamo perso 20 milioni di pezzi prodotti, abbiamo perso 130 000 posti di lavoro, abbiamo perso produzioni di cucine, congelatori, condizionatori e lavatrici. E la domanda è: a favore di chi? A favore delle produzioni dei paesi asiatici? A favore dei produttori della Corea?

Oggi si va ancora più a fondo in questa direzione e si vuole perseverare in una direzione di marcia sbagliata, usando la parola semplificazione, usando la parola «riscaldamento». Nel 1998 la Comunità europea ha stabilito le classi A, B, C, D, E, F e G, nel 2003 A+ e A++, nel 2010 non è bastato e ha stabilito le classi A+, A++, A+++. Adesso si dice che forse abbiamo sbagliato, che serve tornare indietro e quindi riscaldare quelle classi. Chi oggi ha investito, magari per arrivare ad un'A+ diventerà una G, diventerà una C. Questi costi che vengono riversati nell'impresa e nelle produzioni oggi è ovvio che determineranno un'ulteriore direzione di marcia e di delocalizzazione delle nostre aziende. Quindi delocalizzeremo ancora una volta le nostre produzioni.

Se questa Europa vuole realmente affrontare il tema dell'inquinamento ambientale ha solo uno strumento: riportare le produzioni in Europa, riportare le produzioni là dove c'è la cultura del rispetto dell'ambiente. Producendo in alcuni paesi del mondo si inquina di più. Questo è il messaggio.

Dopo di che vogliamo ridurre i costi al cittadino, serve togliere le numerose tasse che stanno sul kilowattora. È impensabile che il 50 % del costo di un kilowattora sia determinato da tassazioni del paese, come è inaccettabile vedere in diverse aule del Parlamento consumi energetici non ancora razionati.

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Hr. formand. Tillykke til ordførerne, som har bidraget til dette resultat. Aftalen om en ny energimærkningsordning er et vigtigt skridt på vejen til at nå vores klima- og energimål fremadrettet. Vi ved, at importen i dag er mere end 50 % af vores energiforbrug i Europa, og det har været stigende de sidste ti år. Hvis vi skal gøre os fri af denne ubehagelige situation, skal vi blandt mange tiltag gøre vores energiforbrug både smartere og mere energieffektivt. Her har vi et sted, hvor forbrugerne kan spille en aktiv rolle og tage del i den grønne omstilling, hvis vi gør dem i stand til at træffe oplyste valg af hvidevarer og husholdningsudstyr. Derfor er aftalen om den nye energimærkningsordning et godt skridt på vejen, og det er ovenikøbet en af de lavt hængende frugter, vi har på hele vores dagsorden. Næste skridt er, at vi ved revisionen af bygningsdirektivet sørger for, at vores hjem og vores arbejdspladser følger trop i indsatsen for mere energieffektivitet, for at få et mere energieffektivt Europa. Der er jo ingen tvivl om, at dette er et af de områder, hvor vi virkelig kan bidrage, så vi også kan passe på vores industri fremadrettet.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli contenti, oggi siamo tutti contenti e soddisfatti che finalmente questa revisione della direttiva del 2010 possa eliminare quell'incertezza e quella confusione di fronte alle etichettature non chiare, spesso anche contraddittorie, che inducevano in contraddizione il consumatore. Questo mi sembra l'elemento più importante, avere portato chiarezza.

Lo dico, sottolineandone l'importanza, perché io sono convinta che rendere protagonista la domanda, e non l'offerta, nel settore dei consumi dell'energia sia una delle chiavi su cui possiamo agire per raggiungere i nostri obiettivi energetici. Un consumatore più consapevole è anche più informato e, rendendogli le cose più convenienti, è un consumatore che va nel senso proprio del risparmio e dell'efficienza, che sceglie le cose giuste anche a un prezzo adeguato, ma sa che cosa sceglie e qual è il rendimento.

Insisto su questo tema della domanda. Se vogliamo davvero raggiungere un obiettivo di rigore energetico, noi dobbiamo prendere in considerazione il cittadino consumatore. Da un lato questa è la leva, dall'altro è quella dell'innovazione tecnologica. Mi compiaccio che ci sia qui un meccanismo di revisione che renderà automatico praticamente l'adeguamento dell'etichettatura alle nuove innovazioni tecnologiche, senza dover rifare regolamenti, atti delegati, eccetera.

Quindi la semplificazione, non le cose che abbiamo sentito, la valorizzazione della qualità della nostra industria europea, non le cose che abbiamo sentito. Non stiamo lavorando contro l'industria, stiamo lavorando per l'efficienza, per il risparmio energetico, per la valorizzazione dei cittadini e anche a vantaggio dell'industria.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – De wetgeving die hier vandaag voorligt vormt een belangrijk onderdeel in de discussies die we hebben rond energie-efficiëntie. Met de nieuwe maatregelen rond de energielabels kunnen we op Europees niveau een energieverbruiksbesparing krijgen die gelijk staat aan het energieverbruik van de Baltische staten en Italië samen, dus niet te onderschatten. Toch een heel belangrijke bedenking. Het gaat hier om één van de vele maatregelen die we nemen en waarmee we de Europese energie-efficiëntiedoelstellingen zouden kunnen bereiken. Maar wat zien we? In de voorstellen rond het winterpakket, rond energie-efficiëntie, wordt heel duidelijk gesteld dat de Europese maatregelen die genomen worden in het kader van energie-efficiëntie door de lidstaten niet kunnen worden meegerekend om hun doelstellingen te bereiken. Daar stel ik mij toch wel ernstige vragen bij. Want wat zitten we hier dan te doen? Waarom maken we dan de Europese regels als zij niet kunnen meetellen?

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, los consumidores van a agradecer enormemente el cambio de etiquetado de productos que aquí se propone. La nueva escala de eficiencia pondrá fin al antiguo modelo y ahora, por ejemplo, los electrodomésticos tendrán una escala más sencilla, de la «A» a la «G», eliminando aquellas categorías de aes más cruces, que resultaban bastante confusas.

Lo hemos hablado en esta Cámara muchas veces. La eficiencia energética es, junto al ahorro, una de las medidas centrales para lograr la necesaria transición energética y reducir las emisiones, pero es que, además, permite reducir nuestro consumo y, por tanto, también reducir nuestra factura. Otra vez, lo que es bueno para el medio ambiente, lo es también para nuestros bolsillos. Y creemos que esto también será bueno para la industria, porque estándares altos de eficiencia o medioambientales son los que convierten a nuestra industria en competitiva por arriba e impulsan la innovación, lo que aumenta el valor añadido y transforma finalmente nuestro tejido productivo en uno menos contaminante, en línea con el clima.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, derrière l'efficacité énergétique, je crains qu'une fois de plus, nous donnions à Bruxelles et à la Commission européenne de nouveaux pouvoirs.

Il est évident qu'il faut une harmonisation de l'étiquetage ainsi qu'une banque de données européenne pour les citoyens. Je suis un partisan absolu de l'efficacité énergétique depuis 1980, quand j'étais le chef, entre autres, de l'efficacité de l'énergie, ici. Mais, avec cette proposition de règlement, on fait tout pour déposséder les États de leurs prérogatives en passant de la directive au règlement, en donnant un blanc-seing à la Commission et en lui octroyant de très larges domaines pour adopter des actes délégués, notamment pour fixer les seuils des catégories de performance énergétique.

Cette logique de désresponsabilisation et de bureaucratisation de nos États avec des plans nationaux à adopter et des rapports obligatoires n'est pas bonne pour l'Europe. Nous devrions être plus pragmatiques, plus décentralisés et plus subsidiaires dans notre approche, plutôt que de tout décider depuis Bruxelles.

Enfin, ce projet se trompe dans son approche, en ne prenant pas en compte l'aval. Le consommateur doit aussi être informé de la performance énergétique du processus et du lieu de fabrication ainsi que du transport. C'est tout l'impact écologique et même, pourquoi pas, social qui devrait être l'objet d'une information au consommateur. Produire localement, c'est aussi limiter les importations. C'est aussi cela l'efficacité énergétique. Sinon, nous risquons de faire ce que nous faisons depuis des dizaines d'années avec notre réglementation écologique: nous exportons notre pollution et nous nous donnons bonne conscience en Europe.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, first of all I welcome the proposals here today and again compliment Commissioner Cañete and his team for the good work they are doing in helping us to meet the Paris climate targets.

This is one area where a lot can be done in a very easy fashion. Firstly, I am becoming more and more convinced that consumers in general want to reduce their carbon emissions, and all they need is help to do so. This is one area where consumers will embrace what we are trying to do. Simplifying the labelling is absolutely crucial. How could anybody come up with a scheme of A, A+, A++? If you are going to buy an appliance and you see it marked 'A', well, you cannot get better than 'A' so it does not really make a whole lot of difference whether it is A+ or A++.

But there is a big difference, psychologically, between A and C, and A and G, and also the seven different colours will help consumers. This is the way the European Union needs to move in everything. Make it easier for consumers to understand what it is about and they will comply.

One area I have a slight difficulty in understanding is the reference this morning to erroneous labelling. Erroneous labelling would not be possible if there were proper surveillance and proper penalties, because those who would engage in it would actually be put out of business. So I think that that is very important and I think the product database will help to ensure that that does not happen because it will mean proper compatibility of products, proper market surveillance, and will mean that suppliers will try and outbid one another to become more efficient and smarter in the appliances.

So this is actually a great opportunity for us to do something simple, straightforward, that will help us to meet the climate-change targets in Paris. Well done!

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, avant tout, je souhaite remercier le rapporteur, Dario Tamburrano, pour son excellent travail.

Ce que nous voterons demain et après le trilogue est, à peu de choses près, la position de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie.

Je remercie le rapporteur, car il y a encore quelques mois, avant de renouveler l'achat d'une machine à laver, par exemple, beaucoup s'y perdaient dans les étiquettes, sans réellement comprendre ni connaître la différence en ce qui concerne la consommation d'énergie. Le système était devenu illisible, voire contre-productif. Il était nécessaire de le simplifier. Cette directive se met donc dans la peau du consommateur citoyen.

Bonne nouvelle également: l'étiquette 2.0. Grâce à elle, le consommateur pourra comparer et choisir librement en connaissance de cause. Chaque consommateur devient ainsi testeur. Cette base de données limitera donc la fraude.

Seul petit bémol, pour les cas de tromperie sur l'étiquette, les socialistes et démocrates auraient souhaité aller plus loin et imposer, par exemple, des sanctions, des enquêtes et des remboursements.

Restons optimistes, cela finira par venir.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, desde el inicio de la presente legislatura, la Comisión ha liderado la transición de la economía europea hacia una economía baja en emisiones, más sostenible.

Prueba de ello es el marco financiero plurianual 2014-2020, en que el 20 % del presupuesto total de la Unión es destinado a acciones para la lucha contra el cambio climático. Fue junto al paquete del verano de 2015 cuando la Comisión propuso una revisión del etiquetado, principalmente porque con el desarrollo de las nuevas tecnologías era necesario actualizar la legislación sobre el etiquetado para hacerla comprensible.

Lo ha dicho el señor Eickhout: ¿Alguien sabría decir cuál es la diferencia entre un electrodoméstico con una eficiencia A++ o uno con eficiencia A+++? De eso estamos hablando.

Debemos clarificar la norma para que los consumidores puedan, de acuerdo con su criterio, adquirir los productos que más les interesen y señalar que, gracias a esta clarificación en el etiquetado, junto con el desarrollo del paquete de ecodiseño, podemos conseguir un ahorro de 500 euros en cada hogar europeo. Y no solo eso: podemos hacer también nuestra industria más competitiva, reportándole unos beneficios de 65 000 millones de euros, según datos de la propia Comisión, y un ahorro en el consumo de energía equivalente al anual de Italia y todos los países bálticos juntos.

Conseguimos, pues, volver a una clarificación del etiquetado —de la «A» a la «G», del verde oscuro al rojo intenso—, introducimos también una base de datos de registro de los productos para asegurar que las autoridades competentes puedan ejercer su papel supervisor y empoderamos a la ciudadanía, mediante una base de datos pública que contenga todas las etiquetas energéticas, para que puedan comparar las diferencias de eficiencia entre los equipos del hogar.

Por todo ello, creo necesario que aprobemos el acuerdo al que se ha llegado en el diálogo tripartito, y aprovecho para felicitar una vez más al ponente y a todos los ponentes en la sombra por el gran trabajo hecho.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Sagen wir mal, ich halte eine kurze Rede, quasi A++++. So zumindest wäre es hier eingeordnet nach dem bisherigen System des europäischen Energie-Labelings – ein Unding, das die Kommission vollkommen zu Recht bereinigt hat. Kein Verbraucher hat etwas von einer Kennzeichnung, die allen Maschinen – egal, ob energieintensiv oder sparsam – ein A verleiht und sich nur an der Anzahl der Pluszeichen dahinter unterscheiden lässt. In Zukunft wird es auch wieder die erkennbaren C-, D-, E-Sünder geben, und das ist gut so.

Gut ist aber auch, dass wir auf Drängen meiner Fraktion mittelstandsfeindliche Auswüchse der Richtlinie vermeiden konnten, etwa die nachträgliche Umetikettierung bereits ausgelieferter Geräte. Das nämlich wäre eine unsägliche Bürde gerade für kleinere Elektrohändler gewesen.

Insgesamt haben wir ein neues Label erreicht, das verbraucher- und verkäuferfreundlich ist, und das ist gut so.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario Cañete, in Europa produciamo ben poca dell'energia che consumiamo e una buona parte della nostra energia arriva ancora da fonti fossili.

Sappiamo allora quanto siano importanti azioni che favoriscono la transizione energetica, attraverso un uso maggiore delle rinnovabili, ma sappiamo anche quanto sia importante ridurre il consumo di energia e quindi aumentare l'efficienza energetica. Con il nuovo regolamento sull'etichettatura energetica degli elettrodomestici e degli apparecchi elettronici facciamo proprio un passo in avanti in questa direzione.

Abbiamo visto che i consumatori sono molto attenti e, grazie al sistema delle etichette, scelgono apparecchi più avanzati e anche capaci di farli risparmiare a fine mese sulla loro bolletta. D'altro canto, grazie a questo sistema, l'industria sviluppa modelli sempre più efficaci per rimanere competitiva sul mercato.

L'esperienza ci ha dimostrato che in diversi casi, come per lavatrici e frigoriferi, in pochi anni la quasi totalità dei prodotti si è andata a collocare nelle classi di efficienza più alte. Anche per questo motivo, oggi si rende necessario aggiornare le etichette, come abbiamo fatto, ridefinendole in modo più chiaro, senza tutti quegli A+, e comprensibile per i consumatori.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur Mr Tamburrano and Herbert Reul from my Group for an excellent job. What is important in this solution, especially after the discussed and approved corrections, is that the energy enabling framework allows customers to be more aware of the energy efficiency and consumption of household appliances such as dishwashers, televisions and fridges, which will help them to reduce their energy costs. This Regulation also contributes to the moderation of energy demand and the achievement of the Union's energy efficiency targets, so there are macroeconomic savings and advantages with this solution. It establishes deadlines to replace the current A++ classes with an A to G scale. It also sets out a procedure for rescaling labels based on technological development, thus also providing incentives for innovation and pushing less efficient products out of the market. This will make energy labels more understandable for consumers and help them make better informed purchasing choices. The proposal also contains clearer rules on promotional campaigns and national incentives to promote higher classes of efficiency, and aims to improve enforcement mechanisms and transparency for customers by creating a platform with a database of products covered by energy labelling requirements. The revised energy efficiency label, together with eco-design, can save households close to EUR 500 per year. It has a clear microeconomic advantage. So let us start together, consumers and businesses, the real implementation.

Miroslav Poche (S&D). – Já jsem velmi rád, že jsme se dohodli s Radou a Komisí na novém značení energetické účinnosti a shodli jsme se na tom, že ten současný systém vyžaduje velmi výraznou změnu.

Já jsem rád, že se vracíme k té bývalé stupnici měření A až G a odstupujeme od toho systému A++. Já se domnívám, že se jedná o velmi dobrý krok, protože se ukazuje, že veřejnost, možná až 80 % veřejnosti, evropských občanů, se dívá na energetický štítek při nákupu spotřebiče. Pevně věřím, že tato úprava usnadní spotřebitelům orientaci v energetických úsporách a že lépe od sebe dokáží produkty odlišit. Tím se také sníží spotřeba energie a spolu s ní i částka, kterou občané za energii platí.

Mimo jiné považuji rovněž za zásadní, že EU znovu potvrzuje, že energetická účinnost je na prvním místě, že je klíčové, abychom se nadále drželi hesla, kterým je účinnost na prvním místě, pokud chceme dosáhnout úspor a cílů z balíčků „Čistá energie pro všechny Evropany“.

Procedura „catch the eye“

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le etichette che indicano l'efficienza energetica di prodotti elettrici come frigoriferi, televisori e lavatrici finalmente cambiano, adeguandosi alla rivoluzione digitale, collegandosi ad un database di dati aperti e disponibili attraverso l'uso di QR Code. Sarà dunque possibile, anche in Europa, confrontare in modo efficiente ed efficace i consumi elettrici di diversi dispositivi al momento dell'acquisto e dunque favorire un consumo più consapevole e sostenibile, tarato sulle abitudini di utilizzo e sul prezzo e la disponibilità di energia elettrica.

È un piccolo passo, ma concreto ed importante, verso il miglioramento nell'utilizzo delle risorse. Tuttavia, è necessario proseguire il lavoro, introducendo criteri più stringenti per il mercato degli apparecchi elettrici e vincolando i produttori all'uso di tecnologie *smart*, in grado di adattarsi ai consumi e alla disponibilità di energia.

L'introduzione di un'etichettatura trasparente e chiara, che passa dalla confusione delle A++ ad una scala semplice da A a G è un netto passo in avanti nei confronti della tutela dei consumatori ma anche dell'industria. Vanno però assicurati controlli adeguati per garantire che quelle etichette corrispondono effettivamente a prodotti con le caratteristiche indicate.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ τον εισηγητή, τον κύριο Tamburrano, για τη σημαντική έκθεση η οποία, πραγματικά, δρομολογεί ενδιαφέρουσες εξελίξεις τόσο υπέρ των καταναλωτών όσο, βέβαια, και για τη στήριξη της ευρωπαϊκής βιομηχανίας. Η νέα διαδικασία σε σχέση με την επισήμανση στηρίζει πραγματικά τους ευρωπαίους καταναλωτές, διότι γίνεται πιο ξεκάθαρη, διότι σταματούμε να έχουμε αδιαφάνεια, σταματούμε να έχουμε σύγχυση. Επομένως, αυτό είναι πολύ σημαντικό, διότι δίνει στους καταναλωτές τη δυνατότητα να κάνουν τη σωστή επιλογή, μια επιλογή με ξεκάθαρα κριτήρια. Και εφόσον γίνει αυτή η επιλογή σωστά, αυτό σημαίνει, φυσικά, και μείωση της κατανάλωσης. Επομένως, σημαίνει και χρήματα στην τσέπη του ίδιου του καταναλωτή. Όμως πρέπει να υπάρξει ρύθμιση για την αποζημίωση του καταναλωτή, ο οποίος μέχρι στιγμής είχε πραγματικά υποστεί ζημιά ανεπανόρθωτη, λόγω της σύγχυσης που είχε δημιουργηθεί. Επιπλέον, χρειάζονται και μέτρα για να μην έχουμε βιομηχανίες οι οποίες παράγουν προϊόντα «μαϊμού» και δημιουργούν επίσης σύγχυση.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – U projednávaneho nařizení jsem byla stínovou zpravodajkou pro stanovisko výboru ENVI. Od té doby uplynula spousta času a skoro bych řekla, že dokument přichází poněkud pozdě.

Ve světle pomalu končícího jednání o balíčku oběhového hospodářství bychom spíše měli již řešit revize předpisů o ekodesignu. Taktéž zůstává velkou otázkou jeho návaznost na teď projednávanou směrnici o energetické účinnosti. Nicméně obecněji jsem poměrně spokojená, jak vyjednávání v trialozích dopadla. Změna škály štítků od A do G je krok správným směrem, který konečně vnese světlo do současného matoucího a pro spotřebitele mnohdy zavádějícího systému značení. To by mohlo přinést nové energetické úspory domácností, které zajisté ocení nejen ony, ale také my v dalším vyjednávání o energetické účinnosti.

Taktéž velice vítám veřejně dostupnou databázi výrobků. Domnívám se totiž, že jen řádně informovaný spotřebitel, který má srovnání, je schopen změnit své chování. Co už se úplně nepovedlo, jsou četné výjimky vedoucí ke zdržování procesu přeštítkování určitých produktů. Domnívám se, že celý proces trvá až nepřiměřeně dlouho.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, doresc să subliniez că acest raport reprezintă un progres în ceea ce privește etichetarea. Ca membră în Comisia IMCO, susțin etichetarea oricărui produs, deci și etichetarea energetică. Să fim corecți! Etichetarea energetică duce indirect la inovație, pentru că va apărea o concurență – cine poate să producă un aparat care are un consum energetic mai mic – și unul dintre obiectivele Uniunii Europene este și eficientizarea energetică.

Sigur că sunt de acord ca orice consumator care este indus în eroare să fie compensat. Eticheta trebuie să fie simplă, clară și consumatorul are dreptul să cunoască ce cumpără.

Însă vreau să atrag atenția că este foarte important, domnule comisar, să vedem cum facem ca să fie etichetate și produsele care intră pe piața internă din țările terțe, pentru a nu crea o competiție incorectă pentru industria europeană.

Într-un cuvânt, cred că etichetarea stimulează cercetarea, inovația în domeniul aparatelor și mijloacelor fixe consumatoare de energie și este necesar să avem acest sistem de etichetare.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr, úgy gondolom, hogy a mai világban nagyon fontos mindannyiunk számára, hogy olyan cselekedeteket hajtson végre az európai intézményrendszer, amiből maguk az állampolgárok is érzik, hogy velük most valami jó történik. Ez a mostani téma ilyen. Ezekkel a címkékkel egyébként sokkal sűrűbben találkozik az európai polgár, mint bármelyik másik politikai eredményünkkel, ugyanakkor nem csak ezzel az egyféle címkézéssel, hanem az élelmiszerek világában is van egy európai uniós egységesítés a címkézés tekintetében. Én azt gondolom, hogy a jövő szempontjából valószínűleg az lenne a legokosabb, ha az élelmiszerek, illetve bizonyos iparcikkek esetében a címkézési módszer egyre inkább közelebb lenne, hogy már ránézésre is orientációt adjon szinte minden fontosabb dologban a fogyasztók számára arról, hogy mit is tart a kezében. Végezetül pedig szeretném elmondani, hogy a mostani igyekeztünk nem csupán energiatakarékosságról szól, hanem arról is, hogy a fogyasztók optimális döntést hozzanak, azaz előbb-utóbb figyelembe kell venni az árak kérdését is, hiszen a szegény ember sokkal nehezebben fordul a korszerűbb,

de drágább dolgok felé.

(Înceierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank honourable Members for all their contributions to this debate. Allow me to make three remarks.

The first is to say that we have the same labelling requirements for imports. It is not only local manufacturers; imports have to be labelled in the same way as products manufactured in the European Union. Many of you expressed concerns about the data, but the best way to ensure data protection is for the Commission to manage the database and also, with the data, we will be able to adjust the labels more efficiently.

On heaters, I saw different positions in the House, but I will say that the Commission proposal did not contain a definite requirement to re-scale. We think that it is an improvement that the agreed version contains a timetable and a final date by which the A and B label will only be available for heat pumps, renewables and CHP. We also think that the timetable makes sense and is reasonable because it will provide time and incentives to bring down the cost of these heaters to the benefit of our industry and our consumers.

Finally, I will recall that the energy union is one of the ten priorities of the Juncker Commission and that ‘energy efficiency first’ is one of its leading principles. In this respect, reaching an agreement on one of the key proposals for delivering real energy and monetary savings to European consumers and business is an important step towards the realisation of any union which aims to provide European Union consumers with secure, sustainable, competitive and affordable energy.

This shows that, when there is political commitment and shared objectives, we are able to offer a concrete response to the needs of business and European citizens. Let us keep this positive spirit and dynamic in the ongoing negotiations on the ‘Clean Energy for all Europeans’ package proposals that are now on the table of this House and the Council.

STATEMENTS BY THE COMMISSION

— This is word for word what was read out by the Commission at the last trilogue on 21 March 2017:

Commission statement on financial compensation for consumers:

‘In view of its ongoing efforts to strengthen the enforcement of Union harmonisation legislation for products, the Commission – in order to address potential financial loss by consumers due to wrongly labelled products or inferior energy and environmental performance than labelled – should investigate whether compensation for consumers in case of non-compliance with regard to the energy class displayed on the label can be addressed.’

Can the Commission support the statement on delegated and implementing acts as proposed by the Council?

— The statement referred to is the following:

Statement by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on Articles 290 and 291 TFEU:

‘Recalling the Inter-institutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 16 April 2016, in particular, its paragraph 26, the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission declare that the provisions of this Regulation shall be without prejudice to any future position of the institutions as regards the application of Articles 290 and 291 TFEU in other legislative files.’

— The Commission can support this statement, as this declaration is in line with the Inter-institutional Agreement, and can be seen as a perpetuation of a similar declaration made at the time of the adoption of previous Energy Labelling Directive in 2010.

Dario Tamburrano, *relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ho ascoltato con attenzione i vari interventi. Chiaramente apprezzo i complimenti, ma apprezzo anche alcune critiche, soprattutto quelle critiche che sono state rivolte al regolamento, che non sono critiche strumentali a dichiarare qualcosa in plenaria per attaccare qualcuno, sbagliando anche date e dati, ma quelle critiche che sono oggettive.

Ci sono effettivamente delle cose che potrebbero essere fatte meglio e il riscalaggio delle etichette, in maniera particolare per le caldaie e i boiler, è un altro cruccio. Poteva essere anticipato, ma confido nel *Clean Energy Package* e ci batteremo affinché venga creato un *environment* a livello europeo perché le caldaie a gas vengano in qualche maniera progressivamente poste fuori mercato, soprattutto nelle nuove norme per quanto riguarda l'efficienza energetica in edilizia e gli edifici attivi ed intelligenti.

Mi auguro però che una cosa venga risolta al più presto – e qui ritorno sul tema dell'interrogazione orale – e cioè che venga posta fine a questo vuoto legislativo nell'Unione europea. I cittadini europei si meritano di essere indennizzati nel caso vengano frodati. Questo vale per l'etichettatura energetica, come per tutti i sistemi di etichettatura dell'Unione europea. Senza indennizzo e senza controllo, ogni sistema di etichettatura rischia di non ricevere la giusta e necessaria fiducia da parte dei consumatori.

Președinte. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc marți, 13 iunie 2017.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Il n'existait pas d'harmonisation en matière d'étiquetage sur l'efficacité énergétique des appareils électroménagers européens. Ce constat poussièreux sera bientôt à classer dans le placard à balais. Nous proposons donc un étiquetage unique étalonné de «A à G» afin de fournir des informations plus claires aux consommateurs et de réduire leur consommation d'énergie.

Cette mesure a également pour but de faire baisser la consommation des citoyens européens de 200 milliards de Kw/h: une économie substantielle pour leur portefeuille. De plus, tous les nouveaux produits mis sur le marché de l'Union devront être enregistrés dans une base de données en ligne, qui offrira une transparence accrue et facilitera la surveillance du marché par les autorités nationales.

85 % des consommateurs européens tiennent compte de l'indice énergétique lors de leurs achats. Cependant, jusqu'à 25 % des produits mis sur le marché ne sont pas conformes aux exigences en matière d'étiquetage énergétique. Il était donc urgent de rectifier le tir et d'améliorer la situation du consommateur.

3. Obvezujuće godišnje smanjenje emisija stakleničkih plinova kako bi se ispunile obveze u okviru Pariškog sporazuma (rasprava)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul lui Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, în numele Comisiei pentru mediu, sănătate publică și siguranță alimentară, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind reducerea anuală obligatorie a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră de către statele membre în perioada 2021-2030, în vederea realizării unei uniuni energetice reziliente și a respectării angajamentelor asumate în temeiul Acordului de la Paris, și de modificare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 525/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind un mecanism de monitorizare și de raportare a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră și a altor informații relevante pentru schimbările climatice (COM(2016)0482 – C8-0331/2016 – 2016/0231(COD)) (A8-0208/2017).

Catherine Bearder, *deputising for the rapporteur*. – Mr President, the most powerful signal that the European Parliament can give is that it is serious about tackling climate change and is taking real action implementing the Paris Agreement by passing the climate action regulation tomorrow. It deals with almost two-thirds of all greenhouse gases emitted across the EU. This law will translate the Paris Agreement into concrete action by the Member States.

However, last week President Trump announced that he would withdraw the United States from the Paris climate change agreement. Even though we know that many US states, cities and businesses are continuing or even scaling-up climate action and green investment. This is sending a dreadful signal to the rest of the world. But, thankfully, China has restated their strong commitment to the Paris Agreement and President Macron has announced that France will do more compared to earlier commitments. So, with or without Trump, climate action and green investment under the Paris Agreement must move ahead.

I applaud that the groups here in the European Parliament have decided to unanimously give a strong signal to the international community that it will support this report in plenary tomorrow. I am also grateful for the strong support the report received in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) and for the further work done ahead of the plenary to build an even stronger compromise.

As a result of this work, ALDE, the EPP and ECR groups agreed to table a set of joint amendments that will do three things: firstly, maintain the strength and emissions trajectory adopted by the ENVI Committee. The trajectory will secure the delivery of our 2030 target under the Paris Agreement.

Secondly, it will increase the optional use of forest credits from 119 million to 280 million tons, which will help build the business case for forest-based climate measures. In the long term, our forests are crucial to build the zero-carbon economy. At the same time, we must maintain a strong driver for energy efficient and clean transport.

Thirdly, we will give better support to lower-income Member States that have reduced their emissions significantly in earlier years. There are 17 Member States that will benefit from these measures. Farming is also covered in this regulation, and we will include special support for climate-efficient farmers. We must recognise the specific situation of the farming sector and ensure that they can continue to produce but protect at the same time.

The compromises reached will represent a balance between delivering on the EU's commitments on the one hand, and providing fairness for all Member States and regulating the regulated sectors on the other. Because of the politically balanced agreement reached and the strong signal the climate action regulation will give to the international community, I urge you all therefore to back the report in full, which includes the compromise package negotiated ahead of the plenary vote.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, it is a pleasure to be here today in the plenary for the effort-sharing proposal. This is an important initiative to accelerate the low-carbon transition of key sectors of the economy in Europe, representing around 60% of European Union total emissions. The latest greenhouse gas emissions statistics, which the European Environment Agency released only two weeks ago, clearly point to the challenges. Emissions, in this sector, outside emissions trading, are increasing again, notably in the transport sector.

This debate, and the vote tomorrow, show that the European Union is serious about international climate commitment under the Paris Agreement and that it wants to progress without delay with domestic implementation. At the same time, Parliament is also making swift progress on one of the key legislative priorities of the European Union, and in the joint declaration on the European Union's legislative priorities for 2017 the three institutions have agreed that the 2030 climate action proposals shall be given priority treatment in 2017.

I very much appreciate the hard work of your rapporteur, Mr Gerbrandy. He would have been happy to be here today but unfortunately he cannot be with us. On this proposal, I want to thank him for the excellent cooperation and I also want to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their efforts in ensuring that Parliament's report could be presented to the plenary before the summer.

Many of the key elements of what you are proposing for the vote in this House tomorrow are in line with the Commission proposals, notably on the national targets and connection between sectors with the use of the flexibilities. This is encouraging for us. As in the Commission proposals, this maintains a careful balance of three central objectives: fairness, cost-efficiency and environmental integrity.

I also note your efforts to better reward early action, which is also a central issue in the discussions in the Council. The LULUCF flexibility proposed by the Commission is of high importance and its extent should be sufficient enough to recognise the lower mitigation potential of agriculture and incentivise actions promoting carbon sequestration in agricultural soils and afforestation.

Let me offer a few comments on two key aspects of the rapporteur's final proposals. Firstly, the report adopted by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) includes a requirement for Member States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in effort-sharing sectors by 80% by 2050 compared to 2005. It is true that consistent and long-term emission reductions are a cornerstone of European Union climate policy. However, I think it is too early to set national targets and emission trajectories for 2050 now already, without any thorough impact assessments and even before the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has provided its special report.

We must also consider the balance with the ETS and with a policy related to land use, land-use change and forestry. We should not set in stone now partial long-term legislation only covering 60% of total European Union emissions. The Commission will address the long-term issues in the context of developing the European Union mid-century strategy, which, in accordance with the G7 Commission, is to be delivered well ahead of the 2020 deadline.

Secondly, I note the proposal for a biennial compliance check instead of every five years. This would significantly increase the misery burden of implementation and would not constitute a good example of better regulation.

The Commission fully supports the efforts of Parliament and the Council to agree on the ETS and non-ETS proposal this year. On the ETS file, we are in trilogue negotiations and I welcome the renewed efforts to make progress there. I look forward to continuing to work with you on the effort-sharing proposal and bringing it to a successful conclusion with your support.

Merja Kyllönen, liikenne- ja matkailuvaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija. – Arvoisa puhemies, komissio, hyvät kollegat, lämmin kiitos kaikille hyvin asiallisesta ja rakentavasta yhteistyöstä. Toivon, että muistamme aina, ettemme ole vähentämässä päästöjä EU:ta tai hallintoa varten, vaan ihmiskunnan ja planeettamme tulevaisuuden säilyttämistä varten.

Kun seuraamme erityisesti liikennesektorilta sitä vastuuta ja toimenpiteiden täytäntöönpanoa jatkossa, meidän on hyvä muistaa, että subsidiariteetin mukaan pallo on hyvin pitkälti jäsenmailla ja erityisesti niiden kaupunkiseuduilla. Rooli sekä hiilidioksidipäästöjen että muiden terveydelle haitallisten päästöjen torjunnassa kaupunkiseuduilla ja jäsenmailla on ehdottoman keskeinen. Kaupunkiliikenne tuottaa 23 prosenttia Euroopan liikenteen hiilidioksidipäästöistä, mutta kaupunkien liikennepolitiikan ja ratkaisujen suhteen EU:lla ei valitettavasti ole suoraa toimivaltaa.

Toivonkin, että komissio edistää kaikessa toiminnassaan hyvien käytänteiden monistamista ja edistämistä jäsenmaiden kesken hyvässä yhteistyössä, niin että pystyisimme suuntaamaan rahoitusta kaikissa hankkeissa nimenomaan päästöjen vähentämiseen.

Nicola Caputo, relatore per parere della commissione per l'agricoltura. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la proposta della Commissione sull'*effort sharing* è un ottimo inizio per assicurare, nei settori interessati, l'obiettivo della riduzione del 30 % delle emissioni entro il 2030. Si rendono tuttavia necessarie alcune modifiche per meglio promuovere la prevedibilità a lungo termine, garantire la coerenza con altre politiche, in particolare l'obiettivo di efficienza energetica, nonché assicurare una sufficiente flessibilità e solidarietà tra gli Stati membri. L'*effort sharing*, può infatti essere un *driver* importante per favorire la decarbonizzazione dell'economia e per adempiere all'accordo di Parigi.

Il settore agricolo è responsabile per il 10 % delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra nell'Unione europea e deve quindi fare necessariamente la sua parte. L'agricoltura è il settore che soffrirà di più gli impatti dei cambiamenti climatici, ma nello stesso tempo ci sono anche pratiche agricole che possono determinare una riduzione delle emissioni e offrire benefici ambientali aggiuntivi e un reddito supplementare per gli agricoltori.

La flessibilità nei settori LULUCF, in particolare il notevole potenziale di mitigazione e di assorbimento derivante dalle foreste, è fondamentale per ridurre i costi di adeguamento alla normativa e per assicurare un sostegno supplementare all'agricoltura che deve contribuire all'azione per il clima. Tuttavia, è essenziale garantire che i crediti LULUCF assicurino reali assorbimenti supplementari e permanenti.

Pilar Ayuso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, dentro de las propuestas del paquete de cambio climático, esta se refiere al esfuerzo que tienen que hacer los sectores llamados difusos: la agricultura, el transporte y la construcción, los edificios, que van a tener que reducir en un 30 % sus emisiones respecto a las de 2005.

Los objetivos por países los han negociado la Comisión y el Consejo, y el Parlamento los ha respetado y no ha querido tocarlos. Nuestro debate ha sido y se ha centrado -que no ha sido nada fácil, por cierto- fundamentalmente en la fecha del comienzo de la trayectoria y en las flexibilidades.

Los acuerdos plasmados en las enmiendas de transacción que votaremos mañana son asumibles. Son asumibles y son equilibrados. Lo que menos le gusta a mi grupo político es el inicio de la trayectoria en 2018, pero se trata de una negociación y todos hemos tenido que ceder. Estamos, sin embargo, razonablemente satisfechos con una flexibilidad LULUCF de 280 millones de toneladas de carbono. Nos habría gustado que hubiese sido un suelo y no un techo, como al final hemos acordado, pero es lo que hemos acordado.

Una reserva por cumplimiento temprano de 90 millones de toneladas es muy satisfactoria, porque puede aliviar el esfuerzo de algunos países que han sido menos favorecidos en el reparto del esfuerzo. También es aceptable la flexibilidad ligada a la cancelación de derechos de emisión.

Como he dicho, no ha sido nada fácil. Quiero agradecerle muy vivamente al señor Gerbrandy su flexibilidad y su disposición para los acuerdos.

Todos tenemos el deseo y la ambición máxima de que todo sea bueno. Finalmente, el papel lo aguanta todo, los deseos son muy loables, pero al final esto se traduce en un esfuerzo para los sectores económicos que son los que crean empleo y, en definitiva, los que sostienen nuestro sistema.

Miriam Dalli, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for being here with us and also Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy who, as the rapporteur of this effort sharing regulation, worked really hard on bringing the Groups together.

Unfortunately, for a long time, we had people who considered climate change to be a fictitious thing – this is happening today as well: if you pretend that it is not real, it will literally disappear. We know today that climate change is affecting every country in every continent. What we face today is a difficult task but an achievable one. The task before us goes beyond the choices that individuals privately make. This is about industries and it is about governments making the right choices and taking concrete measures. This is our moment for action. We had the opportunity to make serious policies with the emissions trading scheme and this is our opportunity now with this regulation.

We need to end once and for all the free ride that polluters have been given. This is not a technical debate but I believe that this is a human rights debate because our citizens and our children have a right to a cleaner world. As Socialists and Democrats, we believe that it is our duty to respond properly to our planet's greatest challenge with determination and honesty. I am proud that this political group was part of a group that stopped the attempts to water down this legislation. This is what we worked hard to achieve in the effort sharing regulation. There are no excuses: our economy will die if our ecosystems collapse.

The climate action legislation sets a clear trajectory to 2030, and a longer-term objective up to 2050, to reduce emissions in important sectors including transport, agriculture, buildings and waste. I would say to the Commissioner that we need to think now if we want to ensure our future and we need to have a long-term perspective. This Parliament must have a progressive and ambitious stand on these measures, closing loopholes and making sure that Member States reduce their emissions; ensuring also that all sectors contribute to a proper reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

We pushed for more compliance checks, yes; every two years. Unlike the Commissioner, we know that this can be done and we want to be ambitious and we want to have something that really works. We aligned the review cycle with the global stocktake of the implementation of the Paris Agreement as well.

We believe that we have the means to stop this devastation but we need to have the political will to do so. This is our opportunity to really show that we are ready to stand up to the occasion. It is no longer time for watering down legislation, because we can make a positive impact. If we do not act now, the effects of climate change will become even worse.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Doceniam wysiłki sprawozdawcy, który po głosowaniu w komisji ENVI zgłosił na sesję plenarną poprawki uwzględniające również moje obawy. Dobrze, że sprawozdawca przywraca mechanizm elastyczności w wysokości 280 milionów ton dwutlenku węgla z sektora LULUCF, poszerzając go o leśnictwo. Szkoda jednak, że nie spotkała się ze zrozumieniem moja propozycja zwiększenia mechanizmu elastyczności do 425 milionów ton – tak, abyśmy promowali rozwój lasów i właściwych praktyk zarządzania lasami, co przecież jest zgodne z duchem porozumienia paryskiego. Właściwe działania w sektorze leśnictwa w znacznym stopniu równoważą emisje.

Ponadto, uważam za niesprawiedliwy przydział jednostek promujący państwa bogatsze. Wyznaczenie punktu odniesienia na lata 2016-2018 jest niekorzystne dla państw biedniejszych. Aby zachować ciągłość polityki, konieczne jest wyznaczenie poziomu emisji, który rozpocznie się z końcem obecnego okresu rozliczeniowego. Nie zgadzam się również na podniesienie ambicji redukcyjnych poprzez wyznaczanie trajektorii do ich obniżania od 2018 roku. Jeśli zaś chodzi o proponowaną rezerwę dla państw biedniejszych, to w minimalnym stopniu zrekompensuje ona ich ogromny wysiłek. Tak więc przegłosowane przez ENVI stanowisko jest w tym kształcie nieakceptowalne.

Nils Torvalds, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, this is in very many ways a discussion about balances and imbalances. We have a lot of political imbalances, we have a lot of environmental imbalances and we have a lot of economic imbalances, and they all act together. Sometimes in a happy way, usually in a less than happy way.

The question about these three files – effort-sharing, emissions trading, and land use, land-use change and forestry – is in the same way a triangle and a very difficult one. It could turn out to be a Bermuda Triangle in which money, hope and environment are those things, or it could show itself to be a functional but very precarious triangle where all the three parts are deeply interconnected. If we are not able to keep up the emissions trading part of it, then things will fall down under effort-sharing and ultimately in the sinks in the forests. So, we need to have a very strong political approach to the problems we are seeing here.

If we do not manage this, if we give in to bad information, bad tweets from the Tweet House – formerly it was called the White House but it has got a new name: the Tweet House – if you do not do this properly, we are doomed. Therefore, the question of how we manage effort-sharing is of utmost importance and I think that Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy has done a terrific job to be able to put the pieces together and be slightly ahead of the curve, because we know that the closer we come to 2040-2050, the harder it will be. So thank you, but now we are in for a fight.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Předem mi dovoluje poděkovat panu kolegovi Gerbrandymu, který si myslím, že to nevzdal, i když to vypadalo chvíli, že vlastně nenajdeme shodu. Nicméně jsme dnes zde a na pořadu jednání plenárního zasedání máme druhý stěžejní dokument pro boj s klimatem a emisemi skleníkových plynů v EU, který zapojuje taktéž dříve mnohem nesmyslně opomíjené sektory, jako je doprava, budovy a hlavně zemědělství.

Od těchto sektorů jsme zde v posledních letech jen slyšeli, jak nic nejde. Nařízení o sdíleném úsilí je tím propojujícím mostem mezi dokumenty EU ETS i LULUCF a dalšími politikami. Dnes více než jindy ve světle zpátečnických a zcela nesmyslných kroků současné administrativy USA je důležité, abychom toto nařízení schválili v ambiciózní a silné verzi, která prošla výborem ENVI, a to ještě před samotným zasedáním Rady pro životní prostředí. Je potřeba demonstrovat naše přetrvávající odhodlání v boji se změnou klimatu.

Vyjednávání byla složitá a nemohu říci, že se vším, co prošlo, jsem úplně spokojená. Speciálně nejsem spokojená s další nově zřízovanou povolenkovou rezervou nebo s dalšími zásahy do ještě ani nefungujícího MSR. Nicméně domnívám se, že se nám podařilo přijmout dostatečně ambiciózní dokument. Jsem třeba ráda, že se podařilo přijmout pozměňovací návrh zapojující zbylou námořní dopravu, které se nevěnujeme v novele ETS. Proto bych se nerada dočkala jeho vykostění, tak jak se stalo před pár měsíci na plénu např. právě u ETS.

Chtěla bych vás požádat, vážené kolegyně a vážení kolegové, dejte nám silný mandát pro jednání v trialogu, ať se nám nestane to, co teď v ETS zažíváme, a ať jsme opravdu tím, kým chceme být. Těmi, kteří chtějí chránit občany EU, chtějí chránit životní prostředí a záleží jim na něm.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Gerbrandy and express my regret that he cannot be here today for personal reasons. I very much regret this because he really put a lot of effort into this file and it is a pity that he cannot be here. Our thoughts are certainly with him.

Secondly, I would like to say that it is a bit strange that tomorrow we are going to discuss Trump withdrawing from the Paris Agreement and today we are going to discuss our own actions. I can tell you that the Greens tried to link those two discussions. A strange idea, is it not: that we link criticism of Trump together with what we ourselves are doing within the EU?

But the big parties, especially the Christian Democrats, did not want to link them and we know why: because it is much easier to criticise Trump, for free, while at the same time knowing that in our own actions we are not doing enough to implement the Paris Agreement at all. But of course we are happy to have that debate on another day.

That is really my main criticism, too, in this Parliament. When you criticise Trump tomorrow, remind yourselves at the same time of what we are doing ourselves. First of all – and we really know all this – the current target on the table that the EU is willing to take of minus 40% by 2030 is not enough for the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Stop saying that the EU is implementing the Paris Agreement. We are not on track.

Secondly, if you look at the two pieces of legislation on the table, we are watering it down. We are creating loopholes – loopholes in the legislation – so that this minus 40% is not even really minus 40%. That is not at all good. The Commission's proposal had too many loopholes. We improved the Commission's proposal. Unfortunately there are a couple of amendments on the table again – in order to get the Christian Democrats on board – to go back to the size of the Commission's loophole, so we are going backwards again, watering the proposal down again, but okay, that is what the Christian Democrats wanted and I hope that they will acknowledge this tomorrow when they criticise Trump.

But it is an improvement compared to the Commission's proposal and the big fight will be with the Member States, because they are also criticising Trump but at the same time watering down the proposal even further.

So please, ladies and gentlemen, let us vote for this and then we will have our proposal on the table. But when we are doing the negotiations, think every time that you criticise Trump that you are only credible in criticising him if you deliver at home.

Julia Reid, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, over the years I have witnessed in this House the perverse mechanism of the EU continuing to further develop a failing project. In the UK, we would say that this amounted to flogging a dead horse. The EU ETS is an example of this. However, in this instance, the project is one of the biggest threats to European industry and competitiveness. Once again, we are expanding and strengthening its remit. This time the European Commission proposal, Climate Action Regulation implementing the Paris Agreement, covers all sectors that currently fall outside the EU emission trading system, with particular regard to transport, waste, environment and agriculture. The aim of this proposal is to deliver, in the relevant sectors, 30% emissions reductions by 2030 compared to 2005 levels. The Paris Agreement sets out the goal to keep global temperature increases well below 2 °C and to strive for no more than 1.5 °C temperature increase. Consistent with these goals, the Paris Agreement also requires that zero net emissions must be achieved in the second half of this century. In addition, in 2009, the EU adopted its objective of 80-95% greenhouse gas emission reductions by 2050.

The EU's climate and energy policies keep perpetuating the same misguided path, continuing to be the solo leader in the futile battle against climate change, whereas the USA and others are acting in favour of progress and prosperity. The sole effect that this huge burden of climate regulation is going to have is to exacerbate the crisis already being experienced by European Union industries that are forced to move offshore, taking their emissions and their jobs with them. My party and I oppose the EU climate and energy policy. We reject climate hysteria and believe that the EU should accept that the Paris Agreement is close to its end.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le retrait annoncé des États-Unis de l'accord de Paris justifie plus que jamais une action dans le cadre des organisations internationales dont les États-Unis sont encore membres. Faut-il rappeler que l'immense majorité des États européens font, eux aussi, partie de la convention-cadre des Nations unies sur les changements climatiques ou encore de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI) pour le secteur aérien ou de l'Organisation maritime internationale (OMI) dans le domaine maritime?

Aussi, ce n'est pas la signature, la ratification et l'application des accords de Paris par l'Union européenne qui feront revenir les États-Unis au cœur d'une action pragmatique, efficace et mondiale pour le climat.

Enfin, l'Union européenne n'est pas à une contradiction près en voulant réduire les émissions d'un côté, tout en défendant, de l'autre, des modèles de libre-échange qui ne font qu'aggraver ces émissions.

En matière écologique, les circuits courts, la relocalisation des entreprises et le patriotisme économique, que nous proposons depuis des années, ne sont pas le problème, mais la solution.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η υπερθέρμανση του πλανήτη, η εξάντληση των φυσικών πόρων και η διαχείριση των αποβλήτων είναι προβλήματα που απαιτούν τη διεθνή συνεργασία, την ευαισθητοποίηση και την εφαρμογή καινοτόμων τεχνολογιών χωρίς επίπλαστα διλήμματα και μακριά από ιδιοτελή ιδιωτικά ή εθνικά συμφέροντα. Δυστυχώς, παρότι χρειάστηκαν περίπου 25 χρόνια από τη Συνάντηση Κορυφής για την προστασία της γης το 1992 στο Ρίο ντε Τζανέιρο και την επικύρωση του Πρωτοκόλλου του Κιότο, η συμφωνία του Παρισιού στερείται νομικής δέσμευσης, και αυτό αποδεικνύεται από την επικείμενη απόσυρση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής. Η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος αφορά στον άνθρωπο και την επιβίωσή του και δεν πρέπει να αποτελεί πεδίο εφαρμογής μικροπολιτικής ή προσπάθεια επιβολής συμφερόντων μεταξύ κρατών. Ως εθνικιστής, πιστεύω ότι είναι δυνατή η συνύπαρξη ενεργειακής απόδοσης και ασφάλειας με την προστασία και χρηστή διαχείριση της βιοποικιλότητας και ταυτόχρονη μείωση των λογαριασμών των καταναλωτών, μέσω αυστηρής τήρησης των υποχρεώσεων που απορρέουν από την εθνική περιβαλλοντική νομοθεσία.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich dem Dank an den Berichterstatter Gerbrandy ganz ausdrücklich anschließen. Er hat hart gearbeitet, und ich glaube, am Ende liegt jetzt ein guter Kompromiss vor. Wir sollten ihm morgen durch ein gutes Abstimmungsergebnis die richtigen Grüße nach Hause schicken, in seiner schwierigen Situation. Ich bedanke mich aber auch bei allen anderen, die mitgeholfen haben, insbesondere bei Pilar Ayuso, der Schattenberichterstatterin der EVP.

Lieber Herr Kollege Bas Eickhout, wir werden morgen unmittelbar nach der Debatte über Trump über dieses Ergebnis abstimmen. Ich glaube, das ist richtig, wir brauchen ein bisschen Zeit, um das zwischen heute und morgen zu sortieren, aber wenn wir morgen eine große Mehrheit für den Bericht von Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy haben, dann ist das gerade das richtige Zeichen in Richtung USA und in die ganze Welt.

Wir sind mit diesem Vorschlag ambitioniert. Wir sind uns einig, dass das Startdatum 2018 sein wird – das ist ambitionierter als der Kommissionsvorschlag. Wir sind uns auch einig – selbst wenn das für manche Länder eine Herausforderung ist, aber es ist international wichtig –, dass kein Land als Basisjahr einen Wert haben wird, der weniger ambitioniert ist als das 2020-Ziel – das ist die richtige Antwort. Aber wir sind nicht überambitioniert.

Einige Mitgliedstaaten haben Herausforderungen: Ich nenne Irland, ich nenne Spanien und Italien, und darauf gehen wir mit der Flexibilität in den Änderungsanträgen von ALDE, EVP und ECR ein, die eben besser und angemessener sind als das, was der Umweltausschuss beschlossen hat. Deswegen glaube ich: Ambitioniert sein, aber realistisch – das ist die richtige Antwort auf Trump, nicht überambitioniert, dann werden wir nämlich auch nicht ernst genommen. Deswegen werbe ich für eine große Mehrheit für den Bericht und die Änderungsanträge von EVP, ALDE und ECR. Dann geben wir die richtige Antwort auf Trump.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli Stati Uniti il presidente Trump mette seriamente in discussione la necessità di combattere contro i cambiamenti climatici, mentre in Gran Bretagna per formare il governo si cerca il supporto di chi nega addirittura l'esistenza del fenomeno.

Ebbene, qui al Parlamento europeo, con l'approvazione di questo regolamento per la riduzione delle emissioni di CO₂ nei trasporti, negli edifici, in agricoltura e nella gestione dei rifiuti, vogliamo lanciare un messaggio chiaro: il futuro nostro e delle prossime generazioni passa per una società e un'economia più sostenibili. L'Europa ne è consapevole e sa anche che per ottenere dei risultati l'azione deve essere globale, perché le emissioni di CO₂, non si fermano alle frontiere di chi le produce.

Io definisco questo testo sull'*effort sharing* un buon testo, un testo ambizioso, ma anche assolutamente pragmatico, che prevede soprattutto un buon sistema di flessibilità per gli Stati membri, proprio per metterli in condizione di realizzare gli obiettivi che sono previsti. Se gestita bene, la transizione a un sistema a basse emissioni non è solo benefica per l'ambiente ma anche per una crescita economica florida delle nostre società.

Non è un caso che uno dei criteri previsti da questo regolamento per stabilire gli obiettivi di riduzione per i singoli Stati membri sia proprio il livello medio di PIL pro capite. Si riconoscono gli sforzi fatti fino ad ora e si permette di valorizzare in modo flessibile la specificità dei diversi territori, da quelli a vocazione più industriale fino a quelli a vocazione agricola o boschiva. Non viene chiesto a nessuno l'impossibile, ma di contribuire al meglio. *Effort sharing* è condivisione degli sforzi. Noi andiamo avanti, convinti e posso dirvi, di ritorno da una missione di lavoro negli Stati Uniti, che al di là dei grandi proclami anche milioni di americani ci credono.

Jørn Dohrmann (ECR). – Hr. formand! Jeg vil også sige tak til alle, og dette er selvfølgelig en god dag, hvor vi kan diskutere, hvad det egentlig er, der er sket, hvorfor fik vi ikke klimacertificeringen med i aftalen, så man kan vise, hvem det egentlig er, der har gjort noget, og anerkende disse folk. Vi ved, at der er nogle lande, der betaler høje skatter, høje afgifter og selvfølgelig gør en masse på dette område. Men vi skal også sige, at der skal være denne byrdefordeling imellem rig og fattig. Vi skal have fleksibiliteten, vi skal anerkende, at vi har noget teknologi, som skal overføres til nogle af de lande, som jo kunne være bedre bidragsydere til, at vi kan gøre mere for klimaet. Så derfor er det vores hensigt, at man netop får udvidet muligheden for at vise, at man har noget afprøvet teknologi, som vil være med til at hjælpe klimaet fremadrettet, og det synes vi er den vej, vi skal gå, og derfor er det godt, at man på denne måde kan lave en byrdefordeling, som kan være til gavn for alle, men også tager hensyn til alle.

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Beste collega's, beste commissaris, de klimaatconferentie van Parijs erkent het belang van de agrarische sector voor onze voedselvoorziening. Toch wordt de land- en tuinbouwsector nog te vaak in de hoek gezet en dat terwijl de land- en tuinbouwsector juist een unieke eigenschap bezit. De agrarische sector is één van de weinige sectoren die ook broeikasgassen kan winnen uit de lucht en omzetten in organische stof in de bodem. Een win-win situatie, want hiermee wordt ook de bodemkwaliteit van onze landbouwgronden verbeterd. Het is daarom terecht dat afgevangen broeikasgassen meegenomen worden in de klimaatdoelstellingen. Het is nu aan de lidstaten om te komen tot een model waarbij de boer en tuinder ook daadwerkelijk beloond worden voor het afvangen van broeikasgassen. Dit kan bijvoorbeeld met een CO₂-handelssysteem of door meer ondernemersruimte te geven. Daarnaast loopt de Nederlandse land- en tuinbouw nu al voorop in innovaties die leiden tot een steeds lagere uitstoot van broeikasgassen per kilogram voedsel. Helaas blokkeert Europese wetgeving innovaties om van het overschot aan dierlijke mest kunstmestvervangers te maken. Hiermee kunnen we volgens berekeningen de consumptie van kunstmest met 15% reduceren, en daarmee dus ook de uitstoot van broeikasgas. De agrarische sector is dit dus niet het probleem, maar juist een deel van de oplossing.

Flexibiliteit binnen wet- en regelgeving is echter wel nodig om boeren en tuinders de mogelijkheid te bieden om te blijven innoveren.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, en los últimos días Trump ha sacado del Acuerdo de París a uno de los países más contaminantes del mundo, junto con China, mientras aquí se utilizan herramientas falsas en la lucha contra el cambio climático.

El informe es un paso muy pequeño. No nos engañemos: hoy ya sabemos que no llegaremos a alcanzar los objetivos marcados por el Acuerdo de París.

De nada sirven los compromisos sobre el papel cuando todo se basa en comprar bonos para seguir arrasando con el planeta y haciendo negocios.

En España, Rajoy dice que hace falta un cambio y, sin embargo, castiga el autoconsumo. Aquí, Cañete abre las puertas a los *lobbies* energéticos, los más contaminantes del planeta. Porque lo único que saben hacer ustedes, señores, es ayudar a sus amigos de las multinacionales.

Y lo que está pidiendo a gritos este planeta es un cambio radical de modelo productivo en nuestro modo de vida, de consumo, en nuestra relación con la naturaleza; un cambio que solo llegará de la mano de una ciudadanía consciente y comprometida, porque lo que nos estamos jugando hoy, en esta Cámara, es el futuro de esta tierra.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo di Parigi non è morto, l'accordo di Parigi semmai viene dimenticato quando, come in questa modifica di regolamento, ne abbiamo cambiato addirittura il titolo, richiamando appunto le azioni da intraprendere in linea con l'accordo di Parigi.

A mio avviso, siamo ben lontani purtroppo da intraprendere una vera strada che guarda davvero in direzione degli obiettivi di Parigi, anche perché i risultati di recenti studi ci dicono che la possibilità di ridurre e di mantenere l'aumento della temperatura globale entro 1,5 C° non sarà raggiunta e potrebbe già avvenire entro il 2030.

Questo dovrebbe darci l'urgenza della nostra necessità di agire, specialmente in questo regolamento che fa parte del secondo pilastro delle politiche climatiche insieme all'ETS, altro strumento che non funziona e che non favorisce gli investimenti verso appunto tecnologie pulite e una produzione davvero sostenibile e che soprattutto ci dà l'esempio di come non vengono utilizzati in maniera appropriata, ad esempio, i proventi delle aste, che dovrebbero e potrebbero essere utilizzati proprio per migliorare e fare degli investimenti nella mitigazione delle emissioni nei settori invece *effort sharing*.

Nessuno Stato membro ad oggi lo ha fatto. Siamo di fronte purtroppo all'ennesimo accordo che di fatto prende in giro l'opinione pubblica. Sono parole vuote, senza un vero contenuto. Io non sono d'accordo con il tentativo del relatore di tenere in barca tutti i grandi gruppi, soprattutto i gruppi conservatori che hanno fatto di tutto per smantellare questo documento e smantellarne l'ambizione. Stiamo per andare davanti al trilogico con il Consiglio e non possiamo permetterci di demolire ancora una volta l'ambizione di uno dei pilastri delle politiche per combattere il clima.

President. – Before I give the floor to my colleague, Mrs McGuinness, I would like to take this opportunity to wish her a happy birthday. She is speaking on her birthday, but still has just one and a half minutes.

(Applause)

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to take ten seconds to thank the visitors to Parliament for wishing me a happy birthday – and no, I am not going to tell you what age I am, but it is all transparent and it is available – and thank you, Mr President.

Now to the subject of this debate, because Mr Liese and Mr Huitema introduced the topic on my agenda: Ireland and agriculture. I know, Commissioner, that you are fully familiar with our problems in Ireland, because we have a strong and large agricultural sector. We are doing a lot of work on climate-smart agriculture, but there is only so far we can go.

I am all for ambition, and, Mr Eickhout, I hope you appreciate that. However, ambition with targets that are unachievable can be distracting, and our 2020 target was unachievable. We know that we have to do more, but what I would ask colleagues to understand is the situation where we do not have heavy industry, we have a large agricultural sector and we need much more flexibility on this issue, because farmers are concerned that the cost of this at the moment – if we look at the calculations – would be over EUR 1.7 billion in terms of purchasing carbon.

I do not want an opt-out here, because we all have duties and responsibilities, but I want an understanding that we are major producers of food – we export it to Europe and beyond – and we need an acknowledgment of that fact in the work, and I hope that in the negotiations it will be acknowledged.

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous avons la lourde responsabilité de définir la politique climatique de l'Union européenne pour les trente prochaines années.

L'urgence climatique nous oblige et nous appelle à prendre des mesures à la hauteur des attentes et de la prise de conscience de nos concitoyens, pour faire face au défi de notre siècle: l'avenir de notre planète.

Le texte dont nous débattons aujourd'hui vise à traduire dans la législation européenne les engagements climatiques que l'Union et les États membres ont pris dans le cadre de l'accord de Paris.

Il s'agit donc de passer du discours aux actes. À l'heure où Donald Trump a pris la décision de quitter l'accord de Paris, il est plus que jamais crucial que l'Union européenne tienne ses engagements dans la lutte contre le réchauffement climatique.

Ce rapport, qui relève le niveau d'ambition de la proposition de la Commission européenne en inscrivant des objectifs à long terme d'ici 2050, en limitant certaines flexibilités et en renforçant le contrôle des efforts et la clause de révision pour revoir à la hausse les objectifs contraignants, permettra d'envoyer ce signal politique fort pour que l'Union européenne assume le *leadership* dans la mise en œuvre de l'accord de Paris.

En conséquence, j'appelle les députés européens à voter en faveur de l'ensemble du rapport adopté par la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire.

On ne peut pas se réjouir en séance plénière de la ratification de l'accord de Paris puis, une fois les textes sur la table, essayer de revoir à la baisse le niveau d'ambition de l'Union européenne.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Fake news staat aan de verkeerde kant van de geschiedenis. Vandaag kunnen we tonen dat de Europese Unie wel woord houdt en het akkoord van Parijs uitvoert. We zijn het aan onze kinderen en onze kleinkinderen verplicht om die verantwoordelijkheid nu op te nemen. De strijd tegen klimaatverandering is een zaak van inspanningen, maar ook van kansen en daarbij moet iedereen zijn steentje bijdragen. Klimaat is immers geen verantwoordelijkheid van de overheid alleen. Vlaanderen zit op het goede spoor. De 2020-doelstelling ligt binnen handbereik. Het bereiken van de 2030-doelen zal heel wat bijkomende inspanningen vragen. Maar Vlaanderen is vastberaden die uitdaging aan te gaan. De Vlaamse regering onder leiding van minister-president Geert Bourgeois trekt daar stevig aan de kar. Het vinden van een delicaat evenwicht tussen ambitie en haalbaarheid blijft evenwel een uitdaging en het vervroegen van de startdatum blijft in die zin een punt van zorg voor ons.

Fredrick Federley (ALDE). – Herr talman! Först av allt vill jag gratulera föredraganden och skuggföredraganden för ett väldigt bra arbete, särskilt en tanke till vår kollega Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, som tyvärr inte kan vara här den här veckan av personliga skäl, men som har lagt ner ett väldigt hårt arbete för att se till att vi kan leverera en bred kompromiss i det här huset som bär klimatpolitiken vidare på ett ansvarsfullt sätt.

Jag tror också att det är oerhört viktigt att vi inte låter presidenten i USA sätta agendan för den europeiska klimatpolitiken. När Donald Trump nu väljer att vända sig från ambition och från klimatansvar har vi faktiskt en stor öppning för Europa att göra ännu mer som kommer att leda till att vi får innovationer, att vi får nya företag och att vi kan leda en teknisk utveckling mot en bättre värld, som skapar morgondagens industri och morgondagens energiförsörjning.

Den delen vi pratar om nu, effort sharing, är en viktig del i klimatpaketet, tillsammans med ETS:n, där vi handlar, och som mer berör industrin. Men det är också viktigt att det energipaket som vi har på bordet nu blir till bra och kraftfull lagstiftning som bygger under det vi nu säger att vi ska göra genom effort sharing. Det finns också mycket att göra beträffande direktivet om förnybar energi, till exempel. Där finns det en risk att vi, med god vilja om att rädda miljön, slår undan de förnybara bränslena, som faktiskt är de som kommer att se till att vi klarar av energiomställningen och som skapar nya jobb på landsbygden och för europeiskt jordbruk. Idag tar vi ett stort steg framåt, men det är såklart väldigt mycket arbete kvar med den tekniska lagstiftningen.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I am sceptical in many ways towards the European Union, but on this, I think it is a challenge that we should meet. Unlike the drive for a single currency or the current drive for a European army, this project is in our interests. But, if we want it to be in our interests, we have to bring the people along with us. Mairead McGuinness, MEP and Vice-President for Parliament, talked about the challenges to Irish farming. There can be benefits if we meet this challenge; there can be benefits in producing our proteins locally, rather than bringing them thousands of kilometres across an ocean; there can be benefits in recycling the animal manure and reusing the energy and the fertiliser, saving on heavy use of energy in chemical fertilisers. There can be use in reusing water. In many cases in Ireland, we are using treated water. This can all bring benefits to the farming community, and we need to sell it to people by showing that there will be financial benefits locally, because if we produce locally, people can stay locally and everyone is happy and the planet benefits.

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro Commissario Cañete, credo che il tema del quale stiamo parlando sia un tema importante perché passa dalla teoria alla pratica. Dopo l'accordo di Parigi proviamo a metterlo in pratica con la regolamentazione pertinente.

Certo, Trump, con una visione sicuramente miope, ha dato una linea diversa, ma non c'è che dire, gli Stati americani, le grandi città e le grandi imprese tendono a dire ogni giorno, sempre di più, che invece sulla linea dell'accordo di Parigi bisogna continuare a operare. L'Europa in questo deve essere leader, deve essere leader sul piano internazionale e sul piano mondiale. La proposta che è stata messa sul tavolo è una proposta interessante. Il Parlamento l'ha sicuramente migliorata e ha corretto alcuni errori che c'erano, signor Commissario, perché gli *early movers*, cioè i paesi che avevano già fatto un grande sforzo e che erano già andati avanti, avevano difficoltà a implementare la proposta e lei ha riconosciuto, sin dalla prima presentazione, che c'era qualcosa da correggere.

Oggi il Parlamento ha messo in atto i correttivi. Con la riserva a 90 milioni di tonnellate, proposta dal collega Gerbrandy, credo che andiamo proprio nella direzione giusta. L'Italia potrà implementare questa proposta, che all'inizio sicuramente era molto avversa al nostro paese. Dall'altro lato, l'ambizione del Parlamento, che come PPE abbiamo accettato di anticipare la curva discendente nell'applicazione degli accordi, è nella direzione giusta. Credo che stiamo lavorando bene e dovremmo votare gli emendamenti proposti.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Köszönöm szépen Képviselőtársamnak, hogy elfogadja ezt a kérdést. Ön is említette az amerikai elnöknek a húzódozását, vagy hát inkább úgy mondanám, hogy otromba kivonulását. Kérdezem azt, hogy ez mennyire aggasztó az Ön véleménye szerint, hiszen úgy tűnik, hogy Amerikában az üzleti szféra maga azért messze túllép a megújuló energiahordozók felé?

Giovanni La Via (PPE), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Credo che l'impatto della scelta di Trump sia un impatto molto limitato per due ordini di motivi. In primo luogo, perché molti Stati, le grandi città e le grandi imprese vogliono continuare sulla linea dell'accordo di Parigi. Dall'altro lato, la procedura per uscire dall'accordo di Parigi è una procedura complessa, che dura del tempo, e sono certo che in ogni caso il prossimo governo americano, di qualunque colore sia, rivedrà la posizione sulla lotta al cambiamento climatico e dovranno recuperare il tempo perso.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, Uniunea Europeană și alți actori globali au reacționat cu forță și unitate la decizia de retragere a Statelor Unite din Acordul de la Paris. Am ales cooperarea internațională în detrimentul izolării și vom continua să jucăm un rol decisiv în combaterea amenințării grave reprezentate de schimbările climatice. Regulamentul pe care îl vom vota este o componentă importantă a politicii UE în privința schimbărilor climatice pe perioada Acordului de la Paris. El va asigura reduceri semnificative ale emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră în sectoare care astăzi sunt răspunzătoare pentru mai mult de jumătate din emisiile de la nivelul Uniunii Europene. Legislația trebuie să fie ambițioasă. În același timp, însă, trebuie să evităm ca ea să aibă efecte economice disproporționate asupra statelor membre cu venituri mai reduse. Corelând obiectivele de reducere a emisiilor cu PIB-ul, această legislație se va asigura că

țările care au de atins obiective dure chiar își pot permite să le îndeplinească.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Heute geben wir Antwort auf den amerikanischen Präsidenten: Wir halten am Pariser Klimaschutzabkommen fest, und wir setzen das in ausgewogener Weise um. Das tun wir insbesondere mit den drei Vorschlägen: CO₂-Minderungen in unserer Industrie, jetzt der heutige Vorschlag für die Treibhausgasreduzierung in Verkehr, Gebäuden, Abfall und Landwirtschaft und im dritten Vorschlag der CO₂-Aufnahmekapazität unserer Wälder, also der sogenannten LULUCF-Sektor. Alle Sektoren hängen mit sogenannten Flexibilitäten eng zusammen und machen nur als Einheit Sinn.

Sehr bedeutend ist dabei die Rolle der Land- und Forstwirtschaft. Sie ist Teil der Lösung und nicht das Problem. Um das Potenzial der CO₂-Minderung ausschöpfen zu können – das war 2012 zum Beispiel 9 % der Gesamtemissionen aller Sektoren –, muss der Sektor auch eine Wertschätzung und einen Anreiz bekommen, CO₂-Gutschriften zu produzieren und damit mehr Aufnahme als Abgabe zu produzieren. Und er darf eben nicht bestraft werden. Deswegen bin ich für den ausgehandelten Kompromiss für die 280 Mio. Tonnen Flexibilität und glaube, dass dies ein sehr guter Kompromiss ist.

Jo Leinen (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Der Klimaschutz ist eine moralische und eine politische Verpflichtung – heute mehr denn je. Das Parlament hat mit dem Vorschlag für eine Klimaschutzverordnung bis 2030 vielleicht keinen perfekten Kompromiss vorgelegt, aber wir haben doch sehr klare Vorgaben für eine konsequentere Reduzierung der CO₂-Gase, auch für einen Fokus auf eine Langfriststrategie bis 2050 und auch für Optionen, wie die Bemühungen der Länder anerkannt werden und auch Flexibilität eingebaut wird, damit Länder nicht überfordert werden.

Jetzt brauchen wir den Rat, wir brauchen die Mitgliedstaaten, damit dieses Paket sehr bald über die Bühne gehen kann. Denn bis zur Klimakonferenz in Bonn, bis zur COP23, sollte die EU ihr Paket fertig haben: den Emissionshandel, diese Klimaschutzverordnung und auch LULUCF. So können wir der Welt zeigen, dass wir nicht nur Klimaschutz global propagieren, sondern auch zu Hause ernst nehmen. Unserer Klimaschutzdiplomatie muss es gelingen, dass wir einen globalen Konsens herstellen, auch wenn Trump dagegen ist.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – A União Europeia não pode hesitar no caminho que traçou para liderar o processo de harmonização e combate às alterações climáticas. O relatório hoje em debate reforça o compromisso da União Europeia com as metas do Acordo Paris e ganha uma importância acrescida com a decisão tomada pela Administração americana de retirar os Estados Unidos desse acordo.

Este regulamento estabelece metas vinculativas de emissão de gases de efeito estufa para os Estados-Membros, englobando os setores da economia não regulamentados pelo RCLE. Esses setores representam quase 60 % das emissões totais na UE em 2014 e a definição de objetivos nacionais foi feita com um processo de equidade.

Esta é uma mudança que proporcionará oportunidades de emprego, crescimento e investimento para a Europa, enquanto mitiga as alterações climáticas e exige mudanças nos comportamentos, nos incentivos às empresas e aos investimentos. É por isso que é fundamental que as opções constantes deste relatório possam ter um amplo apoio neste Parlamento. Fizemos uma opção clara pela liderança na transição para a economia e a sociedade sustentável. Hesitar, no atual contexto global, poderia significar deitar tudo a perder.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Tak for det! USA og Trump vil desværre ikke være med til at efterleve Paris-klimaaftalen, men vi vil i Europa! Klimaet og klodens befolkning har desperat brug for, at vi handler på de klimaforandringer, vi ser. I EU både kan og skal vi levere på vores løfter, og vi skal være ambitiøse. Også når det bliver svært, og også når vi skal fordele byrderne. Miljøudvalget har turdet være ambitiøst. Jeg støtter fuldt ud Miljøudvalgets betænkning. Vi er ambitiøse og balancerede. Særlig godt er det, at vi stiller krav om en tidlig start på indsatsen allerede i 2018. Jo før vi kommer i gang, jo bedre. Flexibiliteten er det mest omdiskuterede. Flexibilitet for de enkelte medlemslande er som udgangspunkt en god ting, men det må ikke blive så fleksibelt, at vi reelt slet ikke får lavet nogen nye klimaaftaler. Alle skal levere, alle sektorer skal være med, ellers får vi ikke løst vores klimaudfordringer.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o Acordo de Paris prevê que as partes tomem medidas para conservar e reforçar, se necessário, os sumidouros e os reservatórios de gases com efeito estufa, nomeadamente as florestas. A presente proposta é parte integrante da aplicação do compromisso assumido pela União Europeia no Acordo de Paris de reduzir as emissões em toda a economia.

Caros Colegas, estamos numa altura de grandes incertezas, de incompreensível negação das evidentes alterações climáticas por quem, como é o caso Estados Unidos, mais contribui para as emissões para a atmosfera.

A principal prioridade da União é criar uma união de energia resiliente que privilegie a eficiência energética e forneça energia segura, sustentável, a preços acessíveis aos cidadãos, bem como aplicar políticas de redução de emissões e substituição dos combustíveis fósseis. E essa, caros Colegas, é a nossa prioridade se quisermos liderar na assunção dos compromissos de Paris. Acredito que só através de uma ação climática ambiciosa se poderá contribuir para resgatar a tempo um planeta que seja sustentável à vida.

Gostaria de congratular o Sr. Gerbrandy por este excelente documento de compromisso e dizer que a Europa não pode agora recuar nos compromissos que assumiu em Paris. A Europa tem agora uma oportunidade única para mostrar ao mundo a sua liderança neste domínio.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, reducerea obligatorie a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră este un obiectiv al Uniunii Europene și este un obiectiv al tuturor statelor membre. De fiecare dată când s-au analizat reducerea emisiilor, problemele de mediu, am considerat că trebuie să luăm în calcul un context mai larg, global, pentru a nu pune Europa și cetățenii ei într-o poziție defavorabilă. Trebuie să finanțăm împădurirea, este nevoie să finanțăm împădurirea, nu trebuie doar să spunem că avem nevoie de împădurire. Este normal să dorim protecția mediului. Până la urmă, vorbim de viață, de viața oamenilor.

Ce ne facem însă cu țările mai sărace, care nu pot să atingă aceste nivele? Ce facem cu poluatorii mari, Statele Unite și China? Ce vom face cu acordul TTIP, dacă America nu va răspunde cerințelor de mediu? Ce vom face cu competiția, cu industria europeană? Cred, domnule comisar, că trebuie să aveți în vedere ca, în toate acordurile comerciale, să puneți și aceste condiții de mediu, pentru că planeta trebuie salvată și nu putem decât prin măsuri corelate nu numai cu Europa, ci și cu celelalte continente.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, για τη μείωση των εκπομπών αερίων ρύπων, για τους στόχους της συμφωνίας των Παρισίων, και όλα αυτά όταν πλέον ένας από τους μεγαλύτερους ρυπαντές παγκοσμίως, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής, δήλωσαν ότι αποσύρονται από τη συμφωνία των Παρισίων. Η απόφαση αυτή των ΗΠΑ ανατρέπει τα δεδομένα και βάζει εκ των πραγμάτων τη συζήτηση σε μια άλλη βάση, διότι οι ΗΠΑ προστατεύουν σε βάρος της ίδιας της υφηλίου τη δική τους βιομηχανία και οικονομία. Για αυτόν τον λόγο, οι στόχοι της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης πρέπει να είναι ευέλικτοι και ρεαλιστικοί και να στηρίζουν την κοινωνία και την οικονομία, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη δράση όλων των παγκόσμιων παικτών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, λοιπόν, οφείλει να ξαναδεί την τροπολογία που είχα καταθέσει επανειλημμένα, δηλαδή, να απαλλαγεί η ηλεκτροπαραγωγή στην Ελλάδα από την καταβολή εισφορών για δικαιώματα εκπομπής αερίων ρύπων, όπως συμβαίνει και στην Πολωνία και στη Βουλγαρία. Επιπλέον, οι στόχοι για το σύστημα ευφύων μεταφορών θα πρέπει να μην διαλύουν τη γεωργία.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wszystkie te cele związane z porozumieniem paryskim są niezwykle ważne, natomiast wydaje mi się, że powinna nam też towarzyszyć pewna refleksja, że powinniśmy być spójni w naszym działaniu, w tym, co robimy również w ramach Unii Europejskiej. Na przykład autor sprawozdania mówi o przyspieszeniu trajektorii redukcji w stosunku do propozycji Komisji z roku 2020 do roku 2018. Pytanie: czy to jest zasadne? Nie znajduje to oparcia w stanowisku wielu państw członkowskich. Z jednej strony mówimy o tym sprawozdaniu, a z drugiej bardzo komplementarne jest tu sprawozdanie posła Linsa, które dopiero będzie omawiane. Być może warto byłoby te dwa sprawozdania omawiać razem. Pani poseł McGuinness mówiła ponadto o kwestii obciążenia pewnych sektorów, na przykład rolnictwa. W niektórych krajach to może być poważny problem i to również wymaga pewnego rodzaju refleksji. I wreszcie wydaje mi się, że potrzeba nam więcej koordynacji, tak aby nasze decyzje w omawianym zakresie były spójne, aby cele wyznaczone w porozumieniu paryskim można było zrealizować.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I am totally in favour of the Paris Climate Accord. I am totally in favour of the European Union approach and especially the 2030 targets and many of the proposals here make sense. They are, however, somewhat discriminatory against agricultural producing countries, including my own.

Mr Grzyb mentioned the starting date of 2018 instead of 2020, and the target is also not appropriate. For instance, we now have to start at the target rather than the actual emissions. It is estimated that this will cost us a billion, and the Commission's proposals took into account the mistakes that were made when the targets were set originally and if we had stuck with the Commission proposals we would have no difficulty.

Parliament is now going beyond this and it means that agricultures like Ireland will be hugely burdened. We will have to purchase compliance because we will be starting in a non-compliant area and this is something that will actually totally discriminate against us in view of the economic crisis, in view of Brexit coming down the track, and now this!

It is unnecessary and it should stop and I am tabling a split vote on it.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Miguel Arias Cañete, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened carefully to the debate today. I am encouraged by the Members' engagement with the issues, and I appreciate the commitment to maintain the European Union's role as a path-breaker in the area of international climate action.

On the two non-ETS proposals, the discussions have progressed well in the Council, the technical work is nearly finalised, and I would like to thank the Members for taking this important step in Parliament, which provides crucial political momentum for this proposal. I am convinced that the Council, under the leadership of the incoming Estonian presidency, will be able to move forward swiftly before the next climate conference in Bonn in November. The European Union, as a driving force behind the high-ambition coalition, cannot come to Bonn empty handed.

I would like to give answers on some other points raised, because it was hinted by someone that the European Union was not implementing the Paris Agreement. We should be clear on two things. The first is that we really are implementing the Paris Agreement. Out of the 140 nationally determined contributions, the European Union has the most ambitious one, namely a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 40%. This is the biggest, most ambitious target. But we have something that makes us different from the rest – in fact, two things. We have launched all the legislation needed to achieve our targets, and I can assure Mr Eickhout that, in all the legislation the Commission is launching, nothing is being watered down, and incidentally that goes for the decarbonisation study too. We will get there –taking into account also that Paris is not an agreement which stops in 2030, it is a dynamic agreement with a five-year ambition cycle, and I am sure we will work in such a way in the coming years that we will bring on board our international partners, including even the USA.

This is one president, but there will come other presidents and other administrations, and we also have to understand that we have seen a movement in the USA in response to Mr Trump's withdrawal: a massive one from states, big cities and major businesses who have announced that they will do their part to help fulfil the original US commitment of reducing emissions by between 26% and 28% in 2025 as against 2005.

So, we are implementing the Paris Agreement. We are serious in the legislation we are introducing, and what we are discussing today is of the utmost importance. Establishing binding targets for Member States was not easy in the discussions with them. Establishing such targets in agriculture, in transport and in the building sector will be a difficult exercise, and this Parliament has improved our proposals. With regard to the agricultural sector, as many of you – Mr Lynch, Mr Caputo, Mr Flanagan, Ms McGuinness and others – have pointed out, agriculture and forestry are part of the solution, and not of the problem. In the discussions, we will have to look further at future reform of the common agricultural policy, to see how we will ensure it contributes to the solution and to maintaining a dynamic and prosperous European agricultural sector.

So, my message today is one of optimism because I have just come from Bologna and, with the Environment Ministers of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom, the European Commissioners are reaffirming their strong commitment to the swift and effective implementation of the Paris Agreement, which remains the global instrument for activity in tackling climate change and adapting to its effects. We are committed to its implementation, our partners are committed to its implementation, the European Parliament is supporting the Commission in having the most ambitious legislation possible.

I would like to thank all of you who took part in this debate, and particularly to thank Mr Gerbrandy, whom I am missing today, for the work he has done and for the good work I am pretty sure we will do in the trilogues.

Catherine Bearder, *deputising for the rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the speakers for their good wishes to my good friend and colleague, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, who is the rapporteur on this report, and who despite doing all the heavy work on this is unable to be with us today because he has a family crisis. I am sure I speak for all this House in wishing Gerben-Jan and his family all the best.

I would like to thank the Commission for its commitment to driving down CO₂ emissions. I heard earlier that there are concerns about how we can get to 2050. Well, nobody has ever said that tackling climate change is going to be easy, but it has to be done. Even the Paris Agreement still only brings us back to a level where we know we were emitting too much. The damage continues to be done to the whole planet. Every tonne of CO₂ that is emitted today will remain in the atmosphere for over a hundred years.

But there is good news. We can have a green economy. We can drive the innovation and business that can address that. It is tough for farmers to change their farming practices. We understand that. We have been as firm as we can but as amenable as possible to their difficulties in making sure that farmers can associate themselves with this message and this regulation.

We have heard from the deniers from – I am ashamed to say – the UK. They deny climate change, they even deny their existence as an effective political party in the UK, and have nearly been wiped out. I think everybody here agrees that climate change is a real issue and one on which action must be effected.

A strong vote from this Parliament tomorrow will send a message to businesses, to farmers, to industry, to consumers, and to voters and the young people of Europe that we are serious about climate change. It is a compromise, sure, but it is one that we have to make and the political groups here are committed to it.

Thank you very much for your support everyone, and for the support from the Commission.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Mittwoch, 14. Juni 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles estamos a favor de la reducción de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero como primera medida urgente para mitigar los devastadores efectos del cambio climático. Tras el anuncio de la retirada de los Estados Unidos del Acuerdo de París, la Unión Europea ha de liderar el proceso y redoblar sus esfuerzos como región referente. Los socialistas queremos evitar que el incremento de la temperatura media global del planeta supere los 2° C respecto a los niveles preindustriales y defenderemos la necesidad de llevar a cabo esfuerzos adicionales para que el calentamiento global no supere los 1,5° C. Defendemos la necesidad de que las emisiones globales toquen techo lo antes posible, si bien somos conscientes de que esta tarea llevará más tiempo en países en desarrollo. En este sentido, apoyamos las contribuciones al Fondo Verde del Clima, dirigido a países en vías de desarrollo con el objetivo de que reduzcan sus emisiones y mitiguen las consecuencias del cambio climático. Para ello, los socialistas queremos mantener el objetivo de movilizar 100 000 millones de dólares al año en 2020 y ampliar esta medida hasta 2025.

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – Az Európai Unió párizsi vállalása teljesítésének egyik legfontosabb eszköze az uniós kibocsátás-kereskedelmi rendszer alá nem tartozó üvegházi gázkibocsátásokat kezelő erőfeszítés-megosztási rendelet. Véleményem szerint a jogszabályjavaslatban megfogalmazott csökkentési célértékek kellően ambiciózusak, és megfelelően tükrözik az egyes tagállamok közös kibocsátás-csökkentési törekvésekhez való hozzájárulásának igazságos mértékét. Ugyanakkor fontosnak tartom azt is hangsúlyozni, hogy egyes országok esetében az előirányzott csökkentési célszámok jobban is igazodhatnak a 2020 előtti kibocsátási lehetőségeikhez. Egy olyan célérték meghatározás lenne ezért elfogadható, amely jobban reagál a 2020 előtti rendszerben tett korai csökkentésekre, mivel ezek kompenzációjára a jogosultságok átvitelének lehetősége nélkül a jól teljesítő tagállamoknak nincs lehetőségük, míg a kevésbé jól teljesítők a túlkínálat következtében lényegében értéktelen kibocsátási jogosultságok átruházásával könnyedén teljesíthetik a kívánt célértékeket 2020-ig. Emellett fontos arra is ügyelni, hogy a célértékekben jelenjen meg az egyes tagállamok tényleges fejlettségi szintje is.

Владимир Уручев (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Уважаеми колеги, Парижкото споразумение напълно очаквано прави необратим процеса на декарбонизиране на световната икономика, предвиждайки до края на този век да се постигнат нулеви нетни емисии на парникови газове.

През 2009 г. ЕС прие своята цел за намаляване на тези емисии с 80-95% до 2050 г. Разглежданият днес регламент за споделяне на усилията или „за действия в областта на климата в изпълнение на Парижкото споразумение“ се отнася до 60% от емисиите на парникови газове в ЕС и обхваща секторите извън схемата за търговия с емисии, включително транспорт, отпадъци, строителство и селско стопанство. Общата цел на европейско ниво за намаляване на въглеродните емисии с 40% до 2030 г. става задължителна за посочените сектори на национално ниво.

Подкрепям установяването на траектория за постигане на намаляване на емисиите с най-малко 80% до 2050 г., с цел осигуряване на дългосрочна предсказуемост на политиките и нужните инвестиции. Приветствам сериозната гъвкавост, която се предоставя на страните членки при постигането на целите на регламента. Тя е особено важна за селското стопанство и горите, които могат да допринесат и за общото намаляване на емисиите чрез естествен механизъм на поглъщане на въглероден диоксид. Приемлив е и призивът за ранни действия, доколкото се съчетава с допълнителни бонуси за съответните страни на по-късен етап.

(Die Sitzung wird um 11.20 Uhr unterbrochen.)

(Das Parlament versammelt sich von 12.00 Uhr bis 12.30 Uhr zur Feier des 30-jährigen Bestehens des Erasmus-Programms.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

4. Obilježavanje 30. obljetnice Erasmusa

Presidente – Signor Presidente della Commissione europea, signora Ministro Dalli, signor Commissario Navracsics, cari rappresentanti di Erasmus, cari giovani che partecipate al programma Erasmus, che siete seduti in tribuna, cari colleghi, oggi celebriamo i primi trent'anni del programma Erasmus. Si tratta di una grande storia di successo, che ha contribuito ad avvicinare l'Europa, i suoi valori, prima fra tutte la libertà, e le sue opportunità a nove milioni di giovani.

Non è un caso che questo programma prenda il suo nome da Erasmo da Rotterdam, un grande umanista del nostro Rinascimento, uno dei padri del pensiero libero, delle libere università, che sono alla radice della nostra identità europea. Erasmus vuol dire scambio, incontro tra culture, tra idee, apprendimento di lingue e mentalità diverse, di flessibilità e adattamento, del cercare di capire l'altro.

L'opera di Erasmo da Rotterdam «Elogio della follia» è parte del nostro patrimonio culturale. Pensare fuori dagli schemi ed essere creativi. Anche per questo, il programma Erasmus ha preparato intere generazioni, non soltanto per allargare i propri orizzonti, ma anche per trovare un lavoro o creare un'impresa.

L'idea di un singolo può cambiare l'Europa. Erasmus è nato così, dall'idea di Sofia Corradi, un'italiana, «mamma Erasmus». La professoressa Corradi non si è fermata davanti alle difficoltà, ma ha creduto in un sogno che è diventato realtà anche grazie alla sua determinazione. E da qui la vogliamo salutare.

Erasmus è iniziato nel 1987, con appena 3 000 studenti provenienti da undici paesi diversi. A quell'epoca, studiare all'estero era veramente un privilegio per pochi. Trent'anni dopo, la mobilità europea è diventata la norma. La generazione Erasmus è il simbolo di una rivoluzione culturale.

Oggi abbiamo invitato alcuni testimoni, che rappresentano i nove milioni di studenti Erasmus, per festeggiare insieme. Abbiamo qui la presidente di un'impresa di successo, un campione di moto mondiale paraolimpico, un designer, un grande chef e persino il Ministro dell'Istruzione del Portogallo, Tiago Brandão Rodrigues.

Per la straordinaria importanza che riveste come volano dell'integrazione e come simbolo della cultura europea, penso che Erasmus debba essere molto più che un programma, debba essere una possibilità per tutti i giovani europei, indipendentemente dal livello di reddito della propria famiglia o dal percorso di formazione intrapreso. Per questo dobbiamo lavorare per avere un bilancio europeo con risorse adeguate per sostenere Erasmus. Più fondi per Erasmus vuol dire anche meno disoccupazione giovanile.

Nella Dichiarazione di Roma ci siamo impegnati per una Unione in cui i giovani ricevano l'istruzione e la formazione migliori e possano studiare e trovare un lavoro in tutto il continente. Il Parlamento europeo assicurerà che questo impegno non resti soltanto sulla carta. Per questa prima generazione di europei, nata senza aver conosciuto la Guerra fredda, senza il muro di Berlino, l'Unione europea non vuol dire più solo la pace fra i popoli del continente, vuol dire integrazione, vuol dire Erasmus.

Do ora la parola al Ministro Dalli.

Helena Dalli, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, as one of the best known and most popular EU programmes, Erasmus has become a symbol of Europe and of our fundamental values, but it is also much more than a symbol. Since its inception in 1987, more than 9 million people have studied, worked or volunteered abroad under the programme. Erasmus has thus proved to be a key tool for international mobility and intercultural exchange. It gives real meaning to the idea of European citizenship. Thirty years means that we can already celebrate three generations of Erasmus students. I am very pleased to note that, amongst decision makers, including within the EU institutions, many colleagues have their own personal experience of having participated in the Erasmus exchange.

We are now midway through the current programme, Erasmus Plus. Our focus now needs to be turned towards the next programming period and we should already start reflecting on the ways in which we can further improve and develop the programme beyond 2020.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Grazie signora Ministro Dalli, perché ha parlato in rappresentanza anche della Presidenza maltese.

Je donne la parole sans plus tarder au président de la Commission européenne, Jean-Claude Juncker.

Jean-Claude Juncker, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente du Conseil des ministres, Mesdames et Messieurs, chers collègues, j'ai trois minutes pour vous parler de 30 années de l'un des programmes les plus emblématiques de l'Union européenne qui, de 11 pays à l'origine, s'étend aujourd'hui à 33 pays et qui, en encourageant la mobilité de tous les jeunes et en leur permettant de développer leurs talents et leurs compétences, a fait émerger une véritable union des citoyens.

Trois minutes, c'est court. Je n'aurai donc qu'un seul message pour l'avenir, alors que nous allons fêter le 9 millionième jeune Erasmus: soyons ensemble au moins 9 fois plus ambitieux, car Erasmus est une bonne réponse à la bêtise des égoïsmes nationaux et du repli sur soi. Erasmus, c'est une Europe porteuse de grandes promesses, une Europe confiante, unie, résolument tournée vers l'avenir. Je compte donc sur vous pour que le budget européen soit à la hauteur du talent de notre jeunesse.

(Applaudissements)

Plusieurs membres de la Commission ont participé au programme Erasmus. Mon voisin Tibor Navracsics, lorsqu'il était jeune étudiant en Hongrie, n'a pas pu participer au programme, mais aujourd'hui il en est le commissaire responsable. De plus, alors que nous fêtons le trentième anniversaire du programme, il fête son anniversaire aujourd'hui, so happy birthday!

(Applaudissements)

Jeder Euro, den wir in Erasmus investieren, ist eine Investition in die Zukunft, nicht nur in die Zukunft eines jungen Menschen, sondern eine Investition in unsere europäische Idee. Denn Europa arbeitend und studierend zu entdecken, heißt auch, es auf Dauer lieben zu lernen. Viele, die bei Erasmus dabei waren, sagen mir, Erasmus hätte ihre Sicht, ihren Blick auf Europa verändert – ja, einige sagen sogar, ihr Leben verändert.

Europa bringt einen unermesslichen Reichtum, der in seinen Menschen und in der Vielfalt an Kulturen, Sprachen, Traditionen begründet ist. Dieser Zauber Europas hat Erasmus von Rotterdam schon vor 500 Jahren zu einem überzeugten Europäer werden lassen. So geht es mir heute auch noch. Wenn ich auf unserem Kontinent unterwegs bin, verliebe ich mich jedes Mal aufs Neue – also in den Kontinent. Das soll ja auch schon bei dem einen oder anderen Erasmus-Teilnehmer passiert sein, mitunter auf romantischere Weise. Inoffiziellen Gerüchten zufolge ist sogar von einer Million Erasmus-Babys die Rede. Damit hat die Kommission nichts zu tun.

(Beifall)

Dies ist nicht auf das Wirken der Kommission zurückzuführen, aber ich begrüße diese Art europäischen Zusammenwachsens sehr.

(Heiterkeit)

In diesem Sinne wünsche ich Erasmus weiterhin viel Erfolg!

(Beifall)

Le Président. – Merci monsieur le Président, votre discours a été bien accueilli par la plénière, donc nous sommes très contents.

I would now like to invite three former participants in the Erasmus programme, representing three generations, to go to the rostrum.

(Applause)

Brandão Rodrigues, Tiago. – Senhor Presidente, Senhoras e Senhores Deputados, Senhoras e Senhores Comissários, Senhora Ministra, caros «Erasmus», também aqui presentes, caros concidadãos europeus, bom dia a todos.

Feliz coincidência esta entre os recentes 30 anos de Portugal na União Europeia e os 30 anos de Erasmus em Portugal e na Europa. Coincidência entre um dos mais felizes capítulos da História recente portuguesa e um dos mais felizes programas da identidade europeia.

Eu sou somente um humilde exemplo dessa feliz coincidência. De classe média, de uma pequena vila rural do norte de Portugal, saí bem cedo de casa para me mudar para a cidade, para a grande cidade, para estudar no ensino secundário. Mudei-me depois para uma das mais antigas universidades portuguesas e depois tive a oportunidade de rumar à Europa. De mochila às costas, cheia, certamente, de incertezas, senti que conquistei Madrid como se fosse a minha pequena aldeia.

Foram 10 eternos e maravilhosos meses onde me fiz aprendiz de cientista e onde me fiz, já aí, europeu pleno. Mas, antes de rumar à Europa, eu já tinha vindo a sentir a Europa de uma forma muito especial, com todos os alunos Erasmus que visitavam a minha universidade e aí permaneciam um semestre ou um ano inteiro. Foram estes «Erasmus» que me antecederam que primeiro me ensinaram o que era ser verdadeiramente europeu.

Queria, dizer-vos, queria dizer-te, Europa, que estás certa quando tens ambição de fazer do Erasmus um parceiro ao longo da vida para todos os teus cidadãos. Terás, certamente, Europa, uma existência mais ampliada porque serás certamente mais Europa, porque nós, os que tivemos a experiência e todos os europeus, seremos mais cidadãos.

Quem vos fala é um embaixador ativo do programa Erasmus e da Europa. Relativamente aos meses que por lá passei, pouco direi, porque todos nós sabemos que o acontece no Erasmus fica no Erasmus.

Muito obrigado, Europa. Muito obrigado, Erasmus.

President. – Now I would like to give the floor to Mrs Alexandra Pascalidou. Ms Pascalidou comes from Sweden, and is a writer, television and radio presenter and human rights advocate, but her name is a Greek name.

Alexandra Pascalidou. – Mr President, I am delighted to be here.

Φίλες και φίλοι, κυρίες και κύριοι!

— Mina damer och herrar! Jag fick precis reda på att man kan prata svenska här, så fantastiskt!

Det är en ära och ett privilegium att vara här. Det bästa EU någonsin har gjort är Erasmus. Jag hade turen och förmånen att vara en av dem som fick denna ynnest att få studera. Det kanske är det viktigaste som någonsin har hänt i mitt liv. Det är också anledningen till att jag står här idag. Jag, som är ett invandrabarn, ett migrantbarn från Grekland, med lågutbildade föräldrar, med föräldrar som har städat Sverige, som kommer till Sveriges fattigaste förort Rinkeby, utan någon som helst akademisk bakgrund, någonstans, någon gång i släkten, någonstans i kvarteren där jag bor, jag fick chansen att studera på ett svenskt universitet och sedan få ett Erasmus-stipendium för att uppleva mitt andra hemland, Grekland, där kunde jag läsa internationell politik och politisk sociologi. Min tacksamhet är oändlig, och min tacksamhet yttrar jag genom att uppmuntra unga människor i hela Europa att fortsätta ta detta tillfälle i akt, att röra sig och att se hela Europa som vårt gemensamma hem.

Framför allt upplever jag att det är en sådan ära att få vara här just idag. Det är så värdefullt med initiativ som Erasmus med tanke på de mörka och turbulenta tider vi lever i, med den rasism, den misogyni, den extremism, den segregation som är en stor utmaning för hela Europa och som jag och ni och väldigt många runtom i Europa, som inte här just idag, kämpar dagligen med. Erasmus är just detta brobyggande. Erasmus är den sociala hissen, som kan lyfta så många människor med enorm potential. Jag vill bara säga ett stort och varmt tack och lycka till. Jag kommer att bära det här minnet och den här förmånen och försöka sprida ordet. Tack så mycket och lycka till!

President. – Three different languages – English, Swedish and Greek – but the same European identity.

(Applause)

El presidente. – Yo no sé si va a hablar en español, en alemán o en inglés, pero ahora tiene la palabra nuestro amigo.

Schmitz, Jens. – Hallo zusammen! Die Zeit im Auslandspraktikum in Spanien damals hat mich in vielerlei Hinsicht weitergebracht in meinem Leben. Ich habe vieles gelernt, wovon ich heute noch zehren kann, sei es zum Beispiel die Selbständigkeit, sich in einem fremden Land trotz größerer sprachlicher, aber auch trotz kleinerer kultureller Differenzen zurechtzufinden. Ich habe meine Ängste abgelegt, in einer Fremdsprache zu kommunizieren, denn ich habe irgendwann gelernt, dass es gar nicht so wichtig ist, fehlerlos zu sprechen, sondern dass auch mit kleinen Fehlern eine Kommunikation mühelos möglich ist.

Des Weiteren habe ich natürlich auch viel Kulturelles gelernt über das Land und auch über den Arbeitsalltag in Spanien. Da fällt mir als Beispiel mein erster Arbeitstag in der Firma ein, wo ich, als ich ankam, eigentlich, so wie ich es aus meiner deutschen Heimat gewohnt bin, mit einem kleinen Begrüßungskomitee gerechnet hätte. Aber da war eigentlich keiner so richtig darauf vorbereitet, was letztendlich aber gar kein Problem war. In kürzester Zeit wurden die richtigen Leute zusammengetrommelt, und kurz darauf war ich dann auch schon auf einer Firmenbesichtigung, die auch mit kleinen sprachlichen Komplikationen verbunden war. Aber man hat viel mit Händen und Füßen und Zeichnungen gearbeitet, und deshalb war es kein Problem.

Also zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass für mich das Praktikum ein Riesenerfolg war. Ich habe tolle Menschen kennengelernt, auch wunderschöne Orte gesehen, ich habe eine hervorragende Organisation seitens Erasmus+ vorgefunden, und ich habe viele Lektionen für mein zukünftiges Leben gelernt.

Glückwunsch Erasmus+ zum dreißigsten Geburtstag!

(Beifall)

Presidente. – I tedeschi che vanno in Germania in genere hanno fortuna, pensiamo a Carlo V. Quindi Erasmus porterà fortuna anche al nostro amico.

I would now like President Juncker and Minister Dalli to join us at the rostrum where we will give awards to the three representatives of Erasmus and gather for a picture.

(Posiedzenie zostało wznowione o godz. 12.30)

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

5. Glasovanje

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest głosowanie.

(Wyniki i inne szczegóły dotyczące głosowania: zobacz protokół)

5.1. Jačanje sudjelovanja partnera i vidljivost rezultata europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova (A8-0201/2017 - Daniel Buda) (glasovanje)

— *Po završetku glasanja:*

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, I wish to highlight that July is Scleroderma Awareness Month. As some colleagues will be aware, I have a lifelong commitment to raise awareness of this rare and wicked autoimmune and connective tissue disease that claimed the life of my late wife, Carmen, at the age of 42. This disease, which is particularly common in females, has no known cure but early diagnosis can be of huge benefit to treatment of patients.

Accordingly, I ask all colleagues and their staff to go away and find out more about scleroderma so that they may better raise awareness in their Member States. Furthermore, I would like to pay tribute to the work of two charities, Scleroderma and Raynaud's UK, and the Federation of European Scleroderma Associations, which work so hard supporting scleroderma patients and their loved ones.

(Applause)

5.2. Troškovna učinkovitost Sedmog programa za istraživanja (A8-0194/2017 - Martina Dlabajová, Inés Ayala Sender) (glasovanje)

5.3. Apatridnost u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Aziji (A8-0182/2017 - Amjad Bashir) (glasovanje)

5.4. Prekogranična spajanja i podjele (A8-0190/2017 - Enrico Gasbarra) (glasovanje)

5.5. Sudjelovanje Unije u Partnerstvu za istraživanja i inovacije na mediteranskom području (PRIMA) (A8-0112/2017 - Sofia Sakorafa) (glasovanje)

5.6. Posebne mjere za pružanje dodatne potpore državama članicama pogođenima prirodnim katastrofama (A8-0070/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova) (glasovanje)

5.7. Označivanje energetske učinkovitosti (A8-0213/2016 - Dario Tamburrano) (glasovanje)

Dario Tamburrano, relatore. – Signor Presidente, giusto pochissime parole. Io vorrei ringraziare oggi i nostri instancabili collaboratori – Fernando, Andrea, Simona, Maria ed Erica – e gli attivisti del Movimento 5 Stelle che ci hanno votato e inviato qui e dato suggerimenti e conforto, e tutta la mia famiglia e mia moglie Laura che mi è sempre stata accanto fin dall'inizio a supportarmi in questa fantastica avventura, iniziata più di dieci anni fa. Grazie, grazie a tutti voi colleghi che ci avete votato. Grazie di cuore veramente.

5.8. Europske prijestolnice kulture u razdoblju od 2020. do 2033. (A8-0061/2017 - Santiago Fisas Ayxelà) (glasovanje)

— *Przed rozpoczęciem głosowania:*

Santiago Fisas Ayxelà, ponente. – Señor presidente, quisiera agradecer a todos los ponentes alternativos su apoyo a este informe. Realmente, eso es lo que permite que haya una serie de países que pertenecen a la EFTA, o que son países candidatos a la adhesión a la Unión Europea, que puedan también participar en este programa de la capital cultural. Y eso no va a impedir en absoluto que los países actuales que forman parte de la Unión Europea sigan con el mismo programa. Es decir, habrá dos países que pertenecerán a la Unión Europea y un tercer país que se incorporará posteriormente o países EFTA.

Quisiera agradecer, de nuevo, su apoyo a todos los ponentes alternativos. Nada más.

5.9. Procjena provedbe programa Obzor 2020. (A8-0209/2017 - Soledad Cabezón Ruiz) (glasovanje)

5.10. Temelji za kohezijsku politiku EU-a nakon 2020. (A8-0202/2017 - Kerstin Westphal) (glasovanje)

5.11. Stanje ribljih stokova i socioekonomski položaj sektora ribarstva na Sredozemlju (A8-0179/2017 - Marco Affronte) (glasovanje)

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam głosowanie.

6. Obrazloženja glasovanja

6.1. Jačanje sudjelovanja partnera i vidljivost rezultata europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova (A8-0201/2017 - Daniel Buda)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr, az utóbbi hónapokban vagy szinte évben már megszoktuk, hogy ilyen körülmények között az Elnök nem kezdi meg a szavazatindokolások lebonyolítását. Kérem szépen, hogy tartsuk magunkat ehhez a szokáshoz, és várjunk addig, amíg a képviselőtársaink szíveskednek elhagyni az épületet vagy a termet. Ez a választópolgároknak is a megalázása, hogy ilyen körülmények között beszéljünk. Kérem szépen még egy kis türelmét, hogy méltó körülmények között kezdhessem meg a felszólalásomat! Köszönöm szépen!

Przewodniczący. – Pani poseł, która teraz chciała przemówić, ma oczywiście rację. Zależy jej na komforcie w trakcie jej wystąpienia, a mówi ona rzeczach ważnych. Jeszcze raz apeluję o sprawne opuszczenie sali przez Panie i Panów Posłów. Bardzo proszę o przeniesienie rozmów w kuluary, ewentualnie do restauracji.

Pani Poseł, myślę, że możemy zaczynać.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr, engedjék meg, hogy felolvassak egy pontot a Foglalkoztatási és Szociális Bizottság indokolásából, illetőleg véleményezéséből, a 18. pont, amelyik azt mondja: „felhívja a Bizottságot, hogy alkalmazzon olyan eszközöket, amelyek révén nem csak a létrejött munkahelyek számát lehet értékelni, hanem a minőségét is, mivel a rossz, megfelelő védelem nélküli munkakörülmények vagy az olyan szerződések, amelyek a munkavállalók kizsákmányolásával járnak, hozzájárulnak a kohéziós politika negatív megítéléséhez”. Pontosán ez az, ami kapcsolódik ahhoz, amiért az ún. bérunió polgári kezdeményezés elindult nyolc volt szocialista ország részvételével. Az Európai Bizottság elfogadta, befogadta ezt a kezdeményezést, kezdődik az aláírásgyűjtés, és látjuk, hogy az elképzelés nincs is olyan távol az Európai Parlament, az Európai Unió jó erőinek, emberközpontú módon gondolkodó erőinek a gondolkodásától, mert hogy tarthatatlan, hogy a közép- és kelet-európai volt szocialista országok bérszínvonala, jövedelem-színvonala és munkakörülményei ilyen mértékben elmaradnak a nyugatiaktól, és az új kohéziós politika célja az kell, hogy legyen, hogy ez a távolság csökkenjen.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, numai o treime dintre cetățenii europeni au auzit despre proiectele cofinanțate de Uniunea Europeană în zona în care trăiesc, deși fondurile structurale și de investiții sunt esențiale pentru a le îmbunătăți viața.

O altă problemă este gradul de absorbție a fondurilor. Ultimul raport al Comisiei arată că pentru 2014-2020 nivelul mediu de absorbție în Uniune este de 1,79 % – foarte, foarte puțin. România are 0,18 %. Deci trebuie să schimbăm toate mecanismele: oamenii trebuie să fie informați, proceduri simplificate, unitare, transparente, ușor de controlat, monitorizate strictă a cheltuiii banilor.

În România, Code for Romania, un ONG de voluntari specialiști în diverse domenii, oferă soluții de bună guvernare și construiește chiar acum un proiect pentru ca cei interesați să aibă exemple de folosire eficientă a fondurilor europene. Deci nu statul face asta, ci societatea civilă. Îmi doresc să văd acest efort și la nivelul guvernelor. Ar fi o dovadă că le pasă de viața oamenilor și că vor să folosească bani europeni pentru autostrăzi, școli, grădinițe, spitale, justiție și pentru viața oamenilor.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, kohezijska politika je jako pridonijela jačanju rasta i zapošljavanja, te smanjenju rasta razlika među regijama Europske unije. Financiranje kohezijske politike Europske unije ima pozitivan učinak na gospodarstvo i život građana, ali rezultati nisu uvijek bili dobri, a svijest o pozitivnim učincima i dalje je prilično niska.

Svijest o lokalnim programima financiranja krajnjih korisnika i civilnog društva ključna je, bez obzira na razine financiranja u određenoj regiji, budući da dodana vrijednost kohezijske politike Europske unije nadilazi pozitivno gospodarsko, socijalno i teritorijalno djelovanje. Povećanje vidljivosti europskih strukturnih investicijskih fondova može pridonijeti poboljšanju percepcije o učinkovitosti kohezijske politike i povratiti povjerenje građana u europski projekt.

Podržavam jačanje partnerstva i značaj europskih fondova kroz nove načine komuniciranja rezultata kohezijske politike na terenu, a sve u cilju povećanja njegove vidljivosti, pružanjem jasne poruke građanima, i povratka povjerenja u zajedničku viziju europskog projekta.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu pana kolegy Budy, protože viditelnost kohézní politiky a jejich výsledků je pro naše budoucí období skutečně zásadní.

Myslím si, že je čím se pochlubit, tzn. přes jistou chybovost je důležité zviditelňovat i projekty, které byly úspěšné a byly vybrány k podpoře, snižují rozdíly právě v zaostávání těch nejmohutnějších regionů a dokazují posilovat jejich růst.

My musíme zlepšit komunikaci, posílit ji, to již je obsahem té zprávy, ale také více zapojovat partnery. Myslím si, že pro budoucí období je jedním z témat, kterému bychom se měli věnovat, i možnost přímo v legislativě jaksi ocenit to, pokud je vybrán projekt s jasně danou mediální prezentací tak, aby EU se i pro to budoucí období mohla kohézní politikou dostatečně pochlubit. Myslím si, že je to věc, kterou nesmíme podceňovat.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, at least we are being honest about our intentions and our motivations. We are not pretending really that the purpose of these Structural and Cohesion Funds is really to improve the economies of the recipients. If it worked, then Greece would now be bailing out Germany, as the biggest recipient versus the biggest donor. What it is all about, as the report says, is the visibility of the European Union. In other words, if you put enough 12-star flags on things, maybe people will support the project, and thus more and more people get drawn into a nexus in which they believe that they are financially dependent on the European Union.

There is though a cost to be paid. If you encourage people to look for every rise in life to Brussels, then they are not out making things and selling things and contributing to the robustness of the private economy, and therein lies our problem.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I supported this report because we need people to understand how Europe works for them, unlike the comments of Mr Hannan. We have already had a very interesting presentation of the Erasmus Programme, which has been in existence for 30 years. Many students who are on Erasmus now do not realise that it is a European Union programme. So I say well done to the rapporteurs on this report.

It is time that Europe started speaking out about its successes. We are damned by those who will point to our problems, but there are enough successes to far outweigh the difficulties that Europe faces. I welcome this report and I think it is the start of a fight-back for the European Union. I am proud that the flag of Europe is on projects. I am also proud when there is an Irish flag on those same projects and I see no conflict. I see a strength in that, not a problem.

6.2. Troškovna učinkovitost Sedmog programa za istraživanja (A8-0194/2017 - Martina Dlabajová, Inés Ayala Sender)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Sedmi program za istraživanje Europske unije s raspoloživim sredstvima u iznosu od 55 milijardi eura dokazao je kako su istraživanje i razvoj najnovijih tehnologija ključni prioritet za daljnji gospodarski rast Unije. Inicijative i ulaganje u okviru Programa nisu samo svim državama članicama Unije od koristi, nego i državama kandidatkinjama i članovima Europskog gospodarskog prostora koji nisu članovi Unije.

Od velike je važnosti da su sredstva u velikoj mjeri među financiranjem 25 000 ostalih projekata u cilju poticanja mobilnosti znanstvenika, tehničkih inovacija i ulaganja u znanstvenu infrastrukturu i centre izvrsnosti bila upotrebljena za strateško poticanje malih i srednjih poduzeća.

Podržavam zaključke Izvješća, čestitam Komisiji na uspješno obavljenom Programu za istraživanja do 2020. godine, ali i podržavam prijedlog o širenju novih mehanizama, uspostavljenih u okviru Obzora 2020., kao što je paušal za posredne troškove, jedinstveni način kontrole i jedinstveni popis svih institucija koje sudjeluju u programu, dakle, širenje na druge strukturne fondove.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych chtěl pouze sdělit k této zprávě, že jsem hlasoval pro, stejně jako jsem se vyjadřoval k této zprávě na včerejším projednávání. Pokládám podporu výzkumu a inovací za skutečné klíče pro naši úspěšnou budoucnost.

EU na tomto poli není lídr, není to zase agenda, ve které bychom výrazně zaostávali, ale myslím si, že se můžeme výrazně posunout dopředu. Chci podpořit návrh, který byl odhlasován, tzn. 3 % hranici pro tu podporu, a lepší přípravu toho 9. rámce. My nyní hodnotíme 7. rámeček, ale je nutné říci, že i ten 9. rámeček pro nás představuje tu největší výzvu.

Zároveň bych byl velmi nerad, kdyby programy, jako je Horizont 2020 a jiné, byly oslabovány nástroji, které se vyrojily v poslední době, jako je zvláštní Junckerův fond. Myslím si, že na to bychom měli najít dostatečné zdroje a prostředky v jiných kapitolách. Takže určitě podpora výzkumu je naší budoucností a já jsem ji rád podpořil.

Ivana Maletić (PPE), – Gospodine predsjedniče, *(Početak govora nije dostupan - izlaganje započelo prije uključivanja mikrofona)* ... okvirnog programa za istraživanje i inovacije još uvijek u tijeku, iako je to program iz razdoblja 2007. i 2013., zbog toga još uvijek konačna revizija i evaluacija nije mogla biti napravljena, ali ono što nema jest i analiza troškovne učinkovitosti Programa, a ovo Izvješće je upravo o troškovnoj učinkovitosti Sedmog programa za istraživanja i inovacije.

Podržala sam Izvješće zato što, unatoč tome što nema evaluacije troškovne učinkovitosti, naglašava kolika je važnost ovog Programa kojim je potaknuta znanstvena izvrsnost na razini Europske unije, inovativnost, povezivanje s gospodarstvom, kojim se jača europska konkurentnost i doprinosi izgradnji Europske unije kao globalnog lidera.

Isto tako, u Izvješću su dane vrlo važne preporuke koje zaista moramo provoditi, poput uspostave zajedničkog centra za podršku, koji će pomoći u koordinaciji provedbi programa u sedam uprava Komisije i isto tako povećati uloge nacionalnih kontaktnih točaka, kako bi krajnji korisnici imali što kvalitetniju tehničku podršku na terenu.

6.3. Apatridnost u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Aziji (A8-0182/2017 - Amjad Bashir)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, this report is a big step forward towards awareness raising and the search for concrete solutions regarding the causes of statelessness and discrimination against stateless people in South and South East Asia. As a shadow rapporteur, I am very pleased to see that the emphasis in the report is on the identification and elimination of statelessness via empowerment of regional human rights bodies, coordination between states, and the encouragement of quantitative and qualitative research.

We draw particular attention to the Rohingyas' situation in Myanmar, where there are up to 1.2 million people denied basic human rights. In addition, we have called for examination of the role which the European Union can play in addressing this problem.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, osobe bez državljanstva su diljem svijeta osuđene na krajnje obespravljenju egzistenciju, često se nalazeći na marginama društva. One ne mogu stjecati kvalifikacije, nemaju zdravstveno osiguranje, ne mogu se legalno zaposliti, sklopiti brak ili ostvariti niz drugih građanskih i političkih prava.

Poseban razlog za zabrinutost je situacija osoba u mnogim državama južne i jugoistočne Azije, a naše znanje o broju ljudi koji ne posjeduju državljanstvo države u kojoj su se rodili i proveli cijeli život je ograničeno, s obzirom na to da se takvi podaci u nekim zemljama regije vrlo slabo prikupljaju ili objavljuju.

Iako se dosadašnje stanje osoba bez državljanstva može pripisati neučinkovitoj administraciji, ozbiljni problemi pojavljuju se tamo gdje se u političke svrhe jedna skupina ljudi marginalizira. Sustavna diskriminacija manjina, poput Mjanmara, predstavlja ozbiljno kršenje ljudskih prava i Unija mora poduzeti sve da se stanje ugroženih skupina u regiji poboljša, uključujući priznavanje tih osoba kao državljana njihove matične zemlje.

Podržavam Prijedlog zbog ključne važnosti pitanja osoba bez državljanstva. Moramo jasno konstatirati u kojim slučajevima postoji sustavna diskriminacija, a u kojima nedostatak upravnih kapaciteta i, ovisno o okolnostima, provesti potrebne mjere.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I want to put on the record my support for this report because there are citizens in the gallery here who, I hope, do not understand because they have not experienced what it means to be in this category of statelessness. But, as we heard from previous contributions, it means that you do not have rights, and you do not have what other citizens have. There is a real problem in South and South East Asia on this issue. This report highlights this, calls for more information and wants action to address the issue.

Mention was made of the situation in Myanmar and of the 1.2 million Rohingyas. This is a very big issue, and I am proud and happy that Parliament has supported this report. But we need to follow up with constant attention and vigilance to the issue, and we need to put pressure on regions and governments to do something about it.

6.4. Sudjelovanje Unije u Partnerstvu za istraživanja i inovacije na mediteranskom području (PRIMA) (A8-0112/2017 - Sofia Sakorafa)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la proposta presentata ha accolto alcuni nostri emendamenti a favore della partecipazione di piccole e medie imprese, con misure e strumenti atti ad allargare il bacino dei potenziali candidati e soprattutto le opportunità concrete di ricevere una sovvenzione.

È per questo motivo che il mio voto sarà comunque a favore, nonostante il testo non sia assolutamente risolutivo in alcune gravi distorsioni già riscontrate. La ricerca, la scienza e lo sviluppo delle innovazioni dovrebbero essere strumenti per una conoscenza al servizio e nell'interesse dei cittadini. Ad esempio, il programma Horizon 2020 dovrebbe basarsi su norme etiche europee e quindi anche sul rispetto dei diritti umani e del diritto internazionale.

Assistiamo invece alla partecipazione di istituti e di università, ad esempio israeliane, collegate al settore militare, che spesso sono coinvolte nell'occupazione dei territori palestinesi o che sperimentano e impiegano direttamente i risultati dei progetti di ricerca contro la popolazione della Cisgiordania e di Gaza.

Questo non solo è contrario ai valori europei, ma è anche una complicità indiretta nella violazione del diritto internazionale. Questo è quindi inaccettabile per un programma di finanziamento europeo.

6.5. Posebne mjere za pružanje dodatne potpore državama članicama pogođenima prirodnim katastrofama (A8-0070/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Nότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υπερηφίσησα την έκθεση διότι είναι σημαντικό να αναλάβει δράση πλέον η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και, με συμπληρωματικά μέτρα, να στηρίξει τα κράτη τα οποία έχουν υποστεί ζημιές από φυσικές καταστροφές. Αυτό ισχύει πλέον και για την Ελλάδα. Πρέπει να στηρίξουμε τη Λέσβο, η οποία έχει πληγεί από σεισμό 6,1 Ρίχτερ. Είχαμε ένα θύμα, μια συμπολίτισσά μας, και εκφράζουμε τη λύπη μας και τα συλλυπητήριά μας. Επίσης, η Βρίσα, ένα χωριό- φάντασμα, πλέον, χρειάζεται άμεση βοήθεια. Θεωρώ σημαντικό ότι η Επίτροπος, κυρία Creţu, απεδέχθη τη χθεσινή πρόταση που έγινε από την πλευρά μου να υπάρξει άμεση παρέμβαση για το ζήτημα αυτό. Επίσης, χρειάζεται στήριξη και η περιοχή του Αμυνταίου, όπου και εκεί είχαμε μεγάλη φυσική καταστροφή λόγω των κατολισθήσεων που έγιναν, ενώ οι ζημιές για τη ΔΕΗ ξεπερνούν το 1,5 δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ. Θεωρούμε, λοιπόν, σημαντικό το ότι το Κοινοβούλιό μας πήρε τις αποφάσεις αυτές να στηρίξει την Ελλάδα και τις άλλες χώρες λόγω των φυσικών καταστροφών που έχουν υποστεί.

6.6. Označivanje energetske učinkovitosti (A8-0213/2016 - Dario Tamburrano)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Já jsem podpořila tento návrh, kterým se stanoví rámec pro uvádění spotřeby energie na energetických štítcích. Domnívám se, že tato změna povede ke zpřehlednění stávajícího systému označování, potažmo ke zlepšení informovanosti o dopadech jednotlivých výrobků na životní prostředí.

Klíčovým pro mé hlasování bylo zejména to, že tento návrh povede k větší transparentnosti a také ke komfortu evropských spotřebitelů. Vítám přestavbu stupnice energetických štítků, která je jádrem tohoto návrhu. Současná stupnice může být pro mnohé z nás zavádějící, a to z důvodu několika tříd A+.

Co se týče nové databáze výrobků, tak si myslím, že by mohla vytvořit prostor pro lepší dozor nad trhem, což také přispěje k větší důvěře evropských spotřebitelů v tento nový systém.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Efektywność energetyczna jest bardzo ważna przede wszystkim w przemyśle, w gospodarce, ale nie mniej ważna jest w gospodarstwach domowych. Dbanie o wysoki poziom efektywności energetycznej to przecież po prostu oszczędność w domach, ale także oszczędność zasobów naturalnych na świecie. Służy wspieraniu zrównoważonego rozwoju, co jest istotą czasów, w których żyjemy. Efektywność energetyczna wzmacnia także rozwój techniczny, technologiczny, a więc innowacyjność, która jest niezwykle ważna. Rozmawialiśmy już o tym dzisiaj w Parlamencie i będziemy jeszcze rozmawiać. Zatem zmiany idące za rozporządzeniem są słuszne i potrzebne. Popieram je.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule preşedinte, oamenii aleg produse electronice care consumă puţin, renunţă pe cât pot la încălzirea cu combustibili fosili şi îşi limitează consumul casnic. Sigur, asta şi datorită furtului care se practică de către multe dintre companiile care au monopol pe furnizarea şi distribuirea energiei electrice.

Dar acum vorbim despre etichetarea produselor electronice cu privire la consumul energetic. Aceasta este esenţială. Este o măsură de transparenţă foarte bună, care vine în favoarea oamenilor. Fiecare persoană care cumpără un produs electronic trebuie să ştie cât consumă acel produs şi din ce fel de energie provine. Piaţa trebuie supravieţuită, pentru ca industriile şi companiile să respecte aceste cerinţe. Industria, la rândul ei, trebuie să se adapteze, mai ales spre energii regenerabile. Să nu uităm că nu oamenii trebuie să se adapteze industriilor, ci industriile trebuie să se adapteze către ceea ce vor oamenii.

Viitorul este al energiilor regenerabile şi al renunţării la independenţa de gazul rusesc. Cât timp nu suntem o Uniune Europeană – sau o ţară, orice ţară – independentă de gazul rusesc, nici politica externă nu este independentă.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, το ογδόντα τοις εκατό των καταναλωτών αναγνωρίζουν τη χρησιμότητα της κλίμακας ενεργειακής απόδοσης στις οικιακές και ηλεκτρικές συσκευές. Ωστόσο, οι περισσότεροι καταναλωτές της χώρας μας δεν γνωρίζουν ότι η πλειονότητα των ηλεκτρικών συσκευών εμπίπτουν στην κατηγορία Α και πάνω, δηλαδή και το τελευταίο ψυγείο που κυκλοφορεί στην αγορά είναι στην κατηγορία Α. Σήμερα διορθώνουμε μια στρέβλωση που προέκυψε μέσα στα χρόνια λόγω τεχνολογικής εξέλιξης. Δημιουργούμε μια ξεκάθαρη κλίμακα που θα καθιστά πλέον σαφές ότι δεν είναι όλες οι ηλεκτρικές συσκευές ενεργειακά αποδοτικές, μια κλίμακα που θέτει τα δεδομένα στην πραγματική τους βάση. Η εισαγωγή της κλίμακας από «Α έως G», αλλά κυρίως η πρόβλεψη της επικαιροποίησης της κλίμακας των προϊόντων, βοηθά τους

καταναλωτές να εξοικονομήσουν χρήματα και δίνει κίνητρα στους κατασκευαστές για περαιτέρω βελτίωση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης των προϊόντων τους. Με το νέο σύστημα, σύμφωνα με την πρόβλεψη, μπορούμε να εξοικονομήσουμε έως και 200 δισεκατομμύρια κιλοβατώρες τον χρόνο ή, αλλιώς, την ενεργειακή κατανάλωση της Εσθονίας, της Λετονίας και της Λιθουανίας μαζί. Κυρίως, όμως είναι μεγάλη η ευθύνη μας για τον πλανήτη που θα παραδώσουμε στα παιδιά μας και αυξάνεται καθημερινά.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo agus bhí sé suimiúil a bheith ag éisteacht leis an Uasal Tamburrano nuair a bhí sé ag caint. Mhol sé a bhean chéile agus is dócha gur féidir a rá gur féidir linn tionchar na mban a fheiscint sna moltaí seo mar tá siad praiticiúil.

Ar dtús nuair a fhéachaimid ar an tseanscém a bhí againn, A, A+, agus A++, chuir sé meascán mearaí ar chustaiméirí. Chonaic na mná, go háirithe mná céile, é sin agus tá athrú tagtha anois. Tá scém i bhfad níos ciallmhaire againn, grád ag dul ó A go G agus dathanna éagsúla ag gabháil leo freisin, a chabhraíonn leis na custaiméirí a n-aighe a dhéanamh suas, a gcuid astaíochtaí a laghdú agus airgead a shábháil dóibh féin i ndeireadh na dála. Dá bhrí sin, is scém phraiticiúil chiallmhar é seo agus molaim gach duine a bhí páirteach ann.

6.7. Procjena provedbe programa Obzor 2020. (A8-0209/2017 - Soledad Cabezón Ruiz)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, international partners should be, and can be, reassured that research, development and innovation in the United Kingdom will continue at the same pace, if not faster, post Brexit. The European Union programme Horizon 2020 does not focus on wealth creation from innovation: it is all about support for researchers, and that is a serious flaw in the programme.

By contrast, Singapore and China, for example, undertake regular and rapid updates of focused R&D to further their commercial and global advantage. If the European Union is absolutely serious, then, instead of the self-congratulation that we heard in the report, this Parliament should be asking the Commission to focus on a new initiative, and on putting a focused team structure in place to galvanise research, exploration and exploitation.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! „Horyzont 2020” to ogromny program warty 80 mld euro. Europa musi szukać instrumentów utrzymania przewagi konkurencyjnej na globalnym rynku. Jestem przekonany, że głównym instrumentem w dzisiejszych czasach jest innowacyjność. Niestety większość krajów na innowacyjność wydaje poniżej poziomu, jaki przewiduje strategia „Europa 2020”. Przypominam, jest to 3 % produktu krajowego brutto. Tylko cztery kraje przekraczają ten poziom. W tym kontekście „Horyzont 2020” jawi się nam jako bardzo ważny instrument osiągnięcia tychże celów. Niestety państwa członkowskie nierówno korzystają z tego funduszu, na przykład państwa Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej wykorzystały do tej pory jedynie 4 % środków, podczas gdy państwa tzw. starej Europy ponad 90 %. Wniosek z tego taki, że więcej pieniędzy z tego funduszu powinno być kierowane do krajów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.

Nότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πρόγραμμα «Ορίζων 2020» δεν πρέπει να χρησιμοποιηθεί για την ενίσχυση των αμυντικών βιομηχανιών της Ευρώπης και σε αυτό είμαστε κάθετοι. Ταυτόχρονα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει επιτέλους να κοιτάξει την ορθή εφαρμογή διαφόρων προγραμμάτων. Αναφέρομαι, εν προκειμένω, στα προγράμματα stage στην Ελλάδα, όπου δούλεψαν χιλιάδες έλληνες πολίτες, οι οποίοι όμως δεν αμειβθήκαν με βάση την οδηγία 1999/70/ΕΚ, αλλά και την απόφαση στην υπόθεση C-596/14 του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι απασχολούμενοι στα stage έπρεπε να έχουν λάβει αμοιβές σαν να είναι εργαζόμενοι αορίστου χρόνου. Οι αμοιβές αυτές δεν τους έχουν καταβληθεί. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει, πλέον, να φροντίσει να καταβληθεί η διαφορά αυτή των αμοιβών που οφείλονται σε αυτούς τους χιλιάδες έλληνες πολίτες που δούλεψαν στα ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα. Όπως, επίσης, οφείλει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να διασφαλίσει ότι θα καταβληθούν και οι ασφαλιστικές εισφορές στο ΙΚΑ, ιδίως τώρα που έχουμε και απόφαση του Αρείου Πάγου στην Ελλάδα. Έκκληση λοιπόν, επιτέλους, να εφαρμόζονται ορθά οι αποφάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε όσους απασχολήθηκαν σε προγράμματα stage στην Ελλάδα.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! To było dobre sprawozdanie, ale chcę podkreślić, że jeszcze ciekawsza, jeszcze lepsza była sama debata. W debacie pojawiły się postulaty dotyczące następnej perspektywy i na nie chcę zwrócić uwagę. Otóż to, co jest kluczowe w samym sprawozdaniu, to uzupełnienie o problematykę bezpieczeństwa: bezpieczeństwa Europy, bezpieczeństwa technologii wojskowych, etc., etc. I w samym sprawozdaniu już określono, że kolejna perspektywa powinna wzmacniać finansowanie związane z bezpieczeństwem Europy, technologiami wojskowymi, cyberprzestrzenią. Ale teraz – podczas tej debaty, którą mamy za sobą – pojawił się jeden ważny postulat, na który zwracam dziś uwagę: aby wyodrębnić finansowanie tej problematyki i nie obciążać „Horyzontu 2020” w następnej perspektywie właśnie tymi celami. Z mojego punktu widzenia to jest bardzo dobre rozwiązanie i z tego też powodu właśnie to sprawozdanie zasługuje na wsparcie takie, jakie uzyskało.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, privremena evaluacija programa Obzor 2020. izuzetno je važna za što bolju pripremu novog, Devetog okvirnog programa za istraživanje i inovacije za razdoblje iza 2020. Važno je da tijekom evaluacije kontaktiramo korisnike, znanstvenike i poduzetnike, jer moramo čuti njihov glas i odgovoriti na njihove potrebe.

Oni traže ubrzanje provedbe, traže pojednostavljenje, više sredstava srednjim i malim poduzetnicima, traže povezivanje s ESI fondovima i ujednačavanje pravila i to kako bi se što veći broj projekata mogao financirati, jer znamo da mnogi ne dobiju financiranje iz Obzora.

Uz to, premalo su zastupljene najmanje razvijene države članice i moramo pronaći zato rješenja i kroz ovaj program, a s ciljem jačanja jedinstvenog europskog istraživačkog prostora.

6.8. Temelji za kohezijsku politiku EU-a nakon 2020. (A8-0202/2017 - Kerstin Westphal)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Аз дадох подкрепата си за този доклад, защото силно вярвам в ролята, която има политиката на сближаване сега, а също така и в бъдещето на Европейския съюз. В тази връзка бих искал да заявя твърдата си подкрепа за тази политика. Кохезионната политика остава основен, много успешен и ценен инструмент за инвестиции и развитие в ЕС, особено в контекста на намаляването на публичните и частните инвестиции в някои държави членки през последните години.

Притеснение буди предстоящият Брекзит, но не трябва с лека ръка да бъде посягано на една от най-успешните политики – възстановяване на европейската солидарност. Кохезионната политика може и трябва да играе важна роля в създаването на региони на растежа с подкрепата на дигитални проекти. Цифровата инфраструктура ще помогне да се намалят тенденциите на обезлюдяване, особено в селските райони.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr, mindig mélyen megrendít, amikor szakértők a televízióban, a rádióban azt magyarázzák, hogy kedves magyarok, értsétek meg, hogy a mi gazdaságunknak és a versenyképességünknek az alapja az alacsony munkabér. Ezt tudomásul kell venni, ezen nincs mit változtatni. A szociológusok ezt a jelenséget valószínűleg interiorizált öngyűlöletnek, vagy interiorizált alacsonyabb rendűségnek neveznék. Én büntetőjogászként odáig merészkednék, hogy ez szinte már egy diszkriminatív gyűlöletbeszéd. Azt sulykolni embereknek, hogy te alacsonyabb rendű vagy, te kevesebbet érdemelsz, te kevesebbet érsz a születési helyednél és a lakhelyednél fogva, mint az, aki tőled adott esetben 300 kilométerre él. Ez egy elképesztő dolog, és ezért is nyugtatott meg ennek a jelentésnek, ami a kohéziós politikáról szól 2020 után, az alapmondata, amelyik úgy szól, hogy a 2020 utáni időszakra szóló kohéziós politikának továbbra is az „egyenlőtlenséget kell felszámolnia és a szolidaritást kell erősítenie”. Ezt üzenem azoknak, akik bagatellizálják és negligálják a nyolc közép- és kelet-európai ország béruniós kezdeményezését.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule preşedinte, politica de coeziune este cel mai important nucleu de dezvoltare al Uniunii Europene. Peste 350 de miliarde de euro, o treime din bugetul Uniunii, trebuie să îl folosim pentru creşterea economiilor, sigur, în mod inteligent, pentru stimularea investiţiilor şi crearea de locuri de muncă. Acum, noi spunem asta de ani de zile: nu toate statele răspund la fel, pentru că unele vor să îşi ţină populaţia în sărăcie, ca să o controleze mai uşor.

Trebuie să ne gândim cum va arăta această politică de coeziune după 2020 și după Brexit. Nu avem linii clare de acțiune. Acum discutăm diverse strategii și posibile acțiuni. Ar trebui să avem planuri în paralel, pentru că, între timp, sunt alegeri și, în mai multe țări, unele schimbă în bine, altele în rău situația care urmează. De aceea lipsește previzibilitatea și acest lucru aduce nesiguranță pentru oameni.

O Europă a mai multor viteze, așa cum o susțin unii, este o Europă care va fi slabă, incoerentă și vulnerabilă, dar desigur că viteza depinde de voința politică a guvernelor din Uniunea Europeană. Dacă vor să dezvolte țara, vor stat de drept, vor oameni liberi, sănătoși și educați, atunci vor trece în viteză întâi.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já jsem pro tuto zprávu nehlasoval, nepodpořil jsem ji ani na Výboru pro regionální rozvoj.

Já vnímám, že některé části této zprávy paní Westphalové jsou rozhodně pozitivní. Jako příklad mohu hovořit o tom, že volání po neomezování kohezní politiky po roce 2020 je samozřejmě i mně velmi vlastní, nebo naopak další kritika pozvolné destrukce kohezní politiky jinými nástroji, jako je Junckerův investiční plán.

S tím vším souhlasím, ale s čím jsem nemohl souhlasit, je opuštění či jisté rozmělnění kritéria HDP, pokud jde o používání tohoto kritéria při rozdělování evropských peněz. Jestliže bude toto kritérium rozmělněno, např. o demografický vývoj, po kterém EP podle této zprávy volá, tak to je podle mne krok špatným směrem, který povede na evropské úrovni ke zbytečným diskuzím a v neposlední řadě je i v rozporu se zájmy ČR. Proto jsem tuto zprávu, jak říkám, nepodpořil.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, podupirem Izvješće o temeljima kohezijske politike Europske unije nakon 2020., jer je jedan od ključnih poslova Unije poticanje ekonomske, društvene i teritorijalne kohezije te solidarnosti među njenim različitim regijama i zemljama članicama. Upravo se provođenje ovih ciljeva osigurava kroz Europsku kohezijsku politiku, ujedno i glavnu investicijsku politiku Europske unije.

Smatram da glavni naglasak treba staviti na zadržavanje iznosa sredstava i u sljedećem proračunskom okviru. Očekujem pojednostavljenje i fleksibilniju politiku, odnosno lakše programiranje, upravljanje i evaluaciju operativnih programa. Posebno ističem kako bi kohezijska politika nakon 2020. trebala pokriti sve regije Europske unije i priznati njihovu posebnost. Zadovoljan sam što su usvojeni moji amandmani, kojima pozivam na priznavanje posebnog statusa evropskih otoka, jer se otocima i otočanima mora olakšati povlačenje sredstava iz Kohezijskog fonda.

Zaključno, Europskoj uniji treba jaka, jasna i uključiva kohezijska politika i nakon 2020., kojom će jačati europski identitet utemeljen na zajedničkim evropskim vrijednostima.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já jsem byl původně připraven podpořit tuto zprávu, která se týká kohezní politiky, protože kohezní politiku považuji za důležitý nástroj EU, jak podporovat méně rozvinuté regiony v rámci EU, ale protože bohužel prošly pozměňovací návrhy, které podle mého názoru porušují a bourají filozofii kohezní politiky tak, jak byla vnímána dosud v EU, tak jsem se nakonec u této zprávy zdržel. Proto podávám toto vysvětlení.

Pro mne je důležité, aby kohezní politika byla realizována tak, že přes evropské peníze podporujeme méně rozvinuté regiony, a tedy kritériem pro přidělování peněz má být HDP jednotlivých regionů. Bohužel prošly pozměňovací návrhy, které toto kritérium rozmělnují, tzn. i bohaté regiony, bohatší regiony budou moci na kohezní peníze dosáhnout a v tom případě pro mě tak trochu kohezní politika ztrácí smysl.

Proto jsem se u této zprávy zdržel a doufám, že nakonec kritéria obsažená v této zprávě nebudou v praxi prosazována, protože tato zpráva nemá normativní obsah.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, de la bun început am spus și în dezbateră de ieri: susțin nevoia de a exista a acestui program de coeziune socială și după 2020. Am auzit voci în Parlament care au combătut acest lucru. Mie mi se pare că este esența Uniunii Europene și că respectă principiul de solidaritate. Ceea ce am cerut ieri Comisiei și doamnei comisar este să găsească un set de măsuri noi, astfel încât să existe o accesibilitate mai ușoară, mai ales a IMM-urilor, mai ales a zonei rurale și să avem posibilitatea să facem această combinație între fondurile de coeziune socială și Fondul european pentru investiții strategice.

Avem regiuni sărace. Nu s-a atins acea coeziune socială pe care o așteptam și cred că, printr-o politică și măsuri noi pe perioada de după 2020, vom reuși să facem ca viața oamenilor în zonele în care acum sunt încă probleme să fie mai bună. Este un program foarte bun, este un program important pentru Uniunea Europeană și cred în necesitatea continuării și nu vreau deturnarea fondurilor de coeziune socială pentru alte programe.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, danas na žalost nisam podržala Izvješće kolegice Vesval, jer smatram da europski fondovi trebaju biti vjetar u leđa provedbi dobro osmišljenih razvojnih programa i reformi na nacionalnoj razini. Ako država nema svoj plan i program promjena i razvoja i ne postiže rezultate i dugoročni rast, onda europski fondovi samo pomažu u usporavanju pada i divergenciji koja je neizbježna, a to ne želimo. Europski fondovi moraju se uklopiti u dobre programe rasta i razvoja i biti dodana vrijednost.

Zbog toga, jako se zalažem za budućnost Kohezijske politike, za jačanje kohezijske politike u budućnosti, ali ona mora biti vezana uz dobro ekonomsko upravljanje. Isto tako, tražim od Europske komisije da što prije donese regulativu za novo razdoblje, kako bi se države članice na vrijeme mogle pripremiti za provedbu i kako bi odmah po početku nove perspektive imali projekte u provedbi.

6.9. Stanje ribljih stokova i socioekonomski položaj sektora ribarstva na Sredozemlju (A8-0179/2017 - Marco Affronte)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con 17 000 specie marittime il Mediterraneo è un paradiso mondiale della biodiversità e la pesca rappresenta un settore economico di grande importanza per la comunità costiera e tutto l'indotto, in particolare quello su piccola scala. È per questo che bisogna trovare una sintesi tra questi due elementi nel nome dello sviluppo sostenibile.

La proposta va proprio in questa direzione. Essa sottolinea innanzitutto l'importanza del coinvolgimento di tutti gli operatori del settore nella definizione delle politiche da attuare, comprese le comunità costiere, e nel rispetto delle tradizioni e, al contempo, pone l'accento sulla necessità di tutelare le risorse ittiche del Mediterraneo, contrastando sia la pesca illegale sia gli altri fattori come l'inquinamento delle petroliere che mettono a rischio tali risorse.

Misure come il fermo biologico possono aiutare a ricostruire gli stock, ma vanno accompagnate da misure adeguate di sostegno al reddito. Inoltre, va contrastata la concorrenza sleale costituita dalle importazioni di pesce da luoghi dove non è garantita la sostenibilità e, al contempo, bisogna lavorare sul fronte del consumo critico, anche con un sistema di tracciabilità e di etichettatura efficace e affidabile.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, uno de los espacios de mayor biodiversidad del mundo, el mar Mediterráneo, sufre sobrepesca en el 93 % de sus especies. Si hay sobrepesca en el Mediterráneo pero se está destruyendo empleo, ¿quién está pescando?

Es sencillo: pescan los grandes monopolios del atún rojo, que se quedan con el 80 % de la cuota para esta especie, mientras los pescadores artesanales se desesperan porque les impiden salir a faenar para ganar el pan.

En este Parlamento es casi una obligación moral, al hablar de pesca en el Mediterráneo, decir alto y claro que el Estado español incumple el artículo 17 de la política pesquera común. El Gobierno español reparte los cupos de pesca por criterios políticos y territoriales y tampoco está controlando, por ejemplo en Cataluña, el pago efectivo de los paros biológicos a la flota pesquera mediterránea.

Proteger la pesca artesanal y defender los recursos marinos van de la mano y ello exige voluntad política férrea porque se lo debemos a los pescadores y a sus familias, que llevan siglos alimentando al pueblo.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η προστασία των ιχθυοαποθεμάτων στη Μεσόγειο δεν θα πρέπει να γίνει σε βάρος των αλιέων μικρής κλίμακας, αυτών των ανθρώπων που παλεύουν για να βγάλουν το ψωμί τους. Είναι γνωστό ότι η υπεραλίευση οφείλεται κυρίως στις μεγάλες συγκροτημένες μονάδες που αλιεύουν ενώ, βεβαίως, οι μικροαλιείς ουσιαστικά δεν μπορούν να βγάλουν ούτε το ψωμί τους. Αυτό ισχύει πολύ περισσότερο για την Ελλάδα, όπου οι αλιείς υφίστανται τη φοροληλασία από πλευράς των μνημονιακών πολιτικών. Να ληφθεί υπόψιν ότι η μόλυνση στη Μεσόγειο είναι σημαντική. Οφείλεται στις εξορύξεις φυσικού αερίου και πετρελαίου, και από κει έχουμε επίσης μείωση των ιχθυοαποθεμάτων. Επίσης, πρέπει να ληφθούν σοβαρά μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση των τοξικών ψαριών, όπως είναι ο λαγοκέφαλος που έχει εισέλθει από την Ερυθρά Θάλασσα μέσω Σουέζ και δημιουργεί τεράστια προβλήματα στους ίδιους τους αλιείς. Επομένως, χρειάζονται στήριξη οι αλιείς, χρειάζεται στήριξη το αλιευτικό εισόδημα, και ιδίως οι αλιείς στην πατρίδα μου, την Ελλάδα.

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

7. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono o godz. 13.35 i wznowiono o godz. 15.00)

Elnökváltás: GÁLL-PELCZ ILDIKÓ

alelnök

8. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik

9. Dokument za razmatranje o produbljenju ekonomske i monetarne unije do 2025. (rasprava)

Elnök. – A következő pont a Bizottság nyilatkozata: Vitaanyag a GMU 2025-ig történő elmélyítéséről (2017/2726(RSP)).

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, the reflection paper on the deepening of the EMU contributes to the broader political debate on the future of Europe started with the March White Paper. The Five Presidents' reports and the Rome Declaration underline that the Union should promote convergence and that we need to work towards completing the economic and monetary union. I would like to thank Parliament for its valuable input in several own initiative reports, namely Brok, Bresso, Verhofstadt and Berès.

The euro is one of Europe's most significant achievements. It is the currency of 340 million people in 19 countries and the second most used currency in the world. It has brought price stability and has made it easier to do business and to travel. The euro quickly became the symbol of prosperity for our citizens and it should remain so. The financial and economic crisis underlines the weaknesses in the way the euro is set up. The determined policy response has made EMU stronger but not filled all the gaps. There is still a lack of convergence and questions remain about the long-term resilience of the euro area.

We cannot wait for another crisis to act. The reflection paper presents a toolbox on the way forward. It is more targeted at what can be done over the next two years to 2019 and more open about what might come afterwards up to 2025. Key guiding principles for any advances are: a balanced approach in which responsibility and solidarity, risk reduction and risk sharing go hand in hand; the openness of the euro deepening process for all EU countries; and keeping the unity of the single market, transparency and democratic accountability.

Our ideas on the way forward are structured in three building blocks: financial union, economic and fiscal union, and governance and accountability. On financial union, we are aiming at renewed financial integration, safer financial institutions that can finance the real economy and more risk sharing via private channels. The capital markets union is key to broadening financial options, so I am glad of the recent agreements reached by the co-legislators on venture capital and securitisation and look forward to working with you on the initiatives on the mid-term review.

We should further reduce risks in our banking sector based on the package of November 2016. We are also working on Member States with a European strategy to reduce the stocks of non-performing loans. The EU framework for bank resolution will not be fully effective without a fiscal backstop to the single resolution fund, and without a European deposit insurance scheme depositors will not be protected to the same extent across the euro area. We need to further weaken the link between banks and sovereigns. In this context we are following the ongoing work in the European Systemic Risk Board on so-called sovereign bond backed securities. They can deliver tangible benefits by increasing the diversification of banks' balance sheets and by fostering private risk sharing. They do not involve debt neutralisation among Member States or changes in the regulatory treatment of government bonds. For the longer term, we need a debate about the zero risk rates of certain banks under current banking rules and a possible new European safe asset. So there are both complex and sensitive issues. Our reflection paper frames them with strong caveats, notably in terms of preventing unwarranted consequences for financial stability and for moral hazard.

In the area of economic and fiscal union, the aim is to see convergence between Member States towards more resilient economic structures. With the bulk of economic and social policies under national responsibilities, there is no doubt that we need to have a continued commitment to structural reforms. The European Semester will continue to be the main platform for policy coordination and we will continue to seek improvements. The capacity of macroeconomic stabilisation in the euro area could also be reinforced. We are presenting three options for such functions to assist countries hit by economic shocks too large to cope with on their own.

One option is the European investment protection scheme. In times of strain, public investment is the first item to be cut from the national budget and this can harm future growth. The investment protection scheme could take the form of a financial instrument and I believe could be set within the existing legal framework. Other options include the European unemployment reinsurance scheme and a rainy day fund. In any case, it should not lead to permanent transfers among countries nor undermine incentives for sound fiscal policy-making at national level.

Finally, we need greater democratic accountability and higher transparency, integrating intergovernmental agreements into EU law and ensuring proper democratic oversight. Pierre Moscovici will be elaborating on this in more detail. I would like to underline that the White Paper and reflection paper process is not an intellectual exercise for the Commission. We hope to reach a constructive debate across Europe in the coming months and to see a broad agreement emerging on the way forward.

Pierre Moscovici, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires européens, avant de vous présenter certaines des idées-clés en complément de ce que vient de dire Valdis Dombrovskis, je voudrais faire peut-être une réflexion politique.

Il était clair, dès le début de ce processus de réflexion, que s'agissant de notre Union économique et monétaire, il n'était pas question de nous demander s'il fallait vraiment avancer. Il ne pouvait pas, cette fois-ci, être question d'avoir plusieurs scénarios, dont un d'entre eux aurait été le statu quo, parce que nous avons la conviction à la Commission, et je m'en réjouis, qu'il faut avancer pour compléter l'Union économique et monétaire. Pourquoi? Pour trois raisons: d'abord, parce que nous avons une reprise économique dans la zone euro qui est là, mais qui demeure trop fragile et trop inégale encore. Il faut la relancer et favoriser la convergence. Ensuite, parce qu'il y a un risque réel qui est celui d'une zone euro à deux vitesses. Ces conséquences seraient graves car, oui, il est vrai que le populisme a perdu quelques batailles politiques en Europe – je m'en réjouis comme Européen, comme commissaire et comme Français –, mais il n'a pas perdu la guerre. Il se nourrit toujours de l'insatisfaction économique et de l'inégalité. Enfin, parce qu'il me semble qu'il y a une «fenêtre d'opportunité» politique qui est en train de s'ouvrir en Europe. Il y a désormais un vent pro-européen qui souffle et c'est le moment, je crois, de nous en emparer.

Je veux souligner que ce que nous proposons aujourd'hui est nécessaire et souhaitable pour les États membres. Quand je dis «pour les États membres», je parle de tous les États membres actuels et je parle aussi de la future adhésion possible des autres. Il ne s'agit pas de forcer quiconque à adhérer, bien sûr, mais il est vrai qu'après le Brexit, le seul pays muni d'une clause d'exemption (*opt-out*) formelle sera le Danemark. Tous les autres ont vocation à adhérer à l'euro une fois les conditions remplies. Notre but n'est pas de rendre contraignant ce processus d'adhésion, il est de le rendre attractif, de faire en sorte que chacun ait envie d'adhérer à l'euro.

Quelles sont nos idées concrètes? Valdis Dombrovkis vous a déjà parlé de l'union financière. C'est le volet sur lequel nous devons articuler le plus finement les principes de solidarité et de responsabilité. Il y a plusieurs propositions concrètes sur la table qui doivent permettre de marier la réduction et le partage des risques, notamment pour les prêts non performants.

Il y a aussi d'autres chantiers sur lesquels le travail est moins avancé, mais qui ne sont pas moins importants. C'est le cas, par exemple, de l'idée de mettre en place un nouvel actif sans risque pour la zone euro, qui pourrait prendre plusieurs formes, mais qui ne doit pas être confondu avec ce qu'on appelait les «euro-obligations».

Ce sur quoi je voudrais insister surtout, c'est sur la création d'une véritable union économique et budgétaire, que nous devons poursuivre si nous voulons une convergence durable et vers le haut de nos économies. Qu'est-ce que cela implique? D'abord, à court terme, nous allons explorer les possibilités pour renforcer la dimension «zone euro» du Semestre européen et créer des critères de convergence avec des incitations financières pour les atteindre. Il existe aussi d'autres voies possibles pour renforcer les capacités existantes dans le budget européen afin d'aider à la stabilisation de nos économies. Mais nous sommes convaincus qu'à moyen terme, nous devons être plus ambitieux en créant une fonction de stabilisation macroéconomique pour la zone euro.

Un instrument de ce type aurait à nos yeux de nombreux avantages: il soutiendrait l'action des stabilisateurs budgétaires nationaux en cas de crise et il permettrait une meilleure politique budgétaire agrégée au niveau de la zone euro dans son ensemble, en particulier quand la politique monétaire atteint ses limites. Nous savons que cet instrument ne devra pas être un mécanisme de transfert permanent, qu'il ne devra pas encourager l'aléa moral, mais nous pensons qu'il doit être mis en place. Bien sûr, nous devons débattre de sa forme, de son utilisation, de son financement et de ses liens éventuels avec le budget européen ou avec un mécanisme européen de stabilité réformé. Là encore, je l'ai dit, il n'y a pas plusieurs scénarios, mais il y a très clairement plusieurs options sur notre schéma ambitieux.

Nous devons aussi discuter de la forme précise qu'il pourra prendre. Cela pourrait être un système de protection des investissements publics en cas de récession, un mécanisme de réassurance-chômage européenne ou encore un *rainy day fund* – un fonds de réserve pour les temps difficiles. L'interprétation la plus ambitieuse de cette idée serait celle d'un véritable budget de la zone euro. Cela a été débattu à plusieurs reprises au sein de votre assemblée. Chaque idée a ses mérites propres. La seule que nous écartons – si j'ose dire –, c'est celle de ne rien faire. Par conséquent, lançons le débat.

Enfin, et ce n'est pas la chose la moins importante, nous voulons aujourd'hui lancer un débat profond sur le renforcement de la gouvernance de la zone euro et sur sa capacité démocratique. Nous pensons qu'une Union économique et monétaire renforcée dépend du fait que nos États membres acceptent de partager plus de responsabilités, de prendre plus de décisions ensemble sur des matières d'intérêt commun avec un schéma juridique qui soit également commun. Il faut donc aller plus loin dans l'intégration politique de la zone euro. Il faut procéder de manière progressive, puis, en parallèle, peut-être lancer de nouveaux chantiers.

Un premier pas pourrait être – devrait être, à notre sens – la formalisation, d'ici à la fin de l'année prochaine, du dialogue, déjà très régulier, entre la Commission et le Parlement européen sur la politique économique. Nous avons des arrangements. Je pense qu'ils pourraient être étendus à d'autres institutions, à commencer par l'Eurogroupe dont, bien sûr, les membres – les ministres des finances – demeureront en premier lieu responsables devant leurs parlements nationaux. Cela pourrait donner lieu à un arrangement sur la responsabilité démocratique de la zone euro, signé par tous les acteurs, en vue de l'élection du prochain Parlement européen, en juin 2019. Puis, à plus long terme, je pense qu'un tel accord, s'il venait à voir le jour, pourrait être intégré dans les traités européens. Ajoutons que l'intégration du «pacte budgétaire» dans le droit européen a déjà été décidée par les États membres participants quand ils ont signé le traité. Il faudrait donc le mettre en œuvre rapidement.

On pourrait aussi explorer une autre voie, qui serait l'intégration du mécanisme européen de stabilité dans le schéma européen. Ce serait bien sûr lié à l'évolution de ce mécanisme européen de stabilité: certains parlent d'un Fonds monétaire européen.

Ce qui, me semble-t-il, est décisif pour faire en sorte que nos décisions soient prises davantage dans le sens de l'intérêt général, c'est la démocratie. C'est la raison pour laquelle, à mon sens et à notre sens, il faut créer un nouvel équilibre entre la Commission et l'Eurogroupe avec – c'est possible – la fusion des rôles de commissaire en charge de l'euro et de président de l'Eurogroupe. Nous pouvons et nous devons aussi avancer. Nous avons déjà fait des propositions à cet égard pour une représentation externe unifiée de la zone euro. Cela reprend ce que nous avons déjà dit au moment de la phase 1 du débat sur l'UEM. Nous pouvons aller encore plus loin avec la création d'un Trésor de la zone euro, qui pourrait prendre en charge les tâches en matière de surveillance budgétaire, de coordination et de gestion de la fonction de stabilisation que j'évoquais un peu plus tôt. Ce Trésor pourrait en quelque sorte rassembler les responsabilités et services existants, y compris le mécanisme européen de stabilité, une fois que celui-ci fera partie intégrante du schéma institutionnel de la zone euro. Ce Trésor pourrait, en définitive, être placé sous la responsabilité d'un ministre des finances de la zone euro. Il ne s'agit pas d'ailleurs de s'attacher à la nomination ou à la dénomination – M^{me} Mogherini qui préside le groupe de travail RELEX et qui est vice-présidente de la Commission n'est pas la ministre des affaires étrangères de l'Union –, il ne s'agit pas de superviser les ministres, mais il pourrait s'agir d'une personnalité qui, justement, pourrait exercer ces fonctions de présidente du conseil ad hoc, de l'Eurogroupe et de commissaire en même temps. Finalement, l'idée d'un Fonds monétaire européen, qui serait naturellement construit à partir du mécanisme européen de stabilité, mérite plus de débats.

Voilà vite rassemblées les idées que nous pouvons trouver. Elles ont différents degrés d'ambition et de précision. Il y a beaucoup d'options, mais nous avons voulu construire un ensemble qui soit équilibré. L'euro est déjà perçu comme un symbole et comme une garantie de stabilité par les Européens. Notre ambition, c'est d'en faire, au-delà de cela, un véhicule pour la prospérité. Comme disait Jacques Delors, «l'euro protège mais ne dynamise pas». Nous devons le compléter dans cette direction et nous pensons que c'est seulement en réduisant les divergences économiques et sociales dans la zone euro qu'on peut battre durablement le populisme, toujours dangereux dans nos pays.

Au fond, notre ambition et notre intention, c'est de dire qu'il est temps maintenant de compléter ce parcours que nous avons commencé à bâtir au moment du traité de Maastricht pour aller vers une véritable et complète Union économique et monétaire avec de vraies institutions et avec une dimension qui est manquante: quand nous sommes à l'Eurogroupe, nos concitoyens sont choqués et frustrés de ne pas savoir ce qui s'y passe, entre quatre murs. On décide parfois du sort de peuples sans que quiconque, à commencer par vous, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, en soit informé. Il faut de la démocratie, car il n'y a pas d'union politique sans démocratie.

Je crois que nous avons fourni, ici, un travail sérieux, qui est soumis à votre débat, et c'est ce débat que nous sommes bien sûr tout à fait disposés à conduire avec vous et, même plus que cela, désireux de le faire.

Françoise Grossetête, au nom du groupe PPE. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président de la Commission, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Europe serait-elle malade de sa monnaie? Nous sommes à son chevet aujourd'hui.

L'euro – vous l'avez dit – a été un grand succès. L'euro nous a protégés, certainement, mais aujourd'hui, notre zone monétaire est tiraillée par de trop grandes divergences macroéconomiques, et ces divergences creusent les inégalités et nourrissent l'euroscpticisme. L'euro est donc à la croisée des chemins.

Je félicite la Commission, parce que ses propositions sont ambitieuses et constituent une base de réflexion utile pour renforcer l'Union économique et monétaire. L'euro n'est plus un tabou: tout doit être mis sur la table.

Les clés de notre réussite sont au nombre de trois: la confiance, la responsabilité et la solidarité.

La confiance, d'abord, est un préalable indispensable; pourtant, cette confiance a été fragilisée par des promesses trop souvent avortées. De nombreux États sont sur la voie des réformes, j'espère qu'il en sera de même pour la France, mais les efforts de chacun sont indispensables pour renouer la confiance et compléter ainsi l'union bancaire, notamment avec une garantie européenne des dépôts – vous en avez parlé – qui fait encore cruellement défaut.

Le corollaire de cette confiance, c'est la responsabilité. Une gestion responsable des finances publiques, selon les règles, par exemple, d'un code de convergence, ouvrirait la voie à la création d'une capacité budgétaire commune et à un renforcement de la gouvernance de la zone euro.

La solidarité, enfin: si nous voulons partager la même monnaie, nous devons mettre en place des mécanismes de solidarité. Il ne s'agit pas, bien sûr, de créer une union de transferts, mais de pouvoir nous serrer les coudes en cas de coup dur. Je plaide à cette fin pour la mise sur pied d'un fonds monétaire européen.

Cependant, j'estime que nous ne pouvons pas attendre 2025 pour mettre en place ces réformes, il faut s'y atteler dès maintenant. Les astres politiques sont alignés, c'est maintenant ou jamais que nous devons agir.

Udo Bullmann, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, die Herren Kommissare, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Meine Fraktion will eine starke Eurozone. Der Euro ist eine unserer größten Errungenschaften, aber er braucht ein gestalterisches Umfeld. Er braucht politische Instrumente, er braucht einen Rahmen, in dem sich nicht nur die Währung entwickeln kann, sondern auch die Wirtschaft. Wir beglückwünschen die Kommission dazu, dass sie mit ihrem Papier in die richtige Richtung geht.

Wir brauchen mehr Investitionen, wir brauchen eine stärkere Koordination unserer Wirtschaftspolitik, wir brauchen verantwortliche Institutionen, und wir brauchen ein Verfahren, in dem die Modernisierung unserer Wirtschaft, die Modernisierung unserer Gesellschaften vorangetrieben wird – Modernisierung ökonomisch, Modernisierung ökologisch und Modernisierung sozial.

Ja, wir wollen ein Semester, das verbindliche Ziele hat. Man kann nicht erklären, warum die Regeln der Haushaltsdisziplin verbindlich sind, warum es aber nicht verbindlich ist, gegen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit zu kämpfen, oder warum diejenigen, die schneller ihre Bildungssysteme modernisieren, die schneller dafür sorgen, dass die Arbeit der Zukunft zu uns kommt und dass die jungen Menschen qualifiziert werden, nicht belohnt werden sollen. Sie werden in unseren Systemen behandelt wie diejenigen, die das Geld in eine wasserköpfige Bürokratie stecken.

Wir müssen unsere Instrumente schärfen, damit sie zwischen guter und schlechter Politik unterscheiden können. Das muss unser gemeinsamer politischer Rahmen leisten. Wir brauchen ein gemeinsames Budget, um diese Initiativen zu unterstützen. Und wir brauchen dieses Budget schnell.

Alles das wird nur gelingen, wenn das Europäische Parlament entsprechend beteiligt wird. Ich habe die Einladung der Kommission verstanden. Wir wollen diese Einladung annehmen, und wir freuen uns auf einen – hoffentlich – effektiven und schnellen Prozess der Stärkung der Europäischen Union und insbesondere hier der Eurozone.

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

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Lieber Kollege Bullmann! Ich habe mit Aufmerksamkeit zugehört, und zum Schluss kam dann sozusagen die Aussage: Wir brauchen ein Budget. Ich gehe mal davon aus, gemeint ist ein Budget für die Eurozone. Wo kommt das her? Wer befüllt dieses Budget? Wer zahlt die Steuern, die in dieses Budget hineingehen? Soll die Europäische Union eine Steuererhebekompetenz bekommen – die sie bisher nicht hat –, oder wird das aus den Mitgliedstaaten gemacht? Ich finde das ein bisschen abstrakt und wäre für eine Konkretisierung dankbar.

Udo Bullmann (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Kollege Lambsdorff! Sowohl in Ihrer heutigen Eigenschaft als auch in Ihrer möglicherweise zukünftigen Eigenschaft können Sie ein gerüttelt Maß dazu beitragen, dass es funktioniert. Meine Fraktion hat hinreichend Vorschläge dazu unterbreitet. Wir sind diejenigen, die aufgedeckt haben, wie viele Steuermilliarden der Europäischen Union jedes Jahr verloren gehen. Diese 1 000 Milliarden wollen wir gerne mit Ihrer Hilfe heben.

Insofern würden wir uns auch sehr freuen, wenn von Ihrer Fraktion nicht länger Anträge kämen wie gestern beispielsweise in der entsprechenden Abstimmung, wo das Country-by-Country-Prinzip unterminiert wird und wir nicht mehr in der Lage sind zu sehen, wo Steuergelder versteckt werden. Sie können also eine ganze Menge tun, um diese Initiativen zu beflügeln, und wir hoffen auf Ihre Kooperation.

Joachim Starbatty, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Im Reflexionspapier heißt es: Der Euro ist mehr als eine Währung. Ja, das ist richtig. Richtig ist aber auch, dass eine falsch konstruierte Währungsunion Europa schadet und spaltet. Sie sagen es ja selbst. In Ihrem Vorwort steht: „Die Europäische Währungsunion ist noch nicht hinreichend in der Lage, das aus der Krise resultierende soziale und wirtschaftliche Auseinanderdriften der Euroländer aufzuhalten und umzukehren.“ Das ist ein entscheidender Satz.

Woran liegt das? Wir haben innerhalb der Eurozone einen falschen relativen Wechselkurs. Der Euro ist für Deutschland zu niedrig bewertet, für die Länder des Südens ist er zu hoch bewertet. In Deutschland laufen wir von Rekord zu Rekord. In den Ländern des Südens bleibt die Arbeitslosigkeit immer noch auf einem traurig hohen Niveau. Jetzt hat Draghi versucht, das über eine Nullzinspolitik zusammenzuhalten. Aber irgendwann muss er zu normalen Zinsen übergehen, und dann bricht es auseinander.

Und was machen Sie jetzt? Die nächste Phase der Vergemeinschaftung. Ich sage Ihnen: Unterschiedliche Entwicklungsfähigkeiten, unterschiedliche Wettbewerbsfähigkeit können Sie durch Vergemeinschaftung der Risiken nicht aus der Welt schaffen – das ist nun einmal so. Und dann heißt es in Ihrem Papier zum Schluss – ein wunderbarer Satz: „Es ist an der Zeit, Pragmatismus über Dogmatismus zu stellen.“

Wer ist mit Dogmatismus denn gemeint? Etwa Frau Merkel? Und was heißt das eigentlich? Pragmatismus heißt letztlich: Wir machen nicht mehr klare Lösungen. Und mit dieser Politik werden Sie Europa nicht retten, werden Sie die Eurozone nicht retten, sondern werden Sie die Europäische Union zerstören.

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, we have had great news lately in the eurozone. For the first time in a while we are feeling more optimistic about the future of our project; that is great news. But before we rush into asking for more new instruments, maybe we should use all our energies to make sure that the current ones work properly. Implementation and enforcement are fundamental for our future. A good application of EU law is basic in order to regain the support of our citizens and increase the efficiency of our monetary union.

For the future of the euro we need to ensure that all Member States comply with the relevant EU economic legislation. Take the Late Payments Directive, for example. As you well know, more than one million jobs have been lost in the south of Europe in recent years due to the bad practices on payments by central banks and big enterprises, forcing thousands of solvent SMEs to close. A business is only made when it is cashed. This is the basis of our model. We need to ensure this before talking about more integration.

So, in my opinion it is better to concentrate our political capital on the outstanding projects that we have initiated, before beginning new ones. For instance, we have to implement the bail-in legislation in a consistent manner in all Member States and all Member States already have to implement correctly the Deposit Guarantee Scheme Directive.

Moreover, we have to rethink our current economic governance framework. Implementation of the deficit rules is still not satisfactory and many recommendations in the European Semester are never implemented by Member States. I hope that in the coming years we will do all this and leap forward in our euro integration, but before we think about eurobonds or an economic treasury, a European treasury, we have to ensure that this is properly done.

Finally, I think that the best way to achieve economic convergence in the eurozone is not through massive fiscal transfer between Member States, but by sharing and extending economic and financial best practices among us.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Num momento de impasse onde é por demais evidente a profunda crise deste modelo de integração da União Europeia, este documento de reflexão representa uma verdadeira fuga para a frente. Num momento em que se exigiria uma profunda reflexão sobre o papel da União Económica e Monetária, neste longo processo de divergência social e económica, este documento propõe, na prática, o aprofundamento de todos os fatores que estiveram na base desta divergência.

Na minha cidade, Aveiro, os trabalhadores que lutam hoje pelos seus direitos e estão em greve sentem bem na pele os efeitos desta União Europeia neoliberal dominada pelas multinacionais. A Europa não precisa de um Ministro das Finanças. Não será uma representação única no FMI que irá resolver os problemas do desemprego e da dependência económica. A capacidade orçamental, com todos os condicionalismos associados, irá apenas reforçar o carácter opressivo da zona euro e limitar a capacidade dos Estados-Membros para dar resposta aos seus problemas de acordo com os seus modelos e de acordo com a vontade do seu povo.

É hoje uma evidência que a zona euro representa um projeto político destinado a forçar uma agenda neoliberal e, por isso, o que se impõe como necessário não é o seu reforço, mas antes a sua dissolução num processo que inclua a recuperação das soberanias monetárias dos Estados-Membros e a renegociação das dívidas públicas cujo aumento não pode deixar de estar associado ao euro e à sua governação económica.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, aucune, je dis bien, aucune union monétaire – Monsieur Starbatty, l'Allemagne en est une –, aucune union monétaire n'est possible sans de puissants mécanismes de solidarité financière, à la fois privés et publics. Pour le dire simplement, sans une union bancaire complète, sans une union sociale, fiscale et démocratique, l'euro est voué à disparaître.

Cette évidence, le document de réflexion déposé par la Commission il y a deux semaines, la reconnaît, mais seulement en filigrane. Il s'ajoute à ceux proposés en 2012 par Barroso, d'une part, et par Van Rompuy, de l'autre, et au fameux rapport des cinq présidents déposé en 2015.

Cela fait donc cinq ans que nous tournons autour du pot, parce qu'il manque la vision et la volonté politique d'agir.

Oui, il nous faut compléter l'union bancaire en ajoutant à la supervision commune et à la gestion commune des crises une garantie commune des dépôts assortie d'un filet de sécurité public budgétaire commun.

Oui, il nous faut un budget de la zone euro pour investir en particulier dans la transition énergétique, parce que, déployé de manière contracyclique, il permettra d'amortir les chocs macroéconomiques, mais il améliorera aussi la solidité de l'économie européenne.

Oui, il nous faut approfondir la solidarité entre nos systèmes de protection sociale, par exemple avec un système de réassurance-chômage commune.

Enfin, si nous devons nous attaquer aux déficits excessifs, qu'il s'agisse de déficits de balances commerciales ou de déficits budgétaires, nous devons nous attaquer avec la même force aux excédents excessifs, car ils sont tout aussi délétères que les premiers.

De même, nous devons enrayer la croissance excessive tant des dettes publiques que des dettes privées, car leur augmentation est signe de danger. Rien de tout cela ne peut se faire sans un contrôle démocratique solide. Le Parlement européen et les parlements nationaux doivent être étroitement associés à ce dispositif.

Chers collègues, partager une monnaie, c'est partager un bien commun. Cela suppose à la fois des solidarités fortes et un sens des responsabilités partagées tout aussi fort. Tout cela n'est possible qu'avec des règles communes, par exemple pour le secteur financier. À ce sujet, permettez-moi de vous dire que ce à quoi nous assistons depuis un an, c'est davantage à un détricotage discret des quelques progrès que nous avons accomplis plutôt qu'à la simplification et au resserrement des règles dont nous aurions besoin.

Nous avons certes des règles en matière budgétaire, mais l'expérience nous montre qu'elles sont inapplicables, tout simplement parce qu'elles sont procycliques, c'est-à-dire qu'elles aggravent la situation quand elle est déjà grave et que, combinées à la doxa néolibérale qui continue de dominer cette assemblée, la Commission et le Conseil, elles font que ce sont les épaules les plus fragiles qui se retrouvent à porter la partie la plus lourde du fardeau.

Plutôt que de nous affranchir des règles, nous devons avoir le courage de les transformer, tant sur le plan financier que sur le plan budgétaire, pour qu'elles retrouvent leur sens, c'est-à-dire celui de la défense de l'intérêt général.

Je terminerai, Madame, si vous le permettez, en disant que l'Europe est un symbole. Certains voudraient en faire le symbole de l'oppression financière. Moi, j'affirme que l'Europe peut devenir ou redevenir le symbole d'une appartenance commune.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io sono d'accordo con il professor Starbatty, che ha parlato prima di me, perché c'è bisogno di una profonda analisi critica di quella che è la situazione dell'attuale assetto legato alla governance economica e legato all'Unione economica monetaria.

Abbiamo una moneta che ha creato evidenti squilibri perché è stata inserita in un contesto non valutario ottimale. Questi squilibri non sono dei successi, perché sono stati i cittadini a salvare l'euro, svalutandosi nei paesi periferici i salari e creando le condizioni di competitività che la Commissione fortemente chiede, su impulso delle politiche neoliberali che sono richieste dai globalisti e dal mercato.

Con questa situazione e quest'analisi forse si può identificare quali sono i problemi. In un'Unione economica monetaria che funziona ci sono dei conferimenti da parte dei paesi in surplus e che godono dei benefici legati alla moneta unica verso le aree depresse. Forse con questa onestà intellettuale si potrebbe cercare di trovare una soluzione. Però non vedo i paesi nordici che godono di questi surplus a voler fare questo tipo di azione politica e quindi è molto difficile essere europeisti in questo momento, nel momento in cui non c'è onestà intellettuale da parte di chi mette il «Germany first» – diciamo così – da diversi anni all'interno dell'Unione europea.

Anche sulle banche, mi spiace dirlo, le soluzioni che vengono applicate adottano pesi e misure sbagliate perché, se analizziamo la situazione dal 2011 al 2013, che ha portato i paesi europei a fare interventi sulle banche, vediamo come ci sia una situazione distorta della concorrenza, dove sistemi bancari come quello tedesco hanno ricevuto quasi 250 miliardi e hanno creato delle situazioni di aiuto, che oggi invece non sono ad esempio consentite in Italia, nel momento in cui il sistema bancario ha bisogno di dare man forte a quello che è il sistema del credito, a sua volta messo sotto pressione dal mercato neoliberale e dalle regole di Basilea.

Mettendo questi principi sotto la lente di ingrandimento forse si potrebbero trovare delle soluzioni ma, visto che non vedo questo nella proposta della Commissione, io penso sia più opportuno al netto parlare di una posizione di disgregazione dell'Unione valutaria.

Barbara Kappel, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Die Reform der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion ist sicherlich neben einer nachhaltigen Lösung der Flüchtlingsproblematik und einer Neuausrichtung der Verteidigungspolitik ein ganz wesentliches Thema und ein ganz wesentlicher Schritt für die Zukunft Europas und der Eurozone. Das vorliegende Reflexionspapier spiegelt die Meinung der Kommission dazu wider. In einem, was Sie heute sagten, gebe ich Ihnen völlig Recht, Herr Kommissar Moscovici: Dieses Haus soll in verstärktem Maße in den Dialog mit einbezogen werden, denn nur so kann eine demokratische Legitimität gegeben werden.

Aber auch die Mitgliedstaaten sind zwischenzeitlich sehr aktiv. Sie wissen, es wird bis Juli ein Arbeitspapier zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich für eine Reform der Eurozone erwartet. Ein gemeinsamer Haushalt für die Eurozone samt Euro-Finanzminister, gemeinsame Steuern und besicherte Verschuldungsmöglichkeiten, eine Vergemeinschaftung der Arbeitslosenversicherung und der Einlagensicherung sind aus meiner Sicht keine probaten Antworten auf die Probleme der Währungsunion. Was die Währungsunion braucht, ist nicht mehr Umverteilung und mehr Transfer, sondern mehr Eigenverantwortung, mehr Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und ein Einhalten der geltenden Defizit- und Schuldenregeln.

Gerade die Eurokrise hat gezeigt, dass sich kaum ein Mitgliedstaat an die Maastricht-Kriterien hält. Warum auch? Echte Konsequenzen sind ohnehin nicht vorgesehen. Die Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion braucht auch keine weitere Vergemeinschaftung der Schulden in Form von Eurobonds oder ESBies. Viel wichtiger sind eine verantwortungsvolle Haushaltspolitik, Maßnahmen, die Wachstum und Beschäftigung schaffen. So wird es uns gelingen, wieder Investitionen in Europa anzukurbeln, das Vertrauen der Investoren zu gewinnen und entsprechende Projekte zu generieren.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, σαν διακρατική συμμαχία του κεφαλαίου, δεν μπορεί να ξεπεράσει το DNA του καπιταλισμού: ανισομετρία οικονομικής ανάπτυξης και κοινωνική εκμετάλλευση. Μερίδα μονοπωλίων και κρατών προωθούν την περαιτέρω ενοποίησή της, με μία ή πολλές ταχύτητες, ενίσχυση ευρωπαϊκών εξαμήνων, σύνδεση χρηματοδοτήσεων στο κεφάλαιο με ένταση αντεργατικών μεταρρυθμίσεων. Ανταγωνίζονται με άλλες μερίδες που αναπτύσσουν φυγόκεντρες τάσεις, προστατευτισμό, με έκφραση τον αστικό ευρωσκεπτικισμό. Ανταγωνίζονται ποιος θα ωφεληθεί περισσότερο από μια ανάκαμψη ισχνή, αβέβαιη, προθάλαμο νέας κρίσης. Σε ένα συμφωνούν όλοι: κλιμάκωση παντού της αντιλαϊκής επίθεσης δίχως τέλος. Το ελληνικό χρέος που συζητείται μεθαύριο στο Eurogroup αντανακλά τέτοιες αντιθέσεις. Προϋπόθεση ρύθμισης του και ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης σημαίνουν παραπέρα μόνιμο σφαγιασμό μισθών, συντάξεων και επιδομάτων, ματωμένα πλεονάσματα για δεκαετίες για νέα κίνητρα στο κεφάλαιο, επιδοτήσεις και φοροαπαλλαγές. Ο λαός δεν χρωστά κανένα χρέος για να πληρώσει. Η αποδέσμευση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με ανατροπή της εξουσίας του κεφαλαίου, με λαϊκή εξουσία, είναι ο μόνος δρόμος επιβίωσης του.

Burkhard Balz (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Herren Kommissare! Die Europäische Kommission leistet mit den Reflektionspapieren einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Debatte über die Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Dies ist eine Debatte, die die europäischen Institutionen gemeinsam führen müssen. Wir benötigen einen breiten Konsens über die Stoßrichtung und die Reihenfolge der nächsten Schritte. Das gelingt uns nur, wenn wir die Glaubwürdigkeit im System stärken. Das heißt, wir müssen auf Basis der uns aktuell zur Verfügung stehenden Instrumente liefern. Das ist sicherlich der Ausgangspunkt, und das erkennt die Kommission ja auch richtigerweise an.

Die europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion hat ihre ganz eigene Architektur. Die EU-Kommission hat Recht, wenn sie sagt, dass wir kein nationales oder internationales Modell kopieren sollten. Wir möchten auf unserem bestehenden System aufbauen, indem wir Regelanwendungen stärken, eine bessere Verknüpfung von nationalen Reformen mit europäischen Kontrollen und Mitteln erreichen, die wirtschaftliche Konvergenz nach oben und damit mehr Wettbewerbsfähigkeit anstreben und die Entscheidungswege in der Union stärken und vor allen Dingen transparenter machen.

Die Vervollständigung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion muss für alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten offen bleiben. Die Mitgliedschaft im Euro soll kein Trennungssymbol werden, sondern ein Symbol für Wohlstand und Wettbewerbsfähigkeit. Deswegen betont die Kommission auch richtigerweise, dass ständige Transfers nicht zur Stabilisierung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion beitragen. Ich glaube, wir müssen *moral hazard* vermeiden, und hier als Stichwort „Glaubwürdigkeit“ die vertraglichen Schranken, an die wir alle gebunden sind, achten. Das ist für uns die Grundvoraussetzung für alle weiteren Überlegungen. Die Kommission lässt dabei leider auch Chancen unberührt. Mir fehlt zum Beispiel ein Vorschlag für ein Staateninsolvenzrecht.

Der Austausch hat gerade erst begonnen. Ich glaube, dass wir alle engagiert und konstruktiv an der Weiterentwicklung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion mitarbeiten sollten.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Madam President, the European Union can only have a future if the eurozone becomes an area delivering prosperity and upward convergence for all its Member States and for all the other states which are planning to join.

We need to stop this machine for divergences which are not only economic; they are social and political. So we welcome the Commission's proposal with a plan which, finally, recognises that the problems of the eurozone are not only financial stability, but also growth, job creation and upward economic and social convergence.

Of course, Member States do need to engage in an effort of their own in reforms and investments in the framework of the European Semester. But exactly because they are confined by a common fiscal discipline, they must also count on an instrument to support this upward convergence. We hope that this instrument will be created in the upcoming next budgetary framework. We need to have it as soon as possible, otherwise we cannot reverse this logic of divergence.

Beyond that, of course, we need to equip the eurozone with the proper fiscal capacity and this fiscal capacity should be based on democratic governance. The proposal of having a Minister of Finance, who is also a Vice-President of the European Commission makes sense from our viewpoint, but this will suppose full accountability before the European Parliament. The proposal coming now from the Commission to have an agreement involving Parliament, the Commission and the Council to discuss this makes sense and we are available to do so.

Sander Loones (ECR). – Ik woon in de Astridlaan in Koksijde, Oostduinkerke, en wij hebben een goede regel in onze straat. De regel is dat iedereen voor zijn eigen deur veegt. Zo is de hele straat proper. Soms veeg ik ook voor de deur van mijn buurman, wanneer die ziek is bijvoorbeeld. Solidariteit. Als ik niet in de Astridlaan zou wonen maar in de Europastraat, dan zou dat anders zijn. Dan zou het noordelijke deel van de straat proper zijn, geveegd zijn, maar het zuidelijke deel niet. Want dat is wat we zien vandaag in Europa: verschillende Zuid-Europese landen weigeren hun deel van het werk te doen en zo werkt het natuurlijk niet in deze eurozone. De eurozone kan enkel draaien wanneer alle lidstaten hun verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Maar vandaag praten we hier niet over het nemen van verantwoordelijkheid. Neen, we praten opnieuw over eurobonds, over een Europees Monetair Fonds, over een Europese minister van Financiën, over het instellen van een Europese transferunie. Een transferunie! Met alle respect, dat is niet de oplossing. Dat is geen solidariteit, dat is profitaat en dat is geen structurele toekomst voor onze eurozone.

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

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE), "blauwe kaart"-vraag. – Meneer Loones, Duitsland bestaat nu min of meer 150 jaar. Sinds 150 jaar is Duitsland een monetaire unie. Sinds 150 jaar zijn er transfers binnen Duitsland. Noemt u Duitsland een groot profitaat?

Sander Loones (ECR), "blauwe kaart"-antwoord. – Dank u wel voor de vraag. De vraag is hoe wij onze Europese economieën opnieuw sterker zullen maken. En wat stel ik vast? Ook in Duitsland werkt het transferbeleid niet. Het werkt ook niet in België trouwens, waar we jaarlijks miljarden transfers naar Wallonië hebben en ook Wallonië er niet bovenop geraakt. Het werkt ook niet in Italië. Een transferbeleid brengt geen sterkere economie, brengt geen sterkere eurozone. Dus dat is niet de weg vooruit. De enige weg vooruit is de weg van de verantwoordelijkheid. Doen wat moet. Structureel hervormen, zodat we samen vooruit kunnen gaan.

Nils Torvalds (ALDE). – Madam President, there is still a strong tendency to talk only about EMU, and that shows that we have a very short memory. Nobody cares to remember what happened after 1971: nobody wants to remember the tunnel, or the snake in the tunnel, and all the havoc they created. Then, all of a sudden, when we decide to get some systematic approach to the whole problem, then half of Europe more or less breaks in, because they had to come here.

I think part of this discussion is still about finding a culprit for a diverse range of things that happened outside our control. Things happened which we could not have any control over, but one of the issues – and I think Mr Loones spoke about it just now – is that, at the same time, we have a very sharp technological conflict going on. We have very steep technological development, and it is very easy to get left behind.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Dombrovskis και κύριε Moscovici, πώς και πότε θα ενισχυθεί ο δημοκρατικός έλεγχος και η ευρωπαϊκή λογοδοσία του Eurogroup; Ως πότε το Eurogroup θα αποφασίζει πίσω από κλειστές πόρτες; Ελπίζω μεθαύριο, στις 15 Ιουνίου, στο Eurogroup, και με τη συμβολή της Επιτροπής, να υπάρξει ένας δρόμος που θα επιτρέψει στην Ελλάδα, τη χώρα μου, μια δίκαιη και ισχυρή ανάπτυξη. Νομίζω ότι αυτός είναι ένας στόχος όχι μόνο ελληνικός αλλά και ευρωπαϊκός. Αλλά χρειάζεται περισσότερη σαφήνεια και τόλμη και από την Επιτροπή, γιατί έχετε ένα περίσσειμα διαπιστώσεων και ένα έλλειμα προτάσεων. Χρειαζόμαστε νέες, τολμηρές λύσεις με ενίσχυση της ανάπτυξης, της πολιτικής διακυβέρνησης, της διαφάνειας, της δημοκρατικής λογοδοσίας, της αλληλεγγύης, και σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Χρειάζεται περισσότερη πολιτική και δημοκρατική Ευρώπη και όχι μόνο αγορά. Για να γίνει αυτό, χρειάζεται να ενισχυθεί ο ρόλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και της Επιτροπής και όχι να αποδυναμωθεί, καθώς και να συγκροτηθεί, επιτέλους, και ένα Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο.

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kommissare, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal: Die Kommission hat aus unserer Sicht hier gute Vorschläge vorgelegt – sie weisen in die richtige Richtung. Wir brauchen mehr an einer gemeinsamen Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik in der Eurozone – daran führt kein Weg vorbei, wenn wir das Ganze zusammenhalten wollen.

Das bedeutet jetzt auch: Der Ball liegt jetzt im Spielfeld der Mitgliedsländer. Die Mitgliedsländer müssen jetzt endlich – nach Jahren der nicht funktionierenden Kooperation hinter verschlossenen Türen in der Eurogruppe – auf den Boden der europäischen Demokratie zurückfinden und selbst starke Vorschläge vorlegen, wie wir eben weiterkommen. Die Vorschläge, die Sie vorgelegt haben, müssen jetzt auch zu Ergebnissen führen.

Die Europäische Zentralbank kann nicht länger alleine dafür verantwortlich sein, die Eurozone zusammenzuhalten. Die Schäden, die das erzeugt, sind immer größer und nicht verantwortbar. Die Antwort darauf bedeutet aber, dass wir zu der gemeinsamen Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik in Europa kommen müssen, statt Mario Draghi zu beschimpfen. Ich finde im Übrigen auch richtig, dass Sie kein gemeinsames Staateninsolvenzverfahren vorgelegt haben, noch dazu – wie der Kollege Balz vorgeschlagen hat –, ohne gleichzeitig irgendwelche Transfers zuzulassen. Warum? Das würde die Eurozone wieder auseinandertreiben, weil damit natürlich die schwächeren Staaten entsprechende höhere Lasten für ihre Staatsverschuldung zu tragen hätten. Damit treiben wir doch den Euro auseinander – statt dafür zu sorgen, dass er zusammenhält.

Jetzt muss es also darum gehen, dass diese Reformen nicht intergouvernemental umgesetzt werden – also rund um eine Vertiefung des Europäischen Stabilitätsmechanismus, wie Herr Schäuble das möchte –, sondern im Rahmen der europäischen Verträge: ein gemeinsames Budget, ein Eurofinanzminister, also ein EU-Kommissar, der gleichzeitig der Eurogruppe vorsitzt, auch ein Mehr an sozialer Verantwortung und Investitionen. All das können wir im Rahmen der Verträge machen. Packen wir es an!

Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD). – Madam President, eurozone leaders remain mired in denial. It is true that, by its miserable standards, the common currency is having a less disastrous year, transforming itself from a snail to a tortoise in terms of growth, but a fortnight ago Mr Dombrovskis claimed that, after its inception, the euro quickly became a symbol of prosperity for our citizens. Tell that to Italians, whose economy is not much bigger than it was at the turn of the century! Tell it to Greeks, whose death rates have soared amid the collapse of the healthcare system!

Mr Dombrovskis says recovery is firmly under way, after having incorrectly anticipated it for several years, but this so-called eurozone recovery is akin to a drunk managing to stagger three consecutive paces in a straight line. We know it is going to lurch face first into a brick wall at any moment, because this is a flawed political construct. To trap Greece and other southern economies in the same currency as Germany is simply folly. These economies need their own currencies that can depreciate to protect their activity levels in the face of Germany's superior productivity path. They do not have Germany's scale, brands, R&D budgets, communications infrastructure, technical education system, export networks, harmonious industrial relations or work ethic. Even their climates dictate a daily pause in activity. But instead of navigating back toward sensible economics, the EU keeps using the ideology of integration as its lodestar.

Even Romania and Bulgaria are expected to join the euro, lining them up for the same fate as has been visited upon Greece. Unless the people of Germany are willing to fund giant and permanent transfer payments to the weaker parts, which they are not, there is no long-term case for expanding or deepening the eurozone. Do not deepen it: dump it.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioners for coming to the Parliament this afternoon. How will we make the Euro more stable by the year 2025? This is the key topic of the reflection paper put forward by the Commission which we are discussing this afternoon.

A more stable euro and a more stable Economic and Monetary Union will undoubtedly lead to more growth, more investment and more jobs. The stability of the euro and the job creation process in the European Union is one of the main concerns of the citizens of the European Union, and this is why we have to address this.

How should we achieve this? Firstly: by respecting existing rules. More than 20 Member States of the Union, over the course of the recent years, have been in excessive deficit procedures. We still have six excessive deficit procedures open right now. We should not start now by questioning the rules which we have given to ourselves, but we should start by applying these rules, because, as we know, unsustainable debt leads to loss of trust, loss of credibility and is also a big burden for the economy.

Besides respecting the rules, what should we do? Firstly, we should encourage and support the Member States of the Union to reform, to improve their competitiveness and to strengthen their economies. If this economic reality leads to the conclusion that we should adjust our institutional framework through the creation of a treasury and a finance minister, then we should be ready to think about this and to discuss it, but we should not start the debate about improving our economy by new changes in our institutional set-up in Brussels.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je vous remercie pour ce diagnostic. C'est une piste de réflexion utile pour défendre ce bien commun qu'est l'euro. Pour des raisons tant politiques qu'économiques, nous devons le préserver.

Vous nous éclairez sur ses faiblesses: c'est utile pour remettre en lumière la nécessité de compléter l'Union économique et monétaire, comme cela a déjà été fait dans le rapport des quatre présidents, dans le rapport des cinq présidents et dans de nombreuses résolutions de ce Parlement, dont la dernière sur un budget pour la zone euro.

Cette analyse peut être complétée, car il faut aussi relever les défauts de conception de l'Union économique et monétaire dans son état actuel et dans son évolution, qui conduisent à l'existence de règles trop complexes, trop opaques, parfois totalement inadaptées et qui induisent un biais contraire à l'investissement nécessaire au fonctionnement de la zone euro elle-même.

Dans le diagnostic, il nous semble peut-être qu'un sentiment d'urgence fait relativement défaut, car nous sommes dans un moment où l'intérêt stratégique de la zone euro a besoin d'être réaffirmé, y compris dans le contexte du Brexit.

Je voudrais m'attarder davantage sur les solutions que vous proposez, dont beaucoup vont dans le sens de ce que nous soutenons et de ce pour quoi nous nous mobilisons, à commencer, comme le commissaire Moscovici l'a indiqué, par un arrangement qui permette un fonctionnement plus démocratique de la zone euro elle-même.

Parmi les quatre principes directeurs que vous proposez, je vous suggère d'ajouter celui d'une contribution au développement durable et à la mise en œuvre des objectifs de la conférence de Paris. Je sais qu'il ne faut pas trop alourdir la barque, mais tout de même, on ne peut pas diviser nos moyens.

Vous proposez des mécanismes de stabilisation macroéconomique: nous le saluons, c'est une piste indispensable. Nous proposons également d'aller vers un code de convergence qui permette d'échapper à une logique trop punitive et qui favorise un système d'incitation grâce à un budget propre de la zone euro, dont le mécanisme européen de stabilité devrait être l'embryon.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, Európska únia pripravuje spoločné ručenie za vklady, to znie pekne a európsky, avšak je to krajne nespravodlivé. Totiž, čím viac krajiny majú zlých úverov, tým je vyššia pravdepodobnosť, že ich banky skrachujú a bude sa z tohto vkladu, spoločného vkladu, ručiť. Zlých úverov je v Európe spolu vyše 1000 miliárd EUR a pozrime sa kde, v ktorých krajinách, sa tieto zlé úvery nachádzajú. Portugalsko 41 miliárd, Francúzsko 148, Španielsko 141, Grécko 115, Taliansko 276. Pre porovnanie, Slovensko má len 2 miliardy zlých úverov, pritom je len polovične tak veľké ako také Grécko alebo Portugalsko. Spoločné ručenie vkladov preto zásadne odmietam, lebo opäť raz na to len doplatia občania Slovenska, tak ako to už bolo v prípade Grécka, keď sme platili na grécke diaľnice my, oveľa chudobnejšia krajina.

PRÉSIDENTE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst einmal vielen Dank an die Kommission. Es ist eine wichtige Debatte, die hier geführt wird. Es ist eine gute Debatte mit verschiedenen Ideen, und wir kommen mit der Debatte zurück zum Ausgangspunkt der Währungsunion, nämlich der Konvergenz, und zur Frage, wie wir zur Konvergenz kommen, also zum Zusammenwachsen der Wirtschaften in dieser einheitlichen Währungszone. Da stellt sich eine Frage, die oft gerade mit Blick auf Deutschland gestellt wird, nämlich: Schaffen wir es, mehr Konvergenz zu erzeugen, indem wir die stärkeren Mitglieder der Währungsunion schwächen?

Ich glaube, das ist der falsche Weg. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die schwächeren Mitglieder aufschließen können, und dazu braucht es entschlossene Reformpolitik. Ich bin optimistisch, was Frankreich angeht. Ich bin nicht so optimistisch, was Italien angeht; da mache ich mir große Sorgen.

Zweiter Punkt: die Stabilisierung. Es kann unverschuldete Schocks, asymmetrische Schocks geben. Deswegen ist eine Aufwertung des Europäischen Stabilitätsmechanismus richtig. Aber, und das ist der dritte Punkt: Regeln werden nur eingehalten, wenn die Anreizsysteme stimmen. Deswegen ist es unmöglich, ein solches System zu bauen ohne ein Staateninsolvenzrecht. Denn ohne das gibt es Fehlanreize für schlechte Politik, was solide öffentliche Finanzen angeht. Wir brauchen aber solide öffentliche Haushalte.

Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL). – Fru formand! Som et af ganske få lande har vi jo i Danmark faktisk holdt en folkeafstemning om euroen. Dengang fik vi at vide gentagne gange, at det kun handlede om økonomi, om renter, om vekselgebyrer. Siden har det jo vist sig, at man faktisk ikke kan have en møntunion med så forskellige lande uden også at indføre en egentlig politisk økonomisk union. Og det er så også den udvikling, vi har set lige siden finanskrisen. Opbygningen af en politisk union, hvor EU sætter stram styring af medlemslandenes økonomier, og hvor tusindvis af borgere lever med konsekvenserne af nedskæringer og velfærdsforringelser. Man kunne have håbet på, at Kommissionen med dette visionspapir ville have brudt bare en lillebitte smule med nedskæringsregimet. Men i stedet er der lagt op til mere EU-ensretning, stærkere kontrol med landenes økonomier og sørme også stærkere EU-institutioner med en euro-finansminister! Men kære venner, det er måske tillokkende at forsøge at løse verdens problemer med mere EU, men de borgere, der lever med konsekvenserne i dag, bliver altså ikke hørt i dette udspil – tværtimod.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Het dak repareren, dat doe je natuurlijk beter als de zon schijnt. Ik denk dat de meesten het hier wel mee eens zullen zijn. En dus is het logisch en ook terecht dat de Europese Commissie het debat over de broodnodige verdieping en versterking van de eurozone met het reflectiedocument (*reflection paper*) weer aanzwengelt. Maar alles staat of valt met een gezond fundament, en volgens de EVP is dat in eerste instantie het stabiliteits- en groeipact – je houdt je aan de regels die je met elkaar afspreekt – en de drie-eenheid structurele hervormingen, investeringen en gezonde overheidsfinanciën. Als we stappen willen zetten in die vervolmaking van de eurozone, dan zullen we vooral moeten werken aan het herstel van vertrouwen, en dat doe je door concrete maatregelen. Ja, ook door een Europees verzekeringssysteem voor deposito's, maar dan wel een systeem dat gebaseerd is op verantwoordelijkheden daar waar het hoort: in de lidstaten én in Europa. Het is niet zo dat je je verantwoordelijkheid naar het Europese niveau kan afschuiven en vervolgens als lidstaat kan zeggen: red je er maar mee. De enige manier waarop wij hopelijk in 2019 met zo'n systeem kunnen beginnen, want het is nodig, is door een manier te vinden om die verantwoordelijkheid te delen en het geen excuusmechanisme, geen afschuiven van verantwoordelijkheid richting Europa te maken. Met andere woorden, concrete stappen die vertrouwen herstellen in plaats van een enorme vlucht vooruit met extra budgetten waarvan niemand weet hoe ze betaald moeten worden, ministers waarvan nog niemand weet wat ze zouden moeten gaan doen. Werk aan het concrete, dan werk je aan vertrouwen.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi accogliamo positivamente il documento della Commissione sull'approfondimento e il completamento dell'Unione economica e monetaria. È un documento ambizioso e realistico, allo stesso tempo, che in molti punti riflette le proposte avanzate da questo Parlamento e che ora deve trasformarsi in una concreta *roadmap*.

Per quanto riguarda l'Unione finanziaria, le misure necessarie al suo completamento sono chiare: garanzie e depositi, *backstop* che attendono solo di essere conclusi. Per quanto riguarda l'Unione economica e di bilancio, occorre invece uscire rapidamente dalla fase degli scenari possibili e intraprendere con coraggio e determinazione quella indicata dal Parlamento, e pure presente nel *paper*, vale a dire la realizzazione di uno scambio tra meccanismi rafforzati e vincolanti di convergenza delle politiche economiche e la costruzione di una capacità di bilancio della zona euro, da collocare nel bilancio dell'Unione e da utilizzare per funzioni di stabilizzazione, tra le quali la più efficace è senza dubbio quella di un'indennità di disoccupazione europea. In questo senso è utile precisare che tale indennità non richiede una preventiva armonizzazione delle regole del mercato del lavoro, ma al contrario può contribuire, insieme ad altri strumenti, a creare le condizioni per una maggiore convergenza in questo ambito.

È anche importante chiarire che, come il Parlamento ha dimostrato, sia le *Convergence Guidelines* sia la *Fiscal Capacity* possono essere realizzati a trattati costanti, senza far ricorso a soluzioni intergovernative, e sulla base del metodo comunitario, che è l'unico che può consentire un appropriato controllo democratico.

In questo senso accolgo positivamente l'invito del Commissario a formalizzare il dialogo tra Parlamento e Commissione sul Semestre, che per noi non è un *arrangement* ma un *interinstitutional agreement*. Per quanto riguarda la questione del *safe asset*, si tratta di un tema molto importante e positivo, che naturalmente richiede di essere affrontato con attenzione per evitare rischi sulla stabilità finanziaria.

Infine, per quanto riguarda l'integrazione del *Fiscal Compact*, la lezione di questi anni è che c'è ripresa e fiducia, anche perché è stata superata la politica rigida di austerità. Quindi integrazione del *Fiscal Compact* se c'è la sua riforma.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – In de Europese Unie wordt vaak dezelfde fout gemaakt. Als een vraagstuk lastig is, dan wordt de grote sprong voorwaarts gemaakt. Nog altijd ontbreken duidelijke exit-criteria voor de euro, maar in plaats van die op te stellen, komt de Commissie nu met een grote sprong voorwaarts. Er wordt helaas niet nagedacht over de vraag hoe de bestaande problemen kunnen worden opgelost. Wat zijn die problemen? Frankrijk en een aantal zuidelijke lidstaten hervormen de arbeidsmarkt niet, hervormen de financieel-economische verhoudingen niet zoals Nederland en Duitsland al wel gedaan hebben. Gevolg is dus dat schulden blijven staan en dat de werkloosheid groeit. Wat moet er gebeuren? De instrumenten van het stabiliteits- en groeipact moeten worden benut en misschien iets worden aangescherpt. We moeten geen gemeenschappelijke schulden aangaan. Landen moeten zelf hervormingen doorvoeren en schulden afbouwen. Daar is zo'n grote stap voorwaarts met een totale EMU echt niet voor nodig.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, in typical Commission fashion, a European unemployment insurance scheme is dangled like a carrot to gain public support, while the trade-off is the harmonisation of labour relations and anti-worker reforms. As for the proposed investment scheme, it is contradictory nonsense to create a scheme to protect investment during downturns while insisting on keeping the Fiscal Compact strait-jacket in place.

These measures will not solve the eurozone structural problems, and they demand a trade-off in rights, democracy and popular sovereignty. I do not oppose transfers to correct imbalances but I will oppose them if they are conditional. Social rights cannot be dependent on economic performance or a state's adherence to fiscal rules. Rights are rights.

We will not fall for the trap of surrendering more ground on democratic rights in exchange for crumbs off the table. What we ultimately need is a real public investment plan to stimulate growth. We need effective sanctions against current-account surpluses, investment to be excluded from the fiscal rules, and rejection of the Fiscal Compact being enshrined in the Treaties at the end of this year.

Bernard Monot (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, dix-huit ans après les débuts de l'euro, la zone monétaire optimale que vous nous aviez promise ne fonctionne pas.

De nombreux pays, dont la France, sont victimes de ce système de parité de change fixe, qui provoque une euro-divergence, dont les taux de croissance économique, les taux de chômage, les taux d'intérêt, les dettes souveraines ainsi que les dettes extérieures posent un grave problème.

Cette situation force les États à mener des politiques récessives de dévaluation interne, pudiquement appelées réformes structurelles, destinées à restaurer leur compétitivité économique.

Dans le sillage de MM. Sarkozy et Hollande, le président Macron va poursuivre et accroître cette purge qui, comme on l'a vu en Espagne ou en Grèce, frappe durement les plus fragiles.

Mais cela ne vous suffit pas. Pour résoudre les défauts structurels de cette monnaie, vous proposez, dans ce rapport sur l'Union économique et monétaire, de déposséder les nations de leurs derniers pouvoirs économiques et budgétaires en les transférant à Berlin via sa succursale de Bruxelles.

Ainsi, après avoir enlevé nos frontières nationales avec Schengen, notre monnaie avec l'euro, nos banques avec l'union bancaire, vous vous attaquez maintenant à nos finances publiques.

Monsieur Macron, nous vous combattons politiquement pour résoudre les problèmes de la zone euro dans le cadre d'une coopération et d'une concertation intergouvernementales.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, I believe that the demand for change in Europe provides strong legitimacy for difficult and far-reaching reforms when it comes to the governance and functioning of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). It is true that there are changes feasible within the current Treaty framework but there are also others that need Treaty change, and of course discussions on decision-making processes are never without controversy.

There might not be great haste or great enthusiasm to embark immediately on Treaty change. Nevertheless, this should not prevent us from analysing where our Treaties should be improved. But the challenge is not only to strengthen the architecture and governance of the EMU. We must also find a way to strengthen its democratic legitimacy.

Lastly, we must make sure that the unavoidable integration gap between EMU members and the non-eurozone will be mitigated by safeguards protecting the integrity of the internal market and the consistency of policies across the Union.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario y vicepresidente, la verdad es que todos celebramos este nuevo informe que plantea un escenario a medio plazo para la unión monetaria. Yo creo que las recomendaciones que hacen tienen sentido; probablemente algunas de ellas deberían adelantarse en el tiempo, teniendo en cuenta que esa capacidad presupuestaria debería acomodarse al nuevo escenario plurianual, al nuevo presupuesto plurianual, que tendrá que discutirse en los próximos años.

En cualquier caso, uno se pregunta ya cuándo vamos a lograr pasar de los planes de las hojas de ruta, a las propuestas.

Conocíamos el informe de los señores Van Rompuy y Barroso, en 2012. En 2014 teníamos el informe de los cinco presidentes. La Comisión publicaba también otro Libro Blanco, hace unos meses, con distintas opciones para la Unión. Y ahora tenemos este Libro Verde sobre la unión monetaria.

Está bien la reflexión, está bien la discusión, pero necesitamos propuestas legislativas concretas por parte de la Comisión y necesitamos también que este Parlamento dé respuesta a algunas que ustedes ya han presentado.

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

Paul Rübzig (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich möchte mich beim Kollegen Fernández recht herzlich bedanken, weil natürlich gerade dieser Aktionsplan neue Chancen für Beschäftigung gibt. Wie, glauben Sie, erhalten eigentlich die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmungen von diesen neuen Rahmenbedingungen einen positiven Effekt, der es ganz einfach ermöglicht, nicht nur in Europa tätig zu werden, sondern vor allem im Export, mit Private-Public-Partnership-Argumenten neue Märkte zu erschließen und auf beiden Seiten für Wohlstand zu sorgen?

Jonás Fernández (S&D), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Agradezco mucho la pregunta, porque cerrar el modelo de unión monetaria debe permitir ampliar la capacidad de crecimiento de todas las economías de la Unión y, por lo tanto, ofrecer nuevas perspectivas de futuro a las pymes —a las pequeñas y medianas empresas—, que conforman el núcleo de la economía europea.

Estamos discutiendo y se han discutido iniciativas en el marco de la unión del mercado de capitales para permitir que las pequeñas empresas puedan financiarse no solamente utilizando los canales bancarios, y yo creo que este esfuerzo para mejorar el funcionamiento de la Unión y la demanda interna es una apuesta de futuro para el conjunto de la Unión.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Das Problem ist in der Tat die Konvergenz in der Eurozone – die Konvergenz, die nicht stattfindet. Wir haben keine Konvergenz, Graf Lambsdorff, wir haben Divergenz in der Eurozone. Über die letzten zehn Jahre hin sind diverse Staaten in der Eurozone, die arm sind, ärmer geworden; die Einkommensunterschiede in der Eurozone haben zugenommen. Diese Einkommensunterschiede, die jetzt größer sind, als sie vor zehn Jahren waren, geben jetzt Anlass für die Kommission zu sagen: Dann müssen wir eben umverteilen, dann müssen wir eben irgendwelche Formen von Transfers schaffen, dann müssen wir versuchen, die Ressourcen aus den reichen Ländern in die armen Länder hineinzubringen. Das sind die Maßnahmen, die der Kommission dazu einfallen. Aber das ist ein Kurieren an den Symptomen, es geht nicht an die Ursachen heran.

Die Ursache liegt darin, dass die Produktivitätsentwicklungen in unterschiedlichen Staaten nun einmal unterschiedlich sind. Wir können uns nicht einfach wünschen, dass sie überall die gleichen Produktivitätsentwicklungen durchmachen, sondern wir müssen zur Kenntnis nehmen, dass sie unterschiedlich sind und dass sich dann entweder die Löhne ganz unterschiedlich entwickeln, was dazu führen wird, dass die EU oder zumindest die Eurozone starken Spannungen ausgesetzt wird, oder aber, dass wir den Euro abschaffen müssen, damit die Abwertungen wieder greifen können, die früher zur Konvergenz in der Eurozone geführt haben.

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

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Lucke, ich stimme Ihnen in vielen Punkten zu. Italien ist das beste Beispiel: Seit 20 Jahren gibt es keine Produktivitätsfortschritte. Das liegt an der Arbeitsmarktpolitik, es liegt an der Bildungspolitik, es liegt an der Reformverweigerung, es liegt an einem insgesamt sozialdemokratischen Politikverständnis, auch was die Sozialpartnerschaft angeht – da stimme ich Ihnen überall zu. Aber wenn die Kommission jetzt alleine gesagt hätte: „Wir müssen das Ganze mit einer Transferunion regeln.“, würde ich das genauso hart kritisieren, wie Sie das gerade getan haben. Das hat die Kommission aber gerade nicht getan, sondern sie hat eine Debatte angestoßen, wie wir es schaffen, mit demokratischer Kontrolle dafür zu sorgen, dass die Konvergenz endlich stattfindet. Sehen Sie das auch so?

Bernd Lucke (ECR), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Kollege Lambsdorff! Ich stimme Ihnen nicht zu, dass demokratische Kontrolle dazu führen wird, dass Konvergenz einsetzt. Ich bin völlig bei Ihnen in der Kritik, die Sie auch in Ihrem Redebeitrag geäußert haben. Aber ich glaube nicht, dass wir durch Strukturreformen dahin kommen werden können, dass die Länder, die jetzt Schwierigkeiten in der Eurozone haben, werden wie Deutschland oder Dänemark oder die Niederlande. Es ist ein falscher Ansatz zu glauben, dass wir das, was wir an Strukturen in den fortgeschrittenen Ländern der Eurozone haben, einfach eins zu eins auf andere Länder übertragen können und dass sie auf die Dauer schon so werden wie wir. Diesen Ansatz, glaube ich, können wir nicht weiterverfolgen. Wir müssen die Heterogenität, die Unterschiedlichkeit der Länder in der Eurozone respektieren und akzeptieren.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, lo que su documento pone sobre la mesa es que no tienen un plan para el euro; que pretenden profundizar en las reformas neoliberales del mercado laboral y la austeridad, obviando que son estas reformas las que están desgarrando la zona euro, las que están empobreciendo a su periferia, las que están condenando a generaciones enteras a la pobreza, el paro y la precariedad.

No es por falta de imaginación, es cobardía frente a Alemania que, como los romanos, creó un desierto y lo llamó paz. Un desierto de deslocalizaciones, de desempleo masivo, de trabajadores obligados a bailar al son de un capital internacional que pone la música con la que bailan la Comisión y los gobiernos —por ejemplo, como el de mi país, España—.

Sin transferencias, sin armonización laboral, sin armonización fiscal, el único futuro del euro es su desintegración. Porque ningún pueblo puede vivir para ser esclavo de una moneda.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Collega's, een muntzone creëren vanuit lidstaten die sociaal en economisch zo fundamenteel van elkaar verschillen, dat was vragen om instabiliteit. Het is mijn mening dat de instabiliteit structureel ingebakken was in het euro-concept. En nu stellen we, naarmate de mislukking steeds duidelijker wordt, vast dat het juist die instabiliteit is die door u wordt gebruikt om uw verdere Europese integratie, uw politieke integratie door te drukken. Het is die instabiliteit van de munt die wordt gebruikt om de verschillen uit te vlakken en in die discussienota (*reflection paper*) waar u nu mee aankomt, komt u op een vrij onbeschaamde manier naar voren met een politiek project. Een politiek project niet alleen van de bankenunie en van de kapitaalmarktenuie en van het afwikkelingsfonds, maar ook van een fundamentele voortzetting van de convergentiestandaarden en van een Europese minister van Financiën en een Europees Parlement, en natuurlijk van Europese schuldpapieren. U wil verder naar het verder uitvlakken van de verschillen, terwijl dat nu juist het on-Europese is aan dit hele project.

De verschillen die Europa hebben groot gemaakt, de concurrentieverschillen die Europa tot welzijn en welvaart hebben gebracht, worden verder uitgevlakt en volgens ons is dat een ernstige, fundamentele vergissing. Het is de vergissing die de Europese Unie altijd begaat: als er zich een probleem voordoet, moet er meer Europese Unie zijn, de vlucht vooruit. Het doordrukken van een politieke dwangbuis naar een politieke eenheid is wat ons betreft on-Europees. Dat is al bij uitstek het geval bij de monetaire politiek van uw ECB. Die moet proberen de instabiliteit te verhinderen door Zuid-Europese landen toe te laten, hun schuld te parkeren op de ECB-balans, wat onvermijdelijk tot transfers leidt. Dat is ook het geval voor het monetair beleid dat nu gevoerd wordt door Draghi en dat uiteindelijk fundamenteel onze reservecapaciteiten verkwist.

De potentiële stimuleringspakketten die we later nodig zullen hebben, wanneer we bij een daling van de conjunctuur of bij de eerstvolgende crisis moeten verhinderen dat we in een recessie terechtkomen, zullen niet meer mogelijk zijn. Uw arbeidsmobiliteit, uw immigratie, uw globalisering, dat zijn sociale uitvlakkingen waarvan de prijs de druk op de lage lonen en de armoede zijn. De schuldenniveaus zijn nog altijd dezelfde als voor de crisis. Lidstaten hebben geen rempedalen meer, geen motor meer, ze hebben zelfs het stuur niet meer in handen. U neemt hen dat allemaal af. We kunnen beter teruggaan naar de tekentafel en terugkeren naar de oorsprong van wat de Europese Unie was: een Unie van verschillende landen die door de verschillen juist meer welvaart en meer welzijn voor de bevolking hebben gecreëerd. U doet het omgekeerde.

Paul Tang (S&D). – De bijdrage van de Commissie komt op een uitstekend moment. Na de verkiezingen kan de Frans-Duitse as weer op gang komen en is er een nieuw debat over de euro. Dat is hoog tijd, want de euro werkt niet naar behoren. De euro zou landen bij elkaar moeten brengen, niet uit elkaar moeten drijven. Hij zou moeten zorgen voor stabiliteit en vooral volledige werkgelegenheid. Maar de Europese instrumenten voor de Europese munt die daarvoor nodig zijn, ontbreken. Een onderling waarborgfonds, waar het Europees Parlement in februari al vóór stemde, kan zorgen dat overheidsbestedingen op het juiste moment en op de juiste plek komen. Een Europese garantie voor spaartegoeden kan voorkomen dat banken landen omver trekken. En de democratische verantwoording moet beter. Waarom wel een schimmige Eurogroep en geen eurozone-parlement? Kortom, het is nog niet te laat om de euro te laten werken. Het is nog niet te laat om een einde te maken aan de struisvogelpolitiek. Het is nu tijd om keuzes te maken.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ONE και το ευρώ αποδείχθηκαν ένας μηχανισμός οικονομικής και πολιτικής επιβολής συγκεκριμένων πολιτικών υπέρ των ισχυρότερων οικονομικά χωρών και υπέρ του κεφαλαίου. Στα δεκαοκτώ χρόνια της ONE, και ιδιαίτερα στα χρόνια της κρίσης, στο όνομα της δημοσιονομικής σταθερότητας έχει εφαρμοστεί σκληρότερη λιτότητα με αποτέλεσμα να διευρυνθούν οι περιφερειακές και κοινωνικές ανισότητες. Χώρες, όπως η Ελλάδα, μπήκαν σε μνημόνιο για να σωθούν οι τράπεζες και το ευρώ. Μνημονιακές κυβερνήσεις, όπως αυτές της Ελλάδας, και ευρωπαϊκοί θεσμοί έχουν παραβιάσει εθνικά Συντάγματα, έχουν ακυρώσει δημοψηφίσματα, έχουν απαξιώσει τη βούληση των λαών και τη δημοκρατία. Σήμερα, η ανάγκη εμβάθυνσης της ONE επί της ουσίας ζητάει περισσότερη λιτότητα, περισσότερες ιδιωτικοποιήσεις, λιγότερα δικαιώματα για τους εργαζόμενους, και περισσότερη ανεργία και ανασφάλεια. Για τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς, η ONE και το ευρώ δεν προσφέρουν προοπτικές ευημερίας και ανάπτυξης. Οι λαοί της Ευρώπης θα βρουν εναλλακτικούς τρόπους οικονομικής συνεργασίας έξω και μακριά από τα δεσμά του ευρώ.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σωστά ο Αντιπρόεδρος, κύριος Dombrovskis, σημείωσε ότι οι πολιτικές μας δεν πρέπει να αλληλοϋπονομεύονται με βάση τους κοινούς μας στόχους. Και πολύ ορθά ο Επίτροπος, κύριος Moscovici, τόνισε ότι μια ευρωζώνη δύο ταχυτήτων είναι επικίνδυνη. Ωστόσο, οι διακηρυγμένες πολιτικές μας, με βάση τον στόχο μας για σύγκλιση των οικονομιών μας, πρέπει να αξιολογούνται και εκ των υστέρων από τα αποτελέσματά τους. Για παράδειγμα, είναι γνωστό ότι η Τραπεζική Ένωση περιέχει και Ευρωπαϊκό Σχέδιο Εγγύησης Καταθέσεων, το οποίο είναι βασική παράμετρος για να υπάρξει σταθερότητα στην ONE. Όμως, χωρίς την εφαρμογή του, υπάρχει μια έμμεση διάκριση εις βάρος των κρατών μελών ιδίως του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου που είναι αδύνατα και μικρά. Πρόκειται για μεταφορά καταθέσεων σε άλλα κράτη μέλη. Καλά, λοιπόν, τα μεγάλα βήματα για Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο, αλλά πρώτα ας εκπληρώσουμε όσα έχουμε συμφωνήσει.

Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D). – Doamnă președinte, Uniunea Europeană va avea succes dacă două condiții sunt îndeplinite în mod esențial: în primul rând, dacă această zonă euro va reuși să aducă prosperitate și convergență între statele membre ale Uniunii Europene, dacă solidaritatea între statele membre va fi o realitate, ceea ce nu a fost până acum, și, în al doilea rând, dacă cetățenii europeni vor susține în continuare Uniunea Europeană.

În acest moment nu avem o plasă socială de siguranță pentru cetățenii europeni. Toate costurile acestor reforme sunt puse în spinarea cetățenilor europeni și nu este normal să se întâmple acest lucru. De aceea, avem nevoie de un control democratic solid, de aceea, avem nevoie de implicarea Parlamentului European în luarea deciziilor în acest domeniu, pentru că Parlamentul European este singura instituție aleasă democratic de cetățeni, care reprezintă cetățenii europeni.

Nu în ultimul rând, lipsește un plan de susținere a țărilor care vor adera la această zonă euro. Nu există un plan de susținere a țărilor care vor intra în zona euro în viitor.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Madam President, the eurozone still faces two major fundamental problems: its component parts diverge economically and socially, and divergence is increasing. This allows parts of the system to automatically benefit from the rules of the game and others to lose out. Secondly, the only available mechanism to repair imbalances is internal devaluation. This creates huge social hardship which, when unfairly distributed, undermines the legitimacy of EMU.

As in the Five Presidents' report, the Commission paper lists the tools that could, if properly used, help to counteract these two major flaws. However, experience has shown that tools lined up to address the problems of European integration – unless they are properly structured through political agreement – correct symptoms while leaving underlying problems to fester. This has been the case with the application of the two-pack and six-pack process, so we have budgetary balances while public investment remains in decline. Any new structural change in the eurozone's structure would need a prior political agreement between eurozone members regarding how such change would operate. Leaving it to be guided by free market forces or making it subservient to the dogma that there can be no transfer union would again simply give greater impetus to divergences while allowing social unfairness resulting from internal devaluation to grow.

Interventions à la demande

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospođa predsjednice, dovršetak i jačanje Ekonomske i monetarne unije neophodno je, jer je to put za postizanje ciljeva koji su nam svima važni, a to je rast i razvoj Europske unije, stvaranje novih radnih mjesta, ekonomska konvergencija, finansijska stabilnost. Prvi korak na tom putu je, kako su i mnoge kolege istaknule, kvalitetna primjena postojećih pravila. Ali, ja bih još dodala i izmjene i prilagodba u dijelovima za koje analize pokazuju da bi to bilo korisno i potrebno – ne smijemo se bojati biti fleksibilni.

Države članice izvan EMU-a treba poduprijeti i pomoći im na putu te važne integracije, osobito one koje primjenjuju sva pravila i ispunjavaju gotovo sve kriterije, poput Hrvatske, iz koje dolazim. Sve države članice trebaju sudjelovati u donošenju odluka o budućnosti EMU-a, biti na sastancima Euro grupe, ako ozbiljno mislimo da je njihova integracija sigurna u skorijoj budućnosti.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, una vera unione economica e monetaria richiede innanzitutto la promozione dell'interesse generale della zona euro e una maggiore trasparenza dei processi decisionali in campo monetario e finanziario. Una maggiore integrazione europea, in particolare sul piano finanziario, non potrà che contribuire a rafforzare l'Europa nel mercato globalizzato.

Una possibile *roadmap* per il 2025 includerebbe l'emanazione di titoli garantiti da obbligazioni sovrane per la zona euro, l'istituzione di un sostegno comune per il fondo di risoluzione e una semplificazione delle regole del patto di stabilità.

In sostanza dobbiamo portare a compimento l'Europa di Maastricht, dotandola di un'istituzione finanziaria di riferimento. Per farlo bisogna saper cogliere il momento e sfruttare i segnali positivi della riduzione del deficit in tutta l'eurozona, creando un *framework* in cui responsabilità e solidarietà vanno di pari passo a partire dagli strumenti di garanzia dei debiti sovrani.

Ma prima ancora bisogna fare in modo che l'aspetto economico e quello sociale convergano, specie in un momento come quello attuale, segnato da nuovi nazionalismi e populismi che remano in direzione contraria, chiedendo di tornare agli Stati europei in competizione tra loro.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η φιλοσοφία και η δομή της ευρωζώνης οδηγεί σε ανισορροπίες, με αποτέλεσμα αυξημένα εμπορικά πλεονάσματα στη Γερμανία και εμπορικά ελλείμματα στον Νότο. Ταυτόχρονα, η Οικονομική και Νομισματική Ένωση δεν πρόέβλεψε κανένα σύστημα δημοσιονομικής αλληλεγγύης και τη δημιουργία ευρωομολόγων. Ως αποτέλεσμα έχουμε στρατιές φτωχών και ανέργων, με τις χώρες του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου να μετατρέπονται σε «αποικίες» της γερμανικής Ευρώπης. Επαναλαμβάνουμε τη θέση μας ότι οι Εθνικές Κεντρικές Τράπεζες πρέπει να μετατραπούν σε ύστατους δανειστές των δικών τους κρατών. Ταυτόχρονα, το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Κεντρικών Τραπεζών πρέπει να γίνει ακόμη πιο αποκεντρωμένο και ευέλικτο, με στόχο οι Εθνικές Κεντρικές Τράπεζες να ασκούν αυτοτελή νομισματική πολιτική, προσαρμοσμένη στις ανάγκες

της οικονομίας της χώρας τους, αξιοποιώντας συμβατικά και μη συμβατικά μέσα, όπως η ποσοτική χαλάρωση (quantitative easing), δημιουργώντας χρήμα χωρίς την έγκριση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και μέχρι του ποσοστού της συμμετοχής κάθε Εθνικής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας επί του εκάστοτε ισχύοντος ισολογισμού του Ευρωσυστήματος, που σήμερα ανέρχεται σε 3,5 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I heard earlier that, apparently, the symbol had become a symbol of prosperity. You can try and dream that up and say it is true, but it is not true. It is a symbol of incompetence; it is a symbol of bad planning. In fairness, you have admitted that there was bad planning, that you did not have the right architecture in place, and it was not very well organised.

Imagine you went out in the morning and bought a car, but when you went out to drive it you discovered when the dark came that there were no lights, and when you tried to put your foot on the brakes, it would not stop and crashed into the ditch. You have admitted that you caused the problem, but when that happens – when you go for something, when you promise something – if it goes wrong, you get compensation for what happened.

In Ireland, we got hit the tune of EUR 60 billion because you had no brakes or no lights on this vehicle. We are currently picking the glass out of our face. EUR 6 billion in the last two years we have borrowed and burned. Symbol of prosperity? Cop on, get real!

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parliamo di un euro che insieme al Patto di stabilità e crescita e al *Fiscal Compact* ha impiccato i cittadini, acuendo le disuguaglianze, accentuando gli effetti della crisi, portando migliaia di persone al suicidio. Il *paper* sull'euro lo indica come uno strumento di successo, di convergenza, da preservare o addirittura portare avanti. E con cosa? Con l'unione bancaria, con la *Capital Market Union*, con strumenti per soddisfare la bulimia della grande finanza?

L'euro doveva dare prosperità, invece ha aumentato povertà e miseria. L'euro doveva spingere l'integrazione invece ha alimentato rancore e odio. L'euro doveva essere un mezzo e invece è diventato il fine di ogni azione politica da difendere a qualunque costo.

Ma l'Europa oggi è fatta anche di paesi che non hanno l'euro e che sono nell'EFTA ed è costituita da tanti cittadini che vorrebbero l'unione dei popoli, coesa a tutela del benessere sociale e dei diritti di ciascuno. Un'unione che sia cooperazione rafforzata e solidarietà. Di un'Unione così non è ancora apparso alcun *paper*. Mentre voi vi occupate della finanza, dell'euro e dei mercati, là fuori ci sono più di 500 milioni di cittadini che attendono un'Europa che ancora non si è vista.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, the title of this discussion is a reflection paper on the deepening of EMU by 2025, and I would like to compliment Commissioner Moscovici and Vice-President Dombrovskis for coming here and making their presentations and taking the views of Parliament on board. I am quite sure they will reflect on what has been said and eventually come up with good, practical proposals. One of the nicest headlines I have seen in the last couple of weeks was one which said: 'Eurozone economy grows more than expected' – 1.9%, in fact – and I was here in the last mandate when everybody was forecasting the demise of the euro and the European Union. Now that measures have been taken to get things on a proper footing and things are beginning to grow again, it is only right that we should reflect and see how we can keep this growing without impinging on national sovereignty. I think this is a good discussion and we can get good progress in due course.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous l'avez dit, l'euro est un symbole de l'Union européenne. Tout à l'heure, nous avons fêté le 30e anniversaire d'Erasmus, autre symbole s'il en est, et je suis persuadé que l'euro a contribué à faire de nos étudiants des Européens convaincus.

Nous ne pouvons cependant pas regarder cette monnaie unique avec béatitude. Il nous faut, au contraire, faire une analyse critique pour mieux conforter cette monnaie devenue, quelque part, l'ADN de l'Union européenne. D'où le travail nécessaire que mène la Commission sur l'Union économique et monétaire avec l'idée de la création d'une zone euro forte et démocratique.

Un budget de la zone euro serait en effet le moteur d'un nouveau développement économique s'appuyant sur des investissements d'avenir, notamment ceux liés à la transition écologique, et permettant ainsi la création d'emplois dont la jeunesse européenne a tant besoin.

Cette zone devrait, bien entendu, constituer un espace de solidarité pour réduire les inégalités sociales et fiscales.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to thank the Vice-President and the Commissioner for the presentation. The more integrated the eurozone is economically, the stronger the EU will be. However, with the UK looking to develop a new relationship with the EU it is really critical that we have clarity in how capital markets union (CMU) becomes a reality for the EU-27. Given the important role the UK is playing in terms of market finance and given the importance of the euro as a global currency, how does this reconcile with calls to localise CCPs out of the UK?

Secondly, with the CMU mid-term review, one of the focuses is on greening of the CMU. This is really welcome and positive, but more needs to be done, for example on the investment side. How do we ensure, Commissioner and Vice-President, that greening of the EU economy finance becomes mainstream?

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

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL), blue-card question. – First off, congratulations on Labour's great result. I would like to ask you this question: do you regret Britain not joining Economic and Monetary Union? If it had joined, Jeremy Corbyn would not have been able to make the wonderful promises that he did to put money into the economy and borrow forward into the future. You would not have been allowed to do that. You would not have had a choice in the election if you had joined EMU. Are you sorry you did not join it, or are you glad?

Neena Gill (S&D), blue-card answer. – Thank you for the congratulations and indeed we are very pleased with the result. We hope that this will lead to a different kind of relationship between the EU and the UK and that is what we are looking to do. Of course we had our reasons in terms of whether we could join the eurozone or not. The timing was not right for us and I am not going to go into what would have been the consequences had we joined or not. I think it was absolutely the right decision at the time for the UK not to join, but we wish the eurozone every success because our economy depends on the eurozone being successful.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Pierre Moscovici, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je vous remercie de ce débat qui a été de haute tenue et très constructif.

Évidemment, vous vous en doutez, la Commission se sent plus proche de ceux qui souhaitent donner à la zone euro une plus grande force et une plus grande ambition que de ceux qui croient aux idées, à mon sens assez régressives, qu'il est bon de la défaire et de revenir à je ne sais quelle situation antérieure, dont nous ne devons pas garder la nostalgie.

Je voudrais simplement faire deux remarques dans cette conclusion. La première, c'est que je suis convaincu qu'il est temps de faire de l'euro un outil de croissance partagée et plus seulement de stabilité. C'est bien de cela dont il s'agit. La question cruciale, c'est celle de la convergence et de la réduction des inégalités territoriales, sociales et économiques au sein de la zone euro pour assumer la cohésion de l'euro et pour lutter contre l'euroscpticisme qui nourrit à son tour les populismes.

De ce point de vue, il y a une notion que je retiens de votre débat, c'est qu'il faut bien faire l'équilibre entre les outils de solidarité, qui sont indispensables, et le principe de solidarité ainsi que les règles sans lesquelles il n'y a pas de zone euro qui tienne. Mais, en même temps, tout cela doit être intégré dans tous les champs: financier, économique et monétaire.

Enfin, ma dernière remarque est transversale à toutes les interventions qui ont été prononcées ici, c'est que nous avons besoin de plus de démocratie dans la zone euro mais pas de plus de technocratie. Nous avons besoin de rendre des comptes, nous avons besoin de transparence. Il y a, en effet, des situations qui ne peuvent pas tenir indéfiniment et qui ne concernent pas – vous avez eu raison de le dire, Monsieur Papadimoulis – que la Grèce, mais qui nous concernent tous. Un budget de la zone euro doit être voté et doit être contrôlé. Pour cela, il est très clair que même si les parlements nationaux jouent un rôle important, à mon sens, c'est le Parlement européen qui doit jouer le rôle de premier plan et qui doit être au cœur de cette construction démocratique.

Ce débat ne fait que commencer. Il est à poursuivre et nous le poursuivrons avec vous.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to begin by thanking the honourable Members for this debate. It clearly shows that views are often quite divergent, and indeed that there is no single answer or one-size-fits-all solution to the future shape of our Economic and Monetary Union. What is needed is an overall common approach and a vision of the future of our single currency.

The challenge now is to put the different ideas into practical solutions and to identify a way forward that is pragmatic and flexible, yet effective. The objective is to restart the process of convergence, to strengthen the euro as a source of shared prosperity and economic and social welfare, and to ensure inclusive and balanced growth, and price stability.

This reflection paper is the Commission's contribution to the debate on the way forward. We look forward to working closely and constructively with the European Parliament to deepen Economic and Monetary Union.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Todos celebramos este nuevo informe que plantea un escenario a medio plazo para la unión monetaria. Creo que las recomendaciones que se hacen tienen sentido. Cerrar el modelo de unión monetaria debe permitir ampliar la capacidad de crecimiento de todas las economías de la Unión y, por lo tanto, ofrecer nuevas perspectivas de futuro a las pequeñas y medianas empresas, que conforman el núcleo de la economía europea. Probablemente algunas de ellas deberían adelantarse en el tiempo, teniendo en cuenta que esa capacidad presupuestaria debería acomodarse al nuevo escenario plurianual, al nuevo presupuesto plurianual, que tendrá que discutirse en los próximos años. En cualquier caso, es necesario pasar de los planes, de las hojas de ruta, a las propuestas. Recordemos el informe de Van Rompuy y Barroso, en 2012. En 2014 se publicó el informe de los cinco presidentes. La Comisión publicaba también otro Libro Blanco, hace unos meses, con distintas opciones para la Unión. Y ahora tenemos este Documento de Reflexión sobre la unión monetaria. Está bien la reflexión, está bien la discusión, pero necesitamos propuestas legislativas concretas por parte de la Comisión.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Európai Unió egyik legnagyobb vívmánya az egész kontinensre kiterjedő közös valuta. Lassan minden tagállam bevezeti az eurót. A szomszédjaink közül a szlovákok és a szlovénok már rég, a románok és a bolgárok pedig most fogják bevezetni az eurót. Sajnos Magyarországon ez még a kanyarban sincs annak ellenére, hogy minden feltételt teljesítünk. A közös valutát használó országokban gazdasági növekedés indult be, és teljesen eltűnt az árfolyamkockázat.

Szlovákiában például az emberek jóval jobban élnek az euró bevezetése óta, az életszínvonal brutális növekedésnek indult. Sőt, az euróvezetben közös uniós védelem áll a bankbetétek mögött. Az euró a világ második legfontosabb valutája az amerikai dollár mögött. Miért ne akarnánk bevezetni? Miért nem akarnánk, hogy a magyarok a közös, erős euró minden előnyét élvezzék? Mi elkötelezettek vagyunk Magyarország eurócsatlakozása mellett, amely a magyar emberek érdekét képviseli.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), *în scris*. – Salut inițiativa Comisiei Europene de a pune în discuție direcțiile de acțiune pentru aprofundarea Uniunii Economice și Monetare. Regret că în acest raport s-a renunțat la ideea de a conveni cu statele membre din afara zonei euro planuri de acțiune și date previzibile pentru trecerea la euro. Aceste state membre, cu excepția Danemarcei, și-au luat angajamentul de a lua toate măsurile necesare pentru trecerea la euro și cele mai multe îndeplinesc criteriile de aderare. Constatăm că, sub presiunea în special a sistemului bancar, guvernele din aceste state membre respective „descoperă” fel de fel de argumente împotriva aderării la euro. Această poziție este contradictorie: pe de o parte, aceste țări se declară pentru aprofundarea integrării, iar, pe de altă parte, amână aderarea la euro pentru un viitor nedefinit. Consider că este timpul ca statele membre din afara zonei euro să prezinte Comisiei Europene și Băncii Europene Centrale un plan concret de acțiune și un termen pentru aderarea la euro. Acest termen nu ar trebui să fie mai departe de anul 2025.

10. Glifosat i postupci izdavanja odobrenja (rasprava)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur la question orale à la Commission sur le glyphosate et les procédures d'autorisation d'Angélique Delahaye, Miriam Dalli, Julie Girling, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Kateřina Konečná, Bart Staes, Piernicola Pedicini et Jean-François Jalkh, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire (O-000046/2017 — B8-0316/2017) (2017/2695(RSP))

Miriam Dalli, author. – Madam President, glyphosate, which we are speaking about today and the oral question that we are presenting and the topic that it is focusing on, is the world's most used herbicide, and obviously the European Union is no exception to this.

The carcinogenicity and the genotoxicity of the substance are confirmed by certain studies but denied by others. The fact is, that it is undeniable that there are serious doubts as to the substance's safety. The Commission keeps on insisting that it arrives to its decisions based on two things: scientific evidence and the rule of law. The issue we are dealing with today goes further. It is about the lack of transparency; it is about questionable scientific reliability and scientific independence. It is about losing public trust and about corporate giants overstepping their authority – and yes, transparency matters.

The glyphosate hazard classification process of the European Commission and its two agencies, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), appears to be a good example of how lack of transparency regarding the scientific evidence that underlies important public health decisions can end up eroding public trust and raise serious concerns.

Independent analysis indicates serious flaws in the EFSA and ECHA safety assessments – namely, eight instances where increases in tumours as a response following glyphosate exposure were not included in the assessment by either agency. In March 2015, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, which forms part of the World Health Organisation, said that glyphosate was 'probably carcinogenic to humans'.

On the other hand, the Commission is claiming that ECHA and EFSA concluded that the available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria to classify glyphosate as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction. No wonder that questions and doubts still exist. Is it too extreme to imagine that there could be an expert panel, financed by corporate giants, who would conclude that available data will not support the conclusion that that glyphosate is a 'probable human carcinogen'? How can we be sure of the validity of the conclusions about the safety or otherwise of glyphosate when there is lack of transparency, and when it has been publicly revealed by the latest US court cases that the scientific data provided by the company experts was falsified?

We have to take a strong stand on this issue. Until we know for certain that glyphosate is safe for our citizens and the environment, we cannot allow this substance to be freely sold in the EU market. And this is why we are presenting this Oral Question: we want to understand what steps the Commission is taking to make sure that the decision on the renewal of glyphosate is based on credible and independent scientific findings. We want the Commission to recommend ECHA and EFSA to critically revise the validity of the current studies, and not to propose the approval of glyphosate as long as the scientific uncertainties have not been clarified. We also require the Commission to rapidly ensure an independent review of the classification of glyphosate in relation to hormone disruption, genotoxicity and carcinogenicity.

Finally, we want the Commission to promote and support the agricultural sector so that our farmers can move towards glyphosate-free agriculture, and towards alternative sustainable and cost-efficient solutions for pest management. We asked precise questions on behalf of the Environment Committee to the Commission, and we are looking forward to precise detailed answers. Ultimately, people's right to health and a healthy environment should be our priority at all times.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am pleased to attend this plenary session to talk about a substance which has generated a great deal of interest and debate, namely glyphosate. I hope that you will allow me a bit of time to insist on this point as it was repeatedly requested by various Members of this House who asked for the debate today, and of course I had slightly different questions compared to those which I received in writing. I believe that it is of the utmost importance to reply as precisely as possible to the specific questions raised by honourable Members.

On the chronology of events: as you know, glyphosate is the most frequently used active substance in herbicide products in Europe as it has already been on the national markets since 1970s. It was previously subject to national approval processes. Since 1 July 2002, this substance has been approved for use at European Union level after a review assessment. It is currently under evaluation as regards a possible renewal of its approval. This evaluation is done following the procedures laid down in the EU legislation concerning pesticides. This is a very strict legislation which you wisely contributed to put it in place.

In April 2015, in accordance with the legislation, a comprehensive assessment of all available data was carried out by the Rapporteur Member State, Germany. This assessment included both studies that industry legally has to submit and independent peer-reviewed scientific literature. This assessment was then also peer reviewed by all other European Union Member State bodies and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) – a lot of bodies together, as you can see.

An agency of the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), also carried out an assessment and concluded, in March 2015, that glyphosate is ‘probably carcinogenic’ to humans (Classification Group 2a). This is why, taking into account public concern, I asked EFSA to ensure that the IARC assessment was fully considered in the EU peer review of glyphosate.

In November 2015, EFSA concluded, in contrast to IARC, that glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans. But the same conclusion was also reached by all – except one – of the regulatory agencies in the European Member States: 27 agencies. In 2016-2017, the same conclusions were also reached by agencies in Japan, New Zealand, Canada and Australia – a lot of agencies worldwide.

In May 2016, the Joint Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues also reached their conclusions, taking into account the work of IARC, which was only a first step in the WHO assessment. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that, even without mentioning tobacco, solar radiation or processed meat – alcoholic beverages are, for instance, classified by IARC in Group 1 as ‘carcinogenic to humans’, contrary to glyphosate. But only glyphosate is high on the agenda in public debates. Does this mean that I should label processed meat or alcoholic beverages as carcinogens, or even ban them? That is an open question.

In 2016, the Commission discussed a possible renewal of the approval of glyphosate with the Member States. Following the divergent opinions between, as I mentioned, IARC and EFSA – and also between different Member States – on the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate, the Commission took a cautious approach, also in light of legitimate public concern. We also used the precautionary approach and therefore made a proposal to extend the expiry date of glyphosate until 31 December 2017 (at the latest!) to enable the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) to deliver its opinion on the hazardous properties of glyphosate based on the proposal from the Rapporteur Member State, namely Germany. In parallel, in April 2016, your House adopted a resolution asking to renew glyphosate for seven years. As always, the Commission was very attentive to this expression of Parliament’s position. We took good note of your support for a renewal of the approval based on scientific assessment conducted in the EU.

Lastly, on 15 March 2017, ECHA’s Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) concluded that glyphosate should not be classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic for reproduction. In recent weeks various sources have reported on the so-called ‘Monsanto papers’. First, the facts. According to media reports and correspondence sent to the Commission, a US Court ordered the release of documents following a freedom of access to documents request, which you mentioned in your speech.

I will now turn to your first question. You rightly pointed to a very important aspect: 'in light of public concern, to ensure credible and independent scientific findings'. In this field, as in others, I heard and listened to public concerns and many questions are legitimate and I am happy to provide you once again with answers. From 2014 when I took office, I have indeed received a lot of letters, messages and emails concerning glyphosate, together with a European Citizens' Initiative registered in January this year, a request for a urine sample last year, and even a citizens' Monsanto Tribunal. This shows a real picture of different opinions and concerns.

We are working on this. For some people, glyphosate is a symbol of intensive agriculture and strongly linked to GMOs. This debate is broader than glyphosate, but this is why the need to maintain a strong scientific assessment in this context is crucial. We will also always take public concern very much into account. This is why we asked EFSA and ECHA to indicate what impact the allegations, if confirmed, would have on the Agencies' overall assessment and conclusions on glyphosate.

Both ECHA and EFSA reached the same conclusion. EFSA confirmed that: 'even if the allegations regarding ghost-writing proved to be true, there would be no impact on the overall assessment as presented in the EFSA Conclusion on glyphosate'. ECHA confirmed that: 'the information contained in the so-called "Monsanto papers" did not have an impact on the overall assessment as presented in the draft opinion of the Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) on 15 March 2017'. This is because 'EU experts had access to the raw data and to the original study reports' and they produced their own independent conclusions based on the original data and not on another interpretation of it.

In contrast, the articles mentioned were study reviews summarising or substantiating the industry position on glyphosate that had been presented elsewhere. These study reviews were known by all assessing bodies and are not new as they were mentioned in the Declarations of Interests of the participating experts.

In other words, the study reviews have limited weight in the overall scientific assessment of glyphosate and, I quote, 'would not normally on their own be sufficient for a conclusion to be reached on a harmonised classification'. This answer is from scientific bodies. The statements of both agencies have been available online since last week.

Overall, there is thus broad convergence between the European and international community of scientists on the fact that glyphosate is not carcinogenic, keeping an eye on public opinion and different views around the world. All agencies – in Japan, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, the EU – came to the same conclusion and only one agency, IARC, had a different opinion. It was little strange to see that so many scientific bodies agreed but we will ask once again how to move forward, keeping an eye on scientific based arguments.

While individual persons may continue to disagree with this overwhelming convergence of scientific opinions, this cannot call into question the robustness of our system and we should proceed with the renewal of the approval of glyphosate as there is no reason to doubt the evidence-based arguments about the safety of the substance.

Therefore the Commission decided, in light of public concern, to propose a renewal for ten years. In parallel, three very clear recommendations to Member States were adopted last year: first, to ban the co-formulant Tallowamine from glyphosate-based products; second, to minimise use in public parks, public playgrounds and gardens; and, third, to be attentive to the pre-harvest use of glyphosate. Let me also recall that, even if glyphosate is approved at EU level, it is within the responsibility of Member States to authorise plant protection products containing glyphosate at national level and decide on the conditions of use. They of course have the right to ban it because it concerns co-formulants. The Commission is therefore not the only one to decide when it comes to pesticides.

On your second sub-question, on investigation, let me stress that, in the case you refer to, the Commission does not have any proof that the allegations are correct. I am not a lawyer but I know that we have a very thorough assessment. Let me turn now to your second question.

I can confirm that the way in which data and information is provided to the regulatory authorities and shared with the public for consideration of the approval of substances will be examined in the context of the REFIT evaluation of the European Union pesticides legislation. Indeed the Commission is specifically asking the external contractor that will conduct an external study on the preparation of the REFIT evaluation to look into this issue. This is actually reflected in the terms of reference which are publicly available, as is everything we do.

As the REFIT evaluation of the EU pesticide legislation and the fitness check of the General Food Law are still ongoing, it is a little bit too early to make assumptions or consider a different course of action at this stage. However, I would like to stress that the outcome of the fitness check of the General Food Law will also be publicly available, once completed, and the outcome of the REFIT evaluation of the EU pesticide legislation will be presented to this Parliament.

In the meantime, I am aware that Parliament is preparing an own-initiative report on the implementation of the Plant Protection Products Regulation. The Commission will of course carefully examine this report and its conclusions once it is finalised and will consider this during the preparation of the REFIT evaluation.

I will now turn to your third question. Let me start by first highlighting that the process of examining the claims made by companies to exclude the public release of certain information is, of course, directly managed by EFSA and Member States. Such claims are considered in conjunction with the rules outlined in the Plant Protection Products Regulation and the relevant rulings of the Court of Justice.

In this context, the Court of Justice rulings of November 2016 in relation to the implementation of the Aarhus Convention in the EU concern two important issues: first, access to confidential information related to the manufacturing and detailed composition of substances, in this case concerning the original approval of glyphosate; and, second, disclosure of studies on substances and formulated products submitted to Member States in the context of product authorisation.

In the first ruling the Court of Justice referred the case back to the General Court and the proceedings before the Court are still pending. As regards the protection of confidentiality and access to information at issue in this case, the Commission is awaiting the outcome. I can assure you that I welcome the initiative to have more clarity in this field. There is no doubt that we need more clarity.

In the second case, the Court of Justice defined information on emissions into the environment with regard to studies submitted for active substances in plant protection and biocidal products. The Commission and the Member States are currently assessing the consequences of this judgment.

I would like to emphasise the following: first, at my request, the companies applying for renewal of the approval of glyphosate made available to Members of Parliament and stakeholders the key studies underlying the assessment of glyphosate in a reading room; and, second, in addition EFSA provided Members of Parliament and stakeholders with access to raw data from a number of key studies, following a request for access to documents. This access is on top of the extensive documentation that had already been made available as part of the standard procedures by EFSA during the peer review of glyphosate.

Therefore, one can only conclude that there has been a particularly high level of transparency in the specific case of glyphosate in the light of public concern. I understand that this might not be enough for some of you in this House and I am also aware that a complaint is about to be lodged with the Court of Justice. Once again, I can only welcome the increased clarity that the Court would give on this matter.

Let me now turn to your fourth and last question. I would like to stress that the Commission, through its research and innovation programmes – such as the Seventh Framework Programme and Horizon 2020 — supports a broad body of research in plant protection to identify new low-risk products and biological control techniques. This is what I highlighted again last week in a very interesting conference in Parliament on biological low-risk pesticides.

Let me stress again that in the Seventh Framework Programme over EUR 100 million was invested by the European Union in cooperative research projects and coordination support actions in the areas of plant protection, plant health, integrated pest management, and risk assessment and diagnostics.

Furthermore, specifically in relation to alternatives to chemical herbicides, a Horizon 2020 initiative, supported by an EU contribution of EUR 7 million, is currently looking at strategies, tools and technologies for sustainable weed management. So, as you will notice, a lot of money has already been invested already in terms of research and development.

With regard to sustainable plant protection more specifically, the need to find alternatives to traditional chemical solutions is also reflected in the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive, which aims at reducing the risks and impacts of pesticide use on human health and the environment, and at promoting the use of integrated pest management and of alternative approaches or techniques such as non-chemical alternatives to pesticides.

The Commission audits Member States to monitor implementation of the Directive and also encourages Member States to share best practice, identify challenges and ensure harmonisation. The Commission is also undertaking several actions to increase the availability of low-risk products. These actions include prioritisation of the assessment for the renewal of potentially low-risk substances and amendment of the low-risk criteria to facilitate their identification.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Angélique Delahaye, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous devons prendre des décisions sur la base d'analyses scientifiques solides et non sur des postures.

Certes, le sujet est technique, mais il est devenu, comme vous l'avez dit, politique.

Nous nous devons de protéger la santé de nos concitoyens de façon générale, mais et en particulier celle des utilisateurs.

Nous avons un système en place, en matière d'autorisation de substances, et n'en déplaise à certains, ce n'est pas parce que les résultats ne nous conviennent pas, que nous devons l'attaquer ou passer par des voies détournées pour le modifier, quand cela nous chante.

Par contre, nous devons avoir confiance en notre système afin d'assurer aux citoyens que les décisions qui sont prises, le sont bien dans leurs intérêts.

Le débat d'aujourd'hui est évidemment le bienvenu, puisque les doutes se sont immiscés depuis un an, comme vous l'avez souligné, Monsieur le Commissaire, et que ces doutes demeurent pour des raisons différentes: .

Premièrement d'abord, les approches différentes de nos agences, les unes basées sur le risque, les autres basées sur le danger – et tout cela crée une confusion, malheureusement savamment entretenue.

Moi, j'ai confiance dans notre système, Monsieur le Commissaire, et puis, comme vous l'avez souligné, le Parlement a pris une posture consensuelle sur dans une résolution l'année dernière. Mais compte tenu de la défiance de nos concitoyens européens et étant donné qu'un doute existe et voit le jour, nous devons clarifier les choses.

Je souhaite à ce titre-là que vous puissiez aller un petit peu plus loin dans les réponses que vous avez commencées à nous apporter, sur les précisions prises apportées données et les mesures prises par la Commission et les mesures qu'elle prend pour une meilleure transparence de ses décisions qu'elle prend qui sont prises par cette dernière, ceci afin de rétablir la confiance perdue par certains.

Vous avez été interpellé par des chercheurs. J'aimerais savoir comment la Commission a été prise en compte cette interpellation en compte. par la Commission, Eet savez-vous ce que l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) et l'Agence européenne des produits chimiques (ECHA) ont fait, ou ont fait de ces informations?

Vous avez souligné le fait que de nombreuses agences de par le monde, mettent en évidence le fait que cette substance ne présente «il n'y a pas de risque de cancer avec cette substance». Malheureusement, il faut aller plus loin et je souhaite que nous ayons, pour les professionnels, des solutions alternatives de rechange économiquement viables et environnementalement viable sur les plans économique et environnemental.

J'aimerais aussi, sur ce point, que vous alliez plus loin sur les mesures et le financement de la recherche.

Eric Andrieu, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, merci de votre intervention, je sais le travail que vous faites au sein de la Commission et je voudrais ici vous en remercier publiquement.

Ceci dit, il est vrai que, sur la question du glyphosate, la position que la Commission a prise quant au renouvellement de son utilisation pour dix ans ne paraît pas convenir à la situation du moment, tant il est vrai – vous l'avez rappelé dans vos propos – que nous sommes au cœur d'une controverse forte, même si bon nombre d'études – vous l'avez dit aussi – révèlent que le glyphosate ne serait pas potentiellement cancérigène. Pour autant, d'autres affirment le contraire. Il est vrai que, dans ce moment où nous devons choisir, vous, en tant que Commission mais aussi nous, ici, au sein du Parlement, avons un devoir d'exigence quant à la qualité et à la véracité des approches scientifiques. Vous n'êtes pas scientifique, nous non plus ici, et nous devons nous appuyer sur des recherches réelles. Mais, actuellement, ne pas s'appuyer sur le principe de précaution ne me semble pas adapté en tant que position responsable et politique.

Vous l'avez dit également, vous avez fait référence aux «Monsanto Papers» et nous savons les uns et les autres les révélations qui y sont faites. Au moment où la justice américaine et le tribunal californien se saisissent de cette situation, il apparaît, à notre connaissance, que Monsanto aurait su depuis 1999 que cette molécule était potentiellement cancérigène.

Aujourd'hui, c'est dans ce contexte que le débat a été ranimé, ici, à travers cette question orale. Dans tous les cas et en ce qui me concerne, je ne peux pas en prendre la responsabilité et je ne participerai pas à ce qui peut ou pourrait potentiellement s'apparenter à un acte criminel, tant il est vrai que, s'il était révélé exact que le glyphosate était potentiellement cancérigène, nous devrions assumer collectivement une grande responsabilité.

Aussi, je vous demande solennellement d'appliquer à l'instant ce principe de précaution absolu et, ensuite, de prendre en compte, comme vous l'avez dit expressément, l'ensemble des expertises scientifiques sur ce sujet et pas uniquement celles réalisées par les agences de la Commission européenne, et enfin permettre l'accès à toutes leurs études dans un souci de transparence absolue.

Enfin, je vous demande de préparer, dès à présent, d'autres molécules possibles pour nos agriculteurs dans l'hypothèse où le glyphosate se révélerait potentiellement cancérigène car, une fois encore, si nous ne faisons rien, ils seront les premières victimes d'un système dont ils sont les otages.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL), *ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα που απευθύνεται στην κυρία Delahaye*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η γαλάζια κάρτα που είχα σηκώσει ήταν για ερώτημα προς την προηγούμενη ομιλήτρια. Δεν με είχατε προσέξει. Νομίζω ότι μπορεί να δοθεί η ευκαιρία να απαντήσει τώρα. Δεν είχα κατανοήσει καθόλου ποια ήταν η θέση της, αν ήταν υπέρ ή εναντίον της συγκεκριμένης ουσίας και θα την παρακαλούσα να το αποσαφηνίσει περαιτέρω.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu» à Takis Hadjigeorgiou*. – Monsieur, il me semble très clair dans les propos que j'ai tenus tout à l'heure que la question n'est pas de savoir si on est pour ou contre, mais de savoir si ce produit présente ou non un danger pour la santé humaine.

J'attends que les scientifiques nous donnent des réponses claires et sûres pour pouvoir assumer mon rôle d'élue.

Bolesław G. Piecha, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Glifosat od lat jest powszechnie stosowany jako składnik lub środek ochrony roślin i od lat toczą się wokół niego różnego rodzaju dyskusje, a w przypadku tych dyskusji wciąż operujemy na zbyt wielu niewiadomych. Wciąż pojawiają się sprzeczne ze sobą raporty dotyczące szkodliwości glifosatu, a co więcej w dyskusji zdarzają się często przeważać emocje, a nie ułatwiają one rzetelnego zabrania głosu i oceny sytuacji glifosatu. Apeluję jednak nie o emocje, a o rzeczowe i ściśle naukowe podejście do zagadnienia, zharmonizowane przede wszystkim na poziomie naukowym a dopiero w dalszym kontekście na poziomie ekonomicznym czy społecznym, przy czym bezpieczeństwo zdrowotne musi być priorytetem.

Choć pewne ostatnie badania odnotowują kolejne przypadki korelacji kancerogennych glifosatu, tak że niektórzy posłowie posądzają wręcz agencje europejskie o manipulowanie danymi naukowymi, to właśnie w myśl powyższego bardzo otwarcie wzywam Komisję Europejską do, po pierwsze, szczegółowego monitorowania i ścisłej współpracy z Europejskim Urzędem Bezpieczeństwa Żywności oraz Europejską Agencją Chemikaliów i innymi. Agencje te bezwzględnie również powinny współpracować z amerykańską Agencją Ochrony Środowiska, aby wspólnie wytworzyć pewien odpowiedni system, po pierwsze zbierania i analizy danych naukowych, ale również wypracować konkretny modus operandi w celu rozwiązania niejasności dotyczących glifosatu w kontekście zdrowotnym. Nie emocje, a dowody naukowe a do tego, Panie Komisarzy, potrzeba większej transparentności instytucji europejskich.

Frédérique Ries, au nom du groupe ALDE. – Monsieur le Président, la saga glyphosate continue donc. La balle est à nouveau, aujourd'hui, chez nous, au Parlement européen, quatorze mois jour pour jour après le vote de notre résolution qui, déjà, appelait à son interdiction dans des usages précis.

D'étude en étude, d'agence en agence, d'expert en contre-expert, les avis se succèdent et ne se ressemblent pas et la clarté n'est pas faite, j'use là d'un euphémisme.

En mars dernier, ce sont les «Monsanto Papers» qui mettent le feu à l'opinion aux États-Unis. Les documents déclassifiés ont parlé. Monsanto s'inquiétait sérieusement, dès 1999, du caractère mutagène du glyphosate. Une dissimulation de preuve s'il en est, mais l'enquête devra le dire.

Le groupe ALDE, que je représente, continue de faire confiance et veut faire confiance au travail de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) et à l'Agence européenne des produits chimiques (ECHA), qui a son siège à Helsinki. Nous savons pertinemment aussi – et le commissaire l'a rappelé – que, sur ce dossier comme sur les OGM, par exemple, les États membres cachent leurs divisions et ne prennent pas leurs responsabilités.

Pour autant, il n'y a plus de temps à perdre: la feuille de route de la Commission devrait reposer sur quelques principes. La Commission doit s'assurer que sa décision finale soit fondée sur des études scientifiques indépendantes et non sur des travaux et documents biaisés, fournis par Monsanto ou d'autres firmes. Dans cette phase de transition, avant le mois de décembre, il est impératif pour la Commission de changer de modèle et de passer enfin à une logique d'interdiction progressive de la substance, plutôt que de réhomologation et de dérogation.

Il faut aussi donner aux agences européennes les moyens de leurs ambitions. Je trouve assez choquant – je le dis en passant – que le budget de l'EFSA soit presque quatre fois inférieur à celui de l'Agence européenne des médicaments, alors que l'alimentation est le troisième poste de dépenses des ménages européens.

Voilà ce que vous devriez faire, Monsieur le Commissaire, mais que vous n'allez très probablement pas faire, au vu de ce que vous venez de nous répondre cet après-midi. En gros, tous les éléments sont connus, je vous cite, il n'y a rien à déclarer, pire encore, les «Monsanto Papers» n'y changeront rien, circulez.

C'est une fin de non-recevoir sidérante, que je trouve regrettable, et j'use encore d'un euphémisme, car, l'essentiel – et parfois les évidences doivent être martelées –, c'est que votre principe d'action publique, ce doit être le principe de précaution, Monsieur le Commissaire.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – To, co děje poslední roky na Evropské komisi a EFSA ohledně autorizace glyfosátu, je nehorázně. Nebála bych se vůbec použít slovo fraška.

Evropský parlament dal v této věci Komisi několikrát jasné instrukce, kterými se však ona zjevně neřídí. V mezidobí prosakuje jeden skandál za druhým týkající se Monsanto a jejich již prokázaného přímého ovlivňování vědeckých studií glyfosátu. Studií, které jak se lze důvodně domnívat, používá i EFSA k podpoře svého stanoviska o nezávadnosti glyfosátu. Přitom tyto studie ani po letech nátlaku stále nikdo neviděl. Stále nejsou k dispozici dokonce ani Mezinárodní agentuře pro výzkum rakoviny, která označila glyfosát za pravděpodobně karcinogenní. Dle uniklé komunikace je zjevné, že se Monsanto neštítlo ani takových praktik, jako je napsání si svých vlastních studií, které jim poté jenom někteří vědci nakonec podepsali, a následně je vydávalo za nezávislé. Navíc již 17 let má tato společnost podezření o tom, že je jejich vlajkový produkt rakovinotvorný, a snaží se to zakrýt, aby se na to nepřišlo. A EFSA i Komise stále mlčí.

Proto to znovu zůstává na Evropském parlamentu. Pokud Evropská komise urychleně nevyšetří, jak tyto praktiky Monsanto ovlivnily hodnocení glyfosátu ze strany EFSA, byla bych pro zřízení vyšetřovacího výboru k prověření této záležitosti. Pane komisaři, nepotřebujete 20 minut na vysvětlování navíc. My po vás chceme jedině: skutečné činy.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, if I have understood the Commissioner well, then everything is fine, everything has been done properly and we can just continue. That is more or less the summary of his 15 minute speech.

That, however, is not really paying attention to the huge scientific debate that has been ongoing on glyphosate from the 1980s onwards, broader than only carcinogenicity – it is broader than that – but secondly and more importantly, it is ignoring the fact that the Monsanto papers show that Monsanto was unduly influencing studies that were being used also, later on, by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). That is a concern and the problem is that EFSA is saying that they used more studies, one that for example the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) did not use, but do not have access to it.

So we do not know exactly which studies have been used by EFSA to come to those conclusions. It is lack of transparency, it is lack of trust in these organisations, and we see in the United States that there is undue influence from Monsanto. We want a good investigation by the Commission on this issue, otherwise we will have to do it ourselves.

Julia Reid, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the deadline for the re-approval of the use of glyphosate in the EU is rapidly approaching, and soon a decision must be made on this very important issue. Although I agree that the release of recent confidential documents disclosed to the public in the US are reason for concern, we take the position that glyphosate is one of the few herbicides that our farmers have at their disposal, and compared to earlier products is safer. Glyphosate is the world's most widely used herbicide, and such products are also used in public and private gardens, as well as in agriculture. However, as much as I would like to see herbicides phased out completely, realistically this is not possible, especially in the UK where we have a very mild, damp climate which is conducive to weed growth. Until an alternative product is found, I believe that we cannot remove a necessary tool from the arsenal of farmers who cultivate vast areas of land. I would, however, like to see Member States give more encouragement and financial help to those farmers that wish to farm organically.

Philippe Loiseau, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, parler du glyphosate, c'est évidemment parler du poids de Monsanto, mais aussi de l'opacité concernant la divulgation des études menées sur ce produit et sur son impact sur l'environnement et donc sur l'homme.

L'Agence européenne des produits chimiques a refusé de classer ce produit comme étant cancérigène, ce qui permet évidemment son maintien sur le marché.

L'immense majorité des agriculteurs souhaite continuer à utiliser le glyphosate, car il est le seul produit qui répond efficacement à leurs besoins.

Le principe de précaution pourrait bien sûr nous obliger à l'interdire, mais cela ne réglerait pas tout. Car c'est bien là le fond du problème: par quoi le remplacer?

Aujourd'hui, il n'y a pas de produits de substitution. Le débat n'est donc plus la dangerosité du glyphosate. La vraie question est sur quelle solution alternative travaille la Commission. Peut-elle être transparente sur les crédits alloués à la recherche et au développement des produits de substitution?

Enfin, je pense qu'il faut écouter les agriculteurs dans ces concertations, car ils sont les principaux utilisateurs de glyphosate, souvent parce qu'ils n'ont pas d'autre choix. Leur voix doit être écoutée et prise en compte dans le débat sur le glyphosate comme dans les recherches d'une solution alternative viable.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, decisions involve choice and choice involves consequences, but the issue that I believe we are facing this afternoon is one of public confidence in the decisions that the European Union takes. Two of the issues that I have with what the Commissioner opened with is how can he stand there and make the points he did when the European Union expert body, the European Union Chemicals Agency, this year said it should not be classified as a carcinogen; the WHO conclusion: 'potentially' hazardous to human health – not conclusively hazardous to health. We have lots of products out there that are 'potentially' hazardous, but we do not ban those. We have to draw a line somewhere in terms of being reasonable.

Some of my colleagues have already highlighted – and others will, I am sure – the issues, the consequences, that will come of banning this particular product, and none of them are very positive for our farmers and for our agricultural business. I have read quite widely issues about protecting wildlife. If the decision to ban this is to protect the environment, I am for it – but not based on the flawed information we have heard.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte darauf verweisen, dass dieses Parlament nach intensiver Diskussion eine Position zu Glyphosat bezogen hat und diese Position mit großer Mehrheit angenommen hat. Das ist ein Kontrast zum Rat, wo sich viele Mitgliedstaaten, auch der, aus dem ich komme, weggeduckt haben. Aus politischen Gründen gab es keinerlei Position. Und ich glaube, wir sollten darauf aufbauen, und die Kommission sollte besser als bisher auf das hören, was das Parlament zu diesem Thema gesagt hat.

Glyphosat ist ein problematischer Stoff. Wenn am Anfang der Debatte über den Kommissionsvorschlag einige Kommissionsvertreter gesagt haben: „Man kann das trinken wie Wasser“, dann war das sicherlich falsch. Man muss damit sehr vorsichtig umgehen. Aber wenn er vorsichtig angewandt wird und wenn das nur in bestimmten Bereichen passiert, dann ist für eine begrenzte Zeit die Anwendung von Glyphosat vertretbar. Das hat das Europäische Parlament beschlossen, und dabei hat sicherlich eine Rolle gespielt, dass zurzeit wenige Alternativen vorhanden sind. Deswegen stimme ich Frau Delahaye zu, die sagt: Wir müssen da forschen, wir müssen neue Alternativen auf den Markt bringen. Das dauert aber seine Zeit, und wir können nicht Europa innerhalb kurzer Frist komplett auf Bio-Anbau umstellen. Deswegen: für eine begrenzte Zeit, aber das heißt nicht fünfzehn Jahre, das heißt nicht zehn Jahre. Das Parlament sagt: maximal sieben Jahre. Und wir sind für viele Einschränkungen – mehr, als die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat.

Für mich ist besonders wichtig, dass die Vor-Ernte-Behandlung aufhört. Es gibt immer noch die Praxis, dass vor der Ernte die Kulturfrucht mit Glyphosat abgetötet wird, um die Erntearbeit zu erleichtern. Das ist sicherlich nicht das, was wir vor unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern guten Gewissens vertreten können.

Deswegen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, lassen Sie uns diese Position, die wir mit großer Mehrheit angenommen haben, weiter vertreten. Und, Herr Kommissar, warten Sie nicht auf den Rat; der wird Ihnen in dieser Frage nicht helfen. Orientieren Sie sich am Parlament!

President. – For the sake of clarity, transparency and understanding, I need to say that, due to time constraints, I will not be taking any blue-card questions.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Jen abych ošetřil všechny přešlapy, které tu předvedla Komise, tak bych potřeboval 5 minut. Komise dostala 20, měla nárok na 3.

Jen namátkou, parlamentní rezoluce požadovala autorizaci maximálně na 7 let, ne na 15 let, a to s takovou sadou omezení, která by skutečně zajistila maximální bezpečnost, a Komise to v podstatě vůbec nerespektovala. To je trochu rozdíl oproti tomu, co zde bylo panem komisařem řečeno. Tu námitku jsem sám podával, takže si to velmi dobře pamatuji. Podával jsem ji proti návrhu Komise autorizovat glyfosát na 15 let.

Jedno ale prostě Komise popřít nemůže a to je, že skandál *Monsanto papers* prostě zpochybnil věrohodnost výzkumů financovaných průmyslem, který je na těch výzkumech finančně zainteresován, je zainteresován na jejich výsledku, a tím naprosto jednoznačně zpochybnil náš vlastní evropský systém autorizace, který je na těchto studiích závislý také.

Vždyť my víme, proč je takový rozpor mezi EFSA a IARC, a ta bulvární dehonestace IARC, kterou jsme zde slyšeli od Komise a která zní jak citát z webu výrobce glyfosátu, na tom vůbec nic nezmění. My to přeci víme. IARC i agentury používají různé statistické postupy, ale hlavně používají různé soubory dat. IARC používá veřejně dostupné akademické výzkumy a naše agentury bohužel používají práce financované průmyslem. V tom je ten rozdíl, proto je ten výsledek rozdílný.

Takže v žádném ohledu nikdo nemůže s klidným svědomím tvrdit, že je glyfosát bezpečný, a dokonce nemůže ani tvrdit, že byly při jeho schvalování dodrženy všechny náležité postupy. Musím říci zcela jasně, že po dnešním vystoupení Komise jsem definitivně přesvědčen, že musíme bezpodmínečně ustanovit parlamentní vyšetřovací výbor, a to nejen kvůli glyfosátu, ale i kvůli celému procesu autorizace pesticidů.

Richard Ashworth (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to say to the Commissioner that we are asking farmers to meet the challenge of climate change and to provide a growing world population with a reliable food supply. Only productive, competitive agriculture can do that, and the key is safe technology. So the message is absolutely clear: public health is not negotiable, but farmers need every tool in the box. This debate about glyphosate is going to be the first of many future technologies, and those debates have got to bring clarity, otherwise scientists are not going to invest in technology. It has got to bring consistency, otherwise farmers cannot plan their future. And it has got to bring confidence that the food we eat is safe. Any debate in the future about technology like glyphosate has to be balanced and has to be proportionate, and that means, Commissioner, the debate has to be about proven science – not about emotion.

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Beste collega's, bij de toelating van gewasbeschermingsmiddelen zorgen de Europese Autoriteit voor Voedselveiligheid alsmede de nationale autoriteiten ervoor dat alle bewijzen worden meegewogen en iedereen gehoord. Deze instituten zijn ingesteld om onafhankelijk en met verstand van zaken te oordelen over de risico's van dit soort middelen. Erg belangrijk, want ik vind dat hierin wetenschap leidend moet zijn en niet onze politieke opvattingen. Een recent vrijgegeven briefwisseling trekt de geloofwaardigheid van een aantal door Monsanto gefinancierde studies in twijfel. Deze studies zijn gebruikt bij de evaluatie van de veiligheid van glyfosaat. Net als mijn collega's wil ik heel graag weten hoe betrouwbaar deze studies zijn en wat de consequenties hiervan zijn voor de risicobeoordeling van glyfosaat. We moeten het besluitvormingsproces altijd kritisch volgen en waar nodig verbeteren. Maar dat betekent absoluut niet dat we moeten ingeven op ons vertrouwen in de wetenschap. Want het alternatief, een politiek wellesnietes, ondermijnt de feiten en leidt tot onrust.

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL). – Al in 2015 concludeerde de Wereldgezondheidsorganisatie dat glyfosaat waarschijnlijk kankerverwekkend is. Inmiddels hebben twee Europese instanties, EFSA en ECA, zich in allerlei bochten gewrongen om aan te tonen dat dit juist niet zo is. De onderzoeken waarop de één zich baseert zijn deels afkomstig van Monsanto, de producent van glyfosaat. De onderzoeksresultaten van de ander zijn zelfs mede geschreven door Monsanto. We kunnen ons natuurlijk afvragen hoe het kan dat Monsanto jarenlang onderzoek naar haar eigen producten kon manipuleren. Maar belangrijker is de vraag waarom het plan om de toelating van glyfosaat met tien jaar te verlengen nog steeds op tafel ligt. Als u zich niet langer baseert op gemanipuleerd en niet gepubliceerd onderzoek, dan heeft u geen enkele reden om milieu, mens en dier nog langer bloot te stellen aan glyfosaat. Glyfosaat is het symbool geworden van wat er mis is in Europa: multinationals boven milieu en geld boven gezondheid. En u, commissaris, heeft nog zes maanden om uw gezond verstand te gebruiken. En voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsector moet worden afgebouwd.

José Bové (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je suis inquiet. Depuis des mois, Monsanto mène des actions de dénigrement contre le Centre international de recherche sur le cancer (CIRC), agence des Nations unies.

Cette firme menace les chercheurs indépendants pour les obliger à se taire. Cette campagne rappelle les pratiques scandaleuses, voire criminelles, de Philip Morris, ces dernières décennies, pour expliquer que le tabac était inoffensif. C'est le même cabinet qui défendait l'industrie du tabac qui défend aujourd'hui Monsanto. Depuis, ces industriels sont interdits de présence à l'Organisation mondiale de la santé (OMS), de même que l'Institut international des sciences de la vie (ILSI), qui est aujourd'hui le bras armé de la défense du glyphosate.

Les scientifiques du CIRC ont mis le glyphosate dans la catégorie «cancérogènes probables». Or, la Commission s'appuie sur le CIRC pour interdire un certain nombre de produits chimiques. Pourquoi ne le fait-elle pas pour le glyphosate?

Monsieur le Commissaire, je vous demande de mettre en place un moratoire tant que la lumière ne sera pas entièrement faite et, éventuellement, de prendre des mesures contre Monsanto si l'on constate que l'entreprise a triché.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi crediamo che trasparenza e accesso alle informazioni siano diritti non negoziabili. Perciò troviamo sconvolgente che la pericolosità di un prodotto come il glifosato debba essere valutata sulla base di studi scientifici prodotti dalla stessa industria che produce il glifosato, tra l'altro scegliendo i dati che sono più congeniali all'industria stessa.

Troviamo sconvolgente che ogni legittima richiesta di accesso agli atti venga sistematicamente negata perché questi dati sono classificati come «confidenziali». Noi crediamo che l'intero sistema regolatorio debba essere modificato e ripensato perché non sarà mai possibile avere studi indipendenti fino a quando sarà l'industria stessa a finanziare questi studi.

Non stiamo parlando soltanto di erbicidi, ma anche di mangimi animali, di carne, di latte, di prodotti derivati dal latte. Insomma, stiamo parlando di salute pubblica, per cui mi sembra davvero il minimo pretendere che le valutazioni scientifiche siano davvero accessibili, trasparenti e comunque indipendenti.

Jean-François Jalkh (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le renouvellement de l'autorisation du glyphosate pour dix années supplémentaires révèle les limites de la réglementation européenne, qui peine à trouver une solution de substitution à cet herbicide.

Les «Monsanto Papers» ont achevé de nous mettre en garde sur la fiabilité des recherches privées et nous prouvent l'influence de très grands groupes sur les décideurs politiques. Ce rapport de force place les intérêts privés au-dessus de l'intérêt général.

La fusion Bayer-Monsanto, envisagée pour la fin de l'année, est une menace supplémentaire de voir un groupe privé et d'envergure mondiale peser davantage sur la décision politique et imposer sa vision de l'agriculture aux agriculteurs, comme aux pays européens.

La Commission peut-elle, à ce titre, nous préciser sa position concernant la fusion Bayer-Monsanto?

Deuxième problématique, c'est celle de la recherche, menée notamment dans les universités européennes et dans d'autres structures publiques, en vue de trouver un substitut suffisant au glyphosate.

À travers les programmes de recherche de l'Union européenne, la Commission entend-elle susciter une étude d'impact sur les autres molécules et technologies disponibles?

La raison d'être des institutions européennes réside en effet dans de telles initiatives.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Επιτροπε, θεωρώ απαράδεκτο το γεγονός πως η Επιτροπή δέχεται, σαν στοιχεία ικανά να ανανεώσουν την άδεια κυκλοφορίας της γλυφοσάτης, μελέτες χρηματοδοτούμενες από τη Monsanto, την εταιρία, δηλαδή, που παράγει το εν λόγω ζιζανιοκτόνο, ενώ υπάρχει αδυναμία διασταύρωσης των στοιχείων και συνεχίζει να αρνείται τη δημοσιοποίηση των μελετών, με το επιχείρημα ότι είναι επένδυσή της. Η Monsanto προφασίζεται κυρίως το εμπορικό απόρρητο και την πνευματική ιδιοκτησία, αλλά ο πυρήνας του μηνύματός της είναι πάντα ο ίδιος. Τα δεδομένα της μελέτης είναι ιδιοκτησία της και δεν παραβιάζονται. Πρέπει να εξακριβωθεί αντικειμενικά η επικινδυνότητα της γλυφοσάτης, τόσο για την ανθρώπινη υγεία όσο και για το περιβάλλον. Οι έρευνες θα έπρεπε να διεξαχθούν από ανεξάρτητα εργαστήρια πολύ πριν τη διαδικασία ανανέωσης αδείας και τα επιστημονικά στοιχεία να τεθούν στη διάθεση της επιστημονικής κοινότητας. Είναι καθήκον των θεσμικών

οργάνων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αξιολογήσουν τη συμβολή που προσφέρουν οι πληροφορίες στην προστασία του δημοσίου συμφέροντος. Έτσι οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες ίσως λάβουν ένα ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα πως οι ευρωπαϊκοί θεσμοί δεν εξυπηρετούν τα συμφέροντα των μεγάλων πολυεθνικών και δεν αδιαφορούν για την προστασία της υγείας τους και του περιβάλλοντος.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das gleiche Thema, eine ähnliche Debatte – haben wir wirklich neue Erkenntnisse? Die ECHA hat bestätigt, dass Glyphosat nicht krebserregend ist – für mich keine neue Erkenntnis. Ich vertraue hier auf die Arbeit von EFSA und auch von ECHA. Deswegen ist es richtig, dass die Kommission einen nun veränderten Rechtsakt vorschlägt.

Nach meinem Dafürhalten sollte die Kommission sich nochmal die Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments aus dem Jahr 2016 genau anschauen. Die wurde hier im Hause mit deutlicher Mehrheit verabschiedet. Wir haben uns für die Zulassung von Glyphosat für weitere sieben Jahren ausgesprochen – aber mit deutlichen Anwendungsbeschränkungen. Schon das erlaubt aus meiner Sicht mehr Artenvielfalt, vor allem, wenn wir es bei der Vor-Ernte-Behandlung einschränken würden und nicht mehr in Kindergärten bzw. auf öffentlichen Plätzen anwenden. Aus meiner Sicht brauchen die Landwirte Glyphosat, den Wirkstoff und die entsprechenden Mischungen, noch, weil es nicht wirklich Alternativen gibt.

Die Politik wäre aus meiner Sicht gut beraten, hier weniger auf Emotionen und stattdessen mehr auf wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse zu setzen. Ich glaube aber auch, dass es richtig ist, die Forschung hier zu verstärken, um am Ende auch Alternativen zu haben. Ich würde mir wünschen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten im Rat nicht wieder dasselbe Theater aufführen, wie sie das im letzten Jahr getan haben. Übrigens wünsche ich mir auch von meinem Heimatland, dass es hier in dieser Diskussion endlich klar Position bezieht.

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Herr talman! Hur många människor är det inte som lever med cancerskräckväldet på vår kontinent? Vår uppgift måste ju vara att se till att färre människor drabbas. Det är därför oansvarigt att kommissionen vill tillåta försäljning av ett ämne som Världshälsoorganisationens internationella agentur för vetenskap om cancer klassificerat som just potentiellt cancerframkallande. Enligt EU-lag ska försiktighetsprincipen gälla, och det borde vara solklart här att den ska vara tillämplig. Det är människors hälsa det handlar om.

Glyfosat används i enorm utsträckning i dagens jordbruk världen över. Den osäkerhet som råder över hur det drabbar människor är djupt allvarlig. Jag tycker också att kommissionen är svag när det handlar om dess ansvar för människors hälsa på andra områden, exempelvis hormonstörande ämnen. Inte heller där visar man att man tar på allvar att människor riskerar att drabbas av cancer. Det finns nu – och flera kolleger har tagit upp det här i salen – återkommande problem kring hur Efsa agerar och vilken tillförlitlighet de har med tanke på hur de behandlar industrin.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Po wieloletnim doświadczeniu kliniczno-naukowo-dydaktycznym w świecie, gdzie nie uznaje się prawdy absolutnej, wielkim problemem są sponsorowane badania naukowe. Jednak mimo wszystko obserwacje i niektóre doświadczenia od dawna dowodzą, że wbrew opinii Monsanto, glifosat jest słabo biodegradowalny, produkty jego rozpadu można znaleźć we krwi matek ciężarnych, we krwi noworodków. W krótkim czasie po urodzeniu wstrzykiwane są szczepionki, w których znajdowano zawartość glifosatu. Największe ilości, według piśmiennictwa, w kontrowersyjnej od dawna szczepionce przeciwko odrze, śwince i różyczce. Poza podejrzanym nawet przez organa ONZ-u działaniem rakotwórczym, udowodniony jest wpływ tego herbicydu – obecnego od lat w glebie, w wodzie – na powstawanie wad wrodzonych, uszkodzeń wątroby, nerek, zaburzeń płodności, alergii, zaburzeń hormonalnych – co jest wystarczającym dowodem na to, żeby zebrać badania wiarygodne z nadrzędnym celem, jakim jest ochrona ludzkiego zdrowia i życia.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, si la Comisión Europea extiende finalmente la licencia de uso del glifosato por una década más, ¿saben lo que ocurrirá? Que a la ciudadanía le quedarán ya muy pocas dudas de que la Unión Europea está dominada por los lobbies de la industria química y agroindustrial y que la salud de las personas importa bien poco.

La Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria se ha basado en estudios patrocinados por Monsanto para llegar a la conclusión de que no existen evidencias para considerar esta sustancia como cancerígena.

¿Quieren evidencias más allá de los estudios de la Organización Mundial de la Salud? Pregunten a los habitantes de barrios como Ituzaingó, en la ciudad argentina de Córdoba, rodeado de campos cultivados con soja transgénica y fumigados con glifosato.

Ya lo hemos dicho muchísimas veces: ¡no se puede jugar con la salud de nuestro pueblo!

Si la Comisión Europea ignora de nuevo el principio de precaución, quedará en evidencia la complicidad de unas instituciones que no están al servicio de la ciudadanía, sino al de las multinacionales.

¡Demuestren que la Unión Europea no está al servicio del agronegocio, que destruye el medio ambiente, pone en peligro nuestra salud y perpetúa las desigualdades sociales! ¡Impidan que el aire que respiramos en la Unión Europea siga impregnado de un pesticida cancerígeno! ¡Prohíban el glifosato!

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, ich dachte eigentlich, dass bei uns immer noch das Vorsorgeprinzip gilt. Es gibt bisher nicht ausgeräumte Zweifel an Glyphosat, und Sie ignorieren das ganz konsequent. Sie ignorieren auch, dass bei den Studien bestimmte Studien überhaupt nicht in das Prüfverfahren einbezogen wurden, sondern nur Studien, die die Industrie erstellt hat. Wir müssen doch mal ernsthaft darüber nachdenken, ob unser Prüfverfahren überhaupt noch den neuen Standards entspricht.

Und bei Ihnen kommen gar keine Zweifel auf. Wenn Sie die Monsanto-Papers aus den USA gelesen haben, dann müssten auch Ihnen Zweifel kommen, ob das Verfahren nicht doch von Monsanto ein wenig manipuliert wurde, um es mal vorsichtig zu formulieren. Und Ihre Konsequenz daraus ist überhaupt keine Einschränkung für Glyphosat, noch nicht einmal in der Vor-Ernte-Anwendung. Sie ignorieren komplett die Gefahren für die Biodiversität, und Sie sagen jetzt: *Business as usual*, es kann so weitergehen.

Das kann so nicht sein! Sie ignorieren auch die Tatsache, dass fast eine Million Menschen Unterschriften sammeln, um hier im Europäischen Parlament nochmal eine Debatte zu bekommen. Auch das ignorieren Sie komplett, und das ist keine gute demokratische Maßnahme.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, io vorrei farle una domanda diretta: lei personalmente non ritiene che sia più corretto utilizzare per le valutazioni scientifiche solo ed esclusivamente gli studi pubblicati e sottoposti alla revisione dei pari, per poter fare una valutazione scientifica da parte delle istituzioni europee e quindi autorizzare sul mercato un prodotto potenzialmente pericoloso come il glifosato? Io credo che questa sia la strada che ci chiedono i cittadini europei ed evidentemente è l'unica strada da poter intraprendere per il futuro, per ridare credibilità a quella che è l'istituzione europea che rappresentiamo.

Inoltre, io vorrei chiederle se fa una rassicurazione. Io vorrei chiederle, nel momento in cui il glifosato dovesse essere bandito, io non vorrei che altre sostanze più tossiche e più pericolose, come ad esempio quelle per le quali sono resistenti alcuni nuovi OGM che stiamo autorizzando a livello comunitario e che sono resistenti al 2,4-D, il componente dell'Agente Arancio utilizzato in Vietnam, siano il futuro dell'agricoltura.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for his very detailed opening to this debate. I think we owe it to you, Commissioner, to read the detail and study it because there was quite a lot of information in this. I think it is also important to point out, because there seems to be some confusion about what glyphosate is, that it is a weed killer, not a pesticide and I think that is an important point.

Secondly, to those who say we can do without it – hands up those in this Chamber who will go out and weed the fields. Because there are very few of you who will do it. I used to do it as a child, and that is long, long time ago. I think we need to be mindful of the possibilities or the options for farmers who need it. I am looking in the gallery here and when I go into a garden centre anywhere in Europe, I see wall-to-wall glyphosate products because gardeners across Europe use this product.

This is a debate that is worth having. Monsanto, I think, is on trial here and I am happy for Monsanto to be on trial, as is GM technology, but I do think we need to be careful about the other issues and Agencies that are on trial here: the Food Safety Agency and the Chemicals Agency. We do have to have trust in these Agencies. I would be deeply troubled if this Chamber became the authorisation place for any product, but I do believe that this Chamber should be where we debate these issues. And that is why I welcome the debate but I am concerned about some of the comments that have been made.

This is an important part of the technology, as has been said, that farmers use. If I believed that there was a problem, I would call for a ban as well. However, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) is out of step with all of the other Agencies that have looked at this product and we need to acknowledge that. So perhaps Commissioner, when we analyse the information you have given us and follow up, as many of us will, with some questions, there will be greater clarity on this issue. However, I think many of us come to this debate with closed minds; mine is slightly open, to science.

Massimo Paolucci (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, devo essere sincero, signor Commissario, lei non mi ha convinto. Lei elude un punto essenziale. Non cattivi ambientalisti e pericolosi estremisti, ma gli atti di un tribunale mettono in evidenza con mail e trascrizioni atteggiamenti truffaldini poco trasparenti e pressioni indebite. Perché se tutto è in ordine si truccano le carte. Io ho fiducia nella scienza ma non ho fiducia in chi manipola le ricerche scientifiche a fini di parte. Ecco perché occorre fare chiarezza. Ecco perché serve una commissione d'indagine ed ecco perché, in assenza di questa chiarezza, la proroga per dieci anni sarebbe uno schiaffo al principio di precauzione.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Vorig jaar stemde ik tegen de verlenging van de licentie voor glyfosaat. Over de hamvraag of glyfosaat kankerverwekkend is, was immers geen wetenschappelijke consensus. Ik pleitte toen voor meer transparantie, duidelijkheid, onafhankelijk onderzoek en dat standpunt blijft vandaag volledig overeind. Het nieuws dat Monsanto onderzoek zou hebben gestuurd en gemanipuleerd, maakt de oproep naar transparantie zo mogelijk nog dwingender. De Commissie moet nu daadkracht tonen. Ik geloof sterk in “evidence based beleid” op basis van objectieve wetenschap. De vraag aan de Commissie hoe ze zo'n beleid verder wil garanderen en hoe ze omgaat met de roep om transparantie is dan ook essentieel. Tegelijk willen wij met een open vizier meedenken over eventuele structurele wijzigingen van het systeem inzake goedkeuring van herbiciden en pesticiden en pleiten we voor een grondige analyse van het professioneel gebruik van glyfosaat. Ik hoop dat de Commissie, net als wij, de bescherming van de volksgezondheid en van het milieu voorop plaatst en met duidelijke antwoorden komt.

Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Im März 2015 kam die IARC zu dem Schluss, dass Glyphosat krebserregend sein könnte. Nur ein halbes Jahr später kam die EFSA zu dem Ergebnis, dass eine karzinogene Gefährdung durch Glyphosat für den Menschen unwahrscheinlich sei. Also gibt es zwei unterschiedliche Bewertungen hinsichtlich der Gesundheitsrisiken. Das hat doch zur Verunsicherung und zu einem berechtigten Misstrauen in der Bevölkerung geführt.

Dazu kommt, dass die einzelnen Untersuchungen der EFSA und die Hintergründe, die zu dieser Studie führten, der Öffentlichkeit und uns nicht lückenlos vorliegen. Zu Recht ist der Verdacht aufgekommen, dass vielleicht Monsanto die Hände im Spiel haben könnte.

Herr Kommissar, um das Vertrauen zurückzugewinnen, hilft nur vollkommene Transparenz. Wenn es um die Gesundheit von Menschen geht, dann dürfen wir doch keinen Kniefall vor der Industrie oder vor den Landwirten machen. Ich appelliere an Ihr Gewissen, das Vorsorgeprinzip walten zu lassen.

Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE). – Vadinamųjų Monsanto dokumentų istorija viešumon iškelė skandalingus klausimus. Ar gali būti, kad Europos Sąjungos vykdamosios agentūros, tokios kaip Europos maisto saugos agentūra ir Europos cheminių medžiagų agentūra, vykdo ne tik Europos Sąjungos teisę, bet ir Monsanto nurodymus? Nenoriu tuo tikėti, tačiau turiu pripažinti, kad tokius kaltinimus labai smarkiai sustiprina bekompromisė jų pozicija, kurią šios dvi agentūros užima teigdamos, kad glifosatai nekenkia žmogaus sveikatai ir greitai suyra. Noriu tikėti, kad šis glifosatų skandalas taps riba, nuo kurios Komisija pradės atsakingiau vertinti potencialiai sveikatai žalingas medžiagas. Tai atlikti turi ne valdininkai, o nepriklausomi mokslininkai, tyrimų rezultatai turi būti aiškūs, prieinami visuomenei ir tokie, kuriuos galėtų patikrinti mokslo bendruomenė.

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Mr President, for 40 years, we have been using this material in Britain very successfully. The British authorities were quite happy to pass it for safety under the risk-based assessment. The EU likes to use the hazard-based assessment – but of course anything can be a hazard, such as the salt and pepper we put on our food; it is the degree that counts. The Canadian authorities have crawled all over glyphosate and they cannot find anything wrong with it. And, of course, over these 40 years we have had canaries in the mine – these are the sprayer operators who handle the concentrated material. There would be queues in doctors' surgeries if there was a problem, but there are not queues in doctors' surgeries. The Health and Safety Executive in Britain, which looks at accidents on farms, sees far more problems with falling from heights, getting tangled in machinery, drowning in slurry or drowning in grain – exposure to pesticides is way down their list. The World Health Organization says this material is no more carcinogenic than sitting in front of a log fire, cutting human hair, working night shifts, being exposed to dry cleaning fluid or drinking the Argentinian drink 'mate'. The WHO says that this material is far less carcinogenic than drinking coffee, drinking alcohol or eating processed meat. We are being very silly here.

The burden of proof is obviously on the manufacturers, and they have always got in mind the thalidomide scandal. It now costs EUR 200 million and nine years to get a material through this process – only a large company can afford to do it. The green lobby are determined to kill agriculture.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nasze zdrowie w dużej mierze zależy od jakości żywności, którą spożywamy, oraz od stanu środowiska naturalnego, dlatego myślę, że bardzo ważne jest, aby wszelkie dodatki i środki chemiczne, których używamy do produkcji żywności, ochrony roślin bądź w rolnictwie, nie wzbudzały żadnych wątpliwości.

Dzisiaj mówimy o glifosacie – herbicydzie, który najczęściej jest stosowany na świecie i patrząc dzisiaj na coraz częstsze przypadki zachorowalności na raka, na coraz mniejszą ilość naturalnych zapylaczy, patrząc na różne wyniki badań, a także patrząc na aferę z udziałem firmy Monsanto, to naturalne, że rodzi się wiele pytań i wątpliwości. Ja w zeszłym roku zadałam pytanie Komisji Europejskiej właśnie na temat negatywnego wpływu glifosatu na zdrowie ludzi i zwierząt, który według doniesień mógł być przyczyną powstawania wad wrodzonych, nowotworów i ciężkich chorób. Komisja odpowiedziała, że jest mało prawdopodobne, aby glifosat stwarzał zagrożenie rakotwórcze u ludzi. Ta odpowiedź stoi w sprzeczności z wynikami czy z opinią WHO, która powiedziała, że glifosat może być przyczyną zapadalności na raka, więc mam pytanie do Komisji – dlaczego, skąd te rozbieżności, na podstawie jakich badań, jakich opinii Państwo udzieliliście tej odpowiedzi? Myślę, że na te wiarygodne odpowiedzi czekają konsumenci, rolnicy, zwłaszcza w obliczu tego, że ma być przedłużone używanie glifosatu w Unii Europejskiej i my konsumenci mamy mieć stuprocentową pewność, że to jest bezpieczny produkt i że badania są wiarygodne, że nie były wykonywane na zlecenie, nie zapłaciła za nie firma, która jest najbardziej zainteresowana, bo jest producentem Roundupu czy innych produktów, które zawierają glifosat.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, wir haben Sie in der Vergangenheit immer als sehr besonnenen und verantwortungsbewussten Menschen kennengelernt, der sich in seinen Entscheidungen immer wieder darauf berufen hat, dass die Entscheidung wissenschaftsbasiert sein muss, dass die Entscheidungen einer empirischen Forschung standhalten müssen. Und gerade deswegen fordere ich Sie heute auf, in diesem Sinne weiter zu agieren. Denn das, was wir vorliegen haben, was zu der Entscheidung geführt hat, dass Sie jetzt um zehn Jahre verlängern wollen – auf diese Entscheidung können wir uns nicht verlassen, weil wir nicht wissen, wie diese Studien zustande gekommen sind.

Wir haben im Vorfeld schon Studien gehabt, die auf der einen Seite behauptet haben: Ja, hier ist ein Risiko. Andere haben das Risiko nicht gesehen. Wenn jetzt ernsthafte Zweifel daran bestehen, dass diese Studien von Monsanto wirklich korrekt, transparent und ehrlich sind, und große Zweifel bestehen, ob ich mich darauf verlassen kann, dann dürfen Sie diese Studien nicht zur Entscheidung heranziehen.

Ich darf Sie nochmal ersuchen, darüber nachzudenken. Ich glaube, die Position des Parlaments von maximal sieben Jahren war schon eine äußerst weitgehende unter diesen Bedingungen.

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Seit März wissen wir, dass Monsanto lügt, verheimlicht und schlimmer: mit schlimmsten Geheimdienstmethoden Wissenschaftler einer UN-Behörde verfolgt und in den USA mit Trump jetzt versucht, die Gelder dieser UN-Organisationen zu kürzen – nur, weil diese Organisation unabhängige Wissenschaftler hat. Und was macht die Kommission seit den Monsanto-Leaks? Weiter so wie bisher. 10 weitere Jahre dieses Produkts.

Warum sind wir als Grüne an diesem Dossier interessiert? Hier geht es um die Glaubwürdigkeit Europas. Deshalb haben wir bereits im März Briefe geschrieben, deshalb gehen wir vor den Europäischen Gerichtshof, um zu klären, welche Studien denn zugänglich gemacht werden. Ich kann die Kommission von Herrn Juncker nur warnen: Hier geht es nicht nur um Gesundheit, hier geht es nicht nur um Landwirtschaft – hier geht es um das Vertrauen zu Europa.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I have listened to this debate. I heard Miriam Dalli outline the case against glyphosate and I listened to the Commissioner very carefully when he answered. I think that on balance the Commissioner is correct. Because if one reputable agency said glyphosate was safe, then you would be inclined to say: this is an independent agency saying it is safe, so you should go along with it. But when two agencies say it is safe, then I think to actually go against them, and especially to ask for a ban, does not make much sense to me.

I have spoken to many farmers, horticulturists, etc. about this, and they are deeply concerned. Before you talk about any ban, you should have an impact assessment on what the effects are going to be. Are we going to allow the weeds to destroy the village farmers' crops? The same for the horticulturists, the same for our gardens when glyphosate has been used for many decades and, to all intents and purposes, seems to be safe.

We have, of course, to take public concerns into consideration. We have to allay people's fears. But we can do so in a practical and logical manner. As the Commissioner pointed out, it is not just European agencies, agencies around the world have said similarly. So I think that this is an overreaction. We certainly have to be careful, we certainly have to be prudent and we have to allay, as I said, people's fears.

But in relation to Monsanto, they do not own the rights any more. They produce it, there is a company in Ireland that produces it and sells it, and they have been doing it for many years. Are we going to suddenly say: 'sorry folks, fold up the tent, your business is gone'? That is not the way to go ahead.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Ja, så står vi her igen med glyphosatsagen, sagen der ikke vil dø! Kommissionen siger, at der er ikke noget at komme efter. Videnskaben har talt, og alt er sikkert. Men alligevel siger I også, at det er vigtigt, at medlemsstaterne gør en stor indsats for at begrænse brugen af glyphosat i parker og private haver osv. Det ville I jo ikke gøre, hvis I ikke mente, at der var bekymringer og problemer omkring dette stof. Det, jeg synes, vi har brug for, er en klar plan fra Kommissionen. Vi har brug for, at I laver en plan for, hvordan vi udfaser glyphosat. Vi har brug for, at I laver en plan for, hvordan vi sikrer gennemsigtighed og troværdighed hos de myndigheder, der skal vurdere stoffer, som vi bruger i EU. Og så har vi også brug for en klar plan og finansiering for, hvordan vi kan finde alternative ukrudtsbekæmpelsesmidler, så vi kan komme af med glyphosat og round-up. Der er ikke behov for, at vi bruger det. Vi bliver nødt til at finde nogle nye. Det er farligt at fortsætte med den kurs. Kom nu med den plan!

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, el glifosato es, según la Organización Mundial de la Salud, una sustancia posiblemente cancerígena, es decir, dañina para nuestra salud. A pesar de esto, la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria lleva un año negándose a hacer públicos los estudios que avalan el glifosato.

Por supuesto, en el Grupo Verts/ALE no nos hemos quedado parados y hemos llevado esos hechos tan graves ante el Tribunal de Justicia Europeo. Queremos que los datos sean transparentes y que los expertos puedan trabajar con rigor científico. Y, también, conocer el papel de Monsanto en este proceso.

Mientras tanto, casi un millón de personas ya están pidiendo la prohibición del glifosato, a través de una iniciativa ciudadana europea. Pedimos sentido común a la Comisión Europea, una moratoria sobre el glifosato y una investigación independiente y transparente. Esto es básico para un debate democrático de calidad con el que repensar nuestro sistema agrícola y proteger nuestra salud.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Въпросът за употребата на най-широко използвания в света хербицид глифозат продължава да бъде актуален, като съществуващото одобрение за неговото използване ще изтече най-късно на 31 декември 2017 г.

Понастоящем глифозат се използва интензивно не само в земеделието, но и за поддръжката на паркове и обществени пространства. Това означава, че на контакт с него са изложени широка гама лица – от селскостопанските работници, влизащи в пряк контакт с продукта, до крайния потребител на земеделската продукция.

Всички знаем, че продуктът глифозат е силно оспорван, тъй като има съмнения, че предизвиква ракови заболявания, тежки увреждания на плода в утробата на майката, сериозни заболявания на стомашно-чревния тракт и редица други негативни влияния върху здравето на хората и животните. Ясни и категорични заключения за неговата токсичност или безопасност все още липсват.

От друга страна обаче продуктите, съдържащи глифозат, се използват широко в редица държави, не само в Европа, но и по целия свят. Това на практика означава, че дори неговата употреба на територията на Европейския съюз да бъде ограничена, влиянието му върху европейските граждани няма да бъде преустановено.

В тази връзка, за всички нас е изключително важно Комисията и държавите членки да разполагат с достоверни данни относно реалното въздействие на глифозат върху здравето на хората и животните. Тези данни трябва да се основават на независими, задълбочени и прозрачни научни изследвания и проучвания.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, comme vous, nous devons faire confiance à la science. Le politique doit s'appuyer sur la science pour décider, mais il y a plusieurs dizaines d'années, des scientifiques ont dit que l'amiante était tout à fait inoffensif et, aujourd'hui, l'amiante fait encore des centaines de milliers de morts par an sur la planète. Des scientifiques ont dit que l'aspartame était inoffensif et le disent encore aujourd'hui, mais l'aspartame est probablement une prochaine bombe alimentaire qui va exploser. Des scientifiques ont dit que le glyphosate était inoffensif, mais les «Monsanto Papers», depuis mars dernier, nous ont montré que certains scientifiques avaient modifié leurs résultats et avaient truqué leur enquête pour permettre la mise sur le marché du glyphosate.

Par conséquent, il est permis de douter des avis scientifiques qui sont remis. Il faut donc faire toute la transparence sur l'indépendance et la fiabilité des enquêtes sur lesquelles s'appuient nos agences pour remettre leurs avis.

Monsieur le Commissaire, c'est pour cette raison qu'il faut une commission d'enquête, pour établir toute la vérité et toute la fiabilité afin d'avoir confiance dans notre système. Il y va de l'intérêt des 500 millions de citoyens européens et de leur santé, et même des 7 milliards de citoyens qui peuplent la planète.

Susanne Melior (S&D). – Herr Präsident, verehrter Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kollegen! Wir haben viele Argumente ausgetauscht. Nicht alle kann ich unterstützen, aber vielen doch folgen. Ich danke Ihnen, verehrter Herr Kommissar, vor allem für Ihre sehr ausführliche Antwort zu Beginn dieser Diskussionsrunde hier im Parlament.

Ich glaube aber, dass wir uns einem Vorwurf ganz hart stellen müssen, und dieser Vorwurf betrifft unsere europäischen Agenturen, nämlich die ECHA und die EFSA. Da heißt es, dass hier eigennützige Studien von Monsanto hinzugezogen worden sind. Dieser Vorwurf muss ausgeräumt werden, auch und vor allem im Interesse unserer eigenen europäischen Agenturen. Deswegen müssen wir hier diskutieren, und deswegen müssen wir hier miteinander streiten und gucken, dass wir das in Zukunft sehr viel besser hinkommen. Dazu gehört auch – Frédérique Ries hat es vorhin schon angeführt – eine gute Ausstattung für die Agenturen, die wir in Europa haben.

Gilles Pargneau (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je connais votre probité, je connais votre expertise, je connais votre volonté, car nous travaillons ensemble, de protéger la santé des Européennes et des Européens.

Dans ce dossier, il y a urgence. Il y a urgence que vous preniez une initiative protectrice dans les mois à venir, avant l'automne prochain, pour contrer tout d'abord l'inquiétude grandissante des Européens devant les révélations récentes concernant ce perturbateur endocrinien préjudiciable à leur bonne santé et à leur espérance de vie.

Il y a aussi urgence sur les inquiétudes qui se développent en raison du manque de transparence. L'avis de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) aurait été fondé sur des études sponsorisées par l'industrie agrochimique. L'identité des 73 experts nationaux qui ont participé à cette évaluation reste inconnue.

J'espère donc qu'avant que les États membres prennent leur décision, à l'automne, le nouveau ministre français, Nicolas Hulot, sera en adéquation avec ce qu'il disait, le 20 avril, dans le cadre de la Fondation Nicolas Hulot: oui, il faut prendre ses responsabilités et protéger la santé des Européennes et des Européens, en interdisant ce renouvellement du glyphosate, compte tenu de l'inquiétude grandissante qu'il suscite.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr, magam is egyetértek azzal, hogy az uniós állampolgárok egészségét maximális mértékben szem előtt kell tartanunk. Éppen ezért örülök, hogy itt a Parlamentben is napirendre tűztük ezt az ellentmondásokkal teli témát. Javaslom, hogy józan ésszel közelítsünk a kérdéshez. Egy Amerikában kirobbant állítólagos botrány ugyanis nem áthatja alá az Európai Élelmiszerbiztonsági Hatóságba és az Európai Vegyianyag-ügynökségbe vetett bizalmat. Amíg a termék szabadalmi védettsége élt, addig furcsa mód a kérdés évtizedekig nem volt az asztalon. Mindezek ellenére úgy vélem, hogy minden esetben az elővigyázatosság elvét kell szem előtt tartanunk. Azt vallom, hogy minden méreg méreg, azonban a szabályozott használattal csökkenthető a káros hatásuk. Nem engedhetjük e szerek mértéktelen használatát, hiszen a 100 tonna számra kijuttatott szerek kumulálódnak a természetben. De a teljes tiltás sem megoldás. Alternatív megoldás hiányában éppen ezért úgy gondolom, hogy a kutatás-fejlesztés mellett a gazdálkodók ismeretanyagának bővítésére is figyelniünk kell. Továbbá kérem a Bizottságot, hogy dolgozzon ki védintézkedéseket, és biztosítsa az engedélyezési eljárások 100%-os megbízhatóságát.

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o senhor é médico e, portanto, vai compreender o que lhe vou dizer. O glifosato é o herbicida mais utilizado no mundo, sendo que 76 % da sua utilização a nível mundial é na agricultura, em aplicações florestais, urbanas e jardins. O glifosato e os seus resíduos foram detetados na água, no solo, nos alimentos e no corpo humano. A OMS classificou este herbicida como carcinogénico provável para o ser humano e carcinogénico provado para os animais de laboratório. O glifosato tem um efeito negativo também nos oceanos, onde tudo depende do fitoplâncton que está no topo da cadeia alimentar.

A iniciativa Stop Glifosato visa pressionar a Comissão para dois objetivos: garantir a transparência e independência dos processos na reutilização de pesticidas e impor prazos obrigatórios para a redução progressiva do uso de todos os pesticidas.

O processo de autorização do glifosato na União tem corrido de forma pantanosa, com estudos contraditórios, documentos mantidos em segredo e conflitos de interesse revelados, e é por isso que precisamos de um estudo baseado em todos os dados científicos disponíveis respeitantes ao carácter carcinogénico do glifosato, bem como às eventuais propriedades perturbadoras do sistema endócrino.

Ao abrigo do princípio da precaução, continuarão a pressionar a Comissão a não renovar a autorização do glifosato, à luz do interesse público superior da defesa do ambiente e da saúde pública.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è la prima volta che discutiamo in quest’Aula di glifosato e ho la netta sensazione che non sarà neppure l’ultima. La recente pubblicazione dei Monsanto Papers ha fatto sorgere ragionevoli dubbi in merito alla credibilità di alcuni studi sponsorizzati dalla stessa Monsanto, che figurava tra le prove documentali utilizzate dall’EFSA e dall’ECA ai fini della valutazione della sicurezza del glifosato. Da settimane filtrano indiscrezioni sulla possibilità di un rinnovo ultra decennale dell’autorizzazione di questo principio attivo, mentre decine di campagne per la sua messa al bando sono già partite in tutti gli Stati europei.

Su questo tema la Commissione deve innanzitutto recuperare credibilità agli occhi dei cittadini europei, assumendo approfondite informazioni sulle accuse di indebito condizionamento della Monsanto, prima di concedere qualsivoglia autorizzazione. Quando è in gioco la salute pubblica, la trasparenza e la disponibilità di studi scientifici credibili rivestono massima importanza e l’Unione europea ha il dovere di rispondere in maniera adeguata alle legittime preoccupazioni di milioni di consumatori.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Επίτροπε, σας άκουσα με προσοχή, μιλήσατε 19 λεπτά, ίσως ήταν η πιο μακροσκελέστατη ομιλία Επιτρόπου που έχω ακούσει σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα, και είμαι πολύ συχνά εδώ στην αίθουσα. Τελικά, μετά την ομιλία σας αυξήθηκαν τα ερωτήματά μου και η ανησυχία μου. Το ίδιο ισχύει και για την πλειοψηφία των βουλευτών, διότι αν, όπως ισχυρίζεστε, η γλυφοσάτη είναι, δήθεν, ακίνδυνη, τότε γιατί λαμβάνετε ειδικά μέτρα όταν έχουμε εφαρμογές σε προϊόντα προσιτά στα παιδιά; Γιατί αν δεν υπάρχει, δήθεν, πρόβλημα θα μπορούν τα κράτη μέλη να την απαγορεύσουν; Η αρχή της προφύλαξης πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί αυστηρά, ιδίως, μετά τα «Monsanto papers» από όπου προκύπτει ότι η γλυφοσάτη είναι δυνητικά καρκινογόνος ουσία. Η Monsanto, όπως γνωρίζετε, στα τέλη του έτους συγχωνεύεται με την Bayern. Επομένως, γιατί να υπάρχει χρήση αυτής της αμφιλεγόμενης ουσίας, βάσει αμφιλεγόμενων εκθέσεων αξιολόγησης, όταν ο ίδιος Παγκόσμιος Οργανισμός Υγείας την έχει χαρακτηρίσει καρκινογόνο;

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ομιλία του κυρίου Επιτρόπου νομίζω ότι ήταν προβληματική. Η γλυφοσάτη, σύμφωνα με τον Παγκόσμιο Οργανισμό Υγείας, είναι προφανώς καρκινογόνος. Ο ΟΗΕ κάνει λόγο για επιθετικές και ανήθικες τακτικές μάρκετινγκ με σκοπό την παρεμπόδιση των μεταρρυθμίσεων και την παράλυση των περιορισμών στα φυτοφάρμακα. Στον βωμό του εύκολου χρήματος, οι θεσμικές διαδικασίες καταστρέφονται. Η επιστήμη εξαγοράζεται και τα στοιχεία αποκρύπτονται. Σε συνέχεια της απόφασης του Ευρωπαϊκού Οργανισμού Χημικών Προϊόντων, τονίζω ότι δεν πρέπει η ασφάλεια μιας ουσίας να βασίζεται αποκλειστικά στις βλαβερές ιδιότητές της. Η διασφάλιση υψηλού επιπέδου προστασίας της ανθρώπινης υγείας και η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος απαιτούν την πρόσβαση σε πρωτογενή δεδομένα και όχι απλή ανάλυση ερευνητικών αποτελεσμάτων που χρηματοδοτούνται από τις εμπλεκόμενες εταιρείες. Η βιομηχανία φυτοφαρμάκων ζητεί περισσότερη επιστήμη και λιγότερη πολιτική. Από την πλευρά μας, πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε ότι η πολιτική παράγει αποτελέσματα, διασφαλίζοντας τη δημοκρατική νομιμοποίηση, αφουγκραζόμενοι τις ανάγκες της αγοράς και της κοινωνίας. Απαιτείται η παρακολούθηση των επιπέδων υπολειμμάτων γλυφοσάτης σε τρόφιμα και ποτά και η υποστήριξη του αγροτικού κλάδου ποικιλοτρόπως προς ανάπτυξη βιώσιμων λύσεων.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Sem sadjar iz Slovenije, ki že 25 let uporabljam glifosat, in če je komu do tega, da bi vedel, kaj je končna resnica glede glifosata, je ravno meni. Ker ne bi želel, da bi nikogar zastrupil s svojimi jabolki, ki jih prodajam, niti sebe ne bi rad zastrupil.

Pri svojem delu moram pač upoštevati tudi inštitucije, ki jih imamo za to ustanovljene. Pregledal sem tako poročilo EFSE, pregledal sem sedaj tudi poročilo agencije za kemikalije, ki potrjuje to, kar je EFSA prej trdila.

Številne svetovne agencije govorijo, da ni nevarnosti v glifosatu. Prebral sem tudi to, kar je zdravstvena agencija zapisala. Urad za kemikalije te agencije pravi, da ni rakotvoren glifosat, medtem ko urad za preprečevanje raka pravi, da je v kategoriji skupaj z rdečim mesom in s podobnimi stvarmi.

In sam mislim, da verjamem tu, kar trdi Komisija, mi pa imamo odgovornost, da se pogovarjamo tudi o tem, da bomo, prvič, zagotovili zdravje Evropejcev, da bo obstala kmetijska proizvodnja, da ne bo Evropa postala odvisna od tistih delov sveta, ki uporablja tako glifosat kakor tudi Monsantoove GMO produkte. Sam sem tudi proti tem produktom.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, muchas gracias, señor comisario, por su amplia explicación: casi veinte minutos.

Muchos de los que han intervenido ni le han escuchado a usted ni se quedarán para el final; venían con su posición prefijada, su minuto de gloria, a decir una posición política. Y eso es lo que está sucediendo con esto.

La Agencia Internacional para la Investigación contra el Cáncer dijo que el coformulante que se mezclaba con el glifosato era el que podía tener efectos cancerígenos. Eliminando el coformulante del herbicida, no tendría el glifosato ningún problema cancerígeno.

Usted se comprometió a que con los análisis científicos que le diera la EFSA, se iba a conceder la autorización o no, teniendo en cuenta también la opinión del Parlamento.

Yo confío en las instituciones europeas. Confío en usted, señor comisario. Confío en las agencias que nos dan seguridad alimentaria.

Por tanto, aquí hemos llegado a un punto en el que hay juicios políticos.

Habrà que aclarar muchas circunstancias, también Monsanto. Pero Monsanto se ha convertido en el «caballo de Atila» en una posición frente a los herbicidas en general. Por tanto, hay una gran manipulación política.

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). – Mr President, I have listened very intently to this debate, and I just want to say that of course we all want a healthy countryside and a good environment for us all to live in; so do our farmers.

No one in this House has a monopoly on virtue in this particular matter. Our farmers are responsible farmers. I represent the East of England, which is a major agricultural sector in the United Kingdom. Our responsible farmers rely on good scientific, evidence-based information for what they are doing. From what I have heard from the Commission this afternoon, that is exactly what we have. I hope that the Commission will bring an end to all the uncertainty on this, and confirm once and for all the authorisation for glyphosate.

It has been very clear: we are hearing repetitions of the same sort of scaremongering, the same things. Listen again to what the Commissioner had to say, look more closely at what he said to us all. So let us put an end to all this nonsense, and let us give certainty to our farmers – our responsible farmers.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, od institucija čiji rad financiraju porezni obveznici država članica očekujem transparentnost, vjerodostojnost i povjerenje. To se odnosi i na rad Europske agencije za sigurnost hrane i Europske agencije za kemikalije. Te agencije trebaju osigurati građanima Unije visoku kvalitetu života bez rizika za zdravlje od proizvoda koje svakodnevno upotrebljavaju.

Objava korespondencije tvrtke Monsanto u procesima pred sudovima u Sjedinjenim Američkim državama koja posljednjih mjeseci preplavljuju medije, a vezano uz više od 60 tužbi za narušavanje zdravlja i pojave ne-Hodgkinovog limfoma povezanog s korištenjem aktivne tvari glifosata u sredstvima za zaštitu bilja, poljuljalo je vjerodostojnost američkih agencija za nadležnih zaštitu zdravlja i okoliša zbog sumnje u vjerodostojnost određenih studija koje su se koristile u procjeni rizika.

Posebno zabrinjava to što su te studije također bile i podloga za ocjenu sigurnosti glifosata pred europskim institucijama.

Očekujem brz odgovor na postavljena pitanja, te prijedloge za poboljšanja procedura koji bi postupke ocjene sigurnosti biocida učinile vjerodostojnijima.

(Koniec zglaszeń z sali)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me start by thanking all the honourable Members because, ladies and gentlemen, you have put a lot of questions on the table but, as you know, I will not be able to address all those questions and to comment as we do not have enough time. However, may I draw your attention to this WHO report which I have here in my hand, because many of you quote the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Here is the IARC report too. I have both reports: from IARC and the WHO joint meeting on pesticide residues.

Two agencies – one and the other – which then decided – because this is the final decision – that glyphosate is unlikely to be carcinogenic. When you speak about the WHO, please read all the documents together, otherwise you will repeat the working group and the very active Professor Portier, who was a chair of the working group. I met him and we discussed this together. I was in Lyons, where we had a lot of discussions. I have visited all the agencies – IARC, EFSA – because I am not responsible to judge on science, colleagues, and I do not think all of you can judge on science.

It must be understood that we have our framework of actions and the framework is law. You mentioned the Monsanto papers but it is enshrined in law that Monsanto is obliged to present a study review, because this is enshrined in law. This law was adopted here in this House together with the Council.

I am responsible for following the law because the rule of law is my basic area in which to act and I would like to say to you, very openly, that we have a very precautionary approach, but do not mix up precautionary approach and precautionary principles. We do the same: we have a precautionary approach and then we use the precautionary principle: we ask EFSA, we ask the ECHA for an analysis.

And then nowadays we have all the agencies at EU level. The 28 EU Member State agencies did the same. ECHA did the same, EFSA did the same. That is all, colleagues. Please, then, do not ask me to present another scientific review. I would like to present you with a scientific view that goes into a very detailed explanation but IARC and WHO are not European Union agencies, they are global agencies, but we take those outcomes into account too. Please tell me: how can I act in this situation? My answer is very simple. I would like to follow only plant protection product legislation. Otherwise I will be in a dangerous situation.

OK, I can show you all the materials I have. I have a lot of meetings with my colleagues from the S&D Group. I have a lot of meetings with the Greens. I know very well that you have your own approach. Here is the Monsanto Tribunal paper. Here you can see the urine test. Here you can see seven reasons why we can ban glyphosate.

Colleagues, this is about politics, it is not about science. But I read it very carefully because some write, quite rightly, that it would be good to ban glyphosate because this would give a very good momentum to promoting organic farming. I am not against promoting organic farming but sorry, it is not about science! It is about your political platform! OK, I respect your political platform but I would like to follow the instruments which are in our hands. I know that scientists have a slightly different approach.

Professor Portier has one approach. John Little sent me a letter today and a lot of their working group people are very active discussing this. OK, we will continue those scientific discussions. I welcome those discussions. It would be good to organise scientific debates and move forward, but we must follow our legal obligations, and I would like to say very openly that I am ready to fulfil my legal obligations.

When I started in 2014 I had doubts because I listened to you and I had doubts about our European Union system. Today I would like to say very openly – let me reiterate this – that I firmly believe that the European Union system concerning the approval of active substances to be used in plant protection products is robust, trustworthy and ensures the highest safety standards for human and animal health and the environment. And this is true, colleagues. I spent two and a half years but I would like to say that today I am a big believer in our European Union safety system. Please follow me. I would like to invite you to organise debates and once again address those issues in a more detailed way.

I don't know who is repeating that I said I can drink glyphosate as a glass of water. Sorry, I never, never, told you such a thing. I would like to mention that glyphosate is, as you know, labelled – this is a hazard classification – as corrosive, causing serious eye damage, hazardous to the environment and toxic to aquatic life, with long-lasting effects. This is on the label. OK, we need to move forward and to see how to manage the situation and how to keep our instruments to guarantee levels – hazard approach, risk approach – and then to fulfil our obligations and of course also finalise our decision. Otherwise it will be very difficult.

Please look, research the consequences of ignoring science and EFSA conclusions in the field of plant health. We now have an entire region infected by Xylella in Puglia. Can you imagine the disaster in Puglia? There is no treatment for this, the only possibility is to remove the trees. Those people who attacked the EFSA proposal to remove those trees did not listen to me – and what is happening today in Puglia? But the scientific advice was clear.

With regard to conclusions about glyphosate, we have today conclusions built by ECHA. Then I have legal obligations, colleagues; six months or until the end of this year. I know that it is only me who will follow the rule of law but I would like to fulfil my obligations.

With regard to the idea to have an inquiry committee, please do it; I will be more than happy to look at your inquiry compared to the Monsanto Papers. Please do it because it will be very good to cooperate with you, and from the Commission side we have no grounds to start with the inquiry procedure but maybe parliamentarians have a bit more space for manoeuvre. Please do it. I will be more than happy to communicate, to coordinate our common knowledge and to present to you the whole picture.

Sorry, friends, but I would like to say that the Commission approach is very clear, based on science, based on precautionary principles. I am a medical doctor, colleagues, and I know how difficult it is to encourage my patients to use medicines in the proper way. You always know how difficult it is to manage medicines but without medicine you have no chance of moving forward.

I know some of you have it in mind to propose glyphosate-free agriculture in the EU. Yes, please do this, please organise a pilot project, encourage farmers to do it; but it is not up to me, it is not up to science. Friends, I am very happy to listen to you very carefully but, sorry, I do not touch all the questions about transparency because I have answers about transparency. I have discussed those issues in a very detailed manner together with EFSA, together with ECHA, together with IARC, together with those working groups and I think we will see possibilities after REFIT. Move forward, but we will do it together. You know, you are also responsible in regard to risk management and risk communication because those messages which are being disseminated today create distrust.

We live in a very difficult society where distrust in science creates a lot of problems. It does not matter what – medicines, vaccinations or plant protection products. Blaming each other is very dangerous. I would be happy to be the scapegoat, the bad guy, but I count on my teams, I count on DG SANTE, I count on our specialists, I count on our scientists around the world – a lot of scientific communities which presented a common picture. And only a few create a lot of problems. Sorry, friends, I would be more than happy to move forward together with you in responding to your questions, but I trust in science.

Przewodniczący. – Panie Komisarzu Andriukaitis! Zwłaszcza ostatnie Pana wystąpienie przekonało nas o tym, że wysłuchał Pan 32 opinii i wypowiedzi. To była prawdziwa debata. Nie wiem, czy wszystkich Pan przekonał, ale niewątpliwie wszyscy czują się usatysfakcjonowani, że uczestniczyli w przyzwoitej wymianie poglądów.

Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – Glifosat od lat jest powszechnie stosowany jako składnik lub samodzielny środek ochrony roślin i od lat toczą się wokół niego dyskusje, jest bowiem substancją niezwykle kontrowersyjną. Wciąż pojawiają się sprzeczne ze sobą raporty dotyczące szkodliwości glifosatu, a w mojej ocenie istnieją poważne obawy co do jego bezpieczeństwa.

Pozwolenie na używanie glifosatu na terytorium Unii Europejskiej wygasa z końcem roku, co jest dla Komisji Europejskiej znakomitą sposobnością na wprowadzenie całkowitego zakazu jego stosowania. Niestety podjęto próbę kolejnego przedłużenia zezwolenia na jego stosowanie, mimo że ostatnie badania odnotowują kolejne przypadki kancerogennego działania glifosatu, a niemiecki urząd ochrony środowiska udokumentował poważny negatywny wpływ glifosatu na bioróżnorodność.

Rolnictwo ekologiczne w każdym momencie udowadnia, że glifosat nie jest niezbędny dla jego wydajności, a rolnictwo przyszłości winno być oparte na wysokiej bioróżnorodności, dużym zróżnicowaniu upraw oraz na pracy w zgodzie z naturą, a nie przeciwko niej. Dlatego wzywam Komisję Europejską do szczegółowego monitorowania badań dotyczących pestycydów oraz ścisłej współpracy w tym zakresie z Europejskim Urzędem Bezpieczeństwa Żywności oraz Europejską Agencją Chemikaliów.

Момчил Неков (S&D), в писмена форма. – Глифозатът е най-използваният хербицид в света. Той намира широка употреба и в селското стопанство, и в градинарството. В европейските градове той се използва широко в борбата с плевелите и де факто милиони европейци са изложени на този хербицид.

Самата Европейска комисия определя веществото като корозивно, предизвикващо вреда на зрението, токсично за водната флора и фауна и с дългосрочен ефект. Това са достатъчно причини в научните изследвания от страна на частния бизнес да се заложи изработването на заместител, който да преодолява тези опасности.

Подкрепям създаването на анкетна комисия в Парламента, за да се повиши осведомеността по въпрос, който буди все повече притеснения сред гражданите. Смятам, че Европа има достатъчно голям научен и икономически потенциал, за да стимулира европейската индустрия за разработването на вещества, които носят по-малко рискове от тези, разработени преди десетилетия другаде. С това ще се подпомогне европейското производство и Съюзът може да докаже себе си като лидер в прилагането на добри практики и работа с хербицидите с минимален риск за околната среда, здравето на човека, почвите и околната среда.

11. Stanje u Demokratskoj Republici Kongo (rasprava)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji / wysokiej przedstawiciel Unii do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa w sprawie sytuacji w Demokratycznej Republice Konga (2017/2703) (RSP).

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the draft resolution before this House identifies a number of key issues which I would like to endorse. First, the need to address urgently a serious upsurge in violence and human rights abuses; second, the need to implement in full the political agreement of 31 December 2016, and to create the right political atmosphere for credible, transparent and competitive elections; third, the importance of working closely with the African Union and regional organisations; and fourth, the importance of support to the United Nations.

Regarding the United Nations, I share the deep regret of this House at the assassination of the two members of the United Nations group of experts and their Congolese colleagues in Kasai in March this year. I express my sincere condolences to their families, friends and colleagues. But let me repeat once again that the agreement of December 2016 is the only pathway to a democratic and peaceful transition of power. The Catholic Bishops' Conference provided leadership in facilitating this agreement and they deserve our particular recognition. But for that agreement to succeed, actors on all sides of the political spectrum have to act in the national interest. This is the only way to deliver elections before the end of 2017, and it is the only way to restore full constitutional legitimacy to DRC. Regrettably, it is clear that the inclusivity required for a successful transition has not yet been achieved – this is the reality – in particular as regards the composition of the current government and on the leadership of the National Council for the Monitoring of the Agreement.

The intimidation and arbitrary arrests of opponents and activists, and politically motivated prosecutions, do not contribute to such an environment. I agree with the call made in the resolution for the need to ensure that investigations of violence and killings take place quickly and that they are demonstrably independent and transparent. This is an issue that we will be pursuing bilaterally with DRC, but also at multilateral level, and particularly in the current session of the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva.

Freedom of expression, including for the independent media, and freedom of association and assembly, must be guaranteed by the authorities. Now, unfortunately, we see too many restrictions.

As you know, my own responsibility covers humanitarian affairs. We cannot ignore the human impact of the outbreaks of violence in all three Kasai provinces, and the ongoing threats in other parts of the country where armed groups are active. The violence affecting civilian populations has already resulted in over 3.7 million refugees and internally displaced people, including 1.1 million in the Kasai region.

We are in constant contact with the humanitarian actors on the ground, MSF and the Red Cross. ECHO Flight, the EU's humanitarian air services, stands ready to intervene and provide them both with support when needed. We are also in contact with other donors to coordinate the next steps of the response to the growing needs in Kasai. This comes on top of our presence in the rest of the country, where we mobilise EUR 23 million this year for a wide range of humanitarian activities.

In responding to the political crisis and the violence and human rights abuses that it has generated, on 29 May the EU adopted individual restrictive measures against nine individuals. I want to be very clear about the use and context of these sanctions. They are not intended to replace justice – they are a tool intended to encourage a change in policy or in behaviour. Sanctions are reversible – we would be open to lifting them if those concerned were to demonstrate that they had turned away from violence. And sanctions are adaptable: the European Union would consider further listings for those – at any level, including the political level – who would obstruct the way to a peaceful and consensual end of the crisis.

I would like to end on a positive note. We believe there is potential for an African-led solution, in line with UN Security Council Resolution 2348. We are encouraged by the interest shown by the African Union, and by regional organisations such as the Southern African Development Community. We will support them as we also continue to definitely support MONUSCO, insisting on an energetic execution of its mandate. Resolution 2348 must be implemented in full and the DRC authorities should allow MONUSCO to fulfil its entire mandate with the necessary resources. This includes the protection of civilians in the areas most affected by violence. We must also not forget the risks presented to DRC's neighbours and the need for contingency planning.

We will also maintain support to DRC and its people through projects and programmes. And we are, of course, if requested, ready to support the preparation of elections if progress is achieved, such as the successful completion of the voter roll, and a realistic calendar and budget.

Once again, please remain assured that despite the difficult situation, the European Union is ready and willing to take part in political and policy dialogue to the benefit of the rights and aspirations of all Congolese citizens.

Michael Gahler, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner very much for his statement, and I can say for my Group that we share his viewpoints and demands. The situation in the DRC is indeed terrible and it has been this way for quite a while, and I am deeply concerned about the handling of the current issue with regard to the Kasai province. You have rightly said that we have got 3.7 million internally displaced people, including the ones in the province of Kasai. Just three weeks ago, I had the privilege to speak as chair of the Delegation for Relations with the Pan-African Parliament (DPAP) in the Pan-African Parliament in Midrand, and I referred specifically to the situation in Kasai. After me, there were two other speakers from the DRC, and not a single one had the feeling that they would have to address this burning issue. That shows, in my mind, the attitude of those who are in charge there. As we speak, we've had a minister from the DRC, Liyota Ndjoli, who was contacting different MEPs here today, and I'm sure we have all given him the same message: fulfil the agreement of 31 December; prepare the elections properly. There is no way out, and if he says 'well, perhaps a month or two later', I will not accept; I think we should not accept anything unless there's really a broad consensus with all political stakeholders. When it's about one month more at the end I wouldn't bother, but I have the feeling rather that Mr Kabila does not, in real terms, have a true intention to leave his office and his position, where he still sits, so we must keep up our pressure and also apply the sanctions that have been referred to and make it very clear that there is no alternative to fulfilling what has been agreed.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente. Pues, una vez más, volvemos a hablar de la República Democrática del Congo en esta Cámara para volver a hablar de crisis política, de crisis humanitaria y de crisis de seguridad en la región. Las cifras ya las han dado mis colegas, y también el comisario.

La cuestión es que todo esto tiene un nombre, ya tiene un nombre. Es Kabila. Ya no podemos seguir ignorando que hay una situación que empeora día a día y que tiene mucho que ver con la nula intención de Kabila de dejar el poder. Entonces, nosotros tenemos que hacer algo, además de nuestras manifestaciones y de haber intentado un acuerdo político en diciembre de 2016, que no está funcionando, aunque yo estoy de acuerdo con el comisario en que es el único espacio que tenemos para negociar.

Tal vez, mantener las sanciones; tal vez, incrementarlas. Dar una respuesta a un bloqueo que está produciendo muchísimo sufrimiento en un país que ya sufre desde hace muchísimo tiempo un infierno en muchas de sus regiones y que espera una respuesta de la Unión Europea.

Mayores sanciones probablemente puedan tener mayores efectos.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, when discussing the Democratic Republic of the Congo in this Chamber six months ago, there was some hope that the deal brokered by the Catholic Bishops' Conference would pave the way for elections by the end of this year, ending the political stalemate, and President Kabila's 16 year-long rule.

Today, no progress has been made in implementing the terms of that agreement and the general security situation has actually worsened. This is particularly the case in the Kasai province, where security forces and members of the Kamuina Nsapu militia continue to clash regularly. Reports suggest that in the last five months, 500 people have been killed in the fighting and a further 1.3 million people have fled the area.

In North Kivu province, meanwhile, concerns remain about the activities of rebel groups including the March 23rd Movement and the Islamist militia known as Allied Democratic Forces. The latter has been accused by the government of being responsible for an attack on a prison just a couple of days ago – an attack in which 11 people were killed and over 900 prisoners escaped.

As similar security threats manifest themselves across the country, the urgency for President Kabila to go and to have fresh elections to be called becomes ever more necessary. Certainly, his justification that the country cannot afford elections is frankly ridiculous.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, gracias señor Stylianides, lo que ha dicho es absolutamente correcto, pero vamos a decir las cosas por su nombre:

Monusco no funciona.

Monusco es una burla; Monusco es un fraude carísimo: 17 000 soldados que no hacen otra cosa que ser turistas-soldado.

A siete kilómetros de Goma, las mujeres son violadas cuando salen del campo de refugiados para ir a buscar agua, porque los soldados de la Monusco, aunque tienen el mandato de neutralizar a los rebeldes y a las fuerzas armadas, son turistas-soldado —que patrullan los ejes principales y están acantonados—, porque sus mandos nacionales les prohíben intervenir.

El mandato existe; lo que es una burla es que cobren y no lo cumplan. Este es el primer problema.

El segundo problema es que las sanciones que se han establecido son para un corto número de personas que se dedican al tráfico, que es la logística de la guerra. Si no se actúa sobre la masa fundamental, sobre los líderes máximos del tráfico, no haremos absolutamente nada.

Y, en segundo lugar, ciertamente, el Gobierno del Congo es un gobierno que se fundamenta en la corrupción, en la violación de los derechos humanos. El acuerdo tomado por el grupo de obispos el 31 de diciembre de 2016 es fundamental. Pero lo que es fundamental es que el Gobierno de Kabila no juegue otra vez con un elemento que consiste, a través de tretas parlamentarias, en retrasar las elecciones —que ya dicen que se celebrarán en el primer trimestre de 2018, cuando tenían que celebrarse antes del 31 de diciembre de 2017—.

Y para que eso funcione, no hace falta legalidad, hace falta apretar las tuercas en los elementos decisivos: sanciones personales y económicas respecto de los activos de estas personas —que están fundamentalmente en el extranjero y en Europa también—, lo que les va afectar decisivamente.

Si no apretamos políticamente al corrupto Gobierno de Kabila, en el año 2018 seguiremos teniendo a Kabila y, aquí, otro debate para nada.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, c'est notre quatrième débat sur la République démocratique du Congo (RDC) en moins d'un an.

À la fin de l'année dernière, nous avons eu un vent d'espoir, mais la conférence épiscopale elle-même vient de jeter l'éponge et Joseph Kabila reste accroché au pouvoir. Ses récentes déclarations ne peuvent qu'inquiéter. «Il faut des élections parfaites», nous dit-il, et ajoute qu'il n'a rien promis. Nous restons sans voix. Les violations des droits de l'homme ne cessent de s'aggraver, y compris avec l'assassinat, vous l'avez dit, en mars dernier, des experts de l'ONU. Comment s'étonner alors de l'accroissement du nombre de déplacés et de réfugiés?

Nous savons tous, ici, que des entreprises multinationales présentes au Congo sont en partie responsables du financement des groupes armés qui opèrent sur place. Alors, au-delà du soutien de l'ONU et de l'aide humanitaire indispensable, il faut agir en utilisant notamment la législation sur les minerais du sang, même réduite à la portion congrue par le Conseil. Elle constitue un outil que l'Union doit utiliser pour passer des discours aux actes.

Jordi Solé, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, en janvier 2015, des manifestations ont éclaté dans plusieurs villes congolaises contre une tentative de modification de la loi électorale. Vingt-sept personnes ont été tuées. Déjà, à l'époque, l'Union européenne était au courant de la grave crise politique dans le pays, mais la Commission et le Conseil ont attendu presque deux ans pour agir et finalement imposer des mesures ciblées contre certaines autorités congolaises responsables de la répression de l'opposition et de graves violations des droits de l'homme.

En même temps, l'Union européenne s'est félicitée du dialogue national, une initiative visant à aider à l'organisation de l'élection présidentielle, mais qui s'avère plutôt une des nombreuses tentatives du président Kabila de reporter ces élections.

Depuis des années, les autorités congolaises ont violé des dispositions-clés de l'accord de Cotonou. Normalement, cela aurait dû déclencher il y a longtemps des consultations officielles au titre de l'article 86. Qu'est-ce qu'on attend?

Alors que le président Kabila n'a pas encore mis en œuvre les accords du mois de décembre, la situation politique, humanitaire et celle des droits de l'homme s'aggravent de plus en plus.

Il est temps que l'Union européenne s'engage plus activement et fortement au Congo afin d'éviter toute nouvelle escalade et toute nouvelle déstabilisation dans toute la région.

Ignazio Corrao, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, da inizio mandato ci siamo occupati tante volte della Repubblica democratica del Congo e per problemi di diversa entità e natura. Abbiamo leader politici che manipolano la Costituzione – come è capitato, lo possiamo chiamare leader politico – pur di restare in carica. Abbiamo regioni vastissime sotto il controllo dei mercenari armati, una grave e diffusa violazione dei diritti fondamentali, crimini internazionali, materie prime insanguinate. La situazione peggiora a vista d'occhio.

È vero che l'Unione europea non ha poteri cogenti in materia di politica estera, ma potrebbe agire con coerenza nei settori in cui è competente, penso soprattutto alle politiche commerciali. I problemi del Congo sono sicuramente complessi e non tutti riconducibili alle speculazioni messe in opera dalle multinazionali per poter approfittare di ingenti riserve di materiali preziosi a basso costo, ma questo è senz'altro uno dei fattori determinanti dell'instabilità del paese e sono certo che un'azione più decisa dell'Unione europea in materia di responsabilità delle multinazionali consentirebbe sensibili passi in avanti per il Congo e non solo. Il Congo è un paese ricco, signor Presidente, ricco da morire, nel significato però reale del termine.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nos résolutions soulignent à raison le bilan humain et humanitaire du conflit en République démocratique du Congo.

Toutefois, je crains qu'elles ne se trompent sur les causes de cette situation qui dure depuis 1998 et qui a déjà tué entre six et huit millions de personnes dans l'ensemble de l'Afrique des Grands Lacs.

En effet, qui a préparé, en Ouganda, l'opération dite «des rebelles»? Pas Joseph Kabila, ni même Laurent-Désiré Kabila, qu'on est allé chercher, mais les puissances occidentales.

Qui est responsable de l'exécution de Laurent-Désiré Kabila? Pas Joseph Kabila, les puissances occidentales.

Qui maintient le désordre pour pouvoir piller les ressources du pays? Pas Joseph Kabila, les puissances occidentales.

Qui laisse Paul Kagamé occuper l'est du pays pour exporter les minerais volés en RDC au Rwanda? Pas Joseph Kabila, les puissances occidentales.

Qui propose de rajouter de la déstabilisation derrière le formalisme démocratique? Toujours les puissances occidentales, pas Joseph Kabila.

Chers collègues, alors qu'une transition douce a été négociée par l'intermédiaire des évêques, certains d'entre vous sont plus intransigeants que l'opposition congolaise, alors que le président Kabila suit la Constitution, par les accords de la Saint-Sylvestre toujours en vigueur.

Vous êtes plus extrémistes que les Congolais en oubliant la finalité de ces accords, à savoir la stabilité, la sécurité de tous les Congolais.

Le 31 décembre, il y aura une transition. J'espère qu'elle se fera en faveur de la paix.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Jak już wielu wspominało, sytuacja w Demokratycznej Republice Konga gwałtownie pogorszyła się od zeszłego roku, kiedy prezydent Kabila złożył obietnicę przeprowadzenia demokratycznych wyborów do końca 2017 roku. Ale dzisiaj, po pół roku obiecujących negocjacji między Organizacją Narodów Zjednoczonych a kongijskim rządem, sytuacja w tym kraju daje wiele powodów do niepokoju.

Próby przedłużenia prezydentury przez Josepha Kabilę spowodowały, że życie ludzi staje się niepewne i zagrożone ze strony nie tylko armii, ale także grup rebelianckich czy bojówek. To zresztą często jest tolerowane przez stronę rządową. Oprócz tego kryzysu – o czym zresztą Pan Komisarz mówił – zamiast bezpieczeństwa mamy do czynienia z tragedią humanitarną, która dotyka prawie 7,5 mln mieszkańców tego kraju.

Raporty i doniesienia z Konga przedstawiają nam alarmujący stan, w jakim znalazło się to państwo. W kraju dochodzi do łamania praw człowieka, przestępstw na tle rasowym, etnicznym, wykorzystuje się dzieci w działaniach grup militarnych, dochodzi do przemocy wobec kobiet, itd. Nasz niepokój powodują także ataki na pracowników organizacji świadczących pomoc humanitarną.

Sądzę, że stabilność polityczna w tym regionie jest bardzo ważna i może nam także pomóc w przyszłej pomocy rozwojowej, nie tylko humanitarnej, i nie tylko w tym regionie, ale na całym kontynencie afrykańskim. Dlatego nasze działania i ta rezolucja są bardzo potrzebne i powinniśmy uczestniczyć w tych aktywnych działaniach dążących do powstrzymania kryzysu politycznego w Kongu.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la situation humanitaire et sécuritaire en République démocratique du Congo se détériore fortement. Dans le Kasai, pourtant autrefois pacifique, les violences et les répressions font rage. Depuis août 2016, les exécutions sommaires, les meurtres d'enfants, le recrutement d'enfants soldats, les violences sexuelles frappent les populations civiles.

Ces violences qui impliquent miliciens, soldats et policiers ont fait plus de 400 morts. Plus de 40 fosses communes ont été découvertes, 400 000 enfants risquent la famine, plus d'un million et demi de Congolais ont fui la région.

Cette crise dans le Kasai se joue sur fond de ce qui devrait être une transition politique prévue par l'accord du 31 décembre 2016 et qui peine à voir le jour. Même si l'enrôlement des électeurs semble s'accélérer, l'adoption des lois électorales et la mise en place du Conseil national de suivi de l'accord sont autant de défis auxquels les autorités congolaises doivent répondre par la tenue d'élections libres, transparentes et démocratiques.

Dans un contexte grave, le Parlement européen appelle les autorités congolaises et la communauté internationale à tout mettre en œuvre afin de respecter la totalité des engagements pris dans l'accord de la Saint-Sylvestre, en ce compris la fixation d'un calendrier clair et précis pour la tenue des élections, sans modification de la Constitution.

Par ailleurs, nous appelons à la mise en place d'une enquête internationale sur les violences dans le Kasai afin que les auteurs de ces crimes puissent assumer leurs responsabilités.

Enfin, le Parlement européen soutient également les sanctions ciblées mises en place par l'Union à l'égard des responsables de graves violations des droits de l'homme.

Je rappelle aussi que c'est au gouvernement de garantir la sécurité de sa population et qu'il en a la responsabilité. Par conséquent, nous appelons à la responsabilité du gouvernement Kabila de protéger sa population.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, I share the Commissioner's assessment of the situation. I would like to stress several issues though. Firstly, the necessity to implement a political agenda based on the Accord of December 2016, the strengthening of the MONUSCO performance, full implementation of the UN Security Council mandate without national caveats, as well as the important implementation of an independent investigation of violations of humanitarian and human rights law.

There is one other item as well: the criminal aspects of mining for minerals in Congo, a possible spillover effect and the necessity to strengthen the rules of international trade applied in Congo.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, traemos aquí la preocupante situación de la República Democrática del Congo. Las cifras ya se han dado: más de 7 millones de personas, de las cuales 4,4 millones son niños, necesitan educación, servicios médicos, asistencia y agua potable; casi 6 millones tienen problemas de alimentación y hay muchísimos desplazados tanto interna como externamente por la situación de conflictividad.

Estamos, por lo tanto, ante una situación de máxima urgencia humanitaria y —como ha dicho bien el comisario— en la que se conculcan a diario los derechos humanos. La conflictividad es diaria, hay torturas, hay secuestros, hay violaciones, hay violaciones sexuales y hay una extrema violencia por parte de todos los sectores. Preocupa, y mucho, la desproporción de la actuación de las fuerzas armadas de la propia República Democrática del Congo.

El país está pendiente de elecciones. Es necesario que la Unión Europea fuerce el diálogo para que cuanto antes se pueda tener un Gobierno legitimado democráticamente en la República Democrática del Congo. No podemos ser —y sé que no lo vamos a ser— meros observadores de una situación en la que se conculcan a diario los derechos humanos y en la que nosotros, la Unión Europea, queremos ser los que representen los valores de la paz y la seguridad. Condenamos, por lo tanto, todas esas violaciones y especialmente vemos con preocupación esa violencia y ese uso desproporcionado de ella por parte de los propios órganos estatales.

La falta de libertad de expresión se produce también en Ruanda. Tuvimos una Resolución aquí en la que pedimos la liberación de Victoire Ingabire. Pues lo mismo también para la República Democrática del Congo. Y hay que señalar la necesidad de que se establezca la misión de las Naciones Unidas para que realmente pueda ejercer su mandato y pueda llegar la ayuda humanitaria a todas las zonas.

En definitiva, hay que investigar hasta el final todos los crímenes, identificar a los responsables y llevar a la República Democrática del Congo a un verdadero gobierno democrático.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, l'article 52 de la Constitution congolaise dispose: «Tous les Congolais ont droit à la paix et à la sécurité.» Pourtant, la violence et l'insécurité se répandent sur l'ensemble du territoire national.

Articles 23 et 24: «Toute personne a droit à la liberté d'expression et d'information.» Pourtant, toute voix qui s'exprime contre le régime en place est violemment réprimée.

Article 15: «La violence sexuelle est érigée en crime contre l'humanité.» Pourtant, des milliers de femmes en RDC n'ont toujours pas trouvé justice.

Article 58: «Tous les Congolais ont le droit de jouir des richesses nationales.» Pourtant, l'État ne garantit aucune redistribution équitable.

Article 47: «Le droit à la santé et à la sécurité alimentaire est garanti.» Pourtant, 400 000 enfants au Kasai sont actuellement victimes d'une catastrophe humanitaire.

Enfin, article 70: «Le mandat du Président de la République est renouvelable une seule fois.» Et pourtant, à ce jour, aucune date pour les élections n'a été décidée.

La RDC doit se réapproprier son avenir et devenir la plus grande nation démocratique et prospère qu'elle aurait dû être depuis longtemps.

La résolution du Parlement européen exige des réponses à toutes ces violations systématiques des principes constitutionnels.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – In maart werden in de Kasai-provincie de lichamen van Zaïda Catalan en Michael Sharp teruggevonden. De 2 VN-experts werden vermoord door militieleden of Congolese militairen. Ze waren er net erop uitgestuurd om aanwijzingen te vinden voor het pas opgelaaide geweld. Intussen werden 20 massagraven ontdekt en spreken bronnen van 1 500 doden. Het had ook helemaal anders kunnen zijn voor de burgers in Kasai. De mogelijkheden om een welvarend stukje Afrika te worden zijn enorm. Kasai is rijk aan mineralen en vruchtbaar landbouwgebied. De doden van Kasai zijn een symptoom van het echte probleem. Congo is een stuurloos schip met een graaiende elite, een verdeeld leger en een onzichtbare president die zich wel vastklampt aan zijn positie. De massale ontsnapping uit de gevangenis van Bukavu in Zuid-Kivu afgelopen zondag is daar nog maar eens het bewijs van. Het politieke systeem in Congo heeft gefaald. Het is failliet, net als de internationale gemeenschap. Die kijkt toe. Die reageert af en toe maar is voor het overige volledig verdeeld en dus machteloos. Het volk van Kasai heeft niets aan internationale veroordelingen zonder gevolgen.

Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE). – Señor presidente, esta Resolución es la voz firme de este Parlamento que se une a los gritos de dolor de tantas mujeres y niñas violadas, niños utilizados como soldados y personas desplazadas que huyen de la violencia que afecta a la República Democrática del Congo desde hace más de veinte años.

Poco ha durado la esperanza del acuerdo político firmado entre Kabila y la oposición. El acuerdo no avanza; lo que sí avanza es el miedo de una población que huye de la violencia, provocada por quienes deberían evitarla. Estamos hablando de crímenes de guerra, cometidos por quienes arrebatan los niños a sus familias para utilizarlos como soldados. También estamos hablando de miles de mujeres y niñas violadas.

Congo es conocido como la capital mundial de las violaciones. Muchísimas son las madres que pasan las noches en vela para salvar a sus hijas de los violadores que las marcarán para el resto de sus vidas. Nadie defiende los derechos de las víctimas porque la corrupción generalizada y el difícil acceso a la justicia hacen que madres, como la de una pequeña violada, terminen acusadas de haber entregado a su hija a los violadores.

Conozco testimonios mucho más atroces, pero necesitaría una hora y no un minuto para citarlos.

En defensa de una población que agoniza, la Unión Europea debe seguir presionando. Quienes tenemos la fortuna de vivir en libertad, debemos luchar por aquellos que, como en el Congo, viven en la esclavitud del miedo. Las condenas, señor comisario, son necesarias, pero la acción y las sanciones lo son aún más.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, si sono riaffacciati i vecchi fantasmi in Congo, in preda a violente tensioni interne che stanno sfociando in un conflitto aperto. Da una parte lo stallo della situazione politica, dall'altra gli scontri nella provincia del Kasai, con la scoperta di numerose fosse comuni. In mezzo i civili, l'umanità dolente di un popolo che non ha mai conosciuto una transizione pacifica del potere e che non usufruisce delle grandi ricchezze del sottosuolo.

Quello spiraglio di dialogo con l'accordo di San Silvestro si è chiuso. Sei mesi dopo quell'intesa è su un binario morto e ciò ha prodotto violenze nel Kivu e nel Nord, nell'Ituri fino al ricchissimo Katanga, nel Sud, per arrivare al dramma del Kasai. Violenze assurde e diritti umani calpestati che reclamano verità. Non è più tollerabile questa situazione. Io spero che ci sia consapevolezza nell'Unione europea e nella comunità internazionale che è necessario oggi, rapidamente più che mai, mettere in atto le azioni per garantire una transizione politica. Il Congo ha bisogno di questo.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Mr President, from a feministic point of view, I would like to stress that the sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo remains extremely serious due to its scale and systematic nature. The victims, in the majority women and children, endure rapes often associated with other atrocities, such as mutilation, forced participation of family members in rape, gang rape and sexual slavery. Conflict-related sexual violence contributes to an increase in the levels of gender-based violence in general, and this lasts for generations if appropriate action is not taken. Therefore, I support the mandate of the UN to protect the population from armed groups and women from rape and other sexual violence. I call on the Congolese Government to end the impunity of the perpetrators of sexual violence. I ask for an end to the violations of human rights in Congo.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, com a manutenção forçada no poder por parte de Kabila, apoiada na controversa decisão do Tribunal Constitucional, a violência voltou à República Democrática do Congo e estamos a assistir a um deteriorar das condições de vida e da segurança no país. Desde 2016, mais de um milhão de pessoas foram obrigadas a deslocar-se da sua residência. Este número é superior ao número de refugiados na Síria. Toda esta instabilidade criou uma crise de segurança generalizada.

Em simultâneo, o surto de ébola regressou ao Congo, generalizando o terror e o medo de contágio desta doença mortífera, que assolou alguns países de África no passado recente. A comunidade internacional e, particularmente, a União Europeia devem ter um papel preponderante e firme na defesa do Acordo de São Silvestre, firmado em dezembro de 2016 sob a égide dos bispos, permitindo chegar a novembro com condições para que se realize um processo eleitoral livre, transparente e sem incidentes.

Temos de estar vigilantes para não sermos cúmplices, por omissão, de mais uma crise humanitária em África.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome the fact that the EU has imposed sanctions against many of those responsible for violence in the DRC, but the rest of the world, as we have heard, is standing by while mass grave after mass grave is being uncovered in Kasai.

Just three questions. Firstly, three million people are displaced in the DRC, half a million children are at risk of malnutrition, where is the global outrage? The UN is struggling to raise 60 million in emergency funds. How can we ensure that funding targets are met and humanitarian access is secured?

Secondly, accountability. We do need to assist in gathering evidence and building cases to bring those responsible for murdering civilians to justice.

Thirdly, addressing the root causes is crucial, not just in Kasai, but the entire DRC is mired in crisis. President Kabila, as we have heard, is part of the problem and we need serious international pressure to kick-start the electoral process.

I urge you to put this on the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Council on the 19th and deliver a strategy to tackle the crisis, together with our international partners. Failing this, destabilisation of the entire Central African region will force its way up the agenda in a matter of mere months.

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, a disputa pelo controlo dos imensos recursos naturais do país e a violência étnica na República Democrática do Congo geraram uma das piores crises humanitárias da nossa história recente que não podemos silenciar.

O balanço é dramático: mais de 5 000 000 de mortos, 3 700 000 de deslocados internos, campos de refugiados sobrelotados e centenas de milhares de pessoas vítimas de fome, doenças e epidemias, incluindo, agora, o regresso do flagelo do ébola.

As mulheres e as crianças são, como na maioria dos conflitos, as principais vítimas do terror da vida quotidiana naquele país. A violação e o assassinato de mulheres converteram-se em algo habitual. Meio milhão de menores de cinco anos padecem de desnutrição aguda e milhares de outras crianças sacrificam a sua infância, tornando-se meninos-soldados.

A inação e o silêncio do Presidente Joseph Kabila face a estas atrocidades contra o seu próprio povo e o aumento de raptos e ataques contra os trabalhadores e caravanas de ajuda humanitária são inadmissíveis.

A União Europeia deve, por isso, prorrogar a aplicação de sanções contra os responsáveis por estas graves violações de direitos humanos, como, aliás, referiu o Sr. Comissário, e pela sabotagem do processo democrático na República Democrática do Congo e apelar ao Presidente Kabila para que acelere o cumprimento da sua promessa e convoque eleições presidenciais até ao final deste ano, assegurando as condições para que este ato eleitoral seja livre, transparente e credível.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, I am gravely concerned about the growing violence and political instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo. It is a situation that is having a terribly bad influence in all the neighbouring countries, and I call on the EU to take the necessary measures and action for the de-escalation of tensions in that country.

The Congolese authorities must work to address the current security and humanitarian crisis, ensuring political stability and full respect for human rights in the Congolese Constitution. A peaceful, transparent, smooth and timely conducting of the next presidential and legislative elections are vital for the security of the Great Lakes region. We must recall the commitments made by the Democratic Republic of Congo under the Cotonou Agreement to respect democracy, the rule of law and human rights. These things are not happening, unfortunately. I strongly believe that respect for democracy, peace and the peaceful transfer of power must now be a priority for all political forces in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η δραματική κατάσταση που επικρατεί στη Λαϊκή Δημοκρατία του Κονγκό δημιουργεί όλο και περισσότερες ανησυχίες. Είναι ένα θέμα το οποίο έχουμε συζητήσει επανειλημμένα εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και κάθε φορά που συζητούμε το ζήτημα, η κατάσταση χειροτερεύει. Παραβιάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, διώξεις κατά των αντιφρονούντων, δολοφονίες, συλλήψεις, απαγόρευση της ελευθερίας του λόγου και της ελευθερίας του συνέρχεσθαι, τεράστιες ανθρωπιστικές επιπτώσεις. Έχουμε πλέον τρισημίσι εκατομμύρια πρόσφυγες, ενάμισι εκατομμύριο στο Κασάι, και υποσιτισμό των παιδιών. Πολλά παιδιά πλέον έχουν μετατραπεί σε στρατιώτες, γεγονός το οποίο αποτελεί, βεβαίως, και ποινικό αδίκημα. Από εκεί και πέρα, αυτή η κατάσταση θα συνεχίζεται διότι ο Καμπιλά είναι γαντζωμένος στην εξουσία, παραβιάζει τη Συμφωνία του Κοτονού, δεν θέλει να κάνει εκλογές και για αυτό δημιουργείται αυτή η κατάσταση, η οποία χειροτερεύει, διότι οι ίδιες οι εξορκτικές εταιρείες είναι πλέον κράτος εν κράτει, μια και είναι τεράστιος ο πλούτος στη Λαϊκή Δημοκρατία του Κονγκό. Χρειάζονται αποφασιστικές παρεμβάσεις, κύριε Επίτροπε.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cosa resta ormai dell'RDC? Mi viene da dire solo la geografia, visto che di repubblica e di democratico ormai nell'RDC c'è rimasto veramente ben poco. Questa crisi in realtà ha un nome e un cognome preciso, quello di Joseph Kabila, e la sua pretesa di violare la Costituzione rinviando le elezioni, insieme al suo entourage, con ogni mezzo, per restare al potere e continuare a sfruttare le immense risorse di un paese ricchissimo e al tempo stesso poverissimo.

L'accordo del 31 dicembre 2016 deve essere attuato, ma purtroppo i colloqui sono ancora in fase di stallo, mentre il paese sprofonda in un inferno di violenza, di negazione dei diritti e delle libertà fondamentali, di bambini soldato, stupri di massa, denutrizione, crimini di guerra e contro l'umanità. Chiediamo che venga finalmente applicato l'accordo di Cotonou, anche il suo articolo 96, che resta spesso un accordo di parole e non di fatti.

L'Unione deve fare la sua parte come mediatore e deve fare la sua parte con ogni forma di pressione diplomatica affinché si garantisca una transizione politica e pacifica vera verso elezioni che siano anche credibili. Il grido di dolore del popolo congolese non può e non deve essere per noi soltanto un'eco lontana.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, we had a very rich exchange and I am very grateful to the honourable Members for their valuable interventions. It bears testimony to the EU attachment to the resolution of the crisis in the DRC.

The European Union's link with the DRC is a link between citizens, between families and between communities. We care about the situation in this great country at the heart of Africa, so we want to do whatever we can using the tools at our disposal. First, to accompany the Congolese people through the current crisis; secondly, to support them and build accountable institutions that will stand the test of time; and third, to help them deliver good governance and, of course, a sustainable democracy.

From this debate, I conclude that we all share a common interest in engaging with the DRC authorities in order to carry the transition forward until the elections, provided that there is increased respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. If this is not the case, we will draw the consequences. So we will continue following closely the situation in the DRC in every dimension.

I completely agree with you that one of the most important issues is humanitarian access. I know this issue well because of my responsibility in my mandate, my portfolio, and as I discussed with some of you, I will try hard to find ways to reach vulnerable people in all regions of the DRC. This is why I have humanitarian access as a top priority, because it is the only way to provide humanitarian assistance to all people of the DRC. At the same time, I completely agree with you that we must keep up our pressure in every dimension in order to see as soon as possible democratic elections. It is the only pathway in order to see a better future for the Congolese people. At the same time, I greatly appreciate Parliament's essential role in keeping the DRC on the international agenda. I can assure you that we will continue to use all tools at our disposal to assist in bringing a durable solution to the current crisis, and I engage to keep you fully informed on developments, in particular on humanitarian access. Thank you very much for this very rich exchange.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo, Panie Komisarzu. Jak Pan odnotował, nieczęsto się zdarza, by wypowiedź zamykająca spotkała się z brawami, a to się zdarzyło dzisiaj. Gratuluję Panu.

Otrzymałem sześć projektów rezolucji złożonych zgodnie z art. 123 ust. 2 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w środę 14 czerwca 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), *per iscritto.* – La situazione politica e sociale nella Repubblica democratica del Congo, è seriamente preoccupante. Essa risente della repressione politica e dei continui conflitti, che si sono reiterati nel tempo. Negli ultimi anni sono stati riportati numerosi casi di violazione dei diritti umani, riguardanti soprattutto le libertà di espressione, di riunione e di manifestazione, l'aumento dei processi per motivi politici e l'uso della forza, durante manifestazioni pacifiche. È assolutamente necessario, che venga istituita una commissione d'inchiesta indipendente, che faccia luce sui terribili fatti avvenuti in passato e faccia pressione sul governo congolese, affinché rispetti, promuova e tuteli le libertà fondamentali, quale fondamento della democrazia.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), *in writing*. – I support the call for the EU to ensure free and fair elections by the end of the year. In accordance with the Congolese Constitution, elections should have taken place in 2016, but President Kabila has made every possible effort to postpone these elections. The Constitution states that a president cannot serve for more than two terms; as such President Kabila is not permitted to serve a third term. I express deep concern over the mass graves discovered in the Grand Kasai region and the resurgence of violence in the northern and eastern parts of the DRC. I firmly condemn all acts of violence and human rights abuses in the country, regardless of the perpetrator, and call for the launch of an independent international investigation.

12. Humanitarno stanje u Jemenu (rasprava)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji / wysokiej przedstawiciel Unii do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa w sprawie sytuacji humanitarnej w Jemenu (2017/2727 (RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, you know well that for over two years, the war in Yemen has devastated the country's infrastructure and undermined its social fabric. Yemen was already one of the least developed nations in the world. After years of hostilities, we are now facing a daunting catastrophe where millions of lives are at stake, and this is now unfortunately aggravated by a severe cholera outbreak.

As you know, the war in Yemen has caused one of the worst humanitarian crises – perhaps the very worst. According to the UN, one child is dying of hunger in Yemen every 10 minutes – a shocking number. Some 20 million people face the grim prospect of famine. The European Union, and now the Member States, recently pledged EUR 430 million in humanitarian aid, out of a total of over EUR 1 billion pledges at the Geneva pledging Conference in April. I was there; I represented the European Union, and I saw the fatigue of the international community regarding the humanitarian crisis across the world, but again the European Union was the biggest donor in this crisis.

I agree totally with the UN Secretary-General that it is now time for urgent action. These pledges must be translated immediately into the concrete action that the people of Yemen need and deserve.

Humanitarian access remains an issue for the international community. For this reason, we have reached out to the warring parties to push for facilitated access to the populations in need, while requesting an end to all violations of International Humanitarian Law. But the EU cannot act alone; there must be a truly concerted international effort, and we will continue to actively promote it. We have always maintained, and we continue to believe, that there can be no military solution to this crisis. It is an illusion. As clearly stated in the EU Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions on Yemen of April 2017, we aim to continue to work with all parties towards a sustained cessation of hostilities. This is the first step. This should be monitored by the United Nations, and would serve as a first step towards the resumption of peace talks under the leadership of the UN.

We offer, as the European Union, our full support to the efforts to relaunch the political negotiations. We are ready to do all we can to create the conditions that would enable both sides to de-escalate and move towards a solution. The European Union has been involved in sponsoring a number of Track II and peacebuilding initiatives, and will step up its efforts in this regard. But it is essential that all international and regional actors engage constructively and in a coordinated manner.

We have been providing considerable humanitarian assistance. Although there is no peace deal yet, the European Union and other development actors are already preparing the ground for early recovery and reconstruction in areas where access is possible. There are people in need who cannot wait until the war is over, as always. To complete this, we need to reactivate our development cooperation and prepare for the necessary future intervention. If we want peace, we must prepare for it. In this manner, we will be ready to effectively contribute to the re-building of Yemen when the moment comes. We will need to focus on sustainable job creation and improved livelihoods.

The war in Yemen is no longer a domestic or even a regional affair. We believe that the gradual destruction of the country's infrastructure and social fabric is a major destabilising factor for the international community as a whole. Vast areas are already controlled by terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda and Da'esh. Crucial maritime routes are endangered by the hostilities, and there is a real danger that piracy will re-emerge. The nature of the conflict is being exploited to fan the flames of sectarianism. These are all threats to international security that the European Union is determined to tackle, together with likeminded partners. You know very well the new development in the region: the new dispute between Qatar and other regional countries. Federica Mogherini, the High Representative, has involved the whole college – this is something very important in order to evaluate the situation in the new current circumstances.

IN THE CHAIR: ILDIKÓ GÁLL-PELCZ

Vice-President

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, des milliers de morts et de blessés, des attaques sans merci contre les civils, une situation humanitaire désastreuse, avec des cas de malnutrition, de famine, de choléra, voici en quelques mots la triste réalité du Yémen aujourd'hui.

Les Yéménites vivent une guerre civile terrifiante et assistent à l'effondrement de leurs institutions. Nous savons tous que ce vide du pouvoir est un terrain fertile pour l'implantation des organisations terroristes. Je pense, ici, à la montée en force d'Al-Qaïda au Yémen, mais également aux organisations terroristes chiïtes.

Au-delà du Yémen, la stabilité de toute la région est en péril, car, comme nous le savons tous, il s'agit d'une guerre par procuration entre l'Iran et l'Arabie saoudite, une confrontation de plus en plus compliquée avec l'évolution récente au Qatar.

Que pouvons-nous faire? L'aide humanitaire de l'Union est indispensable, mais la situation humanitaire ne pourra s'améliorer tant que le conflit restera ouvert. L'Union et ses États membres devraient peser davantage sur le plan diplomatique en facilitant notamment le processus de paix sous l'égide des Nations unies. Nous devons coordonner nos efforts avec d'autres acteurs, et les pays du Golfe sont inévitables dans ce contexte. Puis, nous devons nous concentrer, d'un autre côté, sur plusieurs axes: un arrêt des combats, ainsi que le rétablissement du fonctionnement de l'aéroport de Sanaa et du port de Hodeïda, car ce sont des points d'accès essentiels pour permettre le passage de l'aide humanitaire.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, en torno a dieciocho millones de personas, dos tercios del país, sufren hambre en Yemen y requieren ayuda humanitaria urgente, porque la hambruna lo es sin precedentes. Dos millones y medio de niños y niñas sufren malnutrición aguda. Enfermedades fácilmente prevenibles están acabando con la población, el cólera arrecia y la situación es completamente desesperada para la infancia.

Hoy Yemen es el país del mundo con más vidas en peligro y, sin embargo, no se habla de Yemen. La pregunta es por qué no se abren los informativos europeos con noticias sobre Yemen. Es por eso por lo que el Grupo socialista ha querido traer este debate a esta Cámara. Porque ya era hora de que habláramos de Yemen. Un país que se está debatiendo entre la catástrofe total y la tragedia, algo que es perfectamente evitable, porque catástrofe y tragedia en Yemen están hechas por la mano del ser humano. No vienen de la naturaleza.

El país está atrapado en intereses de potencias regionales que usan Yemen como tablero para su propia partida geopolítica, que se está complicando cada día más. Es un enorme fracaso de la diplomacia internacional y será una gran vergüenza en los libros de Historia. Si no reaccionamos urgentemente, también será nuestra responsabilidad.

Queremos que la Unión Europea sea más activa e influyente en la búsqueda de una solución a esta tragedia. Y queremos que se anime al diálogo intrayemení, también para reconstruir la confianza entre las partes.

Hay pocos actores en el mundo con la capacidad de la Unión Europea para poder tratar de resolver la terrible situación por la que está atravesando ese país, y debemos comprometernos todos a actuar.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the suffering of people in Yemen is unbearable. I had hoped never again to see images of children dying of malnutrition and cholera, especially not in 2017. So much of this war and starvation is man-made, yet women and children suffer disproportionately.

The violence that has broken out has devastating consequences and will not likely lead to a clear outcome. Instead, everything must be done to find a negotiated solution, not only in the interest of the Yemeni people, but also to avoid a spillover into an already fragile and explosive region and to avoid a breeding ground for more violent extremism. It is high time – and this is a real appeal to the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Member States – that the EU develops a common position vis-à-vis Yemen, and at least that Member States stop exporting weapons to Saudi Arabia, which, together with the coalition, continues to indiscriminately bomb civilians and block the ports of Hodeidah, which in turn exacerbates the humanitarian situation.

Of course, the Iranian side must also stop fighting a proxy war in Yemen. Last year, this House called for an arms embargo to Saudi Arabia because of its role in Yemen. It is a very important signal that we must repeat, and at least the call of last year is still very valid if we look at the incredible and unnecessary suffering of millions and millions of people. I think the EU must do more, develop a shared position and step up its efforts to end this disgusting war and the humanitarian suffering in Yemen.

Ángela Vallina, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, Yemen es un polvorín y actualmente sabemos que hay 18,8 millones de personas —más del 70 % de la población— que necesitan ayuda humanitaria; 6,8 millones sufren hambruna y 10 millones de niños, según Unicef, necesitan ayuda humanitaria.

Ya van dos años de guerra civil con miles de muertos, heridos o mutilados, con dos millones de desplazados, ataques contra la población civil y personal de ayuda humanitaria, violaciones, uso de niños soldados y un largo etcétera de crímenes que deberían ser investigados de forma independiente.

La única solución posible es el diálogo, un diálogo entre las partes que debe ser auspiciado por las Naciones Unidas.

Pero aquí no vale la doble moral. Y cuando digo esto me refiero principalmente al papel de la Unión Europea. Condenamos estos días la situación en Yemen al mismo tiempo que sabemos que países como el Reino Unido, España —mi propio país—, Francia, Italia o Alemania siguen vendiendo armas a Arabia Saudí. No digamos ya los Estados Unidos, que están detrás —y todos lo sabemos— de ataques indiscriminados contra la población civil de Yemen.

El fin de las hostilidades no va a venir con intervenciones unilaterales, con la continuidad de la venta de armas ni con la instrumentalización de las diferencias religiosas para instigar crisis políticas y guerras sectarias que alimentan intereses bastante espurios, hay que decirlo. Solo se podrá lograr reforzando la diplomacia y el multilateralismo.

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Seit der bewaffnete Konflikt im Jemen 2015 eskaliert, hat sich die humanitäre Katastrophe dramatisch verschärft. Sieben Millionen Menschen sind akut von einer Hungersnot bedroht. Mehr als zwei Millionen Kinder leiden an Unterernährung. Eine Choleraepidemie breitet sich aus. Angesichts dieser sich zuspitzenden Katastrophe begrüße ich es sehr, dass die Europäische Union auf der Jemen-Geberkonferenz beschlossen hat, weitere Hilfsmaßnahmen in Höhe von 116 Millionen zu geben.

Der Hunger im Jemen ist kriegsbedingt. Daher reicht aber die humanitäre Hilfe nicht aus. Die EU muss entschiedener handeln, um den bewaffneten Konflikt zu beenden. Ganz konkret bedeutet dies, dass es keine Waffenlieferungen an die Konfliktparteien einschließlich Saudi-Arabien geben darf.

Das Europäische Parlament hat sich bereits im Februar 2016 für ein Waffenembargo gegen Saudi-Arabien ausgesprochen. Trotzdem liefern zahlreiche EU-Staaten weiterhin Waffen an den Golfstaat. Damit muss Schluss sein! Wer Waffen an Kriegsparteien liefert, riskiert eine Mitschuld an Kriegsverbrechen. Die EU muss eine politische Lösung unter Führung der UN unterstützen. Sie, Herr Kommissar, haben zahlreiche solche Initiativen aufgeführt.

Abschließend möchte ich auf eine massive Repression gegen die Zivilgesellschaft hinweisen: So sind seit zwei Jahren zehn Journalisten in Gefangenschaft von Huthi-Kämpfern, und auch hier muss sich die EU für deren sofortige Freilassung einsetzen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il presidente Trump che chiude un accordo di vendita di armi con l'Arabia Saudita per un totale di 320 miliardi di euro. Una nuova epidemia di colera che ha colpito più di 80 000 persone, causando 676 morti, e la prospettiva che fino a 200 000 persone vengano contagiate nei prossimi mesi.

I continui bombardamenti di una coalizione di Stati, guidati proprio dall'Arabia Saudita – 320 quelli verificati dall'ONU –, bombardamenti indiscriminati, spesso e volentieri anche su obiettivi civili, con bombe comprate anche dalle industrie belliche di alcuni Stati membri dell'Unione, tra cui quella italiana, della quale l'Arabia Saudita è il sesto cliente a livello mondiale. L'ultimo di questi bombardamenti ha colpito proprio un centro di trattamento per i pazienti affetti da colera, domenica notte, uccidendo e ferendo un numero imprecisato di persone. Un bambino muore ogni dieci minuti, dato confermato sempre dall'ONU. I dati sono spaventosi: 3 milioni di rifugiati interni, 10 000 morti e 44 000 feriti dall'inizio delle ostilità. Si tratta della più grande crisi umanitaria di questo secolo, con oltre 9,6 milioni di bambini che necessitano di assistenza umanitaria.

Questo è quello che avviene in Yemen: una guerra per procura, un massacro sotto silenzio. Forse perché non è implicata la Russia, forse perché i rifugiati, a differenza di altri casi che ben conosciamo, sono tutti interni, bloccati dalla geografia del paese, incastonato tra deserto e oceano, e quindi per qualcuno ci riguardano meno. Lo Yemen è un paese a pezzi, distrutto. Quello che era uno dei più antichi centri di civiltà del mondo intero, dove nacque e morì il Regno di Saba, ormai è soltanto macerie. Di questa situazione soffrono i civili e ne approfittano i terroristi, che come un virus prendono potere e si allargano nel paese.

Abbiamo stanziato 116 milioni di euro, ma ne servirebbero oltre 2 miliardi. Fare di più, quindi, ma soprattutto questo non basta. Abbiamo votato l'anno scorso, a febbraio, un embargo sugli armamenti verso l'Arabia Saudita. Questo è l'unico vero segnale forte e necessario, uno dei pochi strumenti che abbiamo a disposizione per mostrare che siamo seri, ma anche qui molti vogliono il *business as usual* e allora si diventa complici.

Noi chiediamo una soluzione politica, l'unica accettabile sebbene estremamente difficile, e i bambini invece continuano a morire, uno ogni dieci minuti. E quelle bombe sono anche bombe europee.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, two years since the conflict began, Yemen is suffering from an extreme humanitarian crisis. Two million people have been displaced, and over half of the country's population lacks access to safe drinking water or sufficient food supplies. Last month, as has been mentioned, saw the outbreak of a cholera epidemic which has already affected upwards of 100 000 people and claimed the lives of another 800. With humanitarian assistance already struggling to reach those in need, there is continued concern that the Houthi-held port of Hodeidah may be the target of an attack on the Saudi-led coalition. Given that approximately 75% of Yemen's food supplies enter the country via this port, the devastating consequences of its destruction cannot be underestimated. The campaign continues to be marked by the disproportionate level of civilian casualties and very poor targeting of Saudi ordinance in their air campaign. The growing footprint of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) in parts of Yemen is also of grave concern, as are reports that suggest that the Saudi coalition has coordinated its attacks against the Houthis alongside AQAP. This is particularly worrying given the new US Administration's continued hints that it may seek to play a more decisive role in supporting the Saudi-led coalition.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías. La verdad es que no hay palabras para describir la situación que se está viviendo en Yemen. Las cifras son terribles: miles de muertos y, especialmente, la situación de los niños. Dos millones de niños desplazados; quinientos mil niños faltos de nutrición, utilizados como niños soldados. Verdaderamente es una situación horrible, complicada, además, con una pandemia de cólera.

¿Qué podemos hacer nosotros, como Parlamento Europeo, ante esta situación?

Pues, aparte de aprobar resoluciones, creo que -como decía el comisario- tenemos que incentivar la acción de la Unión Europea, apoyar los esfuerzos del enviado especial del secretario general de las Naciones Unidas y aliviar el sufrimiento de las partes.

Pero es importante que atendamos también las causas del conflicto y, sobre todo, instar al cese de la violencia, monitorizado también por las Naciones Unidas, y apoyar claramente esos esfuerzos en favor de la paz.

Y, señora presidenta, no deberíamos olvidar la impunidad en las graves violaciones de los derechos humanos que se están produciendo en Yemen. Y quisiera recordar la importancia que tiene para todos nosotros un Yemen seguro, estable y pacífico, precisamente para combatir la violencia y para combatir el extremismo en la región.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Madam President, the conflict in Yemen has devastated the lives of millions of people and turned into a major humanitarian crisis. The country is slipping into famine, and this can only get worse as the conflict continues. And as you rightly mentioned before, now we have the cholera outbreak – another major tragedy; a blow into the eyes of humanity. The most important thing to emphasise here is that the two sides are starving because of the war; this is a manmade disaster, and it is very brutal on civilians. Both parties are turning starvation into a war instrument – just a war weapon. In addition, I have – and we have – the uncomfortable feeling that the international community and public opinion are turning their eyes from that dramatic conflict, attracted by other major global events.

It is a civilian war that is fuelled and supported by regional actors, a bloody image of a Shia-Sunni conflict in the Middle East. Why it is important today to underline this fact? Because this conflict can be ended with goodwill and with the support of other major regional and global actors, including the European Union, and it's right to mention that Iran and Saudi Arabia – both being more or less our partners – should pay attention and should assume their regional responsibilities, because the responsibility there is bearing on their shoulders. It's equally important to mention that they can destroy and they can devastate the whole region if the conflict will only continue.

It is dangerous today to take a side and, at the end of the day, the only thing which we should care about is human life. For that reason, I call first for pressure to be put on the two sides to stop the conflict immediately and to allow the humanitarian and medical aid; secondly, for full funding for the humanitarian response to be assured; and finally, the European Union should have a more important role in the political transition of Yemen.

Bas Belder (ECR). – De eurocommissaris heeft terecht gewezen op het feit dat in deze oorlogschao in Jemen al-Qaeda en ISIS zich breed maken, en zich steeds breder maken. En gezien de geografische ligging van Jemen en de lange arm van deze terreurorganisaties raken ook Europese veiligheidsbelangen hier rechtstreeks bij betrokken. Eén punt heb ik eigenlijk gemist bij de eurocommissaris, namelijk dat Rusland een steeds belangrijker plaats inneemt op het strijdtoneel. Rusland ruikt zijn kans, is vredesmakelaar voor alle partijen, drukt zelfs de munt, de geldeenheid van de nominale Jemenitische regering. Met andere woorden, wat is het perspectief voor een bijlegging van het conflict als Rusland er ook nog komt? Ik ben buitengewoon sceptisch, en ik vraag ook aandacht van de Europese Unie voor deze rol van Rusland, ook daar, want het leidt alleen maar – kijk naar Syrië – tot meer destabilisering.

James Carver (EFDD). – Madam President, the fact that we are only now having this debate is a shameful indictment of the foreign policy values of this place. Not only is a humanitarian crisis a disaster for the people of Yemen, but also the wider region. The inability to act decisively brings instability to the rest of the world. With the Saleh Houthi regime refusing to negotiate with the UN special envoy, we are no nearer a solution to the crisis; thus, we can expect more bombings and suffering.

One ray of hope is the rise of the Southern Movement. It is possible that we can encourage peace and stability in the south by working with them towards a federal solution, even – as I've been saying for the past three years – if it threatens the integrity of the Yemeni state, which in my opinion is already a busted flush. We must listen to the south Yemenis' peaceful call for a say in their future. Surely it is better than sitting back and continuing to let Yemen be a battleground for wider Saudi and Iranian interests.

Michèle Alliot-Marie (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, le Yémen, nous le voyons, cristallise aujourd'hui la plupart des tensions et des rivalités au Moyen-Orient.

La situation humanitaire, alimentaire, sanitaire y est dramatique. Les nouvelles tensions dans la région, ainsi que l'embargo imposé au Qatar par certains de ses voisins n'arrangent rien.

Ces mesures affaiblissent la coalition des pays du Golfe qui s'était créée autour du Yémen et elles renforcent la fragilité du pays.

Vous nous parliez, il y a un instant, de la nécessité d'être coordonné. Comment coordonner une aide quand ceux qui doivent intervenir sont eux-mêmes divisés? Comment peut-il y avoir une aide quand on voit bien qu'un embargo, qui pèse toujours sur les plus fragiles, tend aussi à fragiliser les moyens économiques?

Il est urgent de faire baisser la tension dans cette région, parce qu'elle est amie avec tous les pays.

L'Europe a un rôle essentiel à jouer. Alors, Monsieur le Commissaire, quelles mesures, quelles initiatives comptez-vous prendre dans les prochains jours pour faire baisser cette tension qui menace directement le Yémen, la stabilité de la région, mais également la sécurité et la stabilité de notre propre région?

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Heute haben wir schon viel über die unvorstellbar triste humanitäre Situation in Jemen gesprochen. Und darauf kann auch gar nicht oft genug hingewiesen werden, weil es skandalös ist, dass die internationale Gemeinschaft noch immer nicht die notwendigen Mittel aufbringt, weil es skandalös ist, dass die saudisch geführte Militärkoalition alle Versuche, die notleidende Bevölkerung mit Hilfsgütern zu erreichen, blockiert und hintertreibt. Und es ist skandalös, dass die westliche Staatengemeinschaft – allen voran die USA, aber auch viele Mitgliedstaaten – das saudische Regime mit Waffenlieferungen versorgt. Diese Geschäfte sind unmoralisch und kurzsichtig, weil sie zur Prolongierung der katastrophalen Situation beitragen.

Leider wurde die Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom Februar letzten Jahres, eben aus diesen Gründen ein Waffenembargo zu verhängen, bislang erst von wenigen Staaten umgesetzt. Es sollte uns allen klar sein: Die beste humanitäre Hilfe für Jemen ist der Verzicht auf Profite durch den Waffenhandel.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come detto, lo Yemen è dilaniato da una guerra civile, all'interno della quale agli interessi nazionali si sono sommati quelli internazionali. Come sempre, le spese più aspre del conflitto sono pagate dai cittadini che si trovano coinvolti contemporaneamente in un conflitto e in una crisi migratoria con l'esplosione di un'epidemia di colera. Nei primi mesi del 2017, la crisi umanitaria ha visto coinvolti 27 milioni di persone. A rincarare la dose e ad aggravare ulteriormente questa crisi il colera che ha mietuto quasi 800 vittime.

A marzo ho avuto modo di incontrare il ministro yemenita per i diritti umani e come oggi anche allora avevo espresso la mia profonda preoccupazione per il paese che sta attraversando una difficile crisi. Ora dobbiamo parlarci chiaro. L'unica soluzione che io vedo è il cessate il fuoco condiviso e duraturo. Non vi è alcuna possibilità di mitigare, tanto meno di risolvere la crisi umanitaria né di controllare l'espansione dell'epidemia senza un solido e duraturo cessate il fuoco, di cui abbiamo assolutamente la necessità. L'Unione europea deve lavorare per raggiungere questo obiettivo.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – As violações do direito humanitário e crimes de guerra que marcam a guerra civil no Iémen, um dos países mais pobres do mundo, são acabrunhantes. Fome, desnutrição, a par de ataques aéreos indiscriminados, matam cegamente, designadamente crianças. Os hospitais destruídos e onde nada chega estão incapazes de fornecer serviços básicos. A violência de todo o tipo, incluindo sexual, prevalece nas ruas.

As consequências estão longe de se circunscrever às fronteiras do Iémen. Enquanto, a norte, as forças rebeldes lutam, a comunidade internacional divide-se na guerra por procuração entre o Irão e a Arábia Saudita, com a cumplicidade dos Estados Unidos e de alguns Estados-Membros da União Europeia, designadamente o Reino Unido e a França.

Organizações terroristas, como a AQAP e o DAESH, esfregam as mãos de contentes, conquistando território no sul do país e intensificando ataques. A solução para o conflito tem que ser política, não é militar. A pressão internacional para uma solução em que todas as partes envolvidas cheguem a acordo tem que existir, não pode tardar. É a nossa segurança que está também em causa.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, no Iémen 14 milhões de pessoas passam fome e 3 milhões de iemenitas são deslocados internos em consequência da guerra civil que, desde março de 2015, opõe as forças leais do Governo do presidente Mansur Hadi aos rebeldes huthis. Na nação mais pobre do mundo, árabe, esta guerra fez disparar em 200 % a taxa de subnutrição infantil e dois terços da população dependem da assistência externa para sobreviver. À terrível crise humanitária junta-se o reforço da presença das filiais do DAESH e da Al-Qaeda no sul e sudoeste do país que, aproveitando a situação caótica, fomentam o terrorismo em toda a região.

A União Europeia deve continuar a apoiar o retorno das negociações ao Iémen e colaborar com as Nações Unidas, quer apoiando a decisão do Conselho de Segurança de prorrogar o atual regime de sanções sobre o Iémen, quer mantendo os seus compromissos financeiros para ajuda humanitária num momento em que a Agência para os Refugiados apenas recebeu 1 % dos valores solicitados a doadores internacionais para socorrer pessoas vulneráveis durante este ano. Como disse a Sra. Embaixadora da União Europeia no Iémen, Antonia Calvo, não podemos deixar que Sana se converta noutra Aleppo.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, the situation in Yemen is extremely worrying. Yemen has been plucked by years of instability, war, poor governance, lack of the rule of law, underdevelopment, environmental decline and widespread poverty. Millions of people are in acute need and urgently require, immediately, life-saving assistance in at least one sector.

Moreover, there is a number of serious allegations of violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law committed by all sides. The humanitarian situation is likely to deteriorate further in 2017. Without urgent action including full funding for the humanitarian response plan, steps by parties to end the war and to facilitate the resumption of commercial food and other imports and full access to all people in need, the crisis will worsen.

It is absolutely essential that the parties to the conflict respect international humanitarian law, allow the importation of food, medical supplies and other necessary goods into Yemen and guarantee unhindered movement of humanitarian actors to reach those in need of assistance.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Υεμένη αποτελεί μια περίπλοκη περίπτωση εμφύλιας σύγκρουσης, όπου οι σίτες αντάρτες Χούτι μάχονται κατά του σουνιτικού συνασπισμού υπό τη Σαουδική Αραβία. Η πάλη εξουσίας μεταξύ των διαφορετικών εκδοχών του Ισλάμ στοχοποιεί τον άμαχο πληθυσμό, ενώ υπάρχουν ενδείξεις τέλεσης εγκλημάτων κατά της ανθρωπότητας. Τα αποτελέσματα της σύγκρουσης είναι καταστροφικά. Τουλάχιστον δέκα χιλιάδες άνθρωποι έχουν σκοτωθεί σε συγκρούσεις, ενώ εκατομμύρια έχουν εκτοπιστεί. Ο αποκλεισμός και η εμφύλια σύγκρουση με διεθνή διάσταση έχει οδηγήσει τις περισσότερες ιατρικές υποδομές να υπολειπθούν, δύο εκατομμύρια παιδιά να βρίσκονται εκτός εκπαίδευσης και την πλειονότητα των πολιτών να ζουν σε κατάσταση επισιτιστικής ανασφάλειας, δίχως πρόσβαση σε ασφαλές πόσιμο νερό ή στοιχειώδεις υπηρεσίες αποχέτευσης. Ειλικρινά, δεν πιστεύω και δεν περιμένω λύση από τη διεθνή κοινότητα, όταν πρόσφατα οι Trump, Merkel και May επισκέφθηκαν τη Σαουδική Αραβία εξασφαλίζοντας δισεκατομμύρια δολάρια από πωλήσεις όπλων. Ο θεμιτός αγώνας κατά της τρομοκρατίας, που μας αφορά άμεσα, δεν μας επιτρέπει να εθελουφλούμε έναντι της επικείμενης ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođa predsjednice, Jemen je jedna od najsiriromašnijih arapskih država na svijetu, a rat koji ne jenjava dalje produbljuje već ionako neizdrživo stanje u državi. Izravne posljedice oružanog konflikta velikih su razmjera i ukoliko se nešto ne poduzme, izravna su prijetnja čitavom stanovništvu. Naime, ovom ratom pogođenom stanovništvu prijeti još veća katastrofa u obliku raznih bolesti, a posebno pojavom kolere.

Pojava i širenje kolere izravno prijeti milijunima ljudi koji već žive u očajnim uvjetima. Samo u zadnjih mjesec dana, više od 100 000 ljudi podleglo je ovoj pošasti, a izvješća brojnih humanitarnih grupacija ističu kako svakih sat vremena u Jemenu jedna osoba umre od kolere. Zastrašujuća je činjenica da oboljeli uopće nisu u mogućnosti zatražiti pomoć medicinskog osoblja ili utočište naći u bolnicama, jer bolnice nisu u stanju pružiti skrb žrtvama kolere zbog broja ratnih stradalnika.

Stabilizacija ovog područja više nije samo prioritet koji ne trpi moratorij, nego je pojavom kolere dobila alarmantnu važnost i iziskuje ekstremnu brzinu djelovanja.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Επίτροπε, όπως επισημάνατε και εσείς, λόγω της ανθρωπιστικής κρίσεως στην Υεμένη, κάθε δέκα λεπτά πεθαίνει και ένα παιδί. Αυτό είναι όντως ένα σοκαριστικό γεγονός. Θεωρείτε όμως ότι η οικονομική βοήθεια που παρέχει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση – που είναι όντως σημαντική – είναι σε θέση να λύσει το πρόβλημα; Ακόμη δε περισσότερο, είναι σε θέση να καλύψει τις ευθύνες της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, η οποία ευθύνεται για την εξέλιξη αυτή; Τι έκανε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όταν η Σαουδική Αραβία επενέβη στην εμφύλιο αυτή σύρραξη, υποστηρίζοντας τις κυβερνητικές δυνάμεις; Αλλά και τώρα ακόμη, που η Σαουδική Αραβία έχει εμπλακεί στην άλλη κρίση με το Κατάρ, τι κάνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Παρατηρεί, απλά, τα γεγονότα και η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος, η κυρία Mogherini, απλά καταγράφει τις καταστροφές. Έχει τη θέληση και τη δύναμη η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να επιβάλει στη Σαουδική Αραβία να παύσει τις εχθροπραξίες, αφού άλλωστε και από στρατηγικής απόψεως είναι σε δυσχερή θέση, ούτως ώστε να πάει εκεί η ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια; Αν δεν το κάνει αυτό, εκείνο το οποίο θα συμβεί θα είναι να παρατηρούμε για μια ακόμη φορά, και συνεχώς, τους θανάτους των παιδιών και να εκφράζουμε, υποκριτικά, την αποτροπή μας.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal celou rozpravu, která zde proběhla. Snažím se sledovat dění v Jemenu dlouhou dobu a musím říci, že to, co zde zaznívalo a na čem se asi shodujeme, je to, že občanskou válku v této zemi nevyřešíme, pokud se mocnosti z daného regionu budou do této země vměšovat a hájit tam svoje mocenské pozice.

Tedy si myslím, pane komisaři, že je velká možnost pro mezinárodní působení EU tlačit na země, jako je Saúdská Arábie, jako je Írán a snažit se při jednání s nimi otázku Jemenu jasně dávat na stůl. Třeba zmiňovaná Saúdská Arábie je naším významným obchodním partnerem. V případě Íránu jsme uzavřeli dohodu, paní Mogheriniová často hovoří o zlepšení vztahů s touto zemí a přitom Írán hraje, podle mého názoru, velmi negativní roli při vměšování do Jemenu.

Takže já moc prosím, pane komisaři, buďme v této věci mezinárodně aktivnější a tlačme na země v okolí Jemenu.

A „catch the eye” eljárás vége.

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, our discussion has been a very useful exchange and I thank my dear colleagues for their constructive speeches. From this debate, I gather first of all that we all share a common sense of urgency, and, at the same time, a strong commitment in the spirit of the Conclusions on Yemen that were adopted by the Foreign Affairs Council, aiming to step up the European Union's role in assisting the warring parties to find, without delay, an urgent solution to the crisis, and of course to find ways to reach a peaceful agreement – not now, not tomorrow, but yesterday.

I conclude from our debate that EU engagement must be based on a comprehensive approach – this is High Representative Federica Mogherini's approach, because she knows well all the implications in the region – while at the same time encompassing all our diplomatic tools and political commitment combined with our development assistance and of course continued delivery of the much needed humanitarian relief. I know well, as Commissioner for humanitarian aid, the major problems for humanitarian access. I would like to say here that we try hard to find new ways for humanitarian access to meet vulnerable people, but on the ground I have to admit that sometimes it is very difficult, and sometimes it is impossible.

Likewise, you have been clear in stating that Member States should fully support the EU in this common endeavour through their bilateral actions and initiatives. I would like to give you some details about our humanitarian assistance and development in more detail in terms of funding. My service, ECHO, has allocated EUR 70 million for 2016, for specific humanitarian projects in the humanitarian field alone. The total ECHO allocations since the beginning of the conflict is EUR 120 million. A new pledge of EUR 123 million was announced this year, as I said at the pledge conference in Geneva. Meanwhile, DEVCO has allocated EUR 52 million in 2015, and now we are preparing EUR 200 million for the period 2018-2020, focusing on resilience, stabilisation, health, and food security.

I would like to close by signalling once again my appreciation for the role of this political body, Parliament, in keeping this often forgotten crisis on the international agenda. I remember that many times, in many international fora, when we tried to raise awareness about the Yemen crisis, sometimes as the European Union we were alone. So I am sure that your attention in particular to the Yemen crisis, in these conditions, in these circumstances, is quite important to maintain this crisis on the international agenda.

Elnök asszony. – Hét állásfoglalásra irányuló indítványt juttattak el hozzám.

A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2017. június 15-én, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Jeemenis valitsev humanitaarolukord on katastroofiline. Olukord halveneb järjest, muu hulgas kannatavad inimesed alatoitumise all ja haiguste käes. Jätkub sõjaline tegevus, humanitaarabi ei ole võimalik kohale toimetada ning abitöötajad ei pääse abistama. Jätkuv sõjategevus on muutnud riigi ebastabiilseks ning seda on varmad ära kasutama terrori- ja äärmusorganisatsioonid. Lahendus saab tulla ainult läbirääkimiste kaudu. Selleks on ELi ja ÜRO jätkuv toetus samuti oluline. Lisaks on oluline, et riigid oma lubatud humanitaarabi vahendid ka tegelikult ÜROle eraldaksid.

13. Ocjena provedbe smjernica EU-a o ljudskim pravima koje se odnose na slobodu izražavanja na internetu i izvan njega (rasprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont a Bizottság alelnökének és az Unió külügyi és biztonságpolitikai főképviselőjének nyilatkozata: Az online és offline véleménynyilvánítás szabadságáról szóló uniós emberi jogi iránymutatások végrehajtásának értékelése (2017/2728 (RSP)).

Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. –Madam President, these last three years since the Council adopted the Human Rights Guidelines on Freedom of Expression Online and Offline have been particularly difficult for journalists and bloggers all around the world. Press freedom and freedom of expression are under attack. In several parts of the world violations and abuses have become more frequent, even in democratic states and societies, including in our own region.

The European Union will not accept this situation as the new normal. Over the years we have continued to support the freedom of journalists and bloggers with public statements or, where necessary, with quiet action behind the scenes. In recent weeks we have raised our voice on a number of specific cases, from Turkey to Egypt, from Mexico to Belarus, just to name a few.

Since the adoption of the Guidelines in May 2014, the Council Working Party on Human Rights (COHOM) has organised three discussions on implementation of the Guidelines. These exchanges constituted an opportunity to evaluate with Member States the general state of play of freedom of expression but also the actions taken by the EEAS, the Commission and Member States to implement the Guidelines.

In addition to these regular exchanges, COHOM has also engaged with civil society on freedom of expression and media freedom. The latest exchange at COHOM took place last November with Member States and Commission services. It was an opportunity to discuss the state of play of our policies in support of freedom of expression.

The European Union's commitment to freedom of expression online and offline has been renewed in the new EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy (2015-2019), including its regular reporting on implementation. In practical terms, freedom of expression continues to be raised on a regular basis in human rights dialogues and the consultations with partner countries. I can mention Laos, Azerbaijan and Bangladesh as the most recent examples.

Let me also emphasise that the EEAS and the Commission organise regular specific training sessions on freedom of expression for EU and Member States' staff, including EU delegations, with the active participation of representatives of civil society. In addition the EEAS and the Commission have regular contact with relevant civil society organisations active on freedom of expression, in Brussels as well as in the context of human rights dialogues with third countries.

I would like to recall that civil society organisations were associated from the beginning with the drafting of the Guidelines and took part in the 2014 December NGO Human Rights Forum, dedicated to freedom of expression online and offline.

This work has changed the lives of many journalists and bloggers. In some cases it has been a true life-saver. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, through its emergency support mechanism, provides protection to journalists both professional and non-professional. We counted more than 200 interventions since 2015 to support people threatened for their defence or practice of freedom of expression.

Since January 2017, a new technical assistance programme, financed by the Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, assists EU delegations in the implementation of the Guidelines. Our aim is to build on best practices and enhance the capacity of EU delegations to work more intensely and creatively.

Looking ahead, the Estonian Presidency of the Council has chosen freedom of expression as one of its human rights priorities. This will give COHOM the opportunity to further evaluate the implementation of the Guidelines, in close cooperation with Estonia.

An informal COHOM will take place on 19-20 October 2017, including a discussion on the lessons learned from implementation of the Guidelines. This discussion will include different stakeholders, such as representatives of EU institutions, international organisations and civil society.

Press freedom and freedom of expression are central to the European way of life and to whom we are. We Europeans will not get used to the violations. We will continue to act quietly or vocally, depending on the situation, for everyone's rights to report, to criticise and to speak up.

Andrzej Grzyb, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Chciałbym podziękować Panu za te informacje, ale jednocześnie też podziękować następnej prezydencji za to, że chce podjąć ten temat, który jest ważny z wielu względów. Bowiem, jak słusznie Pan zauważył, wiele elementów wskazuje na to, że w obszarze wolności wypowiedzi w ostatnim okresie nastąpiło ogromne zaostrzenie działań licznych państw, licznych reżimów wobec ludzi mediów, wobec ludzi, którzy mają prawo do wypowiedzania się nie tylko we własnym imieniu, ale również w imieniu całego społeczeństwa. Prawo do publicznego wyrażania własnego zdania to podstawowe prawo człowieka i nic nie jest w stanie tego zmienić.

Po drugie, jest to też prawo do ludzkiej godności, gdyż człowiek mający prawo wypowiedzi jest jednocześnie szanowany i pod tym względem. Bezpłatne i różnorodne media są niezbędne w każdym społeczeństwie do ochrony wolności opinii, prawa wypowiedzi oraz innych praw człowieka. Podążając za literą Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej i Karty praw podstawowych, należy stwierdzić, że Unia Europejska potwierdza swoją determinację w promowaniu w zewnętrznej polityce tego prawa, z którego może i powinna korzystać każda jednostka. Zdajemy sobie sprawę, że zarówno instrumenty polityczne, jak i finansowe – jak wspomniany tu EIDHR – mogą pomóc w zgodnym, terminowym i spójnym przełamaniu naruszania tych praw.

Chciałbym jeszcze zaznaczyć, że obszar ten mogą wspomagać również inne instrumenty i fundusze, jak choćby Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Demokracji, który stanowi unikalne narzędzie zwiększania wolności wypowiedzi online i offline.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tra le considerazioni generali scritte nelle linee guida si sottolinea che il diritto alla libertà di opinione e di espressione si applica in modo uguale e a tutte le persone e deve essere protetto dovunque e garantito a tutti, indipendentemente da chi siano le persone e da dove vivano.

Nonostante la chiarezza di queste affermazioni, resta la consapevolezza di una necessaria implementazione di queste linee guida affinché possano essere utili non solo all'interno dei nostri confini, ma possono anche incoraggiare i paesi terzi a mettere in atto azioni decise per garantire un ambiente sicuro a chi desidera esprimere la propria opinione. Ogni volta che un individuo è costretto ad autocensurarsi oppure è vittima di intimidazioni e vessazioni, l'intera società a cui appartiene si indebolisce e la diretta conseguenza è un restringimento dello spazio civile.

Esempi di violazione arrivano da tutto il mondo, dalla vicina Turchia, dove una folta schiera di giornalisti, professori e filosofi sono costretti a scegliere tra l'espressione delle loro opinioni e la loro incolumità, oppure dalla Russia, dove l'attivista Alexei Navalny lunedì è stato nuovamente arrestato. Di fronte a questi scenari, di cui noi siamo tristemente testimoni, dobbiamo tenere sempre presente che l'Unione europea è dotata di strumenti potenzialmente efficaci, quali gli accordi commerciali, per fare delle pressioni affinché questi diritti vengano rispettati anche al di fuori dei propri confini. Sebbene sia vero anche che all'interno dei confini dell'Unione europea queste violazioni esistono, noi dobbiamo ergerci al ruolo di garanti dei diritti umani nel mondo.

Monica Macovei, *în numele grupului ECR*. – Doamnă președintă, majoritatea presei și serviciilor online din România aparține unor oameni de afaceri controversați, mulți acuzați de corupție, de fraudă și de alte infracțiuni serioase. Unii dintre ei sunt conectați politic sau unii dintre ei sunt chiar politicieni. Identificarea proprietarilor este uneori dificilă, pentru că se pierde într-un labirint de companii offshore.

Reporteri fără frontiere scrie în raportul din 2017: „în presa românească activează așa-numiți jurnaliști care nu scriu în interesul publicului, ci în cel al patronilor”. Desigur, ca român, pot să vă spun că în toate trusturile sunt și jurnaliști onești, care rezistă cu greu, dar rezistă.

Să dăm câteva exemple dintre acești patroni care au probleme penale sau de altă natură și dictează politica editorială. Fondatorul și finanțatorul trustului Antena 3, care cuprinde mai multe televiziuni, radiouri și ziare, a fost condamnat la zece ani de închisoare și declarat colaborator al Securității de către judecători. Un alt exemplu: România TV, al cărui patron a fost trimis în judecată pentru trei infracțiuni, în trei dosare și a fugit din țară. Televiziunea Digi24 este investigată pentru spălare de bani și evaziune fiscală. Ziarul Ziua a avut ca acționar un condamnat penal și, mai departe, lista poate continua.

Practic, acești oameni impun agenda lor personală drept agendă publică. Iată de ce o parte dintre jurnaliștii de la aceste instituții atacă zi de zi justiția și lupta împotriva corupției.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, blocking websites, shutting down the internet and tracking and tracing human rights defenders via surveillance software is intensifying.

While hopes were high that democracy could go viral because of the open internet and new technologies, instead it seems that technology amplifies relations of power. Dictators are using sophisticated technologies to repress, while individuals are joining forces to make their voices heard. And the key question for us is how to make sure that the European Union stands with people who are facing repression, and how we can further facilitate the enjoyment of universal human rights – online and offline.

It is more important than ever that we, in Europe, take the lead in advancing and defending the right to freedom of expression, access to information and the right to privacy. We can do this by coming to the defence of journalists or bloggers who are intimidated and silenced, by ensuring encryption is used widely to secure information, and by pushing back at the highest political level when websites are blocked or speech is silenced. The 2014 guidelines on freedom of expression online and offline were adopted after a clear push and demand from this House. It was a welcome step, but three years is like a century in light of the rapid technological developments that we see.

If we want to continue to do what is needed, we have to stay up-to-date and up-to-speed. We must build on best practices and make key improvements, based on the lessons learned of the use of these guidelines. I have one specific question to the Commissioner: can he reflect on what is the status of the no-disconnect strategy? It was part of the plan to stop the blocking of websites and the silencing of bloggers, and it has been a bit silent. So it would be good to get an update on that as well.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Madame la Présidente, la liberté d'expression va mal. La situation se dégrade dans les deux tiers des pays répertoriés par Reporters sans frontières (RSF), y compris dans les pays dits démocratiques. L'Europe est même la zone géographique qui a connu la plus forte dégradation de son indice global.

D'un point de vue mondial, une centaine de journalistes ont perdu la vie en 2016, près de 350 d'entre eux sont emprisonnés, un tiers pour la seule Turquie, un autre tiers pour la Chine, l'Iran et l'Égypte, lequel est particulièrement symbolique de cette détérioration. Une cinquantaine de journalistes sont également pris en otage, principalement au Moyen-Orient, zone la plus dangereuse du monde. On peut aussi parler des coupures d'internet avant les élections ou lors des mouvements sociaux et là, c'est le continent africain qui semble avoir la palme de la régression ou encore de la répression des blogueurs.

L'adoption par l'Union européenne de ses lignes directrices en 2014 a donc été une bonne nouvelle, à condition toutefois que cela serve à quelque chose. Or, sur ce sujet comme sur d'autres, nous avons vraiment l'impression que les dirigeants européens se gargarisent plus que jamais de mots et que cela ne se traduit guère dans la réalité des politiques.

Si je devais prendre quelques exemples, je citerais la Turquie, l'Égypte ou la Tanzanie. Dire, c'est bien, consulter la société civile aussi, mais c'est encore mieux quand la mise en pratique touche l'ensemble des partenaires de l'Union européenne, quels qu'ils soient.

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist gut, dass wir heute im Plenum über die Umsetzung der Leitlinien zur Meinungsfreiheit diskutieren, und es wäre auch gut, wenn der Rat und der EAD sich regelmäßig mit den Umsetzungsergebnissen aller thematischen Menschenrechtsleitlinien und auch mit der Leitlinie zum internationalen humanitären Recht befassen würden.

Das Recht auf Meinungsfreiheit wird in allen Regionen der Welt verletzt. Gerade wenn Kritik an Regierungshandeln öffentlich geäußert wird, kommt es oft zu Diffamierungen, zur Verfolgung und Bedrohung der Kritiker durch staatliche Stellen. Davon konnte ich mir auf meiner jüngsten Reise nach Singapur, Bangkok und nach Kambodscha ein konkretes Bild machen.

Im Paragraph 50 der Leitlinie heißt es, dass willkürliche Einschränkungen der Meinungsfreiheit und Gewalt gegenüber Journalisten und anderen Medienschaffenden zu bewerten sind, wenn es darum geht, EU-Kooperationen auszusetzen, oder um das Aussetzen von finanziellen Hilfen.

Ich frage nun: Wie häufig und in welchen Ländern ist dieser Paragraph 50 angewandt worden? Und konkret an einem Länderbeispiel frage ich Sie, Herr Kommissar Hahn: Wie kann es sein, dass in Ägypten, wo einheimische Journalisten nicht frei und unabhängig arbeiten können, ohne bedroht und verfolgt zu werden, die finanzielle Hilfe aufgestockt und die EU-Kooperationen intensiviert wurden – also in krasssem Widerspruch zu den Vorgaben der Leitlinien zur Meinungsfreiheit stehen?

Bill Etheridge, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, freedom of expression and public discourse has always been, and always will be, the enemy of the status quo of the state – whatever that state may be. We see attempts in repressive regimes to clamp down upon that, but even in free western civilised nations we now start to see efforts by the state to clamp down on freedom. And whilst in the past that freedom of discourse might have been in the pub or in a public area, now, of course, it moves to the internet. The very concept of social media being clamped down on by the state – often using fear as the excuse – is completely against all concept of freedom, and I address this as well to the British Government, who have spoken very much about trying to clamp down on these things, using fear of terror as a reason. The one thing I will say, though, is that the idea of guidelines imposed from the European state upon freedom of

expression on social media is in itself something of a contradiction. Free the airwaves, free social media, let's all speak as we wish.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Meinungsfreiheit: Heute Morgen wurde mein Freund Horst Mahler mit 81 Jahren in Ungarn von ungarischen Behörden an deutsche Polizeibeamte ausgeliefert, damit er wieder ins Gefängnis, in die Justizvollzugsanstalt Brandenburg, verbracht werden kann. Was war sein Verbrechen? Er wurde 2009 wegen seiner Meinung, die er geäußert hatte, zu zwölf Jahren Haft verurteilt. Im Gefängnis hat man ihm dann 2015 den linken Fuß amputiert. Und er wollte nicht im Gefängnis sterben, er wollte in Freiheit sterben – deswegen ist er nach Ungarn gegangen.

Wissen Sie eigentlich, Herr Kommissar, dass es in Deutschland jährlich 12 000 Ermittlungsverfahren wegen freier Meinungsäußerung gibt? Dass derzeit an die 400 Bürger rechter Gesinnung auf der Flucht sind und sich dem Strafvollzug entzogen haben, nur weil sie ihre freie Meinung geäußert haben? Setzen Sie sich dafür ein, dass diese Menschenrechtsleitlinien in Bezug auf die freie Meinungsäußerung – online und offline – für alle Bürger der EU gelten!

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! *(Der Redner spricht ohne Mikrofon.)* ... Sonntagsreden die Bedeutung der Menschenrechte für die europäische Außenpolitik hervor. Mit Recht, weil nur Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Menschenrechte Stabilität schaffen. Es war daher positiv, dass der Rat im Mai 2014 Leitlinien zur Freiheit der Meinungsäußerung beschlossen hat. Schon damals wurde auch auf die Bedeutung der Onlinemedien verwiesen. Das Dokument ist heute noch aktuell, das ist in diesem Bereich eigentlich etwas sehr Seltenes. Es spricht wichtige Bereiche wie *hate speech* oder den Datenschutz an. Es ist enttäuschend, dass es bislang noch nicht zu einer systematischen Evaluierung, wie in Artikel 71 der Leitlinien vorgesehen, gekommen ist. Ich habe auch im Menschenrechtsbericht 2015 auf die Bedeutung einer systematischen und mit den Stakeholdern diskutierten Umsetzungsstrategie hingewiesen. Gerade im letzten Jahr hat sich gezeigt, dass Onlinemedien nicht nur die Situation der Meinungsäußerung in einzelnen Ländern beeinflussen, sondern immer mehr auch zu einem Mittel internationaler Auseinandersetzungen werden – Stichwort „*fake news*“.

Wenn die Union ihre Leitlinien wirklich ernst nimmt, dann müsste sie alles daran setzen, diesen Dialog auf einer breiten Basis konsequent und mutig durchzuführen. Ich setze meine Hoffnung auf die estnische Präsidentschaft, dass da endlich etwas in Gang kommt.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Mówimy o całym świecie, o naruszeniach wolności słowa w najdalszych miejscach od Europy, a nie widzimy, że w samym sercu naszego kontynentu, Unii i naszych państw, we Francji, podjęto w tym roku tak zwaną ustawę o zakazie przeciwdziałania aborcji, która dopuszcza kary więzienia dla dziennikarzy działających w internecie, która dopuszcza wysokie, niszczące media, grzywny finansowe i mimo apeli o zajęcie stanowiska w tej sprawie, tak naprawdę do tej pory władze Unii Europejskiej milczą. Bardzo często chwalimy się naszą soft power, tym że nasza opinia ma wagę w świecie, że przez słowa, mówienie prawdy można rzeczy zmieniać. Panie Komisarzu! To jest dla Pana dzisiaj bardzo ważna okazja – wymieniał Pan inne państwa – proszę o zajęcie stanowiska wobec tego, co się stało we Francji, dlatego że jeszcze nie jest za późno, nasz głos może mieć swoje znaczenie.

Kaja Kallas (ALDE). – Madam President, there has been a lot of talk about limitation of freedom of expression elsewhere, but we also have to look into the European Union and what are we doing here. Many decision makers see the online world as this scary place where no rule applies and it is full of hate speech and an incitement to terrorism. But as much as the internet can do bad, it can also do good.

Despite – or maybe thanks to – the scale of the internet, where everything is amplified, freedom of expression matters as much online as it does offline. There is much to be done to educate people as regards to their behaviour online, but one important thing is to understand that if you make it easy to block and take down content, you make it easy to commit censorship. The current discussions are all about how fast a company take down content, how to make it faster. However, I believe that if we are serious about protecting freedom of speech online, we need to take a big step back and ask ourselves if making companies the police, the prosecutor and the judge is the right answer.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, as orientações da União Europeia em matéria de direitos humanos, que estamos hoje aqui a discutir, não têm, como sabemos, nem poderiam ter, aliás, um caráter legal coercitivo. Todavia, a União Europeia, tendo em vista fundamentalmente os seus próprios valores fundacionais, tem a obrigatoriedade moral de pugnar pela sua aplicação e criar as condições para que, com a sua influência política e capacidade negocial, elas possam ser respeitadas e concretizadas em múltiplas situações.

Sabemos que nem sempre assim é. Por todo o mundo vemos, com uma frequência inaudita, ataques à liberdade de expressão que vão dos menos graves até àqueles que só se podem considerar como absolutamente inaceitáveis, como os assassinatos de jornalistas que têm ocorrido no México ou a detenção e a acusação de dezenas de membros de órgãos de comunicação social, que se têm verificado num país nosso vizinho como é a Turquia.

É fundamental que a União Europeia continue a utilizar todos os instrumentos ao seu dispor para combater estes e outros casos de ataques à liberdade de expressão, e creio que, nesse domínio, temos um instrumento fundamental que são os acordos comerciais que estabelecemos com vários países do mundo.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jak wiadomo, grupa robocza ds. praw człowieka uznała, że nie ma potrzeby dokonywania oceny wytycznych w dziedzinie wolności wypowiedzi online i offline. A ten dokument, jak wiemy, powinien wyznaczać kierunek postępowania przedstawicieli UE i państw członkowskich w relacjach z państwami trzecimi. Można się jednak zastanawiać, czy ta powściągliwość w dokonywaniu oceny nie ma związku z tym, że w samej Europie mamy duże problemy z oceną tego, co jest wolnością opinii i wypowiedzi, a co jest mową nienawiści, którą należy eliminować ze sfery publicznej. Jak już mówili koledzy, przede wszystkim kolega Jurek, problem, który widzimy i staramy się piętnować w państwach trzecich, z coraz większą siłą występuje w krajach Unii Europejskiej. Oczywiście nikt w Europie nie zamyka dziennikarzy i ich nie torturuje, natomiast eliminowanie ze sfery publicznej, marginalizacja i zastraszanie są również na porządku dziennym i przykład podany przez...

(Przewodnicząca odebrała posłowi głos)

Ana Gomes (S&D). – É necessário que a União Europeia faça muito mais para proteger jornalistas e bloguistas de todo o mundo e para pressionar outros países a reduzir o fosso digital e facilitar o acesso à informação e à comunicação, incluindo o acesso não controlado à Internet.

É preciso criticar e denunciar ao mais alto nível governos como os da Turquia, Azerbaijão, Bielorrússia, Etiópia, Egito, China, onde são presos bloguistas e jornalistas e se censura o espaço *online*. Por exemplo, o regime angolano, além de reprimir e intimidar jornalistas e *bloguers*, acaba de impedir a transmissão de canais portugueses de televisão, SIC e SIC Notícias, por terem ousado organizar reportagens e debates sobre os direitos humanos naquele país.

Muitos destes regimes, repressivos, importam de empresas europeias material eletrónico de vigilância em massa dos seus cidadãos. A proliferação da monitorização da vigilância da censura e das tecnologias de filtragem representa uma ameaça crescente para os ativistas e defensores de direitos humanos, da democracia e da luta contra a corrupção.

Os nossos Estados-Membros e as nossas empresas têm que ser responsabilizados pelos que fazem e pelo que deixam fazer.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, az emberi méltóság védelmének szempontja sok esetben ellentétbe kerül a véleménynyilvánítás szabadságával. Ma már az offline térben is bonyolult összeegyeztetni ezeket az alapelveket, az online világ térhódítása azonban teljesen átalakította az emberi kapcsolatok jellegét és azt a közeget, amelyet nyilvános térként fogunk fel. Mégis azt gondolom, hogy meg kell próbálnunk érvényesíteni a liberális szólásszabadság eszméjének eredeti meghatározását: mindenki szabadsága addig terjed, ameddig tetteivel, tevékenységével vagy éppen véleményének kifejezésével nem korlátoz szabadságában. Ebben az értelemben igenis mérlegre kell tennünk a véleménynyilvánítás szabadságát az emberi jogi iránymutatások tükrében, hiszen mindenkinek ugyanannyira fontos a szabadsága: annak is, aki véleményét fejezi ki, de annak is, akit ez a vélemény méltóságában, értékeiben, életvitelében sért.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η νέα τεχνολογία πλέον έχει υποταχθεί στην εξουσία και στους κατά τόπους ολιγάρχες. Στην Τουρκία, φιμώνονται οι δημοσιογράφοι. Στις αραβικές χώρες, το ίδιο. Στο Μπανγκλαντές, το πουλέν των ευρωπαϊκών πολυεθνικών όπου κερδίζουν εκατομμύρια, έχει καταργηθεί η ελευθερία του τύπου. Ελευθερία όμως έκφρασης σημαίνει και δικαίωμα των πολιτών, των βουλευτών και των ευρωβουλευτών να έχουν ίση μεταχείριση και πρόσβαση στα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης. Το έχω ξανακαταγγείλει και το λέω, στο Στρασβούργο, εδώ, κάθε μήνα Έλληνες δημοσιογράφοι έρχονται με έξοδα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, χρησιμοποιούν τα στούντιο και τις εγκαταστάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, μαγνητοσκοπούν εκπομπές και συστηματικά αποκλείουν την Ομάδα ECR και εμένα από τις εκπομπές αυτές, που γίνονται εδώ, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Θα υπάρξει μια αντίδραση στο θέμα αυτό; Θα βάλει τάξη και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στα του οίκου του; Θα επιτρέπει να συνεχίζεται αυτή η διακριτική μεταχείριση κατά της Ομάδας ECR και κατά του ομιλούντος από τους Έλληνες δημοσιογράφους που χρησιμοποιούν εδώ τα μέσα του ίδιου του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου;

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Madam President, as we all know well, human rights are not only one of the founding values of the EU, but they are also among the guiding principles and objectives of its actions on the international arena. In this context, the EU human rights guidelines on freedom of expression online and offline aims to provide legal protection to whistleblowers, citizens' privacy and freedom of opinion. However, since its adoption back in 2014, the EU human rights guidelines of freedom of expression offline and online have not managed to provide adequate protection for journalists, bloggers or citizens around the world.

To evaluate the current situation of freedom of expression, it is necessary just to mention the case of Sakharov Laureate Raif Badawi, who has been flogged for blogging. Unfortunately, nowadays there is a record number of journalists in jail globally, and internet freedom has been limited in many countries. Working from this perspective, I call on the EU to increase dramatically the funding for internet and human rights protectors.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony, a szólásszabadság és véleménynyilvánítási szabadság elválaszthatatlan a demokrácia fogalmától, hiszen egy demokráciában az érvek, ellenérvek összecsapásában, csatájában, szabad vitájában születnek meg a demokratikus döntések. Döbbenetes nekünk, magyaroknak, akik közel ötven évig szocializmusban vagy kommunizmusban éltünk, látni azt, hogy Nyugat-Európában hogy szűnik meg bizonyos területeken a szólás és véleménynyilvánítás szabadsága. Ilyen például a migráció. Büntetőjogi eszközökkel nyomják el azokat, akik úgymond migrációellenesek, kritikusak a tömeges bevándorlással szemben. Büntetőeljárást indítanak ellenük, börtönbe zárják őket, munkajogi szankciókat érvényesítenek, kidobják az embereket a munkahelyükről. Mi, magyarok ötven éven keresztül tapasztaltuk a szólás- és véleménynyilvánítás, és ezáltal a demokrácia hiányát. Ne próbálják ránk kényszeríteni ezt, ezen próbálkoznak, de nem lesznek sikeresek, mi meg fogjuk őrizni az értékeinket.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já souhlasím se všemi svými předřečníky, pokud jde o hodnocení mezinárodní situace právě v oblasti svobody projevu, ale myslím si, že bychom si měli tzv. zamést i před vlastním prahem. Situace v Evropě se zhoršuje, v tom rovněž souhlasím s kolegyní Macovei, která toto pronesla.

V ČR jsme svědky jakési koncentrace moci ekonomické, politické a mediální. To tedy nejen pouze v ČR, u nás to vyřešil zákon o střetu zájmů, který zapovídá vlastnictví těchto vymezených nástrojů, které v demokratické společnosti jsou důležité, ale koncentrace do jedné rukou skutečně může být potenciálně velmi nebezpečná.

Myslím si, že bychom se tomu měli věnovat i na poli EU, protože tato svoboda projevu je absolutním základem našich evropských hodnot, a o její dobrý rozvoj bychom měli pečovat i v budoucím období.

(A „catch the eye” eljárás vége.)

Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, this has been a very useful exchange and I would like to thank the honourable Members for the interventions. I wanted to answer Ms Schaake but she is no longer there, so maybe we will have another opportunity to clarify this.

Frau Lochbihler, Sie haben mich wegen Ägypten gefragt. Also ich kann Ihnen nur sagen: Ich weiß nicht, woher Sie die Annahme haben, dass Ägypten mehr Geld bekommt. Fakt ist, dass wir mit Ägypten sehr intensive Gespräche wegen der Menschenrechtssituation haben, wegen der Situation der Zivilgesellschaft. Es gibt eine spezielle Budgetlinie, die sich zusätzlich zu den üblichen Zahlungen an Ägypten mit der Unterstützung in Migrationsfragen beschäftigt. Das ist aber etwas, das Teil der generellen finanziellen Unterstützung nordafrikanischer Staaten ist.

Umgekehrt kann ich berichten, dass es verschiedene Programme gibt, etwa OPEN Media Hub oder MedMedia-Programme. Das sind Programme, die auch dazu dienen, etwa in Ägypten unabhängigen Journalisten und *media outlets* zu helfen, ihrer Arbeit nachzukommen und sich auch persönlich professionell zu qualifizieren.

Finally, let me stress that COHOM is committed to ensuring the effectiveness of the guidelines and will hence continue its yearly evaluation of guidelines. We remain committed to continuing to engage and work with the European Parliament on the implementation of this guideline.

It was not the last, and it will not be the last, discussion on Human Rights guidelines on freedom of expression online and offline; this is something which will stay with us, unfortunately. I think we all should be sensitive and alert on this subject, and should have a regular exchange about the state of play in this area.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

14. Izvješće o Srbiji za 2016. (rasprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont David McAllister által a Külügyi Bizottság nevében készített, a Bizottság Szerbiáról szóló, 2016. évi jelentéséről szóló jelentésről folytatott vita. (2016/2311(INI)) (A8-0063/2017)

David McAllister, rapporteur. – Madam President, after the United Kingdom decided to leave the European Union, people not only in Europe but throughout the whole world have heard and read a lot about Article 50, which sets out the précis of how a Member State may withdraw from the European Union. I believe that we should scroll back one paragraph and focus on Article 49, which provides the legal basis for any European state to join the European Union. That said, the message of our debate tonight on the European Parliament's report on Serbia should be clear: Serbia doesn't only have a European perspective; Serbia has a European future. This country is clearly moving towards the European Union – so far, eight chapters have already been opened in the negotiation process, while two have already been provisionally closed. I strongly welcome that Commissioner Hahn – who I would once again like to thank for his outstanding commitment and engagement in the region – announced this week in Belgrade that two more chapters will be opened this month. There are three points which are of utmost importance on Serbia's path towards the European Union that I would like to mention.

Firstly, the rule of law: I would like to use this opportunity to recall that Serbia's progress on the rule of law Chapters 23 and 24 remains essential for the overall pace of the negotiation process. Judicial independence has to be assured in practice, because corruption and organised crime still remain an obstacle – not only to Serbia, but to all western Balkan countries' democratic, social and economic development. On another point, I agree with the European Commission and the Council that, to guarantee unhindered exercise of the freedom of expression and media, shortcomings in this area should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Secondly, Serbia's economy. The criteria for membership are intended to help Serbia to stand on its own feet and become fit for our common market and for the global economy in general. Serbia made progress with regards to the budget deficit and restructuring of publicly owned enterprises. The government in Belgrade is implementing an impressive economic and structural reforms agenda which has already yielded results in terms of growth prospects and the reduction of domestic and external imbalances. Moreover, this country has demonstrated its commitment to the EU connectivity agenda, which we aim to enhance further at the Trieste summit in July.

Thirdly, regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations: the government in Belgrade has made very important symbolic, but also substantial, steps to contribute to a better understanding and cooperation in the region. We all know that Serbia's EU accession process is closely linked to the normalisation of relations with Kosovo. It is not only about concluding agreements; it is more about implementing them. As soon as Serbia has a new prime minister, and as soon as Kosovo has a stable government, both parties should continue to move forward with the full implementation of all the already reached agreements, and that in good faith and in a timely manner. Both sides, Pristina and Belgrade, should now take clear steps to show their commitment and credibility.

A final remark: I am convinced that this resolution is able to find the right balance between praising Serbia for adopting important reforms and pointing out what remains to be done. As we are having our political discourse, we should not forget that we are talking about changes that demand a lot from the Serbian citizens. I am well aware that this process goes far beyond the purely economic transformation – it is a truly social transformation – but I am convinced that this reform process is worth every effort.

Helena Dalli, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, on behalf of the Presidency it is my great pleasure to address this Parliament to discuss the 2016 report on Serbia. As you know, the Western Balkans featured on the agenda of the European Council in March, where Member States reconfirmed the EU's engagement with the region, including through deepening political and economic ties.

The European Council discussions in March also clearly reaffirmed the unequivocal support for the European perspective on the Western Balkans. In this spirit the Presidency remains committed to advancing the enlargement process in full respect of the basic principles of conditionality and own merits. Serbia has made significant progress in 2016 and the accession negotiations have advanced at a steady pace. The rule of law chapters were opened in July 2016, enabling the EU and Serbia to engage closely on this decisive area.

I am particularly happy to say that we have managed to keep the momentum in Serbia's accession negotiations under the Maltese Presidency with an accession conference at ministerial level held on 27 February.

On this occasion we were in a position to open Chapter 20 – Enterprise and Industrial Policy – as well as to open and provisionally close Chapter 26, Education and Culture. These chapters cover important economic and social aspects which are of interest to Serbia's businesses, youth and citizens in general. Reforms strive to meet the expectations of the Serbian citizens and not only those of the EU. Work on further negotiating chapters is currently being finalised in the Council preparatory bodies. Once all Member States give their agreement, the Presidency stands ready to convene another accession conference next week. Progress in the accession negotiations is an acknowledgment of Serbia's reform efforts, but it should also serve as an encouragement to the new Serbian Government, once in place, to remain committed to pursuing this reform path.

Many areas requiring further reform efforts are rightly spelled out in your draft report. In this regard, let me again underline the particular importance we also attach to key areas such as the rule of law, fundamental rights, public administration reform and economic governance.

The rule of law continues to be at the heart of the enlargement process. Serbia needs to continue to make progress under the rule of law chapters opened last July, guided by the respective action plans and interim benchmarks. To this end, Serbia should intensify reform efforts and focus on effective implementation, which can make a significant contribution to the good results produced by Serbia's economic reforms.

In the area of fundamental rights, Serbia needs to address shortcomings in the freedom of expression as a matter of priority and ensure respect and protection of minorities.

Likewise, the normalisation of relations with Kosovo will also remain essential for the overall pace of the negotiations, especially the further implementation of agreements reached within the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue.

In this context, Serbia's commitment to remaining constructively engaged in the dialogue and to continuously work on a further normalisation of relations needs to be acknowledged. Important steps in the dialogue, such as Serbia's implementation of the telecommunications agreement and the resumption of works on the Mitrovica bridge, should serve as an encouragement to take the process forward.

We look forward to the continued engagement of all involved and urge Serbia to swiftly implement in good faith its part of all past agreements.

In the area of regional cooperation we welcome Serbia's constructive engagement and encourage it to continue its efforts to strengthen good neighbourly relations as well as to remain committed to preserving peace and stability in the region.

Full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia remains essential.

On various occasions the Council has also reiterated its call on Serbia to progressively align with the EU common foreign and security policy, including on restrictive measures in the period up to accession. Let me again underline the growing importance of further deepening cooperation on foreign policy issues.

I will conclude by again welcoming the continued progress in Serbia's EU accession negotiations and the continued good cooperation with the EU and with the region.

Let me also recall our appreciation for the constructive contribution of the European Parliament, and in particular of your rapporteur, David McAllister, to advance Serbia's accession process to the EU. I can assure you that we pay particular attention to the views of the Parliament in this regard.

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

Vizepräsident

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would first and foremost like to congratulate David McAllister for his resolution on the 2016 report on Serbia. This is a balanced and accurate assessment of Serbia's focus on its path to the European Union. From our point of view, it is overall in line with the findings of our own report of November 2016 and the Commission's assessment since then.

I share your view that Serbia has made good progress towards EU membership, which remains Serbia's strategic objective. This has been repeatedly outlined by the Serbian authorities and President Vučić. Serbia's ambitious economic and structural reform agenda is already delivering results. Serbia has shown its commitment to peace and stability in the region: good neighbourly relations, regional cooperation and the continuation of the dialogue with Pristina. This is encouraging for the Western Balkans connectivity agenda and the next Trieste summit in July.

Serbia has also made progress in the reform of its public administration, and has started implementing its ambitious action plans on the rule of law, and Serbia is indeed to be commended for its efforts to address the refugee and migration crisis, which continued EU support. This hard work has paid off with eight chapters opened now, two provisionally closed, and a number of other chapters being prepared for opening. Serbia should now build on its progress and move decisively ahead with reforms, in particular on the rule of law and the protection of the most vulnerable groups and minorities. It is equally important that Serbia continues playing its part in the normalisation of its relations with Kosovo.

Together with you, I regret that some developments have not been of help in this direction, and I look forward to the resumption of the dialogue. I am also encouraged by President Vučić's willingness to launch a domestic dialogue on Kosovo. I also share your views that strategic communication to ensure public support and understanding of the benefits and obligations of EU accession is of key importance for EU supporters in Serbia. The EU is Serbia's number one partner, including on assistance – EUR 2 billion in grants since 2007, and way ahead of any other global partners – and this deserves to be known.

From our side, we are making every effort to strengthen our public diplomacy, and I was in Serbia only last weekend with that in mind. I can only encourage you to support our efforts in this direction.

Now that the Serbian presidential elections are behind us, I am confident that all energy in Serbia will be devoted to the implementation of the reform agenda. Whatever the difficulties – and they are real – Serbia should not lose sight of its EU membership goal and should continue to act accordingly, doing its part of the job with continued EU support. I appreciate that the European Parliament is, in that respect, on the same page.

Cristian Dan Preda, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Domnule președinte, aș vrea în primul rând să îl felicit pe David McAllister pentru raportul pe care l-a redactat și, mai ales, pentru angajamentul său personal în ideea de a ajuta Serbia în parcursul de integrare europeană. E un obiectiv pe care îl împărtășim mai mulți membri ai acestui Parlament.

Ne dorim ca Serbia să continue reformele care o pot apropia de Europa. Nu poate decât să ne bucure faptul că negocierile de aderare progresează și sunt, la rândul meu, cum a spus și David mai devreme, bucuros, pentru că l-am auzit pe comisarul Hahn spunând că noi capitole vor fi deschise cu Serbia în viitorul imediat. E un mesaj pozitiv pentru toate țările din regiune, care sunt îngrijorate de o potențială stagnare a procesului de lărgire a Uniunii noastre.

Desigur, Serbia mai are foarte multe de făcut, începând cu promovarea unor dezbateri serioase despre Uniune, despre instituțiile sale și despre implicațiile aderării. E un lucru foarte util, pentru a evita tensiunile înainte și după aderare. Apoi, Serbia trebuie să continue să își alinieze progresiv politica externă cu cea a Uniunii, mai ales referitor la Rusia, unde e mult de lucru. Accelerarea eforturilor anticorupție, a celor de consolidare a statului de drept, aplicarea coerentă a legislației privind minoritățile pe întregul teritoriu și evitarea tratamentelor discriminatorii sunt alte domenii în care ne dorim progrese semnificative.

În fine, vreau să salut angajamentul autorităților sârbe în favoarea cooperării regionale, însă, ca raportor pentru Bosnia și Herțegovina, sunt preocupat de participarea unor oficiali sârbi la celebrarea zilei Republicii Srpska, pentru că era o aniversare împotriva statului de drept din Bosnia și Herțegovina. Sper să nu se mai întâmple asta.

Tanja Fajon, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I congratulate rapporteur McAllister for a balanced report and good cooperation. Since the beginning of the negotiations with the European Union, Serbia has certainly achieved good progress. Negotiation chapters are being opened and closed and just yesterday, as we heard, Commissioner Hahn has announced the opening of new chapters later this month.

On paper and in the report in front of us, the development in Serbia seems pretty much business as usual. But what I hear when I talk to Serbian citizens shows the contrary. Young Serbs tell me that it is almost impossible to get a job without a party membership card or paying a certain amount of the money to a party official, and NGO reports show continuous decline in the rule of law and unresolved cases such as Savamala prove this in practice.

Media representatives are threatened, investigative journalists are turned away and some of them are even physically attacked. I ask myself, and you: is this the Serbia which we want as part of our European family? Is this what we want to achieve with negotiating chapters 23 and 24? I am afraid not. Serbia should do much more to reach our European standards of democracy, rule of law and the respect for human rights.

I am sure that if we continue to practice constructive criticism and turn a blind eye to the real state of play, we will once again prove that we are doing something wrong. As an important player in the region, I wish for Serbia to develop into a prosperous, economically and socially stable country where democracy is a way of living not a word on paper, where rules, as opposed to the interests of those who hold power in their hands, prevail. This is the Serbia we want to help and support on its path to our European family.

Ivo Vajgl, *v imenu skupine ALDE*. – Dovolite, da izrazim zadovoljstvo s sodelovanjem s poročevalcem za Srbijo Davidom McAllistrom, ki je vložil veliko truda in kreativnosti v ta tehten in uravnotežen dokument.

Srbija je na dobri poti proti članstvu v Evropski Uniji in Unija, da bi dosegla stabilnost in splošni napredek, mora sprejeti Srbijo in odpreti evropsko in evroatlantsko perspektivo vsem državam jugovzhodne Evrope.

Na pozitivni strani poročilo izpostavlja solidne rezultate Srbije na gospodarskem področju in izboljšane standarde demokratičnega vladanja, večjo pripravljenost, a ne še zadostno za sodelovanje s civilno družbo, in odgovoren pristop k potrebnim reformam.

Na kritični strani ni mogoče spregledati tendence občasnega zaostrovanja – zlasti verbalnega – odnosov s sosedi v regiji, taktiziranja med proevropsko in prorusko usmerjenostjo. Pri tem je v pogojih, ko država deklarira svojo nevtralnost, sodelovanje v vojaških manevrih Rusije in njenih tesnih zaveznic sporno.

Ko gre za medije v Srbiji velja, da ustrezná zakonodaja ni dovolj, če so v praksi dovoljeni politična kontrola in pritiski na medije, redukcija medijev na vlogo propagandistov vladajočih strank in osebnosti.

Na poti do kredibilne države prava bo treba odpraviti tudi vmešavanje politike v pravosodje.

Srbija je ključna država regije, ki mora prav zaradi tega samoomejevati svoje ambicije pri promociji svojih interesov v sosednjih državah. Skupaj z drugimi državami v regiji si mora Srbija prizadevati za spravo in umiritev tega dela Evrope.

Evropska perspektiva vseh držav in narodov tega področja je ključ do miru, stabilnosti in napredka.

Jaromír Kohlíček, za skupino GUE/NGL. – Srbský stát byl vždy centrální částí Balkánu. Srbové celá staletí čelili útokům Turků a snahám o likvidaci nezávislosti. Ani Rakousko-Uhersko nemělo zájem o dobré sousedské vztahy. Jugoslávie se stala pokusem o prosazení mírového soužití a rozvoje všech vzájemně propletených národů na Balkáně.

Krvavá odplata, které se dostalo na začátku 90. let 20. století Srbům, následovaná odtržením jednotlivých částí a naposledy protiprávním vznikem Státu Kosovo, ukazují snahu o rozbití celé centrální části Balkánu na co nejmenší jednotky. Drastické bombardování ukázalo, že NATO nebylo a nikdy nebude garantem míru. Pokrytectví vedoucích činitelů EU ukazují mimo jiné body 24 a 30 projednávané zprávy.

Jak si mohou dovolit ti, kteří nevidí pošlapávání menšinových práv v řadě zemí EU, vyzývat Srbsko k důslednému projednávání právních předpisů na ochranu menšin? Jinou ukázkou je výzva, aby srbské orgány podporovaly ústavní reformy v Bosně a Hercegovině. Nechápu, proč podobnou výzvu neadresuje zpráva podporovatelům srbsko-chorvatské muslimské části země. Vrcholem těchto požadavků, mimochodem formulovaných stejnými silami, které zrušily plán Bulharska a Srbska na vybudování plynovodu Southstream, je zdůraznění, že „Srbsko musí rozvíjet svá propojení rozvodných soustav zemního plynu a elektřiny se sousedními zeměmi“.

Není divu, že v důsledku těchto a dalších kroků Evropské komise, která se snaží vměšovat do vnitřních záležitostí Srbska, považují tuto zprávu za jeden z dosavadních vrcholů pokrytectví v integračním procesu zemí Balkánu do EU. Skupina GUE/NGL...

(Předsedající odebral řečníkovi slovo.)

Ulrike Lunacek, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of the Greens/EFA shadow, Mr Igor Šoltes, who is just returning from Kosovo at the moment, as he was the head of the EP delegation to the legislative elections in Kosovo.

First of all, let me say all the positive things we have in the report. I would like also to thank the rapporteur, Mr McAllister, and all the other shadows for their very good cooperation on the topic. There has been continuous progress of Serbia in the EU integration process, which I am very glad to say, and I am also very glad that the Commissioner has announced that new chapters will be opened. This is important to show also that the EU is progressing with Serbia to move ahead. There has also been progress, for example, on the issue of a functioning market economy, especially when it comes to small- and medium-sized enterprises, and I hope this will continue.

Nevertheless, there are several issues of concern, some of which have been raised already by colleagues: the issue of the strong rhetoric used during the presidential campaign by government officials against other presidential candidates, and other issues of irregularities that have been found. One area of strong concern is the Savamala district in Belgrade, where for one year there has not really been an investigation into the demolition of private property which took place there, and that should be done. Another issue that has been raised by Tanja Fajon, Ivo Vajgl and others is the issue of freedom of the media, which really is of concern and is worsening. I hope also that, in the dialogue with Kosovo and Serbia, progress will be made on implementation.

Edouard Ferrand, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous saluons l'arrivée d'un nouveau président en République de Serbie.

Cependant, nous attirons l'attention du Parlement européen sur le fait qu'aujourd'hui, la Serbie est soumise par l'Union européenne à la doctrine Brejnev. Une doctrine de politique extérieure, qui vise trois points, malheureusement.

Premièrement, conditionner l'adhésion à l'Union européenne à l'adhésion à l'OTAN: je rappelle les massacres que l'OTAN a perpétrés en 1999 en Yougoslavie. Deuxièmement, conditionner l'adhésion de la Serbie au renoncement de ses minorités – je pense notamment à la République serbe de Bosnie et au Kosovo –, conditionner l'adhésion également à la rupture des liens étroits qui existent entre la Serbie et la Russie.

C'est pourquoi je pense que nous devons nous rendre compte que la Serbie n'a aucun intérêt à vouloir adhérer à l'Union européenne, qui est un piège tendu contre les intérêts du peuple serbe.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr, legfontosabb üzenetemet írásban is megfogalmaztam. Meg kell vétózni, meg kell akadályozni Szerbia európai uniós csatlakozását mindaddig, amíg nem biztosít önrendelkezést, ideértve a teljes körű és valós, tényleges autonómiát a közel háromszázezer vajdasági magyarnak. Vannak erre tökéletesen működő modellek Európában, Dél-Tirol vagy Baszkföld, ez a kollektív emberi jogoknak a modern felfogása, ezt tessék megkövetelni Szerbiától. Ezeknek az embereknek joguk van a szülőföldjükön magyarként élni. Ez most nem így van. Kérdezem kedves Képviselőtársaimtól és a Bizottság tagjaitól, megkapták-e azokat a dokumentumfilmeket, amiket Önöknek küldtem arról, hogy ...

(Az Elnök megvonta a képviselőtől a szót.)

José Ignacio Salafrañca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, Señorías, quisiera agradecer el trabajo hecho por el ponente, el señor McAllister, en la preparación de este informe, en el que se acoge con satisfacción la voluntad de Serbia de integrarse en la Unión Europea y, sobre todo, de expresar este espíritu constructivo en el proceso negociador como manifestación firme de voluntad política.

Yo creo que el informe tiene dos partes muy claras. En una de ellas se subrayan los esfuerzos y los avances que ha realizado Serbia en el contexto de la política económica.

Hemos seguido, señor comisario, su discurso en Belgrado, hace tan solo unos días, en el ámbito de la cooperación judicial y policial y también de las relaciones con terceros países —en el caso de Albania—, y también el camino que queda por recorrer en lo que se refiere sobre todo a la libertad de expresión y a la lucha contra la corrupción política.

Me gustaría detenerme, señor presidente, en un punto y es el relativo a la aproximación de Serbia a la política exterior y de seguridad común y a las relaciones con Rusia en un momento en el que el presidente de Serbia, en su discurso de toma de posesión, dijo que tenían tres prioridades fundamentales, una que era claramente la de situar a su país en el camino de la Unión Europea, después contribuir a la estabilidad regional y, sobre todo, reforzar sus relaciones con China y con Rusia.

Hoy la Comisión Europea ha aprobado su documento sobre la política de defensa y hemos tenido en la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores a la ministra de Defensa de Alemania. Por eso, señor presidente, me parece particularmente relevante, dentro de este informe, el llamamiento que hace el ponente, el señor McAllister, a la necesidad no solo de avanzar en los capítulos de la negociación —y todos nos felicitamos por ello—, sino de alinear su política con la política exterior y de seguridad de la Unión Europea.

Creo que este es un dato fundamental del dossier. Estamos hablando de política y, por eso, señor presidente, quiero volver a felicitar al ponente por el informe y llamar la atención sobre este importante hecho de su trabajo.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr McAllister, and our shadow, Tanya Fajon, for the fair and balanced draft report.

Today, we in our Group reiterate our commitment to the enlargement process. The accession of the Western Balkan countries and of Serbia remains one of our main priorities. A lot has been achieved in Serbia, notably for the improvement of the overall economic situation, the fight against organised crime and the regional cooperation. This report carefully and fairly acknowledges this.

But I also have a lot of concerns about the status of democracy in Serbia, including the way in which in the recent presidential campaign has been fuelled with populist and nationalist rhetoric and the way in which the freedom of media has been repeatedly undermined. Alleged irregularities in the elections are still awaiting an investigation.

Now some critical remarks, including one on you, Mr Commissioner. Stability in the Western Balkans is important, but we should not sacrifice our values for stability: both have to go hand in hand when negotiating. In playing with the so-called stabilocracy we might lose what is the most important – Serbian citizens and their commitment towards democracy. We have to pay attention to the way the opposition and the freedom of the media are respected and be certain that the civil society concerns are listened to, because the implementation of the reforms matters for its citizens.

In a time of global uncertainty, within the Union and in the Western Balkans in particular, with regional and global actors becoming more and more active in the region, the European Union has to signal its real commitment to enlargement and for the countries in the region, including Serbia, to have unequivocal choices.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, nisam zadovoljna napretkom Srbije, ako se to uopće može nazvati napretkom. Kozmetički se stvari možda mijenjaju, ali suštinski ne. To će naposljetku dovesti do rasta nepovjerenja Europske unije u Srbiju, ali i građana Srbije u Europsku uniju.

Još sam nezadovoljnija stajalištem Komisije koja dozvoljava da se cijeli niz otvorenih pitanja koje Srbija ima s Hrvatskom, a tiču se ljudskih prava, prava vlasništva i poštivanja međunarodnih ugovora i konvencija, izostavi iz ovih pregovora. Od svih tih pitanja samo je granični spor pravo bilateralno pitanje u koje se Komisija i ne treba miješati.

Također, ne vidim nikakvu potrebu za osnivanjem regionalne komisije za utvrđivanje činjenica o ratnim zločinima i drugim teškim povredama ljudskih prava. Iza nas su dva desetljeća suđenja za ratne zločine i činjenice se znaju jako dobro, samo što ih Srbija uspješno ignorira. Ova bi komisija unijela nered i dala dodatan povod Srbiji za neispunjavanje obaveza.

Илхан Кючюк (ALDE). – През миналата година Сърбия постигна значителен напредък в цялостното прилагане на реформите и политиките по пътя си към Европейския съюз. Успехите на Сърбия в процеса на интеграция са ясен знак за европейската ориентация на страната и желанието ѝ да се присъедини към Съюза.

Въпреки това няма как да не отбележим с притеснение, че страната продължава да води външна политика, която не е в пълно съответствие с тази на Европейския съюз, имайки предвид сложната геополитическа обстановка в региона. Действително, липсата на синхрон между външната политика на Сърбия и Европейския съюз е предпоставка за дестабилизиране на Балканите.

Ето защо призовавам сръбските власти да проявят необходимата политическа воля и да преведат своята външна политика в съответствие с тази на Европейския съюз. Необходимо е също така да покажат решителност за нормализиране и задълбочаване на добросъседските отношения, в частност с Косово, защото само тогава сигурността, мирът и европейската перспектива на региона ще бъдат гарантирани.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, ce rapport est très proche, dans sa rédaction, du rapport de l'année dernière, présenté par le même rapporteur. Il n'est pas entièrement négatif. Il reconnaît que la Serbie a une vocation européenne. Toutefois, à quel prix lui reconnaît-on cette dimension? La Serbie doit nier son histoire quand on lui demande de traiter le Kosovo en égal partenaire alors que cette entité, islamisée et gérée par la criminalité organisée, lui fut arrachée par les bombardements de l'OTAN, au mépris du droit international.

La Serbie doit passer sous la domination de la «société ouverte» de M. Soros, qui influence ce Parlement, et gérer les conséquences de la politique migratoire folle que ce monsieur a préparée et que le gouvernement allemand a repris.

La Serbie doit renoncer à son rôle naturel de pont entre la Russie et l'Europe et elle doit suivre une Union européenne au bord de l'abîme, une Union qui en est – excusez-moi du ridicule – à applaudir l'entrée du Monténégro.

En fait, ce que nous demandons à la Serbie, c'est de renoncer à son identité et à sa souveraineté.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, najprv sa chcem poďakovať spravodajcovi Davidovi McCallisterovi za dobre pripravenú správu.

Máme pred sebou text, ktorý objektívne odráža vývoj integrácie v Srbsku za predchádzajúce obdobie. Srbsko prešlo v tomto období niekoľkými politickými zmenami. Som rád, že prezidentské voľby, ktoré sa konali v apríli, mali pokojný priebeh a verím, že nový prezident bude pokračovať v proeurópskom smerovaní Srbska.

Srbsko napreduje v integračnom procese. Otváranie nových kapitol je jasným signálom toho, že krajina je dobre pripravená na prístupové rokovanie. Treba pripomenúť, že v kľúčových oblastiach, ako je právny štát, nezávislosť súdnictva či boj s korupciou, by malo Srbsko preukázať väčšiu politickú vôľu v riešení páľčivých otázok. Ide hlavne o kapitoly 23 a 24, kde očakávame jasný politický signál, reformy a rozhodné riešenie.

Čoraz častejšie sa ku nám dostávajú aj informácie týkajúce sa pretrvávajúcich problémov slobody médií, útokov na novinárov a taktiež problémov týkajúcich sa občianskych slobôd a zmenšujúceho sa priestoru pre občiansku spoločnosť. Hoci sa táto tendencia prejavuje vo všetkých krajinách regiónu, neskrývajte si to, mali by sme byť na tieto otázky veľmi citliví a jasne na ne upozorňovať. Iba takto môžeme prehlbovať dôveru srbskej spoločnosti v európske hodnoty.

Na záver by som chcel povzbudiť srbských politikov v pokračovaní zodpovednej a konštruktívnej politiky v regióne. Srbsko, ako jeden z regionálnych lídrov, má zodpovednosť za stabilitu a rozvoj celého regiónu. Pevne verím, že túto novú rolu bude využívať na stimuláciu spolupráce v celom regióne.

Ďakujem pekne.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, čestitam kolegi McAllisteru na izvješću o napretku Srbije koji je ona ostvarila u protekloj godini. Svakako treba spomenuti otvaranje prvih osam poglavlja, primjetan gospodarski rast i poboljšanje općih zakonodavni okvir. Međutim, u mnogim područjima i ove godine svjedočimo manjku napretka, čak i pogoršanju, unatoč izmjenama zakonodavstva.

Prije svega, danas je u Srbiji ugrožena sloboda medija, nedovoljno je učinkovita borba protiv korupcije i organiziranog kriminala, ne bilježi se potrebno jačanje vladavine prava, kao i implementacija nedavno usvojenog akcijskog plana o poštivanju prava manjina i ljudskih prava, nedostaje puna suradnja s međunarodnim sudom u Haagu te bolje usklađivanje s vanjskom politikom Europske unije. Sve je to dio „to do” liste koju Srbija treba skratiti.

Pored toga, bilo bi nepotpuno govoriti o utjecajnim događajima u Srbiji, a ne spomenuti nedavne prosvjede uglavnom mladih ljudi nakon predsjedničkih izbora. Razlozi njihovog nezadovoljstva izazivaju zabrinutost. Tvrde kako su rezultati izbora donijeli tek formalnu promjenu funkcija.

Od iznimne važnosti u procesu napretka Srbije je i adekvatan doprinos boljim odnosima sa susjedima i rješavanje preostalih bilateralnih pitanja, poput utvrđivanja sudbine nestalih ili sukcesije. Za Srbiju je od osobitog značenja napredak u procesu normalizacije s Kosovom u kojem ima previše oscilacija i zastoja. Nema sumnje da bi rješavanje problema iz prošlosti otvorilo prostor suradnji na pitanjima zajedničke europske budućnosti.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Srbija zaslužuje jasnu i sigurnu europsku perspektivu. Srbija je učinila niz koraka koji su pozitivni i to treba uvažiti. Podržavam ovaj izvještaj, podržavam ono što čini povjerenik Hahn i vjerujem da je to na dobrobit i stabilnost svih zemalja na Balkanu, jer Srbija je itekako važan faktor u svemu tome.

Ali, želim istaknuti da su predsjednički izbori donijeli novoga predsjednika. Treba mu čestitati na izboru, ali treba uvažiti činjenicu da je poslije toga bilo niz prosvjeda koji pokazuju prije svega nezadovoljstvo u Srbiji. Pametna vlast otvorit će dijalog. Problemi pravosuđa, problemi slobode medija, problemi manjina, potrebna regionalna suradnja su sve elementi onoga što očekujemo od Srbije.

I na kraju, nemojmo imati iluzije, većina građana Srbije jeste za Europsku uniju, ali velika većina građana Srbije nije za NATO. I usklađivanje sigurnosne politike biti će u tom kontekstu vrlo teško.

László Tókés (PPE). – Elnök Úr, köszönjük McAllister előadó kiváló munkáját. A volt Jugoszlávia felbomlását követő balkáni háború nyomán megteremtett béke és stabilitás fenntartásában és megszilárdításában meghatározó szerep jut az Európai Uniónak. A nyugat-balkáni országok számára az európai integráció jelenti a kibontakozás és a jövő útját. Éppen ezért az Uniónak nem szabad magára hagynia őket sokrétű válságukban. Ennek tudatában az Európai Uniónak biztosítania kell ezen országok számára a mihamarabbi csatlakozás reális lehetőségét, az integráció útjára lépett feleknek viszont az eddigieknél sokkal nagyobb erőfeszítéseket kell tenniük a velük szemben támasztott követelmények, illetve saját vállalásaik teljesítésére. Úgy tűnik, hogy ezen kívánalmak szempontjából Szerbia jó úton halad.

A szerbiai országjelentésbe foglalt eredmények és hiányosságok vonatkozásában ez alkalommal kizárólag az etnikai kisebbségek ügyére térek ki. A jelentésből hiányolom a kisebbségi autonómia kifejezett megfogalmazását, ennek kapcsán pedig a nemzeti tanácsokról, valamint a nemzeti kisebbségek jogairól szóló törvények egyre halogatott elfogadásának a meghagyását. A dokumentumban szintén elsikkad a kisebbségi közösségi-egyházi vagyonok visszaszolgáltatásának a megkövetelése. Az is tarthatatlan, hogy az egyébként dicséretes kisebbségvédelmi joganyag előírásai általában papíron maradnak, életbe léptetésük notórius módon elmarad. A szövetséges Magyarország képviselőjeként a szerbiai magyar közösség önkormányzati és emberi jogaiért külön is felelem a szavam.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! W tym roku minie 22 lat od zawarcia układu w Dayton, 18 lat od zakończenia wojny o Kosowo. To sprawozdanie, które w bardzo dobry sposób prezentuje ówczesne i obecne zadania dla Serbii, zarówno postępy, jak i to, co jest przed Serbią w zakresie negocjacji w sprawie członkostwa, buduje pewien – że tak powiem – optymizm. Przewodniczący Buzek powiedział kiedyś, że udało nam się zapobiec powrotom konfliktów na Bałkanach Zachodnich w sposób zaskakujący i zarazem prosty, bo państwa regionu ustawiły się w kolejce do Unii Europejskiej. To było ważne stwierdzenie, ale zarazem to jest niewystarczające: my też musimy dokonywać wielu wysiłków. To jest wartość, że Unia – i o tym musimy pamiętać – ma tę siłę przyciągania. Nie brakuje oczywiście głosów krytykujących, podważających wartość Unii, ale wydaje mi się, że warto przy okazji tej debaty, mówiąc o Serbii, o tym przypomnieć.

Sprawozdanie powinno być nie tylko zachętą dla rządu Serbii, ale przede wszystkim powinno być też swoistą zachętą dla obywateli Serbii, że warto kontynuować, trudne czasami i czasami być może nawet niezrozumiałe na danym etapie, reformy. Wydaje się, że chociażby wskazanie przez komisarza Hahna, że ponad dwa miliardy euro przekazaliśmy na wsparcie tych procesów jest warte odnotowania. Jest wiele postępu w obszarze gospodarki i demokratyzacji, otwarto również nowe rozdziały – ale też wiemy, że jest wiele potrzebnych zmian w zakresie praw człowieka, wolności mediów, wymiaru sprawiedliwości czy zaleceń dotyczących chociażby zmiany niektórych przepisów konstytucyjnych. Chcę podkreślić też ważną rolę, którą mogą odegrać Rzecznicy Praw Obywatelskich. W ubiegłym roku zorganizowaliśmy taką konferencję – szczyt rzeczników Europy Wschodniej, krajów Partnerstwa Wschodniego z udziałem Rzeczników Praw Obywatelskich z Bałkanów Zachodnich. Myślę, że warto tę pracę również kontynuować.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur and the Commissioner. I think it is obvious that Serbia is making progress, even though there are still some problems to deal with. But I think some of the best arguments for proceeding with membership of Serbia to the European Union have come here tonight from those who are arguing against membership, because it is very clear that they would like the old conflicts, the old hostilities, the old tensions, to rule over the future of Serbia. They are demonstrating exactly the reasons why we should proceed. And I think it is important to remember – and I think that is a message to all Serbian citizens from here tonight – that, when we are discussing the problems, we are not raising hindrances or obstacles. We are clarifying what needs to be sorted out in order to be prepared for membership of the European Union. And I would like to say that this development is not a sacrifice, because when we discuss all these chapters, it is a way of making Serbia a better society – rule of law, the fight against corruption, an open economy, prosperity. It is not a sacrifice, it is a step forward anyway. I think we need to understand that when some people talk about the costs of enlargement, the policy of enlargement has been one of the main success stories for the European Union. And we shall never forget the cost of non-enlargement: we saw that in history, and we will avoid it in the future.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, želim se zahvaliti gospodinu McAllisteru na ovom uravnoteženom i objektivnom izvješću. Svi se večeras slažemo da Srbija jest postigla određeni napredak u procesu pristupanja Europskoj uniji, ali za područja kao što je vladavina prava, neovisnost pravosuđa, može se reći da još uvijek nisu zaživjela u praksi.

U svakom slučaju, još uvijek su vidljivi nedostaci. Potrebno je još više napora u borbi protiv korupcije i organiziranog kriminala, koji su i dalje prepreka ekonomskom i socijalnom razvoju, ali ugrožena je i sloboda medija. Stalno ponavljamo da je neophodna normalizacija odnosa s Kosovom, gdje se očekuje veći angažman Srbije, a osim toga vrlo je važno da Srbija uskladi svoju vanjsku i sigurnosnu politiku s politikom Europske unije. Posebice ovdje mislim na njihov odnos prema Rusiji.

Što se tiče dobrosusjedskih odnosa, bilateralna pitanja vezana uz druge zemlje, posebno uz Hrvatsku moraju se što prije riješiti. Potrebno ih je hitno riješiti kako bi regionalna suradnja bila moguća i kako bi Srbija nastavila graditi svoju europsku budućnost. Srbija jednostavno mora prilagoditi svoju vanjsku politiku europskoj politici, produbiti dijalog s Kosovom i povećati napore u rješavanju svih preostalih bilateralnih pitanja.

Slažem se s gospodinom Hökmarkom da moramo raspravljati i da je puno bolje omogućiti Srbiji da otvara poglavlje i da se na taj način približava Uniji, nego je prijeći. Naravno, da se u tome slažemo, svjesni onoga što je Hrvatska prošla na svom putu, ali tražimo pravedne kriterije i ispunjavanje kriterija, kao što smo to napravili mi.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Elnök Úr, nagyon örülök annak, hogy végre vitára került McAllister képviselőtársam jól megfogalmazott és kiegyensúlyozott jelentése. A leírtakból egyértelmű, hogy Szerbia jó úton halad, és hogy a régió stabilitásának megőrzésében Szerbiának meghatározó szerepe van. Természetes az is, hogy a csatlakozási folyamatban van még tenni való, a jogállamiság a kisebbségi jogok, a nemzeti tanácsok, a részarányos foglalkoztatás vagy a kisebbségi oktatás terén is. Szerbia ezekre vonatkozóan pontos akcióttervet fogadott el, és bízom abban, hogy Szerbia teljesíti is az abban foglaltakat. De ugyanúgy bízom abban is, hogy az EU is teljesíti saját vállalásait, és hogy konkrét, a szerbiai polgárok számára is érezhető gesztusokat fog tenni. Ezalatt nem csak újabb tárgyalási fejezetek megnyitását értem, hanem ennél sokkal kézzelfoghatóbb lépésekre van szükség, amelyek azt sugallják, hogy az EU őszintén elkötelezett a további bővítést illetően.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, poštovani povjereniče, na početku bih željela čestitati kolegi Davidu McAllisteru na jednom izvrsno izbalansiranom izvješću u kojem je uočen napredak Srbije ka članstvu u Europskoj uniji i njezinim vrijednostima kao jedinom putu i garanciji mira, stabilnosti i sigurnosti na cijelom području zapadnog Balkana. U izvješću, što je izvjestitelj i istaknuo, osim navedenog napretka uočene su i slabosti koje je potrebno otkloniti kako bi Srbija ispunila kriterije za članstvo u Europskoj uniji. Tu mislim na provedbu ključnih reformi na području vladavine prava, neovisnog pravosuđa i slobodnih medija te borbe protiv korupcije i organiziranog kriminala.

Osim ispunjavanja kriterija važnih za članstvo u Europskoj uniji, potrebno je rješavati otvorene bilateralne sporove sa susjednim državama, prije svega mislim na rješavanje sporova s Republikom Hrvatskom. Pitanje nestalih osoba za vrijeme rata, otvaranje arhiva, rješavanje graničnih pitanja te pitanje regionalne jurisdikcije Srbije neka su od otvorenih pitanja koje treba riješiti. Posebno bih se osvrnula i na rješavanja pitanja školovanja na materinjem jeziku hrvatske nacionalne manjine u Srbiji te omogućavanja udžbenika na hrvatskom jeziku i sadržaja koji će njima biti prilagođen.

Smatram kako je to nužan preduvjet za očuvanje identiteta i prava manjina, a što je i jedan od temeljnih uvjeta za ulazak Srbije u Europsku uniju. Rješavanja otvorenih bilateralnih pitanja nisu tu da bi se Srbiju sprječavalo ili blokiralo na njezinom putu u Europsku uniju, već njihovo rješavanje stvorit će pretpostavku za trajne dobrosusjedске odnose i stabilnost odnosa između Hrvatske i Srbije.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Čestitke David tebi, tvojim poročevalcem v senci za odlično poročilo, ki daje objektivno sliko o napredku Srbije v zadnjem letu.

Širitveni proces Evropske unije je tudi zame eden največjih uspehov, to vemo tudi tisti, ki sedaj ob zaključku največ govorimo iz Slovenije, Hrvaške, ki smo del tega širitvenega procesa.

Urejena demokracija rabi politično kulturo, rabi spoštovanje prava, rabi boj proti korupciji, rabi tudi medijsko svobodo. S tem se ukvarjajo tudi države, ki so že članice Evropske unije, in če tega ni v državah, je v državah tudi v nadaljevanju težava. Zato mislim, da je prav, da so ta opozorila, ki so v poročilih, sprejeta dobronamerno in da se popravijo te napake.

Zagotovo pa je veliko dobrega v poročilu o Srbiji, najprej gospodarski napredek, reforme, ki se izvajajo, kajti to je odgovor na to, da se bo demografska slika v Srbiji izboljšala, kajti to, kar beležimo sedaj, da je, ne vem 65 000 rojstev letno, 105 000 mrtvih, govori o slabi situaciji v državi.

Srbija je tudi za garant za stabilnost na Balkanu, kot pa vemo iz zgodovine, je Balkan tudi večkrat bil povzročitelj številnih nemirov v Evropi.

Zato upam in želim, da se najprej Srbija in pa njene sosede vzdržijo nepotrebnih provokacij in da v dobrih sosedskih odnosih gradijo mir in blaginjo v tem delu Evrope.

Der Präsident. – Meine Damen und Herren! Das war der letzte reguläre Redner. Gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 6 der Geschäftsordnung kann der Präsident ein *Catch-the-eye-Verfahren* durchführen. Wir sind weit über unsere Redezeit hinaus, und wir haben viel zu viele Wortmeldungen. Ich werde deswegen nur einem Redner das Wort geben, der vorher aus logistischen Gründen nicht da sein konnte: Igor Šoltes hat für eine Minute das Wort.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Torej to, kar so povedali že moji kolegi, dodajam tudi sam, da pravzaprav je v Srbiji bil narejen določen napredek na poti vključevanja, vključno z odpiranjem posameznih poglavij.

Predvsem pa seveda je jasno, da je pred Srbijo še zelo zahtevno obdobje, zlasti seveda tudi pojmovanje tako imenovane demokracije.

In mislim, da niso tako iz trte izvita tudi nekatera opažanja nevladnega sektorja, tako imenovanih NGO, ki opozarjajo na to, da je seveda Srbija tudi pred težko preizkušnjo, kako pravzaprav zagotoviti pluralen prostor za svobodno izražanje mnenj, svobodo medijev in zatorej to, da so slišane tudi manjšine vseh vrst.

Zato mislim, da seveda moramo na to biti pozorni tudi pri prihodnjih poročilih, predvsem pa odpreti prostor za diskusijo.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for this very interesting debate, which reflects the importance of the enlargement process and of our relations with Serbia as a driving force in the region. I fully understand the sensitivity of bilateral issues. Clearly further efforts will be needed to overcome the legacy of the past. At the same time, we should ensure that bilateral issues do not hamper the firm prospect of EU membership, which continues to drive transformation and anchor stability and security in Serbia and elsewhere in the region. This is more important than ever at a time when our EU's commitment to Serbia and the region's EU path are questioned by some people.

At the same time, of course, we should focus on good neighbourly relations, democratic values and the respect of the rule of law, protection of national minorities, freedom of expression and of the media, ability to address the legacy of the past and war crimes issues. Those are core European values and are simply not negotiable. This is why they are key conditions on Serbia's EU path and I can reassure you that the Commission is committed to continue monitoring Serbia's focus in this respect under our Chapter 23 negotiations and to continue supporting Serbia's efforts.

Helena Dalli, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, Commissioner, honourable Members, I wish to thank you for the very useful debate. I have listened carefully to the views expressed and we look forward to continuing this constructive dialogue and engagement.

I would like to assure you that when moving ahead on the accession process with Serbia, we will closely monitor its progress, paying particular attention to the areas of the rule of law, the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue and other important issues mentioned here today. In this regard the Presidency hopes to hold an accession conference this coming week on 20 June.

David McAllister, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident Graf Lambsdorff, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich möchte mich bei allen Rednern in der Debatte heute Abend herzlich bedanken. Ich glaube, das war eine gute, durchaus kritische, aber zugleich auch konstruktive Debatte über die politische Lage in Serbien. Die serbische Botschafterin bei der Europäischen Union, Frau Ana Hrustonavic, die ich herzlich auch auf der Tribüne begrüße, hat sicherlich auch sehr aufmerksam allen Argumenten zugehört. Mein besonderer Dank gilt den Schattenberichterstattern der einzelnen Fraktionen für die einmal mehr gute und vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit. Ich glaube, es ist uns gemeinsam gelungen, diesem Europäischen Parlament einen Bericht vorzulegen, der ein realistisches Bild von Serbien zeichnet. Und ich glaube, die Botschaft der Debatte heute Abend war – trotz manch unterschiedlicher Auffassung zu Details der serbischen Innenpolitik: Die riesengroße Mehrheit hier im Parlament unterstützt Serbien auf dem Weg in unsere Gemeinschaft von Nationen in Europa.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Mittwoch, 14. Juni 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR), *γραπτώς*. – Κανείς φυσικά δεν ξεχνά ότι η ΕΕ και ιδιαίτερα η Γερμανία και η Αυστρία με την εξωτερική πολιτική που ακολούθησαν κατά τη δεκαετία του 1990 φέρουν τεράστια ευθύνη για τον διαμελισμό της Γιουγκοσλαβίας και τον πόλεμο που ξέσπασε τότε στην περιοχή με χιλιάδες νεκρούς. Μετά από μια δεκαετία πολέμων και νατοϊκών βομβαρδισμών που στόχευαν τη Σερβία, η χώρα αυτή βρέθηκε να έχει απωλέσει σημαντικά εδάφη στα οποία κατοικούσαν σερβικοί πληθυσμοί. Απώλεσε την πρόσβαση της στη θάλασσα αλλά και το λίκνο του σερβικού πολιτισμού, δηλαδή το Κόσοβο, ενώ σημαντικές υποδομές της καταστράφηκαν. Σε μια κοινωνία που βρίσκεται έκτοτε σε καθεστώς οικονομικής ανασφάλειας, έρχεται η ΕΕ και με τον πλέον υποκριτικό τρόπο της ζητά, εδώ και τώρα, απόλυτη προσαρμογή στα δυτικοευρωπαϊκά πρότυπα οργάνωσης του κράτους. Και σαν να μην έφτανε αυτό, η ΕΕ ζητά την *de facto* αναγνώριση του Κοσόβου εκ μέρους του Βελιγραδίου, γεγονός που πέραν των άλλων ενισχύει τον αλβανικό εθνικισμό. Τέλος, αφού επισημανθεί ο θετικός ρόλος της Σερβίας στο προσφυγικό θα πρέπει να παρατηρήσουμε ότι η θέση της ορθόδοξης Σερβίας είναι στην Ευρώπη και ο ελληνικός λαός στηρίζει την ευρωπαϊκή πορεία της Σερβίας.

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan*. – Drago mi je da ovo Izvješće poziva Srbiju da uloži dodatne napore u rješavanje problema opsega, provedbe i učinaka Zakona o organizaciji i nadležnosti državnih organa u postupku za ratne zločine kojim si je Srbija uzela ulogu malog Haaga. Taj Zakon predstavlja opasnost za hrvatske branitelje koji su na crnoj listi Srbije ali i za bivšeg premijera Kosova Ramusha Haradinaja.

Ipak, žao mi je što ukidanje spornih članaka zakona nije postavljeno kao uvjet Srbiji za otvaranje pregovora te stoga pozivam Komisiju da tijekom pregovora o poglavlju 23. inzistira na ukidanju članaka 2. i 3. ovog Zakona. Još jednom upozoravam na sustavnu diskriminaciju Hrvata u Srbiji i osporavanje njihovih manjinskih prava poput osiguravanja obrazovanja i medijskih programa na hrvatskom jeziku.

Također, fizički napadi na temelju nacionalne pripadnosti, a i javna retorika u Srbiji koja sadrži elemente ekstremizma i govora mržnje u suprotnosti su s europskim vrijednostima.

15. Sastav Parlamenta: vidi zapisnik

16. Izvješće o Kosovu za 2016. (rasprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Ulrike Lunacek im Namen des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten über den Bericht 2016 der Kommission über das Kosovo (2016/2314(INI)) (A8-0062/2017).

Ulrike Lunacek, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, Minister, Commissioner, colleagues, let me say first of all there has been some progress in Kosovo over the last year on issues that concern the relationship between the European Union and Kosovo. A stabilisation and association agreement finally has come into force, and that has included the European reform agenda and something we voted recently in the plenary: the participation of Kosovo in EU programmes. So various things were re-signalled – and that is supported by this report – strongly signalled to Kosovo, and to Kosovo citizens: your future is in the European Union.

Nevertheless, we also have to see that, over the last year, things have not progressed as much as Kosovo citizens and also as we here in the European Parliament would have liked them to go. The extreme polarisation of the political landscape (and I will come to the elections of last Sunday at the end), but also no progress here in the European Union. We still – and I have been rapporteur for Kosovo since 2009 — do not have progress with five EU Member States recognising the independence of the Republic of Kosovo. This is harming progress also. This does not give Kosovo citizens the idea that we really want them and that they are part of Europe – they should be part of the European Union. So this report also regrets that still five Members are not recognising Kosovo, and you know, to those of you who come from those five Member States, sometimes I wonder, when you then criticise corruption – organised crime in Kosovo, yes, which exists, like in other parts of the region and also inside the EU – then why do you not want to allow Kosovo to become part of Europol and Interpol? Because that would help. So there is a contradiction in the position of those five Member States, and I hope we will see progress in the next year.

But let me come to some other points. In the normalisation process between Kosovo and Serbia we also have had mostly stalemates. We have had one progress: Kosovo now has a telephone code of its own and not any more the Monaco one or the Slovenian one. It can be still be used, but there is this independent international telephone code.

But nevertheless, so many things have been agreed between the two governments of Kosovo and Serbia, but implementation is still lacking on both sides. Also from Serbia we have had signs that were simply not helpful. The Serbian nationalist train from Belgrade to northern Kosovo with signs on it: 'Kosovo is Serbia'. This simply is not the reality any more, and people in Serbia know that and the Serbian Government knows it. It simply does not help to develop good neighbourly relationships if things like that are supported. And as I said, what is lacking really is implementation.

In Kosovo itself, still administration of justice remain slow and inefficient. Lack of progress has been made in regard to the protection of freedom of expression and media freedom, and several other issues. When I talk about gender-based violence, still women's full rights need to be enjoyed, although there has been some progress as well.

Now let me come to the elections on that weekend. Yes, finally, and it is good that these elections were passed peacefully. There have not been any disruptions. But we still have problems there. There are still voting lists that were not been totally accurate; the electoral system still not functioning well sometimes and financing of political parties were problems. So I think it would be very important also because we have had intimidation against Kosovo Serbs who would not want to vote for the *Socijalistička*.

There I would like to end with asking, as it is said in the report as well, that the leaders of the Kosovo Serb community should take full ownership of them being part of Kosovo and not always referring to Belgrade.

Helena Dalli, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, on 9 March 2017, the European Council discussed the situation in the Western Balkans. The heads of state or government stressed the EU's commitment to the region and reaffirmed their unequivocal support for the European perspective of the Western Balkans, in full respect of the basic principles of conditionality and own merits.

Today we focus on Kosovo's progress in 2016. However, more generally, I would like to stress the importance of Kosovo's stability and of its continuous efforts to advance further on the European path. We welcome the entry into force of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) with Kosovo and the first Stabilisation and Association Council, which both took place last year. The EU-only agreement, which is without prejudice to Member States' positions on status, provides the contractual framework for cooperation between the EU and Kosovo.

It is important for Kosovo to implement the comprehensive reforms to meet its obligations under the SAA in order to fully benefit from the opportunities it brings. We welcome the launch of the European Reform Agenda in November 2016. The Kosovo leadership is responsible for ensuring its thorough implementation, with the objective of improving the rule of law, socio-economic development and building a track record of SAA implementation.

It is key that Kosovo further intensifies its efforts to improve the rule of law, including judicial independence. It also needs to further advance its fight against organised crime and corruption. We welcome the steps taken to increase the number of high-level corruption and organised crime cases being investigated and prosecuted. We encourage further progress in strengthening a solid track record of convictions. We also note progress in fighting radicalisation, extremism and terrorism, and we encourage further efforts.

Effective promotion and protection of human rights throughout Kosovo should be pursued, including the full protection of cultural and religious heritage. Furthermore, the Kosovo authorities should address the inclusion and protection of persons belonging to minorities. This includes additional efforts to ensure a safe environment and the safeguarding of their property rights, as well as the strengthening of social cohesion.

Progress in the process of normalisation of relations with Serbia is essential and underpins the development of relations and cooperation between the EU and Kosovo. We urge Kosovo to swiftly implement in good faith its part of all past agreements achieved in the EU-facilitated dialogue, in particular the establishment of the Association/Community of Serb-majority Municipalities, and to engage constructively with Serbia in formulating and implementing future agreements. We concur with you in welcoming the recent agreements on the implementation of freedom of movement and telecoms. We look forward to a swift appointment of judicial personnel into the Kosovo system in order to ensure the functioning of an integrated judiciary. We also look forward to the opening of the Mitrovica Bridge, as agreed between the two sides.

The Council will continue to monitor closely Kosovo's continued engagement towards visible and sustainable progress so that Kosovo and Serbia can continue on their respective European paths. Neither should block the other in these efforts, and both should be able to fully exercise their rights and fulfil their responsibilities. The High Representative played a key role in promoting additional progress in the dialogue.

We also welcome the agreement reached over the extension of the EULEX mission until June 2018. We urge Kosovo to continue to cooperate closely and effectively with EULEX, and to contribute actively to the full and unhindered execution by EULEX of its mandate. We welcome the fact that Kosovo met its remaining obligation on the establishment of the Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office to investigate allegations of international crimes committed during and after the 1999 conflict. All authorities in Kosovo should comply with their requests for assistance.

Kosovo has made significant progress in meeting the requirements of its visa roadmap, which led to a proposal by the Commission, in May 2016, to transfer Kosovo to the Schengen visa-free list. As rightly noted in your resolution, such a decision can only be taken if Kosovo meets the two remaining requirements: the ratification of the border/boundary agreement with Montenegro, and the continuation of the strengthening of its track record in the fight against organised crime and corruption.

We share your concern about the incidents of violence in the Assembly throughout 2016. It is important that, following early general elections, all political parties and local stakeholders show responsibility and ownership and engage in a constructive dialogue with parliament, as the key forum for political debate.

Finally, we very much welcome the signature of the Framework Agreement on the general principles for the participation of Kosovo in Union programmes. It is of utmost importance for Kosovo to take full advantage of these programmes. We are looking forward to the European Parliament's consent for the conclusion of this agreement.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister, honourable Members, first of all, I would like to thank the Parliament, in particular the rapporteur Ulrike Lunacek, for the report on Kosovo. We believe that this is a balanced report and is in line with the main findings of our 2016 Commission report.

Last Sunday was a crucial day for Kosovo and its democratic development. I would like to thank this House and especially Alojz Peterle for its strong support for the EU election observation mission. This observation mission was deployed in record time. The European Parliament has significantly contributed to making it possible. In most of Kosovo, the election day passed calmly and peacefully. It is a sign of Kosovo's democratic maturity that people generally were able to cast their ballots freely and without hindrance.

However, we do share chief election observer Peterle's concerns about several aspects of the elections. Any incidents of intimidation and pressure as witnessed during the electoral campaign are unacceptable. It will be essential for Kosovo's democratic development that the findings of the observation mission are taken seriously and implemented as a matter of priority. Now that elections are over, Kosovo has no time to lose. Based on the democratic will of the people, we expect a new government to be formed and begin work without delay. A new governing coalition will face huge expectations and challenges. The dialogue with Belgrade needs to move ahead. The people of Kosovo expect decisions on visa liberalisation. The rule of law, economic development and education need to be given the highest priority. Broad societal consensus on the EU reforms will be necessary to navigate through these various challenges. One of the most important priorities the government will have to tackle immediately is delivery on the conditions for visa liberalisation. Kosovo has made progress on its track record of high-level corruption and organised crime cases. This must be a continuous process and one in which momentum must be maintained at all times.

I can assure you that we know how contentious the border demarcation agreement with Montenegro has become. It will now be for Kosovo's new government and parliament to deliver on the expectations of its people. We are ready to support Kosovo every step of the way. Once Kosovo has fulfilled these conditions, the Commission will give its green light to the European Parliament and Council.

Beside these political challenges, Kosovo's priorities should remain the rule of law, economic development and education. Kosovo needs to become an attractive place for business, provide citizens with high quality education and reduce the very high unemployment levels, in particular amongst young people. The incoming government will need to show strong commitment to addressing the systemic weaknesses in the rule of law, as we have frequently pointed out in our reports.

The Commission is providing strong support for the implementation of these priorities through substantive financial assistance and technical advice. For its part, Kosovo needs to keep pace with the rest of the region, to promote economic growth and foster political stability, which is essential for the security of the Western Balkans as a whole. To achieve this, we have jointly agreed programmes with Kosovo: the European Reform Agenda and the Economic Reform Programme. These should serve as guidelines for concrete deliverables. This is the priority for now and the immediate future.

Lars Adaktusson, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, the Commission progress report is issued at an important time for Kosovo, but also for the whole region. Recent events have shown the need for responsible action by the governments and lawmakers of both Kosovo and Serbia, not only for enabling the normalisation between Belgrade and Pristina, but also to convince this Parliament that there is a genuine will for European integration. We as the European Union indeed welcome the progress that has been made, not least in the fight against corruption. Now we are awaiting convictions and not just indictments of high-level individuals. The EPP hopes that visa liberalisation will become a reality. At the same time, we strongly emphasise that a successful fight against corruption and organised crime is a requirement and that the issue is in the hands of the decision-makers of Kosovo.

After the elections last Sunday, we all certainly hope for a new Kosovar government to be formed as soon as possible. We hope that the issues which have been troubling domestic Kosovar politics will be settled through a determined government and a responsible and Europe-oriented political assembly. The resolution we are debating tonight reflects the general view of this Parliament. It is balanced and well drafted by the rapporteur, Ms Lunacek, and I would like to thank you for good cooperation. In order to support the people of Kosovo on their significant path towards the European Union and show that Kosovo belongs in Europe, we will vote 'yes' to the resolution tomorrow.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la collega Lunacek per il lavoro svolto. Questa relazione, oltre a descrivere la situazione dei nostri rapporti, è utile soprattutto a concentrare la nostra attenzione sui diversi punti cruciali che ancora impediscono al Kosovo una completa integrazione.

Il risultato delle importanti elezioni di domenica scorsa ha visto la cosiddetta ala di guerra, come la chiamano i media locali, composta da una coalizione guidata da Haradinaj, ottenere il maggior numero di voti che non sembrerebbero però sufficienti a sostenere un governo senza alleanze con altre forze politiche. Le nostre aspettative sono naturalmente quelle di vedere nascere un governo che garantisca al paese la stabilità necessaria per continuare il processo di stabilizzazione politica e di integrazione del Kosovo nel contesto europeo.

Tuttavia, dobbiamo essere consapevoli che la vittoria di Haradinaj non renderà semplici i rapporti con la Serbia, paese che, come sappiamo, ha emesso un mandato d'arresto internazionale contro l'ex comandante dell'esercito di liberazione del Kosovo. Sarà importante il ruolo dell'Unione europea in questo quadro.

Come giustamente sottolineato nella relazione, resta alta la preoccupazione in merito alla corruzione e alla criminalità organizzata, due fattori che affliggono con una certa pesantezza il paese. Inoltre, nonostante l'apprezzabile miglioramento economico e l'aumento del gettito fiscale, è indispensabile promuovere riforme economiche e sociali strutturali, soprattutto per quanto riguarda il lavoro e per quanto riguarda l'istruzione.

Infine, io invito a riflettere sul fatto che il mancato riconoscimento del Kosovo da parte di cinque Stati membri di fatto ostacola il processo di integrazione. Un cambio di rotta potrebbe essere utile e permetterebbe il miglioramento dei rapporti tra il Kosovo e la Serbia. Penso che sia necessario che il Parlamento europeo mostri più coraggio, perché ciò aiuterebbe ancor di più l'azione politica dell'Unione europea in Kosovo e nei Balcani.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Поздравления първо за вас, г-жо Луначек за доклада, който направихте. Тази неделя бях част от наблюдателната мисия на Европейския парламент в изборния процес в Косово и мога да ви уверя, че демокрацията в страната или поне изборите, както бяха направени, най-вероятно са по-добри и по-добре подготвени, отколкото от някои от нашите държави.

Разбира се, както и в други държави от предприєдинителния процес, и там са налице проблеми в съдебната система, висока корупция, организирана престъпност, независимост на медиите, а стои огромният въпрос и с ислямските фундаменталисти. Но искам да ви обърна внимание на факта, че в Косово се сблъскват интересите и влиянията и на съседни държави, например Русия и Сърбия, които се опитват всячески да развият своето влияние на тази територия.

Турция завладява религиозно и икономически страната и по този начин за нас остава само възможността да сме донори на средства, без видима политическа полза. Именно липсата на видимо присъствие на Европейския съюз кара много косовари да мислят, че Европейският съюз ги е забравил. Затова, уважаеми колеги, Косово има подкрепа повече от всякога сега.

Jozo Radoš, *u ime kluba ALDE*. – Gospodine predsjedniče, kolegice i kolege, prošle nedjelje su održani izbori za skupštinu Kosova i ja bih ovdje želio naglasiti činjenicu da je odaziv bio samo 41 %. Ako znamo da je nezaposlenost na Kosovu vrlo visoka, među mladima i viša od 50 %, te dvije činjenice upućuju na opasnost, ne samo gubitka povjerenja u domaću političku strukturu, što svakako nije dobro. Mala sudjelovanja građana otežavaju kvalitetne politike, ali jednako tako opasnost od gubitka povjerenja u Europsku uniju.

Jesu li rezultati izbora, koji su, sa svim poteškoćama o kojima je govorila gospođa Lunacek kao izvjestiteljica, uglavnom provedeni korektno, ali jesu li rezultati izbora takvi da omogućavaju lakše rješavanje problema s kojima se Kosovo suočava unutar sebe i vanjskih problema, ostaje, naravno, pitanje.

Dakle, i tu uz sve napore koje poduzima kosovska Vlada, odnosno jednako tako i Europska unija, napredak u mnogim područjima je vrlo slab ili gotovo da ne postoji, što prijeti opet opasnošću da se i ovdje u Europskoj uniji, u zemljama članicama, u biračkom tijelu, u Europskom parlamentu, također izgubi podrška pristupanju Kosova i ostalih zemalja zapadnog Balkana Europskoj uniji.

Dakle, radi se o vrlo delikatnoj situaciji. Ja plediram na Europsku komisiju, na kolege zastupnike da ne gube ritam, da ne gube povjerenje i uz sve ove programe koje je Komisija razvila, program povezivanja, energetske veze, pozivam Komisiju da razvije i druge programe zajedničke suradnje zemalja zapadnog Balkana.

Javier Couso Permyu, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente. No hemos variado nuestra postura sobre la declaración unilateral de independencia de Kosovo, un Estado artificial creado bajo cobijo de una intervención militar, fuera de la legalidad internacional y de las Naciones Unidas, con el apoyo, además, de grupos que han violado gravemente los derechos humanos.

No es baladí recordar que se vulneran los principios de soberanía e integridad territorial garantizados por el Acta de Helsinki y que existe una Resolución del Consejo de Seguridad, la 1244, que no se puede poner por un acto unilateral. Hoy ochenta y dos países de las Naciones Unidas, cinco de ellos de la UE, no reconocen esta declaración unilateral de independencia.

La Unión no puede utilizar el Derecho internacional como un traje a medida. El ingreso kosovar en organismos y organizaciones internacionales no es la vía de la solución. La solución pasa por acompañar el diálogo entre las dos partes dentro de la legalidad internacional.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, entre 1999 et 2004, 150 églises et monastères du Kosovo ont été pillés, détruits ou incendiés. Manifestement, la société kosovare actuelle rejette l'histoire du territoire sur lequel elle se trouve. On aurait connu mieux comme moyen de manifester son attachement à l'histoire de l'Europe. Songez au signal que vous envoyez en tendant la main à ceux qui veulent faire disparaître notre histoire.

L'Unesco, antichambre des Nations unies, ne s'est pas trompée en rejetant l'adhésion du Kosovo. Elle sait bien qu'il est impensable de confier aujourd'hui le contrôle des quatre sites de l'Église orthodoxe serbe classés au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité à ceux qui les pillaient hier. Suivons son exemple, renonçons à cette intégration.

En plus d'être un danger pour la culture européenne, l'entêtement à vouloir intégrer le Kosovo se fait au péril de notre sécurité. Dans un même article, la rapporteure révèle le trafic de stupéfiants, la traite des êtres humains ainsi que le commerce et la possession illégale d'armes, et se félicite de la proposition de la Commission de libéraliser le régime des visas. Plus que de l'indulgence, c'est de la complaisance.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως προκύπτει όχι μόνο από την έκθεση της Επιτροπής, αλλά κυρίως από τη γνώση της πραγματικότητας, το Κοσσυφοπέδιο είναι ίσως η πλέον διεφθαρμένη χώρα της Ευρώπης. Υπάρχει διαφθορά σε όλα τα κλιμάκια της διοίκησης, οργανωμένο έγκλημα, καταπάτηση ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, διακίνηση σκληρών ναρκωτικών, εμπόριο οργάνων, ενδοοικογενειακή βία, ξένοι μαχητές στο ISIS και πολιτική πόλωση στη χώρα. Πέραν αυτού, το Κοσσυφοπέδιο δεν πληροί τους όρους της καλής γειτονίας, διότι αρνείται να επικυρώσει τη συμφωνία χαράξεως των συνόρων του με το Μαυροβούνιο και θέλει να ενωθεί με την Αλβανία, η οποία εκφράζει ευθέως επεκτατικές βλέψεις εναντίον όλων των γειτονικών χωρών στα πλαίσια της δημιουργίας της Μεγάλης Αλβανίας. Ιδιαίτερα προκλητική είναι κατά της Ελλάδος. Κάτω από αυτές τις προϋποθέσεις, δεν είναι δυνατόν να εφαρμοστεί η Συμφωνία Σταθεροποίησης και Συνδέσεως του Κοσσυφοπεδίου με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση διότι, όταν σε μια χώρα δεν έχει εδραιωθεί το κράτος δικαίου, πώς είναι δυνατόν αυτή να συμμετέχει στους διεθνείς οργανισμούς;

David McAllister (PPE). – Herr Präsident Graf Lambsdorff, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte zunächst Ulrike Lunacek ein herzliches Wort des Dankes sagen für ihre engagierte Arbeit. Ich finde, wir sollten schon anerkennen, dass es diesem Land gelungen ist, die dritten Wahlen seit der Unabhängigkeit im Jahr 2008 einmal mehr frei und fair abzuhalten. Das Ergebnis darf jedoch nicht zu einer politischen Blockade führen. Und das bereitet mir angesichts des Wahlergebnisses und der Zusammensetzung des Parlaments durchaus Sorge. Eine Regierungsbildung in Pristina mit neun Monaten Vorlaufzeit, wie es nach der letzten Parlamentswahl der Fall war, sollte vermieden werden. Die neue Regierung in Pristina sollte sich im Interesse aller Kosovaren proeuropäisch ausrichten und eine belastbare Strategie für die Zukunft des Landes haben.

Aus meiner Sicht sind in drei Bereichen besondere Fortschritte notwendig. Erstens – es ist bereits betont worden: Das Kosovo ist das einzige Land im westlichen Balkan, welches nach wie vor keine Visafreiheit genießt. Das führt natürlich zu Frustration bei den Menschen. Die neue Regierung in Pristina und das Parlament sollten endlich die Kriterien für die Visafreiheit erfüllen. Dazu gehört zuallererst die Ratifizierung des Grenzabkommens mit Montenegro.

Zweitens: Die neue Regierung sollte wichtige Wirtschaftsreformen und ebenso Reformen zur Stärkung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit verabschieden. Die Fortschritte im Kampf gegen Korruption, Bestechlichkeit und organisierte Kriminalität sind natürlich logische und wichtige Voraussetzungen auf dem Weg in die Europäische Union, aber sie sind auch gleichzeitig die Grundvoraussetzung für weitere Investitionen aus anderen Ländern, beispielsweise aus Deutschland.

Drittens: Der Dialog mit Serbien sollte fortgeführt und vertieft werden, bereits getroffene Vereinbarungen müssen umgesetzt werden. Dazu gehört auch die Errichtung eines serbischen Gemeindeverbands im Norden Kosovos. Den Beziehungen zu Serbien kommt eine Schlüsselfunktion sowohl für die Beziehung zur EU als auch für die Stabilität in der gesamten Region zu.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, čestitam izvjestiteljici Urlike Lunacek na predanom radu na ovom izvješću kao i na odličnoj suradnji s izvjestiteljima u sjeni. Usvajanje ove Rezolucije odgođeno je zbog raspisivanja izvanrednih parlamentarnih izbora, što govori o političkoj dinamici u najmlađoj europskoj državi. Kosovo je izraziti primjer postkonfliktnog društva gdje ključni protagonisti ne uspijevaju razriješiti nagomilane točke sukoba. Prošle godine je čak i u važnim institucijama demokratskog poretka, poput Parlamenta, politička polarizacija znala imati nasilan karakter.

Na stanje na Kosovu velik utjecaj imaju loše socijalne i gospodarske prilike, osobito visoka nezaposlenost mladih, slabost pravosudnog sustava podložnog političkim pritiscima, pritisci na medije kao i nedovoljno efikasna borba protiv organiziranog kriminala i korupcije. Međutim, sva ta opterećenja mogu vremenom biti otklonjena ako kosovske vlasti budu aktivno koristile mogućnosti Sporazuma o stabilizaciji i pridruživanju i budu ispunjavale obveze iz Europske reformske agende. Europska budućnost Kosova bit će određena i odnosom politike, ali i cijelog društva, prema događajima iz nedavne prošlosti kojima će se baviti haški Ured posebnog istražitelja za ratne zločine počinjene u vrijeme agresije na Kosovo.

Pred vlastima u Prištini je također izazov produktivnijeg nastavka razgovora s Beogradom. Obje pregovaračke strane moraju prevladati međusobne animozitete kao i unutarnje otpore procesu koji zapravo nema alternativu. Odnosno, bolje je o njoj ne razmišljati. Kao predsjednik Zajedničkog parlamentarnog izaslanstva s Kosovom, želim naglasiti kako se političke podjele nisu odrazile na naš rad. Štoviše, svi članovi izaslanstva dali su svoj puni doprinos te smo bez većih poteškoća usvojili zajedničke preporuke.

Na temelju toga dozvoljavam sebi nadu da će biti ispunjeni uvjeti za ukidanje viza za građane Kosova te da ćemo u Europskom parlamentu konačno ratificirati odluku o njihovom slobodnom kretanju Europskom unijom. Kosovo zasluži nepodijeljenu europsku podršku, a njen najbolji izraz bilo bi priznanje preostalih članica koje to još nisu napravile.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση της κυρίας Lunacek σωστά επικεντρώνεται στις προσπάθειες εκδημοκρατισμού του Κοσσυφοπεδίου και επίλυσης του προβλήματος με τη Σερβία, θέτοντας ως προϋπόθεση την κατοχύρωση των μειονοτικών δικαιωμάτων των Σέρβων του Κοσσυφοπεδίου. Δυστυχώς, δεν γίνεται καμία αναφορά στο ψήφισμα 1244 του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας. Όπως τονίζεται στην έκθεση, στην περιοχή επικρατεί πολιτική αστάθεια, διαφθορά, ανεπάρκεια δημοκρατικών θεσμών και δικαστικής εξουσίας, και επικίνδυνη διακίνηση ναρκωτικών. Η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, σεβόμενη το διεθνές δίκαιο και την κυριαρχία των κρατών, δεν μπορεί να αναγνωρίσει το Κοσσυφοπέδιο ως ανεξάρτητη αρχή ή κράτος. Βεβαίως, στην έκθεση παραγνωρίζονται οι θέσεις των κρατών μελών που δεν αναγνωρίζουν το Κοσσυφοπέδιο και που δεν έχουν καμία σχέση με τη διεύρυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια. Ελπίζουμε σε γρήγορη ομαλοποίηση των σχέσεων Σερβίας-Κοσσυφοπεδίου στη βάση των αρχών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του διεθνούς δικαίου, για να προωθηθεί το πλαίσιο συνεργασίας που προβλέπει το Σύμφωνο Σταθεροποίησης και Σύνδεσης. Τονίζουμε ότι, αν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν λάβει σοβαρά υπόψη τις εξτρεμιστικές τάσεις που υπάρχουν σε μερίδα του αλβανικού πληθυσμού και την επιρροή ατάκτων κύκλων της Αλβανίας, θα βρεθούμε μπροστά σε τρομακτικές συνέπειες που θα επηρεάσουν κυρίως τα Σκόπια και θα ανοίξουν τον ασκό του Αιόλου στα Βαλκάνια. Ας μην επαναλάβουμε, κύριε Πρόεδρε, το λάθος που κάναμε με την Τουρκία.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, I would like to thank Mrs Lunacek for her excellent work and Mr Šoltes for leading our observation mission. Kosovo's path to the EU is to be welcomed, but problems need also be mentioned.

The reason for the snap elections was said to be governmental inability to make reforms in Kosovo. However, none of the questions that caused stalemate were put to the voters to decide, so there is a risk that we will see a replay of this situation. This deadlock, which is actually Kosovo's biggest problem, is indeed caused by the difficult government coalitions and the unwillingness of some parties to put Kosovo's best interests before those of the party, a simple unwillingness to cooperate if that will cost them voters. This is not unusual for young traditional democracies, but I still believe that we have to demand from whoever forms the government speedy reforms, primarily on the fight against corruption. Sensitive questions like the demarcation line, the Association of Serbian Municipalities, etc. should not be used for political games since they are in the interests of Kosovars. Enlargement is needed. We want it to happen, but all of us want to secure the process and demand reforms.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione riconosce che non vi è libertà di espressione o almeno che si procede lentamente in questa direzione, con le minacce ai giornalisti, corruzione sistemica, paese di deposito e transito per droghe pesanti, basso tasso di condanne nei casi contro la tratta di essere umani, paese di transito e destinazione per donne e minori vittime della tratta, presenza di gruppi armati, coinvolgimento in attività criminali organizzate. Insomma, la descrizione di quello che normalmente si chiama uno Stato canaglia.

Tuttavia, la relazione sostiene, come Alice nel paese meraviglie, che il Kosovo ha compiuto sforzi nel contrastare l'estremismo alla legalizzazione, pur ammettendo che molti *foreign fighters* sono già tornati in Kosovo e non sono monitorati e perseguiti. Quindi mi pare una forte contraddizione.

La portavoce dell'Unione europea, per canto suo, continua a promettere la liberalizzazione dei visti per un paese di questo genere, che esporta soprattutto criminalità e terroristi islamici e rappresenta un pericolo per l'Europa, un pericolo per tutti noi.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πραγματικότητα είναι ότι εντείνονται οι αντιθέσεις ανάμεσα στις αστικές τάξεις στα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια, όχι μόνο στο Κοσσυφοπέδιο αλλά και στην ΠΓΔΜ, την Αλβανία, το Μαυροβούνιο, τη Σερβία, σε συνδυασμό με τους ανταγωνισμούς ανάμεσα σε NATO-Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση-Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και Ρωσία-Κίνα για τον έλεγχο αγορών και δρόμων ενέργειας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, το NATO και οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες βομβάρδισαν και διαμέλισαν την πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβία αλλάζοντας σύνορα και μακελεύοντας λαούς. Όπως και στο Κοσσυφοπέδιο, χρηματοδότησαν και στήριξαν μηχανισμούς, κυκλώματα, κάθε είδους εθνικιστικές και αντιδραστικές δυνάμεις, ως δήθεν απελευθερωτές, για να εξυπηρετήσουν τα συμφέροντά τους, να στήσουν στρατιωτικές βάσεις και να εξυπηρετήσουν τα συμφέροντα ελέγχοντας την περιοχή. Οι λαοί να εναντιωθούν στα σχέδια των αστικών τάξεων και των κυβερνήσεών τους και, σε σύγκρουση με την εμπλοκή Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και NATO, να χαράξουν δρόμο προς το δικό τους συμφέρον, ενάντια στον εθνικισμό και τα συμφέροντα των μονοπωλίων. Να απαιτήσουν κλείσιμο ξένων στρατιωτικών βάσεων, να ανοίξουν δρόμο για να περάσει η εξουσία και η οικονομία στα δικά τους χέρια.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit Sicherheit gilt immer noch die Zusage von Thessaloniki 2003, dass die Staaten des Westbalkans Zugang zur Mitgliedschaft zur Europäischen Union haben. Und gleichzeitig gilt auch der Grundsatz, dass sie die Bedingungen erfüllen müssen. Wir wissen, dass wir in mancher Hinsicht Rücksicht nehmen, weil neue Einflüsse aus dem islamischen Bereich kommen, weil auf dem Balkan Russland tätig ist und weil aus geostrategischen Gründen ein hohes Maß an Geduld aufgebracht werden muss. Dies darf jedoch kein Grund dafür sein, dass man nicht die notwendigen Fortschritte macht.

Ich danke Ulrike Lunacek, dass sie sich erneut in dieser engagierten Weise um das Kosovo verdient macht, aber wir sagen immer: Es müssen Fortschritte gemacht werden – bei der Korruptionsbekämpfung, bei der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und so weiter und so fort. Das heißt übersetzt: Es gibt immer noch Korruption, es besteht immer noch keine volle Rechtsstaatlichkeit, und so weiter und so fort.

Wir haben uns eine Sprache angewöhnt, die, was die wirklichen Umstände in diesen Ländern angeht, an Schönheit nicht zu überbieten ist, und dann kann man verstehen, dass manche dabei über das, was da abläuft, die Geduld verlieren. Deswegen möchte ich auch Wert darauf legen, dass in der ganzen Region Gefahren der Explosion existieren und Sorgen, die wir in dieser Weise in der Vergangenheit nicht gehabt haben, dass aber dennoch darauf geachtet werden soll, dass bestimmte Prinzipien eingehalten werden. Visaerleichterungen kann es nur geben, wenn die Bedingungen erfüllt sind.

Deswegen möchte ich die zukünftige Regierung und mögliche Koalitionspartner der Regierung der stärksten Partei bitten, nur Koalitionsverträge zu machen, bei denen das Grenzabkommen mit Montenegro akzeptiert wird, und sonst bitte nicht in Geschäfte einer Koalitionsbildung einzugehen. Als Bedingung dafür bitte ich darum, die Integrationsgespräche mit Serbien und der serbischen Gemeinschaft zu führen, sonst wird das nichts.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, I congratulate Ulrike Lunacek for an extensive and good report on Kosovo. Snap elections have just taken place and we received the reports from the observation mission, and it seems that elections went smoothly. Now I expect the government to be formed as soon as possible. Every day without government means a day lost in facing various challenges: strengthening democracy, rule of law and the institutions and especially creating better living conditions for all citizens of Kosovo, youngsters in the first place.

As a rapporteur for a visa-free regime for Kosovo, I wish Kosovar politicians would reach an agreement. The deal on the demarcation agreement with Montenegro and improved track record in fighting organised crime and high-level corruption are in the hands of future politicians in Kosovo, the leaders and the government. And the ball is thus clearly in Kosovo's court. I will continue to support Kosovo towards the EU and a visa-free regime, but at the same time I would really like to see some more responsibility from Kosovo's authorities. What we heard about the recognition of Kosovo and the dialogue with Serbia, these are a very crucial questions for a well-functioning state.

We certainly want to see Kosovo committed to the European part as a good neighbour and healthy democracy, free of corruption and organised crime, and a place where young people see their future.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! 60 % der Kosovaren gingen bei den jüngsten Parlamentswahlen nicht wählen, da sie kein Vertrauen in ihre Demokratie hatten, und die wenigen, die wählten, entschieden sich für radikale Kräfte – stimmten mehrheitlich für einen mutmaßlichen Kriegsverbrecher. Der Wahlsieger und designierte Regierungschef Haradinaj soll unter anderem für Entführungen, Mord, Raub, Vergewaltigung und Organhandel verantwortlich sein. Und nachdem neun der zehn Zeugen Attentaten zum Opfer fielen, zog der zehnte offensichtlich seine Aussage zurück, und Haradinaj wurde freigesprochen.

Der Bericht zählt korrekterweise die schwierigen Probleme des Kosovo auf – Korruption, Geldwäsche, Drogenhandel und nicht entschädigte Vergewaltigungsopfer aus der Zeit des Krieges. Es ist für mich daher völlig unverständlich, warum Frau Kollegin Lunacek angesichts der desolaten Verhältnisse im Kosovo eine Empfehlung für eine Visaliberalisierung gibt. Haradinaj gab ja das Wahlversprechen einer 90-tägigen Visabefreiung für die Union. Es ist für mich absurd und unvorstellbar, dass wir nun helfen sollen, dieses Wahlversprechen einzuhalten.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, Kosovo's state is less than ten years old, but its internal situation is still fragile. Joining the EU is the only answer to internal, as well as a regional, conflicts in the Western Balkans. This needs to be clearly understood by all stakeholders, including the EU, and I would like to commend Commissioner Hahn for his dedication and commitment to the Western Balkans.

When we say that the Serbian accession progress is linked to good bilateral relations in the region, the same applies to Kosovo. For that, the normalisation of Serbia-Kosovo relations is crucial. For visa liberalisation to be realised, Kosovo has to fulfil all relevant criteria, including ratification of the agreement with Montenegro. The internal political climate and frustration of a great part of the population in the democratic procedure is deeply alarming. Last Sunday, almost 60% of voters abstained from voting. This provides a dangerous playing ground for radical and nationalist forces.

One political development is that reducing corruption and organised crime and making the judiciary more efficient has been assessed as good by the Commission. On the other hand, no improvement on freedom of expression and economic criteria could be noticed, and, after all, as our rapporteur, Ms Lunacek, said, the key to all solutions is implementation. Ten weeks ago, the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) entered into force. Kosovo now needs, more than ever, national unity, regional reconciliation and credible implementation of the SAA.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, along with four other Members, I have just returned from the Election Observation Mission in Kosovo, where we heard from many reliable sources about significant interference and provocation from Belgrade, including intimidation of candidates and voters during the campaign period, leading in some cases to violence, including inter-ethnic conflict between different Serbian interests. The organisation of buses and trains from Serbia to Kosovo bearing nationalistic slogans in January and carrying likely bought voters last weekend, is also to be deplored.

Outside of the political arena, I witnessed the deep yearning, commitment and action of many Balkan young people who simply want to live side by side in peace, and whose vision shames the old order. Whilst old warlords and vested interests, both Serbs and Albanians, continue to prevaricate, slowing down the accession process, young people of all ethnicities crossed the Mitrovica bridge as part of the Musicians without Borders Rock School.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur Ulrike Lunacek and to congratulate the people of Kosovo for the orderly and peaceful elections conducted last Sunday.

Now it is of the essence to move forward on forming a government and starting to address much-needed reforms. We need to see the improvement of both the rule of law and the fight against corruption. It has been over a year since the Stabilisation and Association Agreement entered into force, and more tangible progress on EU approximation needs to be seen. Kosovo cannot afford to lose more time, as seen in the first half of 2016 during the impasse in the Kosovo Assembly. That is why I urge all political parties to participate constructively in the daily political life of the parliament.

Kosovo's role in the region also remains very important. I hope that the new government will play a positive role in the regional reconciliation. Strong political will and good faith to implement agreements, including the setting up of the Association of Serbian Municipalities, will be a much appreciated gesture from Kosovo to all its neighbours and to its own population. This needs a tough political determination. I hope that the incoming government will possess the political capital to do this.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Úr, Magyarország a nyugat-balkáni térség stabilitásában és országainak európai integrációjában érdekelt. Éppen ezért komoly eredménynek tartjuk a tavaly áprilisában hatályba lépett EU–Koszovó stabilizációs és társulási egyezmény gyakorlatba ültetését előirányzó nemzeti stratégia elfogadását. Magyar szempontból külön is nagyra értékeljük, hogy az ország törvényei szerint a 120 tagú pristinai parlamentben húsz hely illeti meg az etnikai kisebbségeket. Ez az elv követendő jó gyakorlatnak számít az egész nyugat-balkáni térségben. Aggodalomra ad okot azonban az a belpolitikai instabilitás, mely a múlt heti előrehozott parlamenti választásokhoz vezetett. A kicsiny országot megosztó, kiélezett politika ellentétek oda juttatták Koszovót, hogy a kivívott függetlensége kínálta lehetőségekkel nem tud élni, sőt, az eddig elért eredményeit is rendre lerombolja. A pártos viszálykodás leküzdésére és kölcsönös megegyezésen alapuló elkötelezett politikai akaratra van szükség ahhoz, hogy Koszovó eleget tegyen demokratikus vállalásainak, és végre célegyenesbe kerüljön az európai integráció útján.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, zahvaljujem izjaviteljici Lunacek na ovom izvješću. Sporazum o stabilizaciji i pridruživanju s Kosovom stupio je na snagu 1. travnja prošle godine i svakako je pozitivan korak u procesu priključenja Kosova Europskoj uniji. To je također prvi ugovorni odnos između Europske unije i Kosova. Iako je Kosovo donijelo mnoge zakonodavne reforme, vladavina zakona, konkretna i učinkovita provedba ostaju upitni.

Komisija je u svom izvješću o napretku, između ostaloga, istaknula polarizirano političko okruženje i prekide u parlamentarnim aktivnostima. Zastoj u Parlamentu spriječio je Kosovo u ratificiranju sporazuma o razgraničenju s Crnom Gorom, što je jedan od uvjeta koje je Europska unija postavila za liberalizaciju viznog režima. Dakle, potrebni su daljnji napori. Kosovo je još u ranoj fazi pripreme u mnogim područjima, kao što su reforme javne uprave, pravosudnog sustava, borba protiv korupcije i razvoj funkcionalnog tržišnog gospodarstva.

Zato smatram da ovo izvješće Europskog parlamenta može biti dobar poticaj novoj kosovskoj Vladi za nastavak pregovora s Europskom unijom. Koristim ovu prigodu kako bih pozvala ostale članice Europske unije koje nisu priznale Kosovo da priznaju Kosovo kako bi na taj način dali poticaj europskim integracijama i europskoj budućnosti i perspektivi Kosova.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Pridružujem se čestitki gospe Lunaček za poročilo o Kosovu, ki je uravnoteženo.

Poročevalci se trudijo najti predvsem dobre strani, ki se zgodijo v državi v zadnjem letu. Kar na nek način sem imel občutek, da je imela gospa Lunaček kar malce težav pri tem, kajti srečevali smo se z blokado v parlamentu na Kosovu, srečevali smo se celo z nasiljem v parlamentu in dogovarjanje znotraj Kosova je zelo težko.

Težko je tudi dogovarjanje v regiji in tudi ta apel, ki je skozi to poročilo, k boljšemu sodelovanju s Srbijo, Črno goro, je zagotovo na mestu in daje na nek način bodočo politično in tudi gospodarsko perspektivo.

Na področju vladavine prava sta še vedno problem korupcija, organiziran kriminal, tudi radikalizem, nenazadnje borci so iz Kosova odhajali tudi v ISIS.

Želim novi vladi, da najde odgovore na ta vprašanja, kakor tudi na vprašanja na gospodarskem področju, kajti stopnja brezposelnosti, predvsem brezposelnosti med mladimi, in beg ljudi s Kosova je velik problem in odgovori so zelo težki in res jim želim veliko sreče na tej poti.

Pri viza liberalizaciji bo zagotovo potrebno na Kosovu izpolniti pogoje, ki so povezani ravno z vladavino prava, prav tako pa tudi s pogoji na področju političnega sodelovanja in politične kulture v regiji.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjednice, izražavam jasnu podršku europskom putu Kosova pri čemu je prvi korak učinjen stupanjem na snagu sporazuma o stabilizaciji i pridruživanju u travnju 2016. godine. Pred Kosovom je još puno posla, potrebno je provesti reforme, i Kosovu je potrebna podrška na tom putu. U prvom redu podršku bi im trebala dati Srbija, koja im predstavlja najveći uteg. Republika Srbija mora se suzdržati od uplitanja u unutarnja državna pitanja Kosova te izazivanja provokativnih aktivnosti kao i upotrebe ekstremne i provokativne retorike.

Rezultati prijevremenih parlamentarnih izbora održanih prije dva dana na kojima je pobjedu odnijela koalicija na čelu s bivšim premijerom Ramušem Haradinajem, nad kojim je Srbija izdala uhiđbeni nalog temeljem Zakona o organizaciji i nadležnosti državnih organa, nedvojbeno pokazuju volju građana Kosova. To je i poruka Srbiji da prestane zloupotrebjavati sporni zakon. Srbija i Kosovo moraju pronaći zajednički jezik i kanale za suradnju i to mora biti uvjet europskog puta za obje zemlje.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Κοσσυφοπέδιο, σύμφωνα με έρευνες αλλά και δημοσιεύματα, έχει μετατραπεί σε μία σφηκοφυλιά των τζιχαντιστών, και αυτό είναι δεδομένο. Επομένως, μου κάνει ιδιαίτερη εντύπωση πώς θα προχωρήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σε κατάργηση της βίζας, όταν αυτή τη στιγμή είναι αποδεδειγμένο ότι υπάρχουν τρομοκράτες τζιχαντιστές στο Κοσσυφοπέδιο, όταν γίνεται εκπαίδευση. Αντιλαμβάνεστε, λοιπόν, ότι αυτό θα είναι ιδιαίτερα επικίνδυνο για την ασφάλεια της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το δεύτερο είναι ότι αξιοποιείται το Κοσσυφοπέδιο από τους αλβανικούς πληθυσμούς, συνολικά για την προώθηση της ιδέας της Μεγάλης Αλβανίας, μια ιδέα αλυτρωτική, μια ιδέα που αμφισβητεί ακόμη και εδάφη εντός της ελληνικής επικράτειας. Επίσης, το δικαίωμα αναγνώρισης ενός τρίτου κράτους είναι δικαίωμα ανέλεγκτο, δικαίωμα που ανήκει σε κάθε κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης, και, ως εκ τούτου, ορθώς τα κράτη που δεν αναγνωρίζουν το Κοσσυφοπέδιο διατηρούν αυτό το δικαίωμα.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Prvo torej iskrena hvala kolegici Ulrike Lunaček za res odlično poročilo in za njen dolgoletni trud za krepitev Kosova in seveda za njegovo uveljavitev v enakopravni družini držav.

Vsekakor so tudi zadnje volitve pokazale, da seveda bo pred Kosovom kar težko obdobje sestavljanja nove vlade. Zaskrbljujoča je samo 41 % volilna udeležba in pravzaprav veliko veliko število tako imenovanih praznih glasovnic, kar kaže na nek način nek tihi protest ljudi, ker dokler ne bo seveda odločnega boja proti korupciji, dokler seveda ne bo tudi zahtev po in uresničitve po neodvisnem sodstvu, napredka ne bo.

In mislim to je tudi naloga Evropskega parlamenta, da pri tem, kolikor se da, aktivno pomaga kolegom tudi v novo izvoljenem parlamentu Kosova.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr, meglehetősen furcsa annak a helyzetnek a fenntartása, hogy öt EU-tagállam még mindig nem ismerte el Koszovó függetlenségét. A Romániai Magyar Demokrata Szövetség volt az egyetlen a román parlamentben, amely a függetlenség kikiáltása után Koszovó elismerése mellett szavazott, sajnos a román külügy álláspontja azóta sem jutott erre a döntésre. Az elismerés nemcsak az ország kezdeti európai integrációs lépéseinek megtételéhez elengedhetetlen, de a Szerbia és Koszovó közötti közeledésnek is kedvező környezetet teremtene. Arról nem is beszélve, hogy az EU közös külpolitikai megközelítésének szerezne hitelességet és tekintélyt. Meggyőződésem, hogy a nyugat-balkáni államok integrációs erőfeszítéseit jutalmaznunk kellene, mivel vannak olyan nemzetközi szereplők, amelyek szintén aktívak a térségben, és sok esetben a tartós békével ellentétes célokat követnek. Hosszú az út Koszovó EU-csatlakozásáig, de a célnak egyértelműen ennek kell lennie, mert az egész Nyugat-Balkán helye az EU-ban van.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr, hogyan lehetséges a következő helyzet? Koszovóban van egy őshonos, tehát ott született százötvenezer szerb közösség. Ennek a közösségnek az Európai Unió és persze a szerb anyaország kipurítását, kikövetelt egy régi értelemben vett területi autonómiát, teljes körű, tényleges autonómiát. Az előbb tárgyalt Szerbiában van egy háromszázézer, vagy közel háromszázézer őshonos magyar közösség, akiknek nincsen területi autonómiájuk, nincs teljes körű és tényleges autonómiájuk. A kérdésemben persze benne van a válasz, amit úgyszólam szoktam soha megkapni, mert ez nem szokás itt, ebben a Parlamentben, de azért kérdezem Lunacek asszonyt, és kérdezem a Bizottságot. Benne van a válasz: ott az anyaország – és itt most nem pártkérdésekről beszélek – az anyaország kiharcolta, kikövetelte és az Európai Unió is kikövetelte.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Kosovo se nalazi u kritičnoj fazi svoje državnosti. Država postoji, priznata je od 111 država članica UN-a i mora svim svojim građanima pružati sve one usluge koje se od države očekuju. S druge strane, postoje stalni udari na državnost Kosova, prvenstveno iz Srbije i to ovoj mladoj državi jako otežava razvoj.

Odnos Europske unije prema Kosovu duboko je nepravedan, jer mu obećavamo europsku perspektivu, a nismo mu osigurali ni međunarodno priznanje od svih država članica Unije. Ako pojedine članice Kosovo ne priznaju kao samostalnu državu, kako će ga primiti u Uniju?

Na taj način šaljemo i krivu poruku Srbiji, koja će dati sve od sebe da postane članica unije i bez priznanja Kosova. Dopustimo li to, uvest ćemo jedan veliki problem u ovu zajednicu. Mislim da ih imamo sasvim dovoljno i ovaj treba riješiti prije nego što ove dvije države postanu članice.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Johannes Hahn, Mitglied der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, Frau Minister, liebe Ulrike Lunacek! Ich hoffe, der Umstand, dass die meisten Mitglieder des Parlaments nach ihrer Wortmeldung den Saal verlassen haben, ist kein Symbol für die Haltung gegenüber dem Kosovo. Er verdient jedwede Aufmerksamkeit. Ich bedanke mich aber im Großen und Ganzen für die kritischen, aber doch überwiegend positiven Stellungnahmen zur Situation im Land.

Die Wahlen haben gezeigt – und das ist schon hinreichend heute diskutiert worden –, dass das Ergebnis vermutlich nicht dazu führen wird, dass es schnell zu einer Regierungsbildung kommen wird. Das Gegenteil ist zu befürchten. Ich hoffe, es dauert nicht wieder neun Monate. Aber die Rhetorik im Vorfeld hat dazu geführt, dass es jetzt wieder einzementierte Positionen gibt und es schwer sein wird, hier Koalitionen zu finden. Ich hoffe, man zieht seine Lehren daraus und versteht, dass Demokratie eben auch heißt, Kompromisse zu finden und nicht in Schwarz-Weiß-Kategorien zu denken und zu handeln.

Ich kann nur versichern: Die Europäische Kommission ist *committed* zur europäischen Perspektive des Kosovo. Wir tun alles, wir haben auch im Vorjahr geliefert, nicht nur das Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungs-Agreement, sondern auch die europäische Reformagenda. Es liegt jetzt wirklich an den Autoritäten im Land, diese Möglichkeiten zu nutzen. Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger des Kosovo wollen das. 75 % Prozent – eine satte Dreiviertelmehrheit – sind für die europäische Integration.

Auch was die Visaliberalisierung anbelangt, liegt es an den Verantwortlichen, zu liefern. Es ist nicht Aufgabe der Europäischen Union oder anderer hier, die Ergebnisse, die Beschlüsse herbeizuführen. Es ist ein internes Problem.

Wie gesagt: Wir stehen an der Seite des Kosovo, seiner Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Sie verdienen es, diese europäische Perspektive zu haben. Wir erwarten aber auch, dass die neue Regierung ein klares Bekenntnis zur europäischen Perspektive abgibt, und ich sage ganz offen: nicht nur in Worten, sondern auch in Taten.

Helena Dalli, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, Commissioner, honourable Members, I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the excellent work and commitment of the rapporteur of the European Parliament on Kosovo, my friend Ulrike Lunacek.

The EU will continue to assist Kosovo, including through its strengthened presence on the ground. However, the primary responsibility for progress lies with Kosovo: its leaders, institutions and civil society. Reforms are crucial and will require the political leaders to live up to their responsibilities for the good of Kosovo and of its citizens. Key EU-related reforms are essential: not to please the EU but because they are in the interest of Kosovo itself.

Ulrike Lunacek, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, let me first of all thank our colleagues for all the positive remarks and support that I got from so many of them, including from the Council and the Commission. Let me also – before I forget – welcome the Ambassador of Kosovo to the European Union, Bernard Nikaj, up there with Valëza Oruçi. I am glad he is here.

Let me also address the few – I think hardly any of them are still here – who have been very critical of Kosovo. These are the non-recognisers and those from the far left and the far right. First of all, there was a verdict from the International Court of Justice in 2010, which said that the unilateral declaration of independence was in accordance with international law, and this was confirmed by the UN General Assembly. So stop saying that this is against international law. Secondly, you will not be able to turn back history. The Republic of Kosovo exists and is recognised by 114 UN Member States. We will all continue to struggle to make Kosovo part of that European Union in a very positive way.

Turning back to what now has to be done in Kosovo, a new government has to be formed, and I hope this will happen swiftly. We cannot wait another nine months as happened last time. This is because of Kosovo's citizens: they will not do it for us. It is not for us here in the Parliament or for the European Union that a government should be formed; it is for delivering on the promises that the candidates have made to the people, and it is for delivering what people expect: for example, visa liberalisation.

It is sure that the new Assembly now has to ratify, as swiftly as possible, the border demarcation with Montenegro – there is no way around that – and deliver on the track record of convictions against organised crime and corruption. That has to be done by the government. Without that, progress will not be possible and citizens will not believe that there is a new government that is theirs. That is important.

We have the support, and I hope we will have a good vote tomorrow for this report in the interest of Kosovo's citizens.

Der Präsident. – Als Erklärung an den Kommissar: Die meisten der Abgeordnetenkollegen haben Besuchergruppen aus den Wahlkreisen da, und die erwarten, ihre Abgeordneten abends zu sehen, damit sie den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern europäische Politik erklären. Ich vermute, das ist der Grund, und nicht die Haltung zum Kosovo.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Mittwoch, 14. Juni 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Andor Deli (PPE), *írásban*. – Először is szeretném örömet kifejezni, hogy a 2016-os koszovói országjelentés a szerb ország jelentéssel napirendre került. Magyarország számára prioritás a Nyugat-Balkán stabilitása, ezért támogat minden olyan kezdeményezést, amely a megbékéléshez vezet, továbbá igyekszik ösztönözni a régió országai között a szorosabb gazdasági és politikai együttműködést, amelyben az EU-nak vezető szerepet kellene vállalnia.

A régió stabilitása nagyban függ a Szerbia és Koszovó között zajló normalizációs folyamatoktól, az úgynevezett brüsszeli egyezség következetes végrehajtásától. Belgrád részéről az egyezség több pontjában is láthatunk előrehaladást (energetika, telekommunikáció, stb.), viszont Pristina hosszú ideje nem hajlandó megteremteni a feltételeket a Szerb Községek Közösségének megalapításához. Úgy gondolom, hogy az EU ebben a kérdésben következetesebben kell, hogy eljárjon. A vasárnapi előrehozott választások kapcsán szeretném reményemet kifejezni, hogy az európai értékek és a megbékélés iránt elkötelezett kormány fog alakulni, amely többek között kisebbségi önkormányzatiság és autonómia megteremtését is prioritásként fogja kezelni. Köszönöm, hogy meghallgattak.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), *písemně*. – Celá zpráva je poznamenána oprávněným úsilím Srbska o neuznání jednostranného odtržení Kosova. Z tohoto postoje logicky plynou ve zprávě kritizované kroky Srbska. Jde zejména o zabránění účasti na práci mezinárodních organizací a propojení energetických sítí. Zpráva konstatuje, že 90 % obyvatel se obává nezaměstnanosti, přitom podporou malého a středního podnikání se vláda příliš nezabývá. S drzostí sobě vlastní se autorka zprávy v bodě 8 domnívá, že je důležité, aby bezpečnostní politika Kosova byla v souladu se společnou zahraniční a bezpečnostní politikou EU. Experti připravující podklady ke zprávě zřejmě mají patent na rozum. Kroky Srbska směřující k odsouzení válečných zločinců zpráva kritizuje, ale zároveň požaduje vyšetření a odsouzení válečných zločínů. Znepokojení nad nedostatkem ochrany svobody projevu a svobody médií stejně jako hluboce zakořeněná korupce, existence ozbrojených skupin zapojených do organizované trestné činnosti s přeshraničním rozměrem aktivit. Praktická neexistence zabavování majetku, obstavování aktiv pocházejících z trestné činnosti. Chybějící účinná strategie pro sledování a stíhání navrátilivších se zahraničních bojovníků, to vše jsou další argumenty poukazující na praktickou neexistenci konsolidovaného státu. Zpráva žádá řešení otázky zaručení návratu a znovu začlenění vysídlených osob, včetně dodržování občanských svobod všech komunit. Jelikož v posledních volbách v Kosovo zvítězily síly spojené UCK, velkou naději na zlepšení situace zde nevidím.

Kati Piri (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – Terwijl Kosovo net verkiezingen achter de rug heeft, wil ik de aandacht vestigen op het volgende probleem: de mogelijke sluiting van het International Business College van Mitrovica. Op 31 juli aanstaande dreigt het International Business College van Mitrovica gesloten te worden. Voor de helft van de 174 leerlingen brengt dit grote problemen met zich mee. Circa 80 studenten zijn afkomstig uit minderheidsgroepen en de continuïteit van hun onderwijs staat op het spel. Zij kunnen niet worden overgeplaatst naar andere universiteiten, omdat nergens anders in het Engels of Servisch wordt onderwezen.

Donorfinanciering was beschikbaar tot begin dit jaar. Kosovo had 1,5 miljoen euro geïnvesteerd en landen als Zweden, Denemarken, Zwitserland, het Verenigd Koninkrijk en Nederland – maar ook de EU – hebben gezamenlijk 13,5 miljoen euro gedoneerd. Het is doodzonde dat het succes van deze multi-etnische school ten onder dreigt te gaan aan een gebrek aan gevoel voor urgentie bij de Kosovaarse overheid.

Vandaar mijn verzoek aan de Europese Commissie om politieke druk uit te oefenen op de minister-president en de minister van Onderwijs om zo spoedig mogelijk een verzoek voor noodfinanciering voor deze school op te stellen en hiermee een oplossing te creëren voor de continuïteit van deze school.

17. Podnošenje dokumenata: vidjeti zapisnik

18. Dnevni red sljedeće dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik

19. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice

(Die Sitzung wird um 23.00 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Oznake postupaka

*	postupak savjetovanja
***	postupak suglasnosti
***I	redovni zakonodavni postupak, prvo čitanje
***II	redovni zakonodavni postupak, drugo čitanje
***III	redovni zakonodavni postupak, treće čitanje

(Navedeni se postupak temelji na pravnoj osnovi predloženoj u nacrtu akta.)

Kratice za nazive odbora

AFET	Odbor za vanjske poslove
DEVE	Odbor za razvoj
INTA	Odbor za međunarodnu trgovinu
BUDG	Odbor za proračune
CONT	Odbor za proračunski nadzor
ECON	Odbor za ekonomsku i monetarnu politiku
EMPL	Odbor za zapošljavanje i socijalna pitanja
ENVI	Odbor za okoliš, javno zdravlje i sigurnost hrane
ITRE	Odbor za industriju, istraživanje i energetiku
IMCO	Odbor za unutarnje tržište i zaštitu potrošača
TRAN	Odbor za promet i turizam
REGI	Odbor za regionalni razvoj
AGRI	Odbor za poljoprivredu i ruralni razvoj
PECH	Odbor za ribarstvo
CULT	Odbor za kulturu i obrazovanje
JURI	Odbor za pravna pitanja
LIBE	Odbor za građanske slobode, pravosuđe i unutarnje poslove
AFCO	Odbor za ustavna pitanja
FEMM	Odbor za prava žena i jednakost spolova
PETI	Odbor za predstavljanje
DROI	Pododbor za ljudska prava
SEDE	Pododbor za sigurnost i obranu

Kratice za nazive klubova zastupnika

PPE	Klub zastupnika Europske pučke stranke (kršćanski demokrati)
S&D	Klub zastupnika Progresivnog saveza socijalista i demokrata u Europskom parlamentu
ECR	Europski konzervativci i reformisti
ALDE	Klub zastupnika Saveza liberala i demokrata za Europu
GUE/NGL	Konfederalni klub zastupnika Ujedinjene europske ljevice/Nordijske zelene ljevice
Verts/ALE	Klub zastupnika Zelenih/Europskog slobodnog saveza
EFDD	Klub zastupnika Europe slobode i direktne demokracije
ENF	Klub zastupnika Europe nacija i sloboda
NI	nezavisni zastupnici