



C/2024/3188

16.5.2024.

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 12. PROSINCA 2017.

(C/2024/3188)

EUROPSKI PARLAMENT

ZASJEDANJE 2017. – 2018.

Dnevne sjednice od 11. do 14. prosinca 2017.

STRASBOURG

Sadržaj	Stranica
1. Otvaranje sjednice	4
2. Izvješće o istrazi o pranju novca, izbjegavanju plaćanja poreza i utaji poreza (rasprava)	4
3. Sastav odbora: vidi zapisnik	29
4. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (rasprava)	29
5. Glasovanje	43
5.1. Održivo upravljanje vanjskim ribarskim flotama (A8-0374/2017 - Linnéa Engström) (glasovanje)	43
5.2. Izmjene različitih uredbi u području poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja (A8-0380/2017 - Albert Deß) (glasovanje)	43
5.3. Sustav EU-a za trgovanje emisijskim jedinicama (EU ETS): nastavak postojećih ograničenja područja primjene za zrakoplovne djelatnosti i priprema provedbe globalne tržišno utemeljene mjere od 2021. (A8-0258/2017 - Julie Girling) (glasovanje)	43
5.4. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (A8-0198/2017 - Udo Bullmann, José Manuel Fernandes) (glasovanje)	43
5.5. Propisi o ostvarivanju autorskog prava i srodnih prava koja se primjenjuju na određena internet-ska emitiranja organizacija za radiodifuziju te reemitiranja televizijskih i radijskih programa (A8-0378/2017 - Tiemo Wölken) (glasovanje)	43
5.6. Zahtjev za zaštitu povlastica i imuniteta Eleonore Forenza (A8-0398/2017 - Gilles Lebreton) (glasovanje)	45
5.7. Zahtjev za ukidanje imuniteta Ingeborg Gräßle (A8-0397/2017 - Jean-Marie Cavada) (glasovanje)	45

Sadržaj	Stranica
5.8. Carine na uvoz određenih proizvoda podrijetlom iz Sjedinjenih Američkih Država (A8-0331/2017 - Jiří Maštálka) (glasovanje)	45
5.9. Sporazum o zračnom prometu između EU-a i SAD-a (A8-0376/2017 - Theresa Griffin) (glasovanje)	45
5.10. Sporazum između Europske unije i Švicarske o povezivanju njihovih sustava trgovanja emisijama stakleničkih plinova (A8-0386/2017 - Christofer Fjellner) (glasovanje)	45
5.11. Sporazum o pojačanom partnerstvu i suradnji između EU-a i Kazahstana (Suglasnost) (A8-0325/2017 - Liisa Jaakonsaari) (glasovanje)	45
5.12. Sporazum o pojačanom partnerstvu i suradnji između EU-a i Kazahstana (Rezolucija) (A8-0335/2017 - Liisa Jaakonsaari) (glasovanje)	45
5.13. Obnova mandata predsjednice Jedinstvenog sanacijskog odbora (A8-0393/2017 - Roberto Gualtieri) (glasovanje)	45
5.14. Izvješće o građanstvu EU-a za 2017.: Jačanje prava građana u Uniji demokratskih promjena (A8-0385/2017 - Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea) (glasovanje)	46
5.15. Ususret strategiji digitalne trgovine (A8-0384/2017 - Marietje Schaake) (glasovanje)	46
6. Obrazloženja glasovanja	46
6.1. Izmjene različitih uredbi u području poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja (A8-0380/2017 - Albert Def)	46
6.2. Sustav EU-a za trgovanje emisijskim jedinicama (EU ETS): nastavak postojećih ograničenja područja primjene za zrakoplovne djelatnosti i priprema provedbe globalne tržišno utemeljene mjere od 2021. (A8-0258/2017 - Julie Girling)	46
6.3. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (A8-0198/2017 - Udo Bullmann, José Manuel Fernandes)	47
6.4. Izvješće o građanstvu EU-a za 2017.: Jačanje prava građana u Uniji demokratskih promjena (A8-0385/2017 - Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea)	48
6.5. Ususret strategiji digitalne trgovine (A8-0384/2017 - Marietje Schaake)	49
7. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik	50
8. Nastavak zasjedanja	50
9. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	50
10. Stanje u Afganistanu (rasprava)	50
11. Položaj naroda Rohingya (rasprava)	59
12. Godišnje izvješće o provedbi zajedničke sigurnosne i obrambene politike – Godišnje izvješće o provedbi zajedničke vanjske i sigurnosne politike – Stalna strukturirana suradnja – otvaranje novoga poglavlja u europskoj sigurnosnoj i obrambenoj politici (rasprava)	69
13. Delegirani akti (članak 105. stavak 6. Poslovnika): vidi zapisnik	95

Sadržaj	Stranica
14. Dogovor s Iranom o nuklearnom pitanju (rasprava)	95
15. Najava američkoga predsjednika Trumpa da će priznati Jeruzalem kao glavni grad Izraela (rasprava)	110
16. Položaj migranata u Libiji (rasprava)	124
17. Godišnje izvješće o ljudskim pravima i demokraciji u svijetu za 2016. godinu i politici EU-a u tom području (rasprava)	138
18. Hong Kong, 20 godina nakon primopredaje (rasprava)	147
19. Uporaba fosforne kiseline – fosfata – di-, tri- i polifosfata (E 338-452) u zamrznutim mesnim ražnjicima za okomito pečenje (rasprava)	149
20. Dnevni red sljedeće dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	155
21. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice	156

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 12. PROSINCA 2017.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA

místopředseda

1. Otvaranje sjednice

(The sitting opened at 9.05)

2. Izvješće o istrazi o pranju novca, izbjegavanju plaćanja poreza i utaji poreza (rasprava)

President. – I start with an apology that we are starting five minutes late. We took the liberty of waiting a while for Commissioner Moscovici, who is on his way from the railway station. We will start now, because I believe that he will be with us in a few minutes.

The next item is the report by Petr Ježek and Jeppe Kofod, on behalf of the Committee of Inquiry to investigate alleged contraventions and maladministration in the application of Union law in relation to money laundering, tax avoidance and tax evasion, on the inquiry into money laundering, tax avoidance and tax evasion (PANA Committee) (2017/2013(INI)(A8-0357/2017).

Petr Ježek, rapporteur. – Mr President, I will inform the Commissioner later. First of all, I would like to thank the journalists involved in the leaks and revelations. They did a splendid job and this was investigative journalism at its best. It seems that the British media magnate, Lord Northcliffe, was thinking about Panama and other leaks when he famously said that 'news is something someone wants suppressed'. Indeed, those who carried out the barbaric murder of Daphne Caruana Galizia aimed to suppress a similar kind of revelation. In my view, the work of journalists was not only key to the issues related to taxes and money laundering, but it was part of global proof of the paramount importance of traditional journalism in times of disinformation campaigns and distorted or entirely fake news.

I am proud that the European Parliament took the baton and established its Committee of Inquiry into Money Laundering, Tax Avoidance and Tax Evasion (PANA Committee) and has been delivering. In particular, those citizens who feel left behind and abandoned by globalisation and other developments may see the behaviour of some rich individuals and companies implicated in leaks as further evidence of the injustice of the world they live in. The European Parliament, after thorough investigations, puts forward clear recommendations on how to improve the situation. Furthermore, it has already presented some of these recommendations, the Commission has made some proposals and the Member States have taken some steps in the directions indicated.

Last week, for the first time, the EU published a list of tax havens. It took time and it has certainly not expanded, as some expected, but it is a first and important step. Stricter rules will apply when doing business with the listed countries as two important proposals made by the Commission refer to this list, namely the public country-by-country reporting proposal and a proposal on transparency requirements for intermediaries. Stricter reporting requirements will apply for multinationals with activities in listed jurisdictions or for intermediaries designing tax schemes routed through a listed country. To be credible, we should not only look outside the EU. Speaking about Member States, nothing is all shiny there. I would not perhaps go as far as Oxfam and consider Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta and the Netherlands to be tax havens *per se*, but some Member States are not very helpful in the fight against tax evasion and tax avoidance and for fairer taxation in general.

Tomorrow there will be another – hopefully final – trilogue meeting on the revisions of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. This is an essential piece of legislation and, in my view, the one that directly answers the Panama Papers revelations. One of the remaining key issues is the level of public access to the register of beneficial owners of companies and trusts. The PANA Committee is in favour of the widest possible access without limitations. One of the significant PANA recommendations relates to the financial intelligence units in Member States. They must be strengthened and have appropriate resources and personnel at their disposal.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank Jeppe Kofod, my co-rapporteur, and the shadows and other colleagues for their work and cooperation. It has been a lot of work and we must get the best out of it in tomorrow's vote.

Jeppe Kofod, rapporteur. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the co-rapporteurs, my co-rapporteur and the shadows for the work that we have done in the PANA Committee over the last one-and-a-half years. I would also like to be able to thank the Council, but I have to say that it has been very difficult for us in the PANA inquiry committee to have sincere cooperation with the Council. One of the things we should do is reform the way in which we deal with corporate tax policies in our European Union.

The Panama papers, as you all know, were at the time the largest leak – 11.5 million documents. It revealed that a corrupt global elite of politicians, celebrities and corporate leaders had been corrupted and that they do not only put themselves above tax laws, but also above the law as such. We looked into that world in the PANA Committee. We have seen that many heads of states and governments have used opaque structures to hide their assets, to avoid taxes, to do money laundering, and even to carry out criminal activities. This is really detrimental to the trust in our societies and to democracy. Therefore, we need to act on behalf of the citizens to clean up the mess that we have seen in the Panama Papers.

Our conclusions are clear. We have seen that EU legislation has not been properly implemented by Member States or enforced by the Commission, for example the Anti-Money Laundering Directive or the Directive on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation. We have seen that the Commission lacks resources and enforcement in this area; we have seen that some Member States grant golden visas to ultra-rich people and do not carry out the due diligence that they should. We have seen that sweetheart deals for big corporations multinationals like Apple, Nike, Starbucks and Ikea have been done by Member States. We have become caught in a sick race to the bottom on taxation and on regulation, and also sometimes on lack of implementation of our own EU legislation. Some of our EU Member States work to dilute and to avoid taking real steps in this field. We have had a secret working group in the Council – the Code of Conduct Group (Business Taxation) – for more than 20 years and they have not proven that they can end these harmful cross-border corporate tax regimes.

In our recommendations, we are clear that we need to see open doors and transparency, not only in the way we make corporate tax policies and anti-money laundering policies within the European Union, but also when it comes to intermediaries, banks, lawyers, wealth managers, accountants, the whole industry that lives to put these schemes in place.

We need a public EU register for beneficial ownership. We need a tax Europol to have true law enforcement for the people who commit these crimes. We need also to see that tax advisers face real sanctions if they engage in illegal behaviour. We need to end secrecy, tax secrecy and tax havens, and we also need to see that whistle-blowers are protected much better in European Union and also that we support investigative journalism that is doing the job that politicians should have done instead. What we see tomorrow is very important. We have in our recommendations 211 concrete recommendations to fight international tax evasion, tax avoidance and money laundering.

Tomorrow, we will see which political groups and which Members of this Parliament are ready not only to talk, but also to vote and to ensure that we have a progressive stand in this Parliament. Now it is time to act, and we want a minimum corporate tax rate in Europe in order to end the endless race to the bottom on corporate taxes and regulation. We need a good and sound list of tax havens, not only in third countries outside Europe, but also in our own family. We need to clean up our own mess within EU Member States and ensure that they also fulfil the highest standards. We have four countries in the EU, and we need to take action to ensure that they also fulfil the highest standards in order to fight tax evasion and avoidance.

President. – I thank both rapporteurs for their work on what is, in my opinion, one of the key items on the agenda of this plenary. Like you, Mr Kofod, I regret that the Council did not take the opportunity to be with us.

Pierre Moscovici, *membre de la Commission.* – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je prends la parole devant vous aujourd'hui avec une certaine solennité, parce que nous sommes en train de conclure ensemble un cycle. Ce cycle – cette séquence politique – s'est ouvert très tôt dans votre mandat et aussi dans le mien, qui a été marqué par une succession quasi ininterrompue de scandales financiers fracassants. Ce Parlement européen était à chaque fois au rendez-vous avec les commissions TAXE 1, TAXE 2 et, aujourd'hui, PANA.

Je veux adresser, bien sûr, mes sincères félicitations aux deux rapporteurs, MM. Kofod et Ježek, à la commission d'enquête, à son président, M. Langen et à l'ensemble de celles et ceux qui ont contribué au rapport que nous évoquons ce matin. Si les travaux de la commission PANA trouvent aujourd'hui un aboutissement, je souhaite ardemment que les dynamiques qu'ils ont portées se prolongent. Je sais que votre Parlement, à cet égard, souhaite poursuivre ses travaux. Il le fera avec le soutien total de la Commission et avec le mien en particulier.

En matière de fraude et d'évasion fiscales, le travail n'est en effet pas fini, et j'irais même plus loin: il n'est jamais fini et ne sera jamais fini. L'imagination des fraudeurs et leur capacité à inventer de nouveaux mécanismes sont sans fin, et le combat doit donc aussi être sans fin et sans relâche. D'autres scandales viendront peut-être, et je dirais même, hélas, sans doute, car la nature humaine est ainsi faite, de même que la cupidité de certains. Cela appellera une nouvelle réponse déterminée de nos institutions, de la Commission et du Parlement, en particulier.

La mise en œuvre des avancées réelles que nous avons engrangées ces dernières années doit être effective, et nous avons encore largement besoin de l'élan politique insufflé par cette assemblée pour faire aboutir les nombreuses propositions qui sont sur la table.

Bref, si ce cycle s'achève ce matin, le momentum politique, celui de la priorité à la lutte contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales, l'optimisation fiscale et la planification fiscale agressive n'est pas achevé et ne doit pas s'essouffler. Ce serait d'autant plus regrettable que la Commission européenne et le Parlement ont travaillé – comme vous le savez – en étroite collaboration, pour ne pas dire main dans la main, avec la commission PANA comme avec ses prédécesseurs.

Il y a deux semaines encore, j'étais moi-même devant la commission PANA pour faire le point sur nos avancées après avoir longuement échangé avec la commission ECON sur notre agenda fiscal. Ce que je peux dire, trois ans après l'entrée en vigueur de cette nouvelle commission, c'est que cette collaboration a porté ses fruits: nous avons déjà imposé un changement complet de paradigme. Nous sommes passés pendant ces années – c'est d'ailleurs un mouvement international – de la culture du secret à celle de la transparence, du cloisonnement à la coopération entre administrations. Cela n'avait jamais été fait auparavant. Il n'y a pas de quoi être autosatisfait, le combat n'est pas terminé, mais nous avons beaucoup avancé et ce serait absurde de ne pas le dire.

Nous avons pu faire tout cela grâce à votre soutien et grâce à notre travail commun. Je forme donc un vœu: c'est que, demain, nous puissions poursuivre dans cette voie et même l'approfondir. C'est le Parlement – comme tout Parlement – qui doit décider de l'organisation de ses travaux, de la forme qu'ils prendront. Pour avancer encore, nous nous inspirons, bien sûr, de vos propositions, qui font un écho au rôle moteur que nous voulons, que je veux continuer à jouer à vos côtés contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales.

Je vais donc commencer par revenir sur certaines de vos propositions pour montrer comment d'ores et déjà les agendas et les priorités de nos institutions convergent, et puis aussi montrer comment nous pouvons aller plus loin. Je vais les classer sommairement en deux ensembles: les actions qui visent à faire de l'échange d'informations entre administrations fiscales la norme et celles qui visent à pousser la transparence jusque dans les moindres détails et dans les moindres recoins.

Nous le savons tous, l'échange automatique d'informations est crucial pour empêcher les multinationales et certains contribuables, en général fortunés, de faire leur marché entre les codes des impôts nationaux. Votre rapport souligne, à juste titre, qu'il faut renforcer encore notre système sur ce point. Des progrès majeurs sont déjà visibles sur le terrain, avec la généralisation de l'échange automatique d'informations. Celui-ci a commencé à s'appliquer pour certaines catégories de revenus en 2015. Le premier échange automatique de renseignements relatifs aux comptes financiers a eu lieu à la fin de septembre 2017 et, en juin 2018, auront lieu les premiers échanges automatiques d'informations de nature fiscale sur l'activité des multinationales.

Quand la mise en œuvre est défaillante, la Commission n'hésite pas et n'hésitera pas à intervenir. À titre d'exemple, nous avons déjà ouvert 18 procédures d'infraction pour défaut de transposition de la directive sur la coopération administrative: une pour ce que l'on appelle DAC 1, 13 pour DAC 2 et neuf pour DAC 3. Idem pour la quatrième directive antiblanchiment: nous avons déjà engagé des procédures d'infraction à l'encontre de 16 États membres pour défaut de transposition.

Chacun doit bien sûr faire son travail pour que les résultats soient au rendez-vous à toutes les étapes: proposition, adoption et transposition effective sur le terrain. Évidemment, cette tâche n'est pas terminée. Plusieurs chantiers sont ouverts et lancés pour faire progresser encore l'échange automatique d'informations.

J'ai ainsi présenté, il y a moins de 15 jours, une proposition pour développer la coopération et la confiance entre administrations européennes pour enquêter plus efficacement sur les cas de fraude à la TVA. Vous savez que cette fraude à la TVA, notamment transfrontalière, est passive et qu'elle représente 50 milliards d'euros de pertes pour nos budgets nationaux au profit de la criminalité organisée et sans doute aussi du financement du terrorisme.

Les Paradise Papers ont mis encore davantage en lumière l'ampleur de cette fraude dans certaines juridictions sur des biens de luxe, comme les yachts ou les jets privés. Je dis au passage – je vais y venir un peu plus tard – à ceux qui nous disent «mais vous ne mettez pas de pays européens sur votre liste de paradis fiscaux» – je m'en expliquerai – que ce sont bien des pratiques européennes dont je parle et que nous devons bannir et combattre. Nous devons proposer de renforcer les pouvoirs de ce qu'on appelle «Eurofisc», qui est aussi la coopération entre l'administration fiscale et douanière, leurs partenaires européens, tels qu'Europol, OLAF et le tout nouveau Parquet européen.

Je sais que, en procédant de la sorte, nous marchons un peu sur les plates-bandes de la souveraineté des administrations fiscales et qu'il y aura des résistances. Pourtant, si on ne passe pas de la culture du chacun pour soi à une culture de coopération et de transparence, aussi entre administrations, alors on ne fait pas son travail. Je lance donc à nos États membres et à leurs administrations fiscales le message fort selon lequel il faut que cette coopération prenne place.

Votre rapport mentionne aussi la coopération entre les cellules de renseignement financier (CRF) qui jouent un rôle essentiel. La Commission a publié, en juin, un rapport et des recommandations qui identifient tous les obstacles à cette coopération. Nous soutiendrons activement les travaux de la plateforme des cellules de renseignement financier. Nous prévoyons également de proposer une initiative en vue d'améliorer le partage transfrontalier de données financières. À côté de l'échange automatique d'informations, qui – je le répète – est la mère de toutes les réformes et à l'essence de tous les progrès, il faut maintenant encore davantage de transparence.

Les «Panama Papers» et plus encore les «Paradise Papers» ont mis en évidence le rôle des intermédiaires dans les montages d'évasion et d'optimisation fiscales. Votre rapport fait le constat d'un manque de transparence – et j'allais dire presque par définition – sur ces schémas d'optimisation agressifs. Nous le partageons pleinement.

Il faut faire la lumière sur ces arrangements entre amis qui lient, dans la plus grande opacité, des multinationales – pas toutes les multinationales –, des cabinets de conseil – pas tous les cabinets de conseil –, des cabinets d'avocats – pas tous les cabinets d'avocats – et des banques – pas toutes les banques. Je dis cela parce que je pense qu'il faut éviter de stigmatiser des professions. Je comprends tout à fait qu'elles s'en offusquent, mais en même temps il faut séparer le bon grain de l'ivraie. Ceux qui font leur travail dans le respect absolu des lois et de l'éthique et ceux qui manquent de le faire.

C'est pourquoi la Commission a proposé en juin que les intermédiaires déclarent systématiquement à l'administration fiscale du pays de leurs clients les schémas d'optimisation qui répondent à certaines caractéristiques – pas tous les schémas, certaines caractéristiques. Ces données seront accessibles à tous les États membres pour renforcer encore la coopération entre administrations. Je l'ai dit devant la commission PANA, je le redis ici devant la plénière: j'appelle à une adoption de cette proposition fondamentale par les États membres dans les six mois. Ne perdons pas de temps, cela doit se faire intégralement pendant cette mandature.

Enfin, la déclaration publique obligatoire pays par pays, que nous avons proposée l'an dernier, sera aussi une avancée capitale. J'insiste sur le terme «publique»: je pense qu'aujourd'hui, refuser la transparence, plaider l'opacité est quelque chose de totalement archaïque, qui appartient au passé. Ce sont de vieux réflexes de protection qui ne correspondent à rien aujourd'hui. Opposer transparence et compétitivité est un pauvre alibi. Oui, il faut aller vers la déclaration publique et il faut il y aller vite.

Contraindre les grandes entreprises à dévoiler le détail de leur activité dans chaque pays où elles opèrent, ou plutôt leur demander de le faire, permettra à chacun (aux citoyens, aux journalistes, aux parlementaires, aux ONG) d'exercer son droit, qui est un pouvoir de contrôle. Les derniers scandales nous rappellent à quel point le rôle de cette transparence et de ces acteurs du contrôle public est fondamental pour révéler au grand jour les pratiques frauduleuses. J'en profite pour vraiment saluer le travail des médias, du Consortium international des journalistes d'investigation, sans lesquels nous n'aurions pas fait autant de progrès.

Même si la coopération européenne en matière fiscale est absolument nécessaire, elle n'est certainement pas suffisante. Nous savons que les multinationales ou les riches particuliers utilisent des montages fiscaux à l'échelle planétaire pour se soustraire à l'impôt. À cet égard, je veux insister, bien sûr, sur la liste des pays tiers à haut risque de blanchiment ou de financement du terrorisme – c'est un outil fondamental. Une autre liste fondamentale est la première liste des paradis fiscaux, adoptée par les États membres la semaine dernière.

Je veux ici dire les choses très franchement. C'est un progrès: 17 pays ont été recensés pour manquement vis-à-vis des standards de bonne gouvernance, mais surtout – car c'est au moins aussi important – 47 pays se sont engagés à un très haut niveau politique à réformer leur système fiscal et à remplir les critères de bonne gouvernance fiscale. C'est donc une dynamique qu'il faut saluer. Pour autant, il faut aussi dire qu'il y a des insuffisances ou des incomplétudes. Je demande aux ministres des finances d'éviter toute naïveté sur les engagements des 47 pays de ce que l'on peut appeler «la liste grise», qui doivent changer leur législation fiscale au plus vite. Il faut suivre cela de très près et, si cela n'est pas le cas, noircir la situation. Je veux donc interpeller ici formellement et solennellement les États membres sur le suivi de ces listes.

Je les appelle d'abord à définir des sanctions nationales dissuasives. Nous devons tout faire pour maintenir la pression sur les pays membres, le principe du «*name and shame*» (dénoncer et blâmer) est une première avancée, mais il faut aller plus loin. C'est pourquoi il faut examiner les effets immédiats de l'adoption de la liste et son impact sur le déclenchement du Fonds européen de développement durable, sur celui du Fonds européen pour les investissements stratégiques ou plus largement sur la régulation financière de l'Union. Il faut trancher ces questions rapidement. Cela vaut pour les fonds européens; cela vaut aussi pour les institutions financières internationales, comme la BEI ou la BERD.

Je demande aussi – j'en finis, Monsieur le Président – aux États membres d'enfermer le suivi de ces premières étapes dans un calendrier à la fois serré et précis. Dans trois mois, nous devrions examiner la situation des pays touchés par les ouragans – nous leur avons donné un délai, il faut ensuite examiner cas par cas. Dans six mois, nous devons réexaminer l'ensemble des engagements et nous assurer qu'ils sont tenus. Dans un an, il faudra revoir la liste en faisant sortir ceux qui ont tenu leurs engagements – c'est bien le but – et ajouter ceux qui n'ont pas tenu parole.

Je sais que, sur certains bancs – je les comprends d'autant mieux que je partage cela – et au-delà de cet hémicycle, certains espéraient davantage de cette liste. Je partage ces attentes, mais je crois qu'il faut prendre cette liste pour ce qu'elle est – une première étape positive – et aller plus loin. Je sais qu'au passage se pose la question de nos propres États membres. Je le redis ici devant le Parlement – je sais que cela ne fait pas un tabac médiatique, mais c'est la vérité: on ne peut pas comparer la situation d'un quelconque pays de l'Union européenne avec tel ou tel paradis fiscal, c'est-à-dire systémique et systématique qui figure sur notre liste.

Mais il y a des pratiques, dans nos États membres, qui doivent être combattues, et dire qu'ils ne sont pas des paradis fiscaux ne signifie pas qu'il faut laisser ces pratiques continuer à se perpétuer tranquillement. Non, quand il y a de la fraude à la TVA ou quand des suspicions de fraude existent à Malte, à l'Île de Man, quand il y a aux Pays-Bas des législations qui apparaissent comme devant être déjà condamnées, je dis «accélérez». Il faut donc être absolument rigoureux avec cela et ne pas confondre des pratiques à combattre ou à bannir avec l'appartenance à une liste.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je n'avais pas l'ambition de couvrir toutes les recommandations de votre rapport, cela aurait été encore plus long. Il est très exhaustif, mais je tenais à rappeler les grandes lignes du travail que nous accomplissons pour garantir une taxation plus efficace et plus juste dans l'Union européenne, conformément aux attentes de nos concitoyens et à vos recommandations. Je sais aussi que, vous, comme moi, nous savons que, pour aller plus loin, il faudra aussi changer la règle du jeu et passer du vote à l'unanimité au vote à la majorité qualifiée. Tout cela, votre rapport le dit ou le suggère, et je vous remercie. Je vous redis toute ma disponibilité pour continuer à collaborer pleinement avec votre assemblée dans la lutte contre la fraude, l'évasion et l'optimisation fiscales. Je sais que, dans ce combat, la Commission et le Parlement avancent, encore une fois, ensemble. Je sais que, pour vous, c'est une condition sine qua non et, pour moi, un appui absolument indispensable, dont je veux vous remercier en saluant, une fois de plus, le travail des rapporteurs et de la commission.

Luděk Niedermayer, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, tax policy should be one of our key economic priorities, and it is, unlike in the past. We have actually achieved a lot. We have introduced new measures such as the Anti-Tax Avoidance Package (ATAP), we improved cooperation through the Directive on Administrative Cooperation and we are improving our efforts to fight money laundering through amendments to the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. We have also improved transparency, which is a very important part of this fight, and a lot of initiatives such as the Common Corporate Tax Base (CCTB) and tackling VAT fraud are on the table.

So progress has been made, but, as was revealed in the work of the PANA Committee, the mission is far from being completed. We need to improve enforcement, as was suggested, for example, in the Azerbaijan Laundromat hearing. We must make beneficial ownership information more available in order to fight money laundering, and the EU should use its soft and hard power more effectively to influence other countries.

Last, but not least, the Finance Ministers must agree to dismantle tax practices that are not in line with the mutual interests of the EU. At the same time, over-politicising the issue, proposing not functional, or even bad, measures that make good headlines and no progress, is not the way forward. That is why I believe that in the plenary vote we will substantially improve the report of the committee and the report will get broad support. As a consequence, we will strengthen our push for the Commission to fight in this area.

Peter Simon, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Jetzt, zum Abschluss der Arbeiten des Panama-Untersuchungsausschusses, gilt es Resümee zu ziehen.

Ich glaube, was wir feststellen können, ist – wie auch nach dem Abschluss der Arbeiten im Sonderermittlungsausschuss TAXE –, wie wichtig es ist, dass wir neben den Mitgliedstaaten hier als Bürgerkammer Europas – als Europäisches Parlament – gegen Geldwäsche und gegen staatlich organisierte Steuervermeidung, ins Feld ziehen.

Warum? Die *Code of Conduct Group* der Mitgliedstaaten und die sonstige Kooperation der Mitgliedstaaten sind unzulänglich. Kein Mitgliedstaat hackt – wie die Krähe – dem anderen ein Auge aus. Das ist die Erfahrung, die wir in den letzten Jahren gemacht haben, und nur, wenn wir als Europäisches Parlament hier entschlossen vorangehen, ungeachtet dessen, welche Regierung in einem Mitgliedstaat an der Macht ist, werden wir es auch schaffen, gegen Steueroasen und Orte, wo der Kampf gegen Geldwäsche nicht so betrieben wird, wie wir uns das vorstellen, auch tatsächlich vorzugehen.

Wir als Bürgerkammer haben die Möglichkeit, hier den Mitgliedstaaten nicht nur Grenzen aufzuzeigen, sondern sie auch zum Handeln zu bewegen. Wir als Bürgerkammer Europas sind in der Lage, den Druck in der Öffentlichkeit zu entfalten, der hinter verschlossenen Türen, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten diese Dinge diskutieren, mit Sicherheit nicht entsteht.

Dann werden wir hoffentlich auch in Zukunft zu besseren Listen von Steueroasen außerhalb der Europäischen Union kommen. Hoffentlich auch zu Listen mit Steueroasen innerhalb der Europäischen Union und den entsprechenden Listen von Ländern, die wir als Geldwäschesparadiese ansehen und gegen die wir vorgehen wollen.

(Der Präsident unterbricht den Redner.)

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, най-напред бих искал да поздравя докладчиците и докладчиците в сянка и да благодаря на всички колеги, с които заедно работихме, за свършената работа. От създаването на тази специална комисия се проведеха седем мисии за установяване на факти по прането на пари и по данъчните измами – от февруари 2017 г. до септември 2017 г.

В допълнение към това бяха проведени двадесет и девет обикновени заседания, шестнадесет срещи на координаторите и серия публични изслушвания. Всичко това беше в изключително напрегната и строга времева рамка. Докладите в комисията PANA показаха колко е важно да имаме подходящи системи за бдителност и надзор.

Въпреки че все още има много проблеми, някои по-сериозни от други, бих искал да приветствам усилията на държавите членки, които активно се стараят да работят в борбата срещу незаконното данъчно облагане и схемите за изпиране на пари. Особено важно е да се говори за данъчните убежища и местата за данъчен рай. Важно е да не забравяме, че се полагат големи усилия и трябва да бъде постигнат и видим, и значителен напредък. Това е особено важно във времена като нашето – с безброй нови форми на заплахи за националната сигурност, гражданите и т.н.

Схемите за изпиране на пари не се използват само за лични облаги, но и както всички знаем – за финансирането на терористични дейности съвсем близо до нашия праг. Постигането на баланс между това да не спъваме икономическото развитие и да съхраним нашата сигурност не е лесна задача. Но трябва да се направи всичко възможно, за да защитим гражданите на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз. Считаю, че широките дискусии, които имаме тук на тази сцена, ще допринесат за намиране на добри решения и за поддържане на отворения диалог.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, en esta comisión no hemos conocido quién era el filtrador de los papeles de Panamá, y afortunadamente, porque no habríamos podido protegerle. Y en este momento tenemos que acordarnos de los valientes. Los periodistas nos han dicho que temen las querellas multimillonarias. Pero Daphne Caruana ni tan siquiera; además de estar con el problema de querellas multimillonarias fue asesinada. Y su familia se ha puesto en contacto con nosotros para decirnos que siguen necesitando una comisión de investigación independiente y que no están siendo informados. Así que, le dimos su nombre a una sala para reconocer su memoria, pero tenemos que hacer algo más.

En esta comisión hemos tenido que revisar la legislación europea existente y su cumplimiento real, tanto en materia fiscal como financiera. Hemos tenido que evaluar qué falla en la lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales; cómo desaparecen los capitales en las haciendas públicas; cómo es posible financiar el terrorismo, el narcotráfico o la esclavitud sexual. Son los más graves delitos, los que más atacan a la libertad, los que más atacan al Estado de Derecho.

Y las guaridas del secreto financiero colaboran con intermediarios en los países ricos, donde están esos grandes patrimonios. Algunos de los más inteligentes asesores fiscales, abogados, entidades financieras, auditores y gestores de los grandes capitales y patrimonios han actuado en realidad como facilitadores de la evasión o la elusión. Y la elusión —ya se ha dicho— solo es posible si los Estados miembros la permiten activa o pasivamente. Y los supervisores financieros nacionales y europeos no funcionan suficientemente —esto hemos podido aprender—. Así que, si la clave de los graves delitos es esconder el beneficiario real del dinero, nosotros tenemos que sacarlo a relucir.

Hoy no está aquí el Consejo, y no me extraña, porque han sido cobardes con la lista y nosotros no podemos esperar más, comisario. Dentro de seis meses volveremos a hablar y usted seguramente nos dirá alguna cosa para animarnos, pero las cosas están así. Necesitamos transparencia.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente. No podíamos empezar esta intervención sin expresar nuestro agradecimiento a filtradores y periodistas. Sin su trabajo, esta comisión no habría sido posible, no se habría producido. Porque son los escándalos los que motivan que luego las instituciones tengan, justamente, que hacer comisiones como para demostrar que se hace algo contra la evasión fiscal. Si esta comisión ha demostrado algo es que este no es un problema coyuntural, sino que es un problema estructural. La evasión y la elusión fiscales son problemas estructurales. Y justamente por eso proponemos una comisión permanente, no más comisiones especiales. Una comisión permanente en el Parlamento Europeo.

Para muchos, la comisión de investigación ha sido, simplemente, un lavado de cara. Pero yo creo que de esta comisión hemos conseguido, en base al trabajo, sacar un buen informe: recomendaciones que no son vinculantes pero que son importantes para poder trabajar contra la evasión fiscal, una herramienta útil.

Pero muchos de los logros de esta comisión están en riesgo. Están en riesgo por las enmiendas de los Grupos ALDE y PPE, que quieren mutilar este texto mañana, eliminando elementos claves para la votación. Si esto se produce, estaremos dando una imagen tan bochornosa como la lista blanca de paraísos fiscales de la Comisión y del Consejo.

Tocqueville decía que la Revolución francesa comenzó realmente con una revuelta previa de los privilegiados. Hoy, doscientos años después, tenemos una revuelta de los privilegiados: los que no quieren pagar impuestos.

(El presidente retira la palabra al orador.)

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, it was the Greens/EFA Group that began the process of establishing the inquiry committee into the Panama Papers whose report we are debating today.

We have a report to be proud of, with strong recommendations to clamp down on tax avoidance, tax evasion and money laundering. Our recommendations include requiring an economic justification before offshore structures can be established and ensuring that EU funds can never find their way to tax havens. We hope that our friends in other Groups will support this strong action against tax cheating to respond to the public outcry against continuing scandals. Any weakening of this report's proposals represents contempt for their views.

After months of evidence-gathering and inquiry and the further revelations of the recent Paradise Papers, there can be no excuse for inaction. The Commission must take immediate steps to turn these recommendations into legislative proposals. We also look to the Council to adopt the legislative proposals made in the aftermath of the Panama Papers, especially greater transparency for the activities of large companies and the revision of the anti-money laundering rules.

A failure by Member States to cooperate to fight tax evasion and tax avoidance means that too many proposals are blocked in Council, which demonstrates its contempt for our work by not even sending anybody to be present at this debate. To break this blockage, we call on Commissioner Moscovici to present a legislative tax proposal under codecision during 2018.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo arrivati alla conclusione di questa terza commissione che si è occupata del problema dei paradisi fiscali.

Ricordo che ci sono dei paradisi fiscali all'interno dell'Unione europea e questi paradisi fiscali sono riportati nella recente relazione Oxfam, e sono Lussemburgo, Irlanda, Malta e Paesi Bassi. Sono paesi che sono anche fondatori dell'Unione europea e che continuano a perpetrare una politica fiscale che va ad aggredire quella che è la possibilità dei paesi di recuperare le imposte dalle multinazionali, e noi dobbiamo fare il possibile affinché questo scandalo finisca.

La relazione non è vincolante, purtroppo, infatti si trova un ampio consenso in questo Parlamento. Il problema poi è nelle proposte legislative: noi vogliamo che il Consiglio riesca a lavorare bene su questo e trovi delle soluzioni e prenda a tesoro quello che sarà scritto nella relazione. Spero, ripeto, che nella votazione non venga depauperato un testo che comunque, per quanto non legislativo, sarà importante per dare una mossa a questo sistema.

Barbara Kappel, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Moscovici! Eine konkrete Forderung des Panama-Untersuchungsausschusses wurde ja bereits erfüllt, nämlich die schwarze Liste nicht kooperationswilliger Staaten, die seit 5. Dezember vorliegt. Viele waren enttäuscht, dass sich darauf nur 17 Staaten fanden, kein einziges EU-Land, auch nicht einschlägige Steuerparadiese wie Guernsey oder Andorra und auch nicht die USA, die nicht mit den europäischen Steuerbehörden kooperieren wollen. Ganz im Gegenteil: Erst dieser Tage erging ein Schreiben von fünf EU-Finanzministern an den US-Finanzminister, in dem davor gewarnt wurde, dass manche der angedachten Regelungen im Rahmen der neuen Steuerreform gegen die WTO-Regeln und die Absprachen der OECD im Kampf gegen Steuervermeidung verstoßen.

Die schwarze Liste zeigt dennoch Wirkung; von den 92 angefragten Staaten haben nämlich 47 ihre Zusammenarbeit mit den EU-Finanzbehörden und eine Anpassung ihrer Steuergesetzgebung in Aussicht gestellt und sind auf einer grauen Liste gelandet. Es soll in Zukunft sogar Sanktionen gegen diese Staaten geben, vom Einfrieren von EU-Mitteln bis zu Maßnahmen auf Landesebene.

Die schwarze Liste ist aber nur eine Forderung des Berichts des PANA-Untersuchungsausschusses, viele andere Punkte sind noch offen. Hier ist großer Handlungsbedarf gegeben, denn den europäischen Haushalten gehen durch aggressive Steuerplanung jährlich 70 Milliarden Euro an Einnahmen verloren.

In finanzieller Hinsicht ein großes Thema ist der Mehrwertsteuerbetrug, 150 Milliarden Euro schlagen zu Buche. Und die Digitalwirtschaft, wo der Rat am 5. Dezember neue Vorschriften angenommen hat, mit denen es Online-Unternehmen erleichtert wird, die Mehrwertsteuerbestimmungen einzuhalten. Dem Kampf gegen Geldwäsche wird mit Überarbeitung der vierten Geldwäscherichtlinie begegnet. Ebenso soll es schon bald Vorschläge gegen Vermittler geben.

Es ist noch viel zu tun bei der Bekämpfung von Steuervermeidung. Aber wir sind auf dem richtigen Weg. Der PANA-Untersuchungsausschuss und TAXE 1 und TAXE 2 haben dazu beigetragen, dass eine Vielzahl konkreter Maßnahmen vorgeschlagen wurde, die zu mehr Transparenz und fairem...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση περί φορολογικών παραδείσων στιγματίζοντας δήθεν κάποιους «ανήθικους» καπιταλιστές αθώνει το σύστημα που τους εξασφαλίζει τα αποθηκευμένα εκεί κεφάλαια, που δεν ξεπερνούν το 5% των συνολικών καταθέσεων. Τελικά καταντάει και ανέκδοτο! Ομολογείτε δηλαδή ότι μετά τις αποκαλύψεις, που δεν εξυπηρετούν βέβαια τη διαφάνεια αλλά απλώς ανταγωνιστικά συμφέροντα, πολλαπλασιάστηκαν εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης οι φορολογικοί παράδεισοι.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο με παζάρια εξαίρεσε απ' τους φορολογικούς παραδείσους περιπτώσεις κραγμένες όπως τα νησιά Κέιμαν. Το συζητούμενο ψήφισμα επιμένει και προτρέπει σε διάκριση παράνομων και νόμιμων τακτικών φοροδιαφυγής και φοροαπαλλαγής, διαιωνίζοντας τα φορολογικά προνόμια του κεφαλαίου, που πληρώνει ο λαός με άγρια φοροεπιδρομή, όπως με την αύξηση του ΦΠΑ στα ελληνικά νησιά, που δοκιμάζονται.

Ονομαστικοποίηση όλων των μετοχών, άρση κάθε απορρήτου, απαγόρευση off shore εταιρειών, έλεγχος κίνησης κεφαλαίων: μπορείτε να τα κάνετε αυτά; Όχι βέβαια, γιατί πάνε κόντρα στο DNA του συστήματος και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, δηλαδή την ελευθερία του κεφαλαίου να μετακινείται και να θησαυρίζει όπου μπορεί καλύτερα. Αυτό, ό,τι και να κάνετε, δεν βελτιώνεται. Μόνο ανατρέπεται.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Ujawnienie w 2016 r. papierów z Panamy spowodowało wielki skandal, ponieważ pokazało, na jak wielką skalę dochodzi w świecie do unikania płacenia podatków, uchylania się od opodatkowania i do prania brudnych pieniędzy.

Według szacunków Komisji Europejskiej łączne straty budżetów państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej tylko z tego tytułu sięgają 1 000 mld euro rocznie, a w skali świata tego typu praktyki mogą kosztować budżety poszczególnych państw ponad 3 000 mld dolarów. Ulubionym miejscem tych przekrętów są oczywiście tzw. raje podatkowe, ale generalnie chodzi o to, że to są jurysdykcje, które oferują sekretność, anonimowość i bardzo niskie stawki opodatkowania. Komisja śledcza wykonała bardzo dobrą pracę. Sprawozdanie, które otrzymujemy i o którym dyskutujemy, jest dobrym sprawozdaniem. Jego główne punkty zostały już zreferowane. Chciałbym powiedzieć, że moglibyśmy to sprawozdanie jeszcze bardziej ulepszyć, gdyby była lepsza współpraca pomiędzy grupami politycznymi w Parlamencie. Zwracam się w tym kontekście do grupy Socjalistów i Demokratów, żeby przed jutrzejszym głosowaniem wykazali się jeszcze pewną

elastycznością i wyszli naprzeciw oczekiwaniom innych grup politycznych, dlatego że my w Parlamencie potrzebujemy bardzo silnego sygnału do opinii publicznej. Musimy mieć w tej sprawie poparcie całej izby. W związku z tym apeluje o to, żeby przed jutrzejszym głosowaniem dojść do pewnych kompromisów, które pozwolą na to, żeby cała izba głosowała za tym sprawozdaniem.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Sobre os Panama Papers, na mesma semana em que reunimos com o Conselho e a Comissão, na 9.ª ronda de negociações sobre a 5.ª diretiva para a prevenção do branqueamento de capitais e financiamento do terrorismo, que se arrastam há oito meses por pura obstrução de alguns Estados-Membros, o Conselho persiste em negar acesso público aos registos de beneficiários efetivos de empresas e trusts e insiste em manter lacunas e escapatórias para a indústria da criminalidade financeira continuar a operar com impunidade.

Até a criação de uma Unidade de Informação Financeira Europeia foi ominosamente recusada pelo Conselho. Ora, avançar para a 5.ª diretiva resultou do imperativo de combater o financiamento do terrorismo depois dos ataques ao Bataclan, em Paris. Mas, apesar da retórica reformadora, escândalo após escândalo e ataque após ataque, certos Estados-Membros não querem realmente mudar.

A captura de governos europeus pelos interesses da indústria, da evasão fiscal e do branqueamento fica exposta na falta da ação coerente e decisiva pela justiça fiscal contra o crime financeiro, a corrupção e o financiamento do terrorismo. Malta, onde foi assassinada Daphne Caruana Galizia, é sinistro exemplo desta captura. Sabemos que o nosso trabalho no Parlamento Europeu, aliado à imprensa de investigação, que saúde, pode fazer a diferença.

Graças à nossa pressão sobre o escândalo Luxleaks, a Comissária Vestager exigiu ao Governo irlandês que recuperasse os impostos que deixou poupar à empresa Apple e o Comissário Moscovici fez propostas inéditas e positivas.

Vamos prosseguir as investigações dos Panama Papers e dos Paradise Papers e esporemos os capturados, os corruptos, os encobridores e os criminosos, onde quer que se encontrem, e muitos estão aqui, na Europa, onde há muitos paraísos fiscais que não constam da lista recentemente aprovada pelo Conselho, cinicamente.

(A oradora aceita responder a uma pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul», nos termos do artigo 162.º, n.º 8, do Regimento.)

Nuno Melo (PPE), Pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Queria só perguntar-lhe se, aqui chegados, está finalmente convencida de que o Panamá é o Panamá, a Madeira é a Madeira, a Madeira não tem nada que ver com o Panamá, que quando trata a Madeira como se fosse o Panamá não ajuda a Europa mas, seguramente, prejudica Portugal. E finalmente, na ocasião, tendo em conta a sua parte final, talvez queira aproveitar para dizer qualquer coisa sobre o atual escândalo das Raríssimas, em Portugal, e aqueles que envolve, porque, enfim, é muito a sua área e a sua palavra talvez tivesse algum peso.

Ana Gomes (S&D), Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – A Madeira é a Madeira e quem a trouxe aqui foi o Senhor Deputado, e eu acho que a Madeira é um paraíso fiscal. Aliás, a justificação para os paraísos fiscais como a Madeira é a mesma no Luxemburgo ou em Malta: somos pequeninos, não temos recursos, logo, podemos entrar na criminalidade organizada. Poderia ser a droga, é a criminalidade de colarinho branco.

Do meu ponto de vista, isto não é aceitável, nem em Portugal nem em toda a União Europeia, e a Comissão tem aqui responsabilidades e não pode continuar a endossar situações como a Madeira. E em relação a quaisquer escândalos de corrupção, em Portugal, do José Sócrates às Raríssimas, ou o que quer que seja, eu serei primeira a fazer tudo para os expor...

(O Presidente retira a palavra à oradora)

President. – Colleagues, I am about to close the list for catch-the-eye in a couple of minutes. While we have a lot of requests for the floor from a number of the Groups, we still do not have any from two or three Groups, so I will give a few final minutes to attract the attention of the Chair for catch-the-eye and then I will close the list.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, meine sehr verehrten Kollegen, die Sie heute nicht da sind.

Wo sind sie eigentlich? Warum ist denn dieser Plenarsaal wieder mal gähnend leer? Nun hat der wichtigste Untersuchungsausschuss dieser Legislaturperiode getagt – für anderthalb Jahre lang. Es ging um Steuerhinterziehung, kriminelle Aktivitäten, Geldwäsche, Terrorismusfinanzierung, um Anliegen, die von zentraler Bedeutung für unser aller Zukunft und für unsere Gesellschaft sind, und das Parlament scheint sich gar nicht dafür zu interessieren.

Warum ist denn der Plenarsaal heute nicht gepackt voll? Warum sind die Kollegen denn nicht gespannt darauf, was dieser Untersuchungsausschuss herausbekommen hat? Ich frage mich: Der Kollege Simon hat davon gesprochen, dass wir ein Bürgerparlament sind. Was sind wir denn? Wie wollen denn unsere Bürger verstehen, was wir gemacht haben, wenn hier nicht wenigstens zur Kenntnis genommen wird, welche Arbeit hier geleistet worden ist und wo die Missstände sind. Hier werden schwerste Vorwürfe gegenüber Mitgliedsstaaten erhoben, die die dritte Geldwäscherichtlinie nicht umgesetzt haben, sowie gegen die EU-Kommission, die dem nicht Nachdruck verliehen hat, dass das umgesetzt wird.

Auch gegenüber dem Parlament, das es über Jahre hinweg versäumt hat, irgendwie tätig zu werden, obwohl jeder wusste, dass diese Art von Steuerhinterziehung und Geldwäsche ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

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

Peter Simon (S&D), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Lucke! Sie ziehen hier über die ganzen Kollegen her, die nicht da sind. Sie wissen ganz genau, dass in ungefähr 70 Sitzungsräumen, die es hier gibt, die Kolleginnen und Kollegen arbeiten. Finden Sie diesen Populismus nicht etwas billig?

Bernd Lucke (ECR), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Simon! Manchmal gibt es in einem Parlament wichtige Dinge zu verhandeln, und ich glaube, heute haben wir eine solche Stunde, wo wir etwas Wichtiges besprechen. Da ist es den Kollegen auch zuzumuten, dass sie mal in den Plenarsaal kommen und an einer solchen Debatte teilnehmen oder ihr zumindest zuhören.

Was wir hier erlebt haben, ist ein großer Verstoß gegen Gerechtigkeit. Hier gibt es Reiche und Superreiche und Superinflussreiche, die einfach nicht die Steuern zahlen, die sie zahlen müssten, die ihre Erträge in irgendwelche Steueroasen verlegen. Und Ihr Parteivorsitzender, der frühere Präsident dieses Parlaments Martin Schulz, hat Gerechtigkeit zu seinem zentralen Wahlkampfthema gemacht. Da frage ich mich: Warum sitzen nicht Sozialdemokraten in größerer Anzahl im Plenum, als es jetzt der Fall ist?

President. – Colleagues, we have had an exchange of views on participation in this important report, but I would appreciate it if we could now focus on the substance and on the report itself.

Enrique Calvet Chambon (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, por supuesto felicito a todos los miembros de la Comisión PANA por el trabajo realizado, ya que aporta, sin duda, una serie de elementos muy positivos para la lucha.

En tan poco tiempo solo puedo ir a lo esencial: ha dicho el señor comisario que agradecía el apoyo del Parlamento. Mire usted, no es apoyo, es exigencia. Es decir, esto es de una mayor importancia política de lo que uno se pueda imaginar. Cuando sale lo de Panamá y todo eso —dando las gracias a los periodistas que lo sacan—, algunos reaccionan por el morbo de un futbolista, de un superrico y tal, pero el pueblo sabe que la democracia y sobre todo el Estado europeo de bienestar están siendo atacados de manera injusta. No es europeo el que se lo programa sino el que trabaja. El adversario es el Consejo y hay que convencerle de que hay que ser mucho más ambicioso porque está en juego la democracia europea.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is ironic but hardly surprising that, just as the Panama Papers inquiry is finished, we are now faced with an even bigger offshore leak: the Paradise Papers. We urgently need a new committee to examine those Appleby revelations. Let us remember that there is a human cost to this system that allows the ultra-rich to avoid contributing to society in any meaningful way and which deprives communities of the public services they need. In Ireland, we have seen eight people die in the freezing cold on the streets in a period of 14 weeks as a result of a homelessness crisis largely caused by a lack of investment in social housing.

Our governments are not innocent bystanders in the corporate tax avoidance system. In many cases, they actively promote it. There is a political choice to be made by those in power. Either shield the financial secrecy of the super rich, or promote the rights and wellbeing of communities. You cannot do both. This Parliament has a role to play in setting the political agenda. We need to make the strongest possible statement calling for this rotten offshore system to be wiped out when we vote on this report.

President. – I will now close the catch-the-eye list and I will not re-open it. We have a long list and we also still have a long list of scheduled speakers.

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben hier im letzten Jahr und schon länger eine gute Arbeit über die Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg gemacht.

Ich möchte mich ausdrücklich bei der Kommission bedanken, die vieles von dem, was wir hier bearbeitet haben, in Vorschläge übernommen hat. Was jetzt allerdings hier im Plenum vor uns liegt, das ist schon ärgerlich: Wir haben insgesamt 38 Änderungsanträge und *split votes* plus 12 weitere, also 50 Anträge der Christdemokraten, 34 der Liberalen, die darauf abzielen, diesen Bericht in aller Mehrheit zu schwächen.

Dabei geht es nicht um einige Details, sondern einige dieser Änderungsanträge oder Streichungsversuche zielen in das Herz dieses Berichts. Ich bitte Sie wirklich, sich das im Detail noch mal anzuschauen. Es ist nicht richtig, dass wir bei Rechtsanwälten oder Wirtschaftsprüfern die Selbstbeaufsichtigung bei der Geldwäsche beibehalten.

Liebe Liberale: Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Mitgliedstaaten sind notwendig, wenn sie die Regeln nicht einhalten. Wir brauchen eine Mindestbesteuerung bei den übelsten Verschiebungen von Zinsen und Lizenzgebühren. Genauso ist es falsch, wenn Herr Juncker für Mehrheitsverfahren eintritt, Sie aber genau diese Gesetzgebungsvorschläge nach Artikel 116 streichen.

Bitte überlegen Sie sich das noch mal!

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, Merry Christmas to friends and foe alike. Over the last few years, this Parliament has come up with a plethora of tax reports. Time after time, the conclusions are the same. We need more taxes, we need higher taxes, and we need a harmonisation of tax policies. In the meantime, the European Commission is advocating a common consolidated corporate tax base (CCCTB) and last week the European Code of Conduct Group proudly announced a blacklist of tax havens. It seems the EU federalists want to punish the UK for taking a democratic decision to leave. This is why some EU politicians are telling journalists that the UK will be blacklisted as a tax haven after Brexit. By threatening us, you are proving once again that the only aim of these EU tax proposals is banning freedom and free competition. According to this Panama report, tax avoidance is the improper utilisation of tax regimes. What you do not seem to understand is that people have the right to keep the fruits of their labour. Tax ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

President. – Thank you colleague, and thank you for your Christmas wishes, which I can reciprocate.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è convincente la sottile distinzione che il Commissario Moscovici, per giustificare l'assenza di Stati membri nella lista, ci ha proposto fra Stati che hanno qualche pratica irregolare e quelli che sono invece un sistema generale di protezione delle finanze occulte.

Io penso che questa distinzione un po' gesuitica del Commissario Moscovici venga utilizzata al contrario, possa essere utilizzata al contrario: avete messo nelle liste nere la povera Mongolia ed escludete il Lussemburgo, che è uno Stato in forma di paradiso fiscale. È un paradiso fiscale, per meglio dire, in forma di Stato, come tutti sappiamo. E però non c'è, non l'avete messo.

La relazione va un po' criticata perché non approfondisce, come si doveva approfondire, due aspetti: primo, il forte legame del tema dei paradisi fiscali con i capitali sporchi, mafiosi, irregolari, del traffico internazionale di droga. Persino un altissimo esponente dell'ONU da Vienna, e l'ha ripetuto qui a Bruxelles, ha denunciato il ruolo delle banche nel traffico internazionale, nella copertura dei capitali del traffico di droga. Questa relazione non è sufficiente, e per questo non la voteremo.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα τελευταία χρόνια είναι πάρα πολλές οι φορές που σαν θέμα συζήτησης στην Ολομέλεια έχουμε τη δημοσιοποίηση εγγράφων που αποκαλύπτουν κάποιους από τους ιδιοκτήτες υπεράκτιων εταιρειών. Πρέπει να σημειωθεί πως δυστυχώς σχεδόν πάντα στις λίστες αυτές περιλαμβάνονται και ονόματα πολιτικών, συχνά δε πολύ γνωστών. Βέβαια, υποπτεύομαι πως, όπως και τις προηγούμενες φορές, κι αυτή τη φορά θα εκφραστούν διάφορες απόψεις αλλά στο τέλος θα έχουμε μηδενικό πραγματικό αποτέλεσμα ή ίσως –το καλύτερο σενάριο– να ασκηθούν διώξεις εναντίον κάποιων αποδιοπομπαίων τράγων και όλοι οι υπόλοιποι να συνεχίζουν να εκμεταλλεύονται τα κενά του διεθνούς χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος.

Και θα συνεχίσουν να τα εκμεταλλεύονται, διότι αυτές ακριβώς οι υπεράκτιες εταιρείες αποτελούν τη ραχοκοκαλιά του συστήματος αυτού. Ο διεθνής κορπορατισμός, προς την πλήρη επικράτηση του οποίου οδεύουμε σταθερά, δεν θα μπορούσε να επιβιώσει χωρίς τις υπεράκτιες εταιρείες, οι δε πολιτικοί ηγέτες αρκούνται πλέον στον ρόλο του απλού διεκπεραιωτή διαφόρων υποθέσεων των μεγάλων πολυεθνικών εταιρειών. Δεν υπάρχει λοιπόν καμία περίπτωση να αντιμετωπιστεί το φαινόμενο αυτό με το υπάρχον οικονομικό σύστημα και η μόνη λύση την οποία εμείς προτείνουμε είναι η εκ βάθρων ανατροπή του.

Werner Langen (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Als Vorsitzender des Untersuchungsausschusses möchte ich mich zuerst bei allen Mitgliedern, beim Sekretariat, bei den Berichterstattern, aber auch bei Kommissar Moscovici für die faire und gute Zusammenarbeit in den letzten anderthalb Jahren bedanken. Wir haben 25 Hearings durchgeführt, elf Studien veranlasst und sieben Vor-Ort-Besuche gemacht. Das Ergebnis liegt jetzt vor, und es liegt in der Hand der Fraktionen, die Empfehlungen, die der Ausschuss erarbeitet hat, anzunehmen. Ich habe die große Bitte, dass wir diesen Bericht jetzt am Ende nicht so gestalten, dass wir keinerlei Forderungen mehr haben. Wir müssen den Druck aufrechterhalten! Deshalb bin ich auch dafür, dass ein Sonderausschuss bis Ende der Legislaturperiode installiert wird. Und ich hoffe, die Fraktionen finden hier eine gemeinsame Linie.

„Transparenz ist der Schlüssel“, hat Herr Moscovici gesagt. Dass wir den Paradigmenwechsel bereits erreicht haben, wage ich allerdings zu bezweifeln. Die Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten untereinander und mit dem Parlament lässt zu wünschen übrig. Bevor die EU-Mitgliedstaaten Sanktionen gegen Drittstaaten beschließen, müssen sie ihren eigenen Verantwortungsbereich in Ordnung bringen. Das ist meine Schlussfolgerung aus den Panama-Papieren. Und deshalb sage ich: Persönlich werde ich dem Änderungsantrag Nummer 14 der Sozialdemokraten, in dem vier Mitgliedstaaten genannt werden, auch zustimmen. Und ich bitte alle, morgen einen Beschluss und einen Vorschlag zu erarbeiten, der auch den notwendigen Druck erzeugt.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Langen, comme président de la commission PANA, vous avez été un excellent président et vous venez d'en faire la démonstration. Je vous invite dès lors à convaincre votre groupe, si vous ne voulez pas baisser le niveau d'ambition de ce rapport, de retirer toutes les demandes de votes séparés qui ont été déposées par votre groupe ou des amendements qui visent toujours, après avoir partagé un constat sur le scandale que représente l'évasion fiscale ou la fraude fiscale, à élargir le champ des exceptions ou à diminuer le champ d'application des législations que nous mettons en œuvre.

J'invite aussi à l'esprit de bonne coopération auquel M. Rosati a fait appel. Nous lui donnons rendez-vous pour être ambitieux, à nos côtés, dans la dénonciation du rôle des intermédiaires, car il s'agit de la prochaine étape conséquente, lorsque nous aurons adopté ce rapport de la commission PANA.

Enfin, s'agissant de la liste des paradis fiscaux, je soutiens, moi aussi, bien évidemment, les amendements de mes collègues Peter Simon et Paul Tang, qui doivent permettre de faire la lumière sur les pratiques au sein de l'Union européenne.

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

President. – Ms Berès, I am afraid that only one minute was communicated to the Secretariat. I do apologise.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, PANA-tutkintavaliokunnan mietintö on herättänyt paljon mielipiteitä puolesta ja vastaan. Erityisen suuria tunteita on herättänyt kohta EU:n sisäisten veroparatiisien listaamisesta. Nyt saavutetusta ratkaisusta riippumatta on selvää, että ennemmin tai myöhemmin tähän ongelmaan täytyy puuttua. Tämä on vähänkin pidemmällä aikavälillä myös veroparatiisipalveluita tarjoavien valtioiden kansalaisten etu. Jos finanssi- ja verosuunnittelusektori saavat liian suuren vallan, häviävät lopulta kaikki.

PANA-mietinnössä on myös monia muita tärkeitä kohtia. Nostan esiin vaatimukset kehittää veroparatiiseille yhteinen määritelmä, vapaatuotantoalueiden parempi sääntely, kolmansien valtioiden rahanpesukartoitusten kunnianhimon tason nostaminen, yritysten käytännösääntöryhmän vahvistaminen sekä veronkierron ja veron välttelyn välittäjiin puuttuminen. Keskeisiä aloitteita yhdistää se, että ne vaativat pitkän aikavälin seurantaa. Siksi PANA-tutkintavaliokunnan tekemää hyvää työtä täytyy jatkaa entistään tarkemmin...

(Puhemies keskeytti puhujan)

(Puhuja ei suostunut vastaamaan sinisen kortin kysymykseen (työjärjestyksen 162 artiklan 8 kohdan mukaisesti))

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, à partir de ce rapport et des 200 recommandations qui l'accompagnent, il est urgent de s'attaquer à l'évasion et à la fraude fiscales en mettant nos actes en accord avec nos paroles et avec ce texte. Il est temps de mettre fin à cette folie qui coûte aux travailleurs européens 1 000 milliards d'euros, selon le chiffre de la Commission européenne. Ceci représente plus de dix fois le budget de l'Union européenne elle-même. C'est aussi dix fois plus que ce que la conférence de Paris a décidé d'attribuer au Fonds vert pour le climat.

Il faut donc avancer à grands pas vers une harmonisation de la fiscalité des entreprises et des banques qui soit efficace, dès lors qu'elle permettrait de réorienter l'argent vers la création d'emplois et la transition environnementale: taxer la spéculation financière, exiger la transparence bancaire et empêcher la fraude organisée, notamment à la TVA. Un acte efficace serait aussi de sortir de l'impuissance et d'utiliser les ressorts de l'article 116 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, qui autorise la modification de l'exigence d'unanimité au Conseil européen.

Eva Joly (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, voilà dix-huit mois que notre commission enquête sur le scandale des «Panama Papers». Demain, nous voterons notre rapport final. Nous, députés au Parlement européen, devons être au rendez-vous!

À l'heure où les citoyens ne supportent plus l'impunité et l'inaction face aux privilèges fiscaux de quelques-uns, il est inacceptable, et surtout incompréhensible, que certains, dans cet hémicycle, cherchent à affaiblir nos recommandations pour combattre l'évasion fiscale. Soyons à la hauteur de nos responsabilités, adoptons un rapport ambitieux face à des États membres qui bloquent systématiquement les réformes nécessaires de transparence et d'harmonisation fiscales. Notre Parlement doit leur rappeler le sens de l'intérêt général.

À celles et ceux qui hésitent encore à voter certaines des recommandations clés, je veux rappeler ceci: l'évasion fiscale est un processus destructeur qui pille les finances publiques, accentue les inégalités et menace les fondements du vivre ensemble. Qui refuse d'agir contre elle détruit l'Europe.

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

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – Madam Joly, everyone wants to continue this committee. I wondered if you would agree with me that perhaps a good name for it should be the 'Robespierre committee', because it just seems to be an excuse for a bunch of lefties to give big business and little businesses who are trying to protect themselves a good kicking. So perhaps, Madam, you would agree with me, the 'Robespierre committee' should be the name given to this committee in the future?

Eva Joly (Verts/ALE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Je retrouve là votre attitude habituelle de négation des crises climatiques ou des crises financières, et du rôle des paradis fiscaux, et notamment celui de l'Angleterre, qui a un réseau de paradis fiscaux qui sont extrêmement néfastes pour le reste de l'Union, et j'espère bien que, dans la deuxième partie des négociations, nous parviendrons à ce que votre pays soit tenu d'appliquer la réglementation européenne à vos territoires offshore pour avoir accès au marché unique.

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

Thomas Mann (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Joly, wir beide hatten ja Gelegenheit, an einem Bericht zum Thema Geldwäsche zu arbeiten.

Meine Frage ist folgende: Sind Sie dafür, dass wir die schwarze Liste haben mit Nennung der Namen, inklusive der europäischen Länder?

Das Zweite: Ist es nicht unumwunden wichtig, dem Vorschlag von Jean-Claude Juncker zu folgen, der gesagt hat: Diese schreckliche Einstimmigkeit in Steuerfragen bei den Mitgliedstaaten muss verändert werden. Wie stehen Sie dazu?

Eva Joly (Verts/ALE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Évidemment que je voterai l'amendement qui propose de citer les paradis fiscaux internes à l'Union. C'est très important et je remercie Peter Simon d'avoir déposé cet amendement. Nous devons passer outre l'unanimité au Conseil, qui est une disposition tout à fait dépassée. Je prends acte de la promesse qu'avait faite Jean-Claude Juncker devant nous d'utiliser l'article 116. C'est donc un espoir et je voudrais que les membres de cette assemblée n'affaiblissent pas nos recommandations en ce sens.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Belastingontduiking is strafbaar, belastingontwijking is dat niet. In principe heeft iedereen het recht om zo weinig mogelijk belastingen te betalen zolang men binnen de krijtlijnen van de wet blijft. De kern van het probleem is dat, hoewel elk individu en elk bedrijf dezelfde rechten heeft, ze niet beschikken over dezelfde mogelijkheden. Een kmo in West-Vlaanderen kan de diensten van Appleby gewoonweg niet betalen. Dit is wat ik noem klassenfiscaliteit. De *Panama Papers* en nadien ook de *Paradise Papers* brachten de omvang hiervan aan het licht. Nu moeten we de politieke keuze maken voor fiscale rechtvaardigheid en dat moeten we samen doen.

De aanbevelingen die de PANA-commissie voorlegt zijn nodig, maar zolang de lidstaten niet meegaan in de logica van rechtvaardige fiscaliteit blijft het vechten met één arm. Ook de commissaris heeft het in zijn inleiding aangehaald. De Commissie en vooral de Raad moeten mee in het bad. Als overheid is het belangrijk om een wettelijk kader vast te leggen zonder juridische achterpoortjes en met transparantie als voornaamste leidraad. Maar een overheid moet ook haar beperkingen kennen. Met een kloppacht winnen we niets. Met een politiek steekspel tussen lidstaten trouwens evenmin.

Collega's, onze reputatie als Europees Parlement staat hier op het spel. Ik roep iedereen dan ook op om zich bewust te zijn van de impact die onze aanbevelingen zullen hebben. We moeten ambitieus zijn, maar mogen ons niet verliezen in onrealistische, populistische voorstellen. De lidstaten moeten overtuigd worden en niet tegen elkaar opgezet worden. Indien we hierin niet slagen, zullen de lidstaten blind blijven meegaan in de logica van multinationals en dan zijn zij uiteindelijk de winnaars.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, come Lei sa bene, i temi della politica fiscale sono diventati centrali nella discussione del Parlamento e delle istituzioni europee, soprattutto per gli scandali, purtroppo – prima «LuxLeaks» e adesso «Panama Papers» – per questa ragione abbiamo bisogno di azioni ambiziose ed efficaci per contrastare il fenomeno dell'evasione come quello dell'elusione.

Allora bisogna introdurre meccanismi che proteggano in maniera efficace gli informatori che ci hanno permesso di conoscere lo stato delle cose, bisogna proibire la creazione di società di facciata, bisogna introdurre criteri più stretti e sanzioni efficaci nella definizione delle liste europee, e bisogna definire una quota di tassazione minima nell'Unione europea per tutte le imprese.

Credo però che le cose più importanti siano, da un lato, indicare esplicitamente quali sono i paesi europei da mettere nella *black list*, quelli cioè che praticano e favoriscono processi di evasione e di elusione delle imprese lì residenti. Ma ancor di più, bisogna superare le conseguenze negative della regola dell'unanimità attraverso l'utilizzo dell'articolo 116: non è possibile lasciare ad un paese il diritto di veto sulle politiche fiscali.

Roberts Zīle (ECR). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Es vispirms gribu pateikties Langena kungam par komitejas vadību un pārējiem kolēģiem par darbu, lai arī nevaru piekrist visiem punktiem rekomendācijās.

Savā komitejas darbā mēs redzējām, cik grūti ir sadarboties finanšu ziņu iestādēm, kas vāc šo informāciju, un finanšu tirgus uzraugiem ne tikai pārrobežu ziņā, bet arī citreiz vienas valsts ietvaros. Tāpēc, manuprāt, atslēga nav veidot jaunas institūcijas, bet nodrošināt šo finanšu ziņu apmaiņu un finanšu tirgus uzraugu informāciju. Bet Panamas komitejas laikā mēs redzējām arī, cik dažāda un atšķirīga ir izpratne par politiku ētiku, par likumdošanu, kas regulē interešu konfliktus dažādās Eiropas Savienības dalībvalstīs, un arī par nodokļu likumdošanu, un mēs satikām ministrus – valdību ministrus, kuri bija lieliski eksperti trasta kompāniju jautājumos. Tai pašā laikā mēs sastapām deputātus, kuri joprojām strādā par nodokļu konsultantiem un brīvajā laikā nodarbojas ar likumdošanu, un tad nav brīnums, ka šajās valstīs notiek kliezsoši noziegumi kā žurnālistu noslepkavošana.

Netīra nauda nenes laimi. Tai seko netīri cilvēki ar savu neētiku.

(Runātājs piekrita atbildēt uz “zilās kartītes” jautājumu (Reglamenta 162. panta 8. punkts))

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – Do you think with all these rules and regulations that are being brought in by the European Union on the back of this report that business is going to flood into the UK immediately after Brexit because people want to put their money where they feel it is safe and is not going to be plundered by a lot of left-wing individuals who just want to destroy businesses and create a Communist super state?

Roberts Zīle (ECR), blue-card answer. – The short answer is no.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente. Yo creo que nos ha quedado un buen informe. Lamento las enmiendas presentadas y los votos parciales por parte de liberales y populares y quisiera hacer una petición específica a aquellos diputados populares y liberales que sí creen en la justicia fiscal: que, por favor, mañana nos apoyen para tener un buen informe. Y estoy convencido de que habrá muchos diputados que no van a votar a favor de las enmiendas oficiales presentadas por su grupo o sus grupos, y así lo espero.

Porque, además, necesitamos un informe muy contundente —que lo tenemos—, porque sabemos que tenemos un problema en el Consejo. Y un riesgo de esta legislatura es que después de todo el trabajo realizado todas las cuestiones queden bloqueadas en el Consejo. Y tenemos en estos momentos la Directiva sobre transparencia fiscal, la base común imponible del impuesto de sociedades, la lista negra, que nos ha dejado evidentemente un regusto amargo, porque tiene muchas limitaciones, sanciones prácticamente inexistentes, no menciona paraísos fiscales europeos. Hay una batalla que dar en el Consejo, y este Parlamento debe sacar mañana un texto muy ambicioso.

Y también me sumo a la petición a la Comisión Europea de que utilice el artículo 116 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea para hacer propuestas fiscales en codecisión y salir de este bloqueo inaceptable de los Estados miembros.

President. – From now on, for time reasons, no blue cards will be accepted.

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die Aufarbeitung der Panama Papers hat für mich im Wesentlichen zwei Erkenntnisse zutage gebracht. Erstens: Bei der Bekämpfung von Steuervermeidung und Steuerhinterziehung benötigen wir natürlich eine internationale Zusammenarbeit. Aber das geht nur, wenn wir auch einen entsprechenden Druck aufbauen, dass zusammengearbeitet wird. Und zweitens: Wir müssen schon klar machen, dass wir auch innerhalb der Europäischen Union Rechtsräume haben, wo Steuersparmodelle und Steuergestaltungsmöglichkeiten vorhanden sind. Ich hätte mich gefreut, wenn die Sozialdemokraten meinem Antrag im Ausschuss schon zugestimmt hätten und nicht jetzt groß ihren befördern.

Dass es nicht gelungen ist, in die schwarze Liste, die die Finanzminister beschlossen haben, auch Rechtsräume der Europäischen Union mit aufzunehmen, zeigt, wie wenig entwickelt die Sensibilitäten hier sind. Und zweitens: Wer es auf die Liste geschafft hat – diese 17 unglücklichen Staaten –, muss nicht mal mit Sanktionen rechnen. Ich glaube, dass wir hier als Europäer schon etwas stärker auftreten sollten, um einen Beitrag dazu zu leisten, dass Geldwäscherhochburgen ausgetrocknet werden.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Das internationale Journalistenkonsortium hat bei Geldwäsche, bei Betrug, bei aggressivster Steuervermeidung, beim Verstecken von Geld von Reichen und Multis, mithilfe von Handlangern wie Mossack Fonseca Licht ins Dunkel gebracht.

Wir im Europäischen Parlament, wir Sozialdemokraten, sind auf der hellen Seite der Gesetzgebung. Ich sehe, die Kommission ist es auch. Jetzt ist es vor allem an der Zeit, dass die Mitgliedstaaten sich nicht mehr verstecken. Es geht um die Umsetzung und die Weiterentwicklung der Geldwäscherichtlinie. Es geht um öffentliche länderweise Berichterstattung. Es geht um die berühmte Liste der Steuersümpfe: auch EU-Staaten gehören da drauf. Es geht darum, Briefkastenfirmen endlich zu verbieten. Es geht darum, die digitale Betriebsstätte zu definieren. Vieles ist zu tun. Im Übrigen bin ich deshalb der Ansicht, dass die Einstimmigkeit im Rat bei Steuerfragen abgeschafft gehört.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, os paraísos fiscais prejudicam os mais pobres, sobrecarregam quem paga impostos, prejudicam a concorrência, sobretudo as pequenas e médias empresas, minam e prejudicam também o crescimento económico e o nosso modelo social. Os jornalistas, agradecemos-lhes, juntaram-se em vários consórcios, denunciaram e deram visibilidade a um problema que, para ser eficazmente combatido, também ele precisa de um novo consórcio, à escala global, o dos governos, mas também exige da nossa parte aquilo que podemos fazer já da parte da União Europeia.

Não é necessário uniformizar as taxas, mas podemos uniformizar a base tributária, no mínimo, os conceitos e as definições. Desde logo, devíamos ter na União Europeia uma definição comum e rigorosa para paraíso fiscal. As propostas que temos também são simples: a existência de um número de identificação fiscal para a União Europeia, a troca automática de informações entre as autoridades fiscais, a introdução de uma matéria coletável comum consolidada, o controlo das sociedades residentes e a penalização de empresas que não cumprem a legislação.

Hugues Bayet (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, les masques tombent enfin.

La première étape, c'était mardi dernier, lorsque les États membres ont approuvé une liste de paradis fiscaux complètement faussée: pas de sanction, pas d'États membres de l'Union concernés, pas de mécanisme de suivi précis pour la Suisse, Jersey ou les Îles Caïman, par exemple. Les États-Unis, quant à eux, ne sont même pas cités.

La deuxième étape se déroule devant nos yeux. On voit une droite voulant affaiblir largement un texte qui contient, enfin, des propositions consistantes pour lutter contre le fléau du blanchiment et l'évasion fiscale.

La troisième étape, enfin, c'est l'attitude de certains États membres en politique intérieure, à commencer par mon propre pays, la Belgique, dont le gouvernement fédéral de droite traîne les pieds pour appliquer concrètement plusieurs dispositions antiblanchiment relatives aux bénéficiaires effectifs.

Il y a ainsi en vérité chez les conservateurs une profonde hypocrisie entre l'indignation qui suit chaque *-leaks* et la faiblesse des actes posés. J'espère donc que tout le monde votera tous les éléments de ce texte, sinon ceux qui votent contre seront responsables du prochain scandale fiscal.

Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE). – Señor presidente, señorías, la democracia es un régimen de opinión pública. Por tanto, es inexcusable felicitar al consorcio de periodistas que, con valentía, denunció el tremendo escándalo que ha dado origen al trabajo de la Comisión PANA.

A mi juicio, resulta prioritaria una definición común de paraíso fiscal. Y también cabe resaltar que, aunque en la lista negra no figuren algunos Estados miembros, no es tolerable que algunos se comporten como paraísos fiscales. Debemos distinguir entre evasión fiscal y elusión fiscal. La evasión siempre es punible y su persecución tiene que ser implacable. La elusión fiscal puede ser legal, pero no es ética. Hay que impedir que las leyes permitan la elusión fiscal. Hay leyes que no son éticas, y, por tanto, hay que modificarlas para impedir que existan ámbitos privilegiados que, aun cumpliendo las leyes, puedan eludir los compromisos morales y sociales.

Por último, me gustaría recordar que el papel de la Unión Europea es impulsar la reforma de las leyes de los Estados miembros para que sus jurisdicciones sean competentes para juzgar no por el lugar donde se produce el acto ilícito, sino por quien lo promueve, y así poder fallar en contra del infractor.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente. Yo me atrevo a decir, señorías, que estamos ante uno de los informes más importantes que este Parlamento va a aprobar en esta legislatura. Y me sumo a los que piden a la derecha que no diluya el contenido de este informe, la fortaleza de estas propuestas.

Creo que estamos ante una gigantesca maquinaria financiera en general, en todo el mundo, para evadir impuestos. Y la evasión fiscal provoca alarma social, en gran parte porque es letal para el Estado del bienestar.

Va a haber, en mi opinión, tres grandes líneas de lucha en esta larga marcha por la justicia fiscal. La primera es la lucha contra los paraísos. Es una idea que ha empezado a tomar cuerpo, la Unión Europea está ya haciendo la lista. No es perfecta —lo sé— pero es una lista que nadie ha hecho en el mundo. Y es el primer paso.

La segunda es la lucha contra la opacidad fiscal, el secreto bancario, los intermediarios. Yo creo que esto es clave en esta larga marcha que estamos queriendo llevar a cabo.

Y la tercera es la colaboración internacional. Estamos ante un tema internacional que requiere el esfuerzo de todos nosotros.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Tausend Milliarden Euro gehen Europa wegen Steueroasen und Steuerhinterziehung verloren. Da kann etwas nicht in Ordnung sein! Es ist haarsträubend, was wir täglich bei jeder neuen Untersuchung, bei jedem neuen Ausschuss an mangelndem politischem Willen, an mangelnden Sanktionsmechanismen, an Instrumenten und an Steuerschlupflöchern neu entdecken.

Das größte Problem ist nicht nur außerhalb der Europäischen Union, das Problem beginnt mitten in der Europäischen Union: der Mangel an europäischer und internationaler Zusammenarbeit, die Uneinigkeit und der Egoismus mancher Mitgliedstaaten und das Fehlen einer gemeinsamen europäischen Steuerpolitik. Wegen zu wenig Europa haben wir zu viel an Steueroasen und zu wenig Handlungsmöglichkeit. Ich fordere eine Besteuerung dort, wo die Wertschöpfung stattfindet, eine Offenlegung aller Mitgliedstaaten, die sich nicht an die Regeln halten ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, due sono le lezioni che dobbiamo trarre dai lavori di questa commissione: su elusione ed evasione fiscale l'Unione europea non può permettersi di fare sconti, e la battaglia a casa nostra è tutt'altro che conclusa.

Il Consiglio deve fare la sua parte. Abbiamo una *black list* ora, ma siamo delusi dal fatto che non ci siano sanzioni e dal fatto che vi siano alcuni esclusi: i paradisi fiscali di casa nostra, che incentivano pratiche di pianificazione fiscale aggressiva, consentendo alle multinazionali aliquote dello «zero virgola»; bisogna superare l'unanimità sulle questioni fiscali e approvare gli strumenti che servono, in primis la rendicontazione Stato per Stato, su cui quest'Aula si è già espressa.

Infine, i lavori della commissione hanno finalmente chiarito che i fenomeni di elusione ed evasione sono globali, ed è a livello globale che vanno adottate le soluzioni che servono. I paesi in via di sviluppo pagano il prezzo più alto: noi vogliamo valutazioni di impatto delle politiche fiscali europee sui paesi in via di sviluppo e che l'Unione spinga per avere un vero organismo intergovernativo a livello ONU che riscriva le regole fiscali globali in condizioni di parità con tutti i paesi.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τασσόμαστε ανεπιφύλακτα υπέρ της καταπολέμησης της φοροδιαφυγής, της φοροαποφυγής, του ξεπλύματος βρόμικου χρήματος. Όμως κανένας δεν νομιμοποιείται, εν ονόματι της καταπολέμησης της φορολογικής παρανομίας, να ισοπεδώσει τον φορολογικό ανταγωνισμό στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, να ισοπεδώσει τη δυνατότητα των χωρών μελών να ασκούν και να καθορίζουν τη φορολογική τους πολιτική, που είναι κυριαρχικό τους δικαίωμα και ένα από τα βασικά στοιχεία της ελεύθερης οικονομίας, εκτός κι αν θέλουμε να επιστρέψουμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σε ανελεύθερες, κλειστές, κεντροποιημένες οικονομίες.

Δεν μπορούμε εμείς οι ίδιοι να προσπαθούμε να θέσουμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εκτός χρηματοοικονομικών περιουσιών· να μην μπορεί να προσελκύσει επιχειρήσεις· να μην μπορεί να προσελκύσει επενδύσεις αλλά ταυτόχρονα να της επιβάλουμε και υψηλούς φορολογικούς συντελεστές, που θα σκοτώσουν και τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις. Εμείς λέμε «ναι» στον δίκαιο φορολογικό ανταγωνισμό, «όχι» στον αθέμιτο φορολογικό ανταγωνισμό.

Αλλά, κύριε Επίτροπε, πιστεύω ότι ήταν άστοχο εκ μέρους σας να θέσετε ζήτημα για την πλειοψηφία όσον αφορά τις αποφάσεις για τη φορολογική πολιτική. Εδώ υπάρχουν άλλα μη σοβαρά θέματα και πιο χαμηλής ισχύος θέματα...

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Trgovina z orožjem, terorizem, droga, korupcije, davčne utaje, bogatenje multinacionalk. To je to, o čemer danes govorimo, ko govorimo o zakrivljanju izvora denarja in premoženja, davčnih utajah, izogibanju plačevanja davkov.

Nekaj nezakonitega, nekaj neetičnega, zagotovo pa vse to razjeda ustroj tako Evropske unije kot sveta v celoti. Kot smo slišali, se v enem letu v Evropski uniji izgubi toliko davkov, kot je naš proračun za sedem let. Se pravi, da gre za resen fiskalni problem, zaradi česar nimamo takšnega razvoja, kot ga bi želeli, predvsem pa nimamo kvalitetnega življenja za tiste ljudi, ki živijo tudi od plačevanja davkov. Nimamo kvalitetne sociale, nimamo dobrega izobraževalnega sistema, zdravstvenega sistema, zato je nujno, da so ukrepi jasni, odločni in da se pri tej stvari ne želi gledati skozi prste, niti če so o vprašanju države članice EU.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la commissione di inchiesta istituita dopo i «Panama Papers» è un'importante manifestazione dell'impegno assunto dalle istituzioni europee per debellare la piaga della finanza illecita nel mercato unico. Il risultato che abbiamo ottenuto con l'aggiornamento della *black list* dei paradisi fiscali è sicuramente parziale e molto resta ancora da fare. Ma è sicuramente un passo fondamentale verso un rafforzamento della trasparenza e della responsabilità nel sistema finanziario.

Il nostro dovere è quello di dare un seguito concreto alla preziosa attività di inchiesta portata avanti negli ultimi anni da giornalisti e ONG, svelando un inquietante sommerso fatto di corruzione, frodi, conflitti di interesse, evasione fiscale e pericolose infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata nel mercato, e che fra le altre cose è costata la vita a Daphne Caruana Galizia.

La libertà di informazione va tutelata con un forte senso di responsabilità e moralità, e dobbiamo sempre tenere presente che i passi in avanti che l'Europa compie verso una reale trasparenza della finanza non riguardano solo il mercato o le banche, ma prima di tutto la democrazia e i cittadini.

PRÉSIDENTENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME*Vice-présidente*

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το χτύπημα της φοροδιαφυγής και της φοροαποφυγής στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση βρίσκεται στο Συμβούλιο. Εκεί είναι το κλειδί. Εκεί πρέπει να ληφθούν σοβαρές αποφάσεις και εκεί υπάρχουν κράτη μέλη τα οποία όχι μόνο δεν επιθυμούν να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένες αποφάσεις αλλά εμποδίζουν και τη λήψη των αποφάσεων.

Επομένως έχουμε επιθετικό φορολογικό σχεδιασμό, ο οποίος ουσιαστικά είναι η δεύτερη φύση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, διότι η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιθυμεί να υπάρχουν γκρίζες ζώνες. Επιθυμεί ουσιαστικά να δημιουργηθεί αυτός ο αθέμιτος φορολογικός ανταγωνισμός μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Νομίζω, λοιπόν, ότι εκεί είναι το κλειδί.

Πρέπει να ληφθούν αποφάσεις με τον εξής γνώμονα: οι πολυεθνικές και οποιοσδήποτε βγάζει κέρδη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα πρέπει να φορολογούνται στο συγκεκριμένο κράτος μέλος. Εκεί που βγαίνουν τα κέρδη, εκεί πρέπει να φορολογούνται. Εάν περάσει αυτή η βασική αρχή, τότε ξεκινάμε πάρα πολύ σωστά.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, žijeme ve světě, kde procento nejvíce majetných vlastní polovinu světového bohatství. Deset procent nejbohatších vlastní dokonce osmdesát devět procent a platit daně je však asi proti společenskému bonmotu a tak se ekonomické nůžky mezi těmi nejbohatšími a námi ostatními dále rozevírají.

Devadesát devět procent obyvatel zažívalo za ekonomické krize škrty a jedno procento si užívalo v daňových rájích. To je to, co ničí svět a naději na spravedlivou společnost. Boj proti daňovým rájům považuji za zcela principiální a zcela nutný pro sociálně-ekonomickou stabilitu státu. Zákon a pravidla mají chránit ty nejzranitelnější, a nikoliv jen ty nejbohatší.

Odmítám si zvyknout na to, že mocní a bohatí prostě odmítají platit daně a okrádají tak společnost, která jim pomohla k bohatství. Musíme přestat po každém úniku prostě jenom dávat najevo naše zděšení a něco opravdu začít reálně dělat. Tato zpráva může být začátek, ale musíme ji dovést ke zcela konkrétním krokům.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η νομιμοποίηση από παράνομες δραστηριότητες είναι μία πρακτική η οποία είναι παλιά αλλά έχει έξαρση τα τελευταία χρόνια. Το άσχημο στην προκειμένη περίπτωση είναι ότι η διαφθορά που προκύπτει και από τα Paradise Papers και από τα Panama Papers αλλά και από άλλα σκάνδαλα του παρελθόντος έχει αποκαλυφθεί από δημοσιογράφους και όχι από τις αρμόδιες κρατικές αρχές. Αυτό αποδεικνύει την αδυναμία αλλά και την απροθυμία των κρατών να πατάξουν τις παρανομίες.

Βεβαίως, χρειάζεται σε κάθε κράτος ένα δίκαιο φορολογικό σύστημα και όχι σαν αυτό που έχουν επιβάλει οι διεθνείς τοκογλύφοι στην Ελλάδα, κυρίως στα ελληνικά νησιά, που ωθεί τους πολίτες στη φοροαπαλλαγή και στη φοροαποφυγή. Βεβαίως και απαιτείται συνεργασία, διαφάνεια και έλεγχος. Τίποτε όμως από όλα αυτά δεν πρόκειται να γίνει, διότι οι πολιτικοί εκείνοι οι οποίοι οφείλουν να λάβουν τις σωστές αποφάσεις χρηματοδοτούνται είτε από πολυεθνικές εταιρείες είτε από άλλους αφανείς χρηματοδότες με σκοτεινούς σκοπούς. Όλες όμως αυτές οι αδυναμίες επ' ουδενί δεν πρέπει να αποτελέσουν πρόσχημα για να καταργηθεί η αρχή της ομοφωνίας, όπως εισηγήθηκε ο επίτροπος ο κ. Moscovici. Αυτό θα καταστρέψει την ενότητα της Ευρώπης.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Lahko smo zadovoljni z delom v odboru PANA, za kar gre seveda zahvala predvsem gospodu predsedniku Langnu in obema poročevalcema.

Vendar pa smo skupaj opravili veliko delo, pokazali smo tudi na številne zelo konkretne primere davčnih utaj in pranja denarja, med drugim tudi na pranje denarja v največji slovenski državni banki.

Seveda pa so naše pristojnosti omejene. Mi ne moremo ukrepati tam, kjer bi morale ukrepati države. To je njihova naloga in mi nimamo izvršilne moči.

Ukrepanje v teh primerih, ko gre za davčne utaje, ko gre za pranje denarja posameznih držav, pa kaže tudi na to, kako resno so države pripravljene, da se soočijo in spopadejo s tem problemom. Nekatere namreč ne ukrepajo popolnoma nič, zato seveda podpiram tudi amandma, ki je predlagan v tej smeri, da morajo pristojni organi in države ukrepati takoj, ko zaznajo sume nepravilnosti.

Monika Beňová (S&D). – Pán komisár, kolegyne, kolegovia, boj proti daňovým únikom a praniu špinavých peňazí musí byť spoločným záujmom všetkých členských štátov Európskej únie. Vzájomná výmena informácií, ale aj ochota spolupracovať v tejto oblasti, má však, ako vidíme, veľké medzery. Nečinnosť kompetentných inštitúcií na národných, ale aj na európskej úrovni, to ako vždy len reagujeme na nejaké nové zverejnené informácie, údaje a škandály, to všetko vyvoláva veľkú mieru sklamaní u občanov. A zvlášť u tých podnikateľov, ktorí svoje dane poctivo platia. Musíme byť úprimní a priznať, že nielen schránkové firmy či podvody s DPH, ktoré idú do miliárd eur, ale aj rôzne formy daňových úľav pre rôzne formy podnikania, ako to vidíme napríklad v Luxembursku, v Holandsku, na Cypre, v Írsku či v iných krajinách, neprospeievajú dobrým a najmä férovým praktikám v Európskej únii. Osobitným problémom potom sú schránkové firmy, ktoré participujú priamo na peniazoch z rozpočtu Európskej únie a na rôznych projektoch, ktoré Európska únia ponúka na zlepšenie prostredia vo svojich členských štátoch.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođa predsjednice, EU ulaže velike napore u identificiranje i sankcioniranje subjekata koji sudjeluju u pranju novca i utaji poreza. To je ispravan put jer svi moraju dati svoj financijski doprinos društvu kako bi ono moglo prosperirati.

Na više je mjesta naglašen nedostatak resursa koji muči Komisiju, ali i nadležna nacionalna tijela. Budimo realni, za učinkovitu borbu protiv pranja novca i utaje poreza potrebna su velika financijska sredstva.

Ironija je u tome da popriličan dio sredstava koja se troše na ovakve operacije dolazi od oporezivanja malih i srednjih poduzeća te građana, dakle onih koji si, čak i da to žele, ne mogu priuštiti skrivanje novca po poreznim oazama. Veliki skrivaju novac, a mi dodatno opterećujemo male kako bismo ih u tome spriječili.

Zato smatram da, osim usavršavanja metoda borbe protiv pranja novca i utaje, moramo ozbiljno poraditi na poreznoj politici. Osim sprječavanja i kažnjavanja, u ovoj je borbi vrlo važan faktor i demotivacija koja se postiže stimulativnom politikom koja nagrađuje reinvestiranje, zapošljavanje i rast.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όλοι σχεδόν εδώ μέσα τασσόμαστε εναντίον της φοροδιαφυγής και της φοροαποφυγής. Όμως νομίζω, συνάδελφοι, ότι δεν είμαστε όλοι ειλικρινείς και θα το δείτε στις ψηφοφορίες, όταν δούμε τι θα ψηφίσουν οι συνάδελφοι του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος. Εκεί, όταν πάμε στην ώρα των αποφάσεων, παίρνει άλλη στροφή το πράγμα.

Έχει λεχθεί και είναι πολύ σωστό ότι άλλο φοροδιαφυγή και άλλο φοροαποφυγή. Η φοροαποφυγή γίνεται νόμιμα. Είναι εδώ που πρέπει να δράσει η Ευρωβουλή, έτσι ώστε αυτό το πράγμα να καταργηθεί ή να μπουν οι περιορισμοί του νόμου. Υπάρχει και ένα τρίτο ζήτημα: Τα δισεκατομμύρια που χάνονται από τη φοροδιαφυγή και τη φοροαποφυγή –πολύ σωστά θα πει κάποιος– θα έμπαιναν στην οικονομία, αλλά πέρα από αυτό υπάρχουν και τα τρισεκατομμύρια που παρκάρονται στους φορολογικούς παραδείσους και που επίσης θα μπορούσαν να μπουν στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία και να καταναμεθθούν πιο σωστά υπέρ των κοινωνικών δικαιωμάτων των πολιτών.

Κλείνω με την εξής φράση: να πολεμήσουμε τη φοροδιαφυγή και τη φοροαποφυγή, αλλά πρέπει να λάβουμε υπόψιν ταυτόχρονα και τις ιδιαιτερότητες των οικονομικών βιομηχανιών των κρατών μελών.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Rad bi poudaril, da je ... rad bi čestital najprej vsem članom odbora PANAMA za dobro opravljeno delo, poročilo je odlično, veliko je priporočil, ki lahko dobro vplivajo na regulacijo tega problema, tako na evropski kakor tudi v državah članicah.

Še posebej bi pa rad povedal naslednje: v vseh državah članicah demokratična javnost, ki se bori za vladavino prava, ni dovolj močna, da bi se uspešno spoprijela s finančno mafijo, ki vlada ponekod. Zadnji primer velike afere, ki je bil že v dvorani omenjen, NLB Irangate, kjer se je oprala več kot milijarda umazanega iranskega denarja za sumljive nevarne namene, je že eden takih.

Ravno zato potrebujemo močno Evropsko unijo in učinkovite inštitucije, ki ne bodo samo s prstom kazale na napake, ampak tudi ukrepale.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Nem hiszem, hogy bárki vitatná: rendszerszintű problémákkal állunk szemben, ami az adókielérés különböző technikáinak alkalmazását illeti. Egyértelmű, hogy transznacionális vállalkozások vagy óriási vagyonnal rendelkező személyek sikerrel bújnak ki adófizetési kötelezettségeik alól, megbotránkozást váltva ki a polgárok részéről, és megingatva hitüket a közös teherviselés igazságosságában.

Nem tehetünk úgy, mintha nem látnák: egyes országok és állami intézmények cinkosaik és anyagi haszonélvezőik ezeknek a mechanizmusoknak, amelyek megmérgezik társadalmainkat és hiteltelenítenek kormányokat, intézményeket, politikai mozgalmakat is. A probléma megoldásához komplex jogalkotási, jogalkalmazási, szabályozási, ellenőrzési és szankcionálási eljárásrend szükséges.

Kérdés, hogy most tesszük-e meg ezeket a lépéseket vagy akkor, amikor még nagyobb károkat okoz a jelenség. A jogállamiság érvényesüléséhez ugyanis nem csak a törvények betartása, hanem a társadalmi igazságosság érvényre juttatása is szükséges. Ha pedig erre a jelenlegi politikusok nem képesek, akkor a polgárok újakat keresnek helyettük.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Pierre Moscovici, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je remercie l'ensemble des parlementaires, sur tous les bancs, parce que je note tout de même, par-delà les différences normales, légitimes, une volonté commune de lutter contre l'évasion fiscale, la fraude fiscale et l'optimisation fiscale.

Depuis le début de ce mandat, vous savez que c'est aussi une priorité forte de cette Commission, et c'est assurément la mienne. Ensemble, nous avons fait – c'est sans doute dû à un contexte, mais c'est aussi dû à une volonté – plus en trois ans que dans les vingt années précédentes sur ce front, grâce aux journalistes – à qui je rends hommage –, grâce aux lanceurs d'alerte – dont je reconnais le rôle –, grâce au Parlement, grâce à votre travail, et j'espère aussi un peu grâce à la Commission.

Quelles sont les réussites que nous avons déjà engrangées depuis trois ans? Ne les négligeons pas, ne faisons pas, à chaque fois, comme si nous partions d'une espèce de table rase, car cela a un côté un peu décourageant. Les échanges automatiques de renseignements relatifs aux comptes financiers, et, du coup, la fin du secret bancaire, c'est quand même une vraie révolution pour toute une génération ou des générations. La déclaration pays par pays, pour les entreprises, n'est pas encore publique et j'appelle à nouveau le Conseil à aller dans ce sens-là, mais il existe. Les deux directives de lutte contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales qui vont, petit à petit, prohiber toute une série de mécanismes répréhensibles, dont certains – c'est un peu une illusion d'optique – appartiennent déjà au passé, alors que leurs effets sont révélés. Je salue l'adoption au Conseil, la semaine dernière, de la proposition sur la TVA pour le commerce en ligne, qui va aussi réduire la fraude. Vous voyez donc qu'on avance. On avance, parfois à grand pas, parfois à plus petits pas, mais on avance.

Peut-on se satisfaire de ce premier bilan? Par définition, non. Il faut continuer, il faut aller plus loin, il faut ne jamais relâcher la pression, il faut continuer à alimenter en propositions. Vous savez que, pour ma part, je ne lâcherai pas le morceau et que la Commission sera active sur ce front jusqu'au dernier jour de son mandat, je vous l'assure. Les citoyens européens nous le demandent. Plus que cela, ils l'exigent. Chacun d'entre nous – et cela vaut pour les États membres d'abord – aura à rendre des comptes sur ce front.

Je le dis clairement, il ne faut pas que nous attendions le prochain scandale pour agir. La Commission prend ses responsabilités. Nous avons, dans ce sens-là, relancé le projet d'assiette fiscale européenne pour l'impôt sur les sociétés. Je dis ici que cette réforme, qui n'est pas qu'une réforme de lutte contre la fraude, qui est la définition de la fiscalité des entreprises pour le 21^e siècle, est la mère de toutes les réformes. Je ne pourrai pas terminer ce mandat satisfait de mon action comme commissaire à la fiscalité si nous n'y parvenons pas.

Vous avez raison, il faut accélérer et j'appelle le Conseil à accélérer et à conclure ce dossier avant le terme de cette année 2018 qui va commencer. Il faut ainsi mettre en pratique un principe simple selon lequel les entreprises doivent payer leurs impôts là où elles génèrent leurs profits. Vous savez que le fait d'avoir une assiette commune consolidée – et j'insiste sur le terme «consolidée» – permet justement d'éviter le transfert de bénéfices, qui est une source de fraude absolument massive, voilà ce qu'est la vraie justice fiscale en actes.

La Commission va aussi faire des propositions pour une taxation plus juste des entreprises numériques qui, par leur nature même et par l'archaïsme de nos systèmes fiscaux, échappent largement à l'imposition des sociétés. Il n'est pas acceptable que le taux d'imposition effectif des entreprises numériques soit plus de deux fois moins élevé que celui appliqué aux entreprises traditionnelles. Il y a là quelque chose qui est une distorsion. Préparer l'avenir, c'est aussi adapter notre système fiscal pour l'adapter à ces nouvelles réalités. Je voulais vous assurer de la volonté de la Commission d'avancer dans ce sens-là.

Je voudrais réagir à quelques-unes des très nombreuses questions soulevées par les députés. Je vais commencer par la liste noire. Je veux, là-dessus, être sans ambiguïté: cette liste noire n'est pas la liste de la Commission, c'est celle des États membres, c'est celle du Conseil. Les États membres et le Conseil ont choisi une modalité qui est de passer par le code de conduite, d'avoir un mode d'élaboration intergouvernementale. Eh bien, c'est leur responsabilité et ce sont les ministres des finances qui doivent la justifier. Je vois mon nom, à chaque fois, ce serait la liste Moscovici. Non, ce n'est pas la liste que j'ai proposée. Ce que j'ai proposé, c'est qu'il y ait une liste, mais c'est le Conseil qui a fait sa liste, avec ses forces et ses faiblesses. Cela étant dit, je veux quand même dire une chose à ce Parlement – que je connais bien, j'en ai été membre –: parfois, le mieux est l'ennemi du bien. Cette liste, incontestablement, est un progrès, d'abord parce qu'elle existe – c'est la première dans l'histoire de l'Union européenne –; ensuite, parce que le processus de *screening*, de dialogue avec les États membres a été mené de manière sérieuse; enfin, parce que ces résultats ne sont pas négligeables: 17 pays sur la liste noire et 47 sur la liste grise. Ce qui est important pour moi, c'est cela, c'est que le processus même de listage, de *listing*, a conduit beaucoup de pays à prendre des engagements.

Alors je le dis de cette façon-là, je pense que discréditer cette liste, la considérer comme anodine, comme nulle et non avenue, comme inutile, cela n'est pas un bon procédé. Si on fait ainsi, on va décourager cette bonne volonté encore incomplète, alors qu'il faut, au contraire, aller plus loin. Oui, cette liste est un progrès, un progrès limité, un progrès incomplet, mais un progrès incontestable.

Comment faire en sorte de le compléter? D'abord, être extrêmement sérieux sur les engagements. C'est le cœur pour moi.

Deuxièmement, demander avec force aux États membres de mettre en place des sanctions, et des sanctions réelles, et puis être capable d'ouvrir un processus. Ce n'est pas une photo, ce n'est pas un quitus. Il va falloir, derrière ça, qu'on fasse vivre ce processus.

Alors, il y a une grande question qui est posée, j'ai vu qu'il y avait un amendement qui avait été déposé, sur lequel je me garderai de me prononcer, de savoir s'il y a ou pas des paradis fiscaux dans l'Union européenne. Si on regarde les critères qui ont été pris au départ, si on fait une analyse systémique, si on se compare à d'autres, je pense que ce point est contestable. Je l'ai dit. Par ailleurs, je pense, là encore, que mettre tel ou tel pays sur la liste des paradis fiscaux, ce serait un peu les décourager ou les inciter à ne pas poursuivre des efforts qu'ils ont déjà faits, et je ne veux pas les nommer, mais l'échange automatique d'informations, cela existe, l'application de BEPS, cela existe. Il n'y a pas de pays dans l'Union européenne qui ait un taux d'imposition zéro.

Cela dit, il y a de très graves problèmes et de très graves manquements dans un certain nombre de pays de l'Union européenne, et si le Parlement estime que cela justifie de les inscrire en tant que paradis fiscaux, c'est votre droit de le faire. Pour ma part, j'ai essayé d'expliquer ce qu'était la démarche. C'est là-dessus que je veux insister, pas seulement sur les listes, mais sur les systèmes fiscaux des États membres, parce que c'est cela le problème. C'est le fait que certains de ces systèmes fiscaux sont favorables, c'est vrai, à des pratiques que nous condamnons.

L'agenda de la transparence fiscale se construit et se met aussi en place au sein de l'Union européenne. C'est la mise en place des mesures BEPS – j'en ai parlé –, c'est la convergence en matière fiscale, qui doit demeurer un objectif. Là, j'incite les parlementaires, mais aussi les citoyens, à demander des comptes à leurs gouvernements, à dénoncer ceux qui refusent d'avancer sur le chemin de la transparence. C'est vrai qu'il reste encore des différences marquées, des prudenances, et que, quand le feu des médias retombe, quand il n'y a plus de scandale, je vois revenir moi-même cette sorte de nature humaine et politique qui fait que, tout à coup, le naturel revient au galop et la timidité s'impose à nouveau.

Je continuerai, pour ma part, à appeler les États membres à travailler à la modification de leurs règles fiscales, celles qui restent favorables à la planification et à l'optimisation fiscale agressive, à adopter de vraies sanctions – je crois vraiment que cela doit être une conclusion très opérationnelle pour tous nos travaux –, et je souhaite aussi que – j'ai entendu des points de vue contrastés là-dessus – nous avançons vers la fin de la règle de l'unanimité. La Commission va publier une communication là-dessus début 2018.

Enfin, j'entends les appels à utiliser l'article 116 et je m'engage à avancer sur cette voie d'ici la fin du mandat, avec, quand même, une finalité, qui est de ne pas l'utiliser à mauvais escient. Nous avons un outil qui s'appelle «les coopérations renforcées», qui n'avait jamais été utilisé de façon conclusive. Je voudrais que, si on utilise l'article 116, on le fasse de manière positive.

Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, je vous remercie nouvelle fois de votre implication, de votre détermination. Vous allez voter demain les amendements et le rapport final de votre commission et, dans le rôle qui est le mien, je vous invite à maintenir le plus haut niveau d'ambition. La Commission a déjà répondu et continuera à répondre présent, à répondre à vos appels et je ne ménagerai pas vos efforts. Je vous le redis: ensemble, ne baissons pas la garde contre l'évasion et l'opacité fiscales. Nous avons déjà remporté des batailles. La guerre, elle, est loin d'être gagnée et donc, comme on disait dans ma jeunesse, continuons le combat.

Petr Ježek, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I appreciate the debate and the contribution and the overall approach by Commissioner Moscovici. When it comes to the report itself, I want it to be based primarily on the findings of our investigations. We have a committee of inquiry, not the committee of impressions or prejudices.

Therefore, my Group does not support the paragraphs which either go against the compromises we have reached, those that are entirely out of the scope of our investigation, or those which would give some unworkable recommendations. The vote on those amendments was not fully representative of the balance of the committee. We would have liked to streamline the report for the plenary and make strong and credible recommendations. It is more or less the same as what we have done with the draft report and compromises, which were supported by a broad majority.

Finally, I would like to call on the Commission and especially on the Member States to take our recommendations seriously and to follow up on our proposals. Our citizens expect us to deliver on tax justice.

Jeppe Kofod, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, thank you so much to my colleagues for this very important and good debate. I also appreciate the strong support for the report and recommendations and I want to thank Commissioner Moscovici for the great work the Commission is doing in this field and also – in his words – ‘to end the culture of secrecy’ and, I would say, obstruction in the field of taxation and avoidance and to create a culture of transparency and sincere corporation in this field between Parliament and Commission and hopefully also, in the future, with the Council.

The Council needs to open up, it needs to be accountable to the citizens, to the public in Europe and we need to discuss this in the open. When countries block progress, they need to be named and shamed. We need to have an open and sincere debate. That is what the citizens of Europe deserve in such a serious matter as tax avoidance and taxation.

I also would like to thank the EPP Group. I heard Mr Rosati saying that we had a very strong and good report. I want to urge all of my colleagues to keep it that way because tomorrow we are going to vote and, as some have noticed, there are a lot of split votes unfortunately, but I just appeal to Parliament for us to have a strong and good report, as Mr Rosati said and others said. Do not water down the strong recommendations we have.

It is time now to stand up for the citizens of Europe. I also urge the citizens and the media to look into each and every vote tomorrow and see who is on the side of citizens in this very important fight. We have to win that fight. This Parliament must take a brave stand with this report. We are not going to end with this report. We also call, from the S&D Group, for a special committee to be set up until the end of the term to investigate, to further follow up on all of these 211 recommendations, because there is a lot of work to do. We have made progress and will continue to make progress, but we can only do that if we have a strong vote tomorrow.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – Komisja śledcza Parlamentu Europejskiego prowadząca przez rok dochodzenie w sprawie Panama Papers wydała szokujący wyrok. Brak woli politycznej niektórych państw członkowskich UE umożliwił omijanie przepisów podatkowych. Komisja rzuca ciężkie oskarżenie pod adresem rządów europejskich, które przez ponad 20 lat stały się współnikami prania czarnych pieniędzy oraz omijania przepisów podatkowych. Europosłowie zgodnie podkreślają, że Unia Europejska jako całość musi odgrywać zasadniczą rolę w globalnej walce z praniem brudnych pieniędzy i uchylaniem się od płacenia podatków. Należy jednak realistycznie podejść do problemu. Wątpliwość może budzić dotychczasowy efekt prac Komisji w postaci raportów końcowych, których z uwagi na niektóre postanowienia nie mogą poprzeć. Chodzi tu o powtarzające się zapisy o harmonizacji prawa podatkowego, wprowadzenie wspólnej, skonsolidowanej podstawy opodatkowania, zniesienie zasady jednomyślności w Radzie. W mojej opinii naruszałyby to suwerenność podatkową Polski. W związku z powyższym wstrzymuję się od głosu.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), írásban. – A Panama Papírokból világossá vált, hogy a világ pénzügyi és politikai elitje különböző offshore-cégekben és országokon keresztül próbálja elrejtetni vagyona egy jelentős részét a nyilvánosság elől. Azóta számtalan hasonló ügy került nyilvánosságra: a Paradicsom papírok, az azeri pénzmosoda, amelyek ugyanarra a logikára épülnek: bonyolult céghálón keresztül elrejtetni a kétes eredetű vagyont, bevételt, hogy ne kelljen elszámolni, és ne kelljen adót fizetni.

Eközben elvileg szigorú pénzmosság elleni szabályok léteznek az unión belül, valamint a bankoknak, és a bankfelügyeleti szerveknek egyaránt szigorú ellenőrző rendszerei vannak. Sajnos az unió jogszabályok sem fednek le minden kiskaput, de a tagállami jogba való átültetés, sőt a végrehajtás és a végrehajtás ellenőrzése sem történik megfelelően. Alapvetően azért, mert a korrupció és a pénzügyi érdekek hálóját átszövi a gazdaság és a politika világát, kihasználva jogszabályi háttér inkoharenciáját.

A hatékonyság növeléséhez az EU-nak számos olyan döntést kellene hoznia, ami a szabályokat szigorítaná. Többek között: meg kellene tiltania az adóparadicsomokban letelepedett jogi konstrukciókkal való kereskedelmi kapcsolatokat, amennyiben a végső kedvezményezett nem azonosítható. A céghálókkal kapcsolatosan a nyilvánosságot növelni és garantálni kell. EU-s forrásokat nem szabad olyan cégek számára kifizetni, amelyekkel kapcsolatban felmerül az adóelkerülés gyanúja, valamint meg kell tiltani az offshore háttérű cégek közbeszerzésekben való részvételét.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), în scris. – După mai multe amânări, Comisia Europeană și-a îndeplinit angajamentul de a publica lista cu paradisurile fiscale care nu cooperează pe linia prevenirii spălării de bani și a evaziunii fiscale. A fost nevoie de obiectivitate și analize aprofundate.

Ceea ce ridică semne de întrebare este însă lista mult mai lungă cu acele paradisuri fiscale și alte jurisdicții fiscale care sunt pe o altă listă, și anume a celor paradisuri fiscale care și-au luat angajamentul că vor adopta măsurile necesare pentru a deveni pe deplin cooperante. Aici avem nevoie de monitorizarea riguroasă a acestor paradisuri fiscale astfel încât, dacă nu îndeplinesc angajamentele luate, să fie trecute în lista neagră a celor necooperante.

Așteptăm acum propuneri ale Comisiei pentru sancțiunile pe care statele membre trebuie să le aplice paradisurilor fiscale necooperante.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Pinigų plovimas susijęs su neteisėtu pinigų nuslėpimu, taip pat naudojantis tarptautiniais nusikaltėlių tinklais, siekiant užmaskuoti neteisėtai gautų pajamų pobūdį, kad atrodytų, jog jos gautos legaliai. 2016 metais Parlamentas sudarė Tyrimo komitetą įtarimams dėl Sąjungos teisės pažeidimų ir netinkamo administravimo taikant Sąjungos teisę atvejais, susijusiais su pinigų plovimu. Jo išvados yra šokiruojančios. Panamos dokumentuose nutekėję duomenys apima konfidencialius 213 634 užjūrio įmonių duomenis kartu su dvylikos dabartinių ir ankstesnių valstybės vadovų, beveik 200 politikų iš viso pasaulio ir daugybės įžymybių iš įvairių sričių vardais. Daugeliu atvejų nebuvo atlikta jokių tyrimų siekiant nustatyti pagrindinius tikruosius subjektų savininkus arba tokie tyrimai buvo neišsamūs. Šito pasekmė yra tai, kad neįmanoma nustatyti subjekto savininką ir jį kontroliuojančią struktūrą arba gautos informacijos apie verslo santykių tikslą ir numatomą pobūdį. Tai reikia pakeisti. Pelnas turėtų būti apmokestinamas jo gavimo vietoje. Dabartiniai Sąjungos teisės aktai yra nepakankami, o tai sudarė sąlygas Panamos dokumentuose atskleistiems veiksams ir finansinėms struktūroms. Būtinai reikia nustatyti bendrą ES požiūrį, kuriuo būtų vadovaujamas kovojant su priedangos įmonėmis trečiosiose šalyse, užjūrio šalyse ir teritorijose bei atokiausiose regionuose, taip siekiant galutinai nutraukti praktiką, kuria siekiama išvengti deramos mokesčių dalies mokėjimo ES.

3. Sastav odbora: vidi zapisnik

4. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (rasprava)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport d'Udo Bullmann et de José Manuel Fernandes, au nom de la commission des budgets et de la commission des affaires économiques et monétaires, sur la prolongation de la durée d'existence du Fonds européen pour les investissements stratégiques (COM(2016)0597 — C8-0375/2016 — 2016/0276(COD)) (A8-0198/2017).

Udo Bullmann, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, wert Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als EFSI, der Fonds für strategische Investitionen in Europa, 2015 gestartet ist, hat die Kommission uns wissen lassen, dass sie den jährlichen Investitionsbedarf, die Investitionslücke, mit 700 Mrd. Euro beziffert.

Heute sagt uns die Europäische Investitionsbank: Mit dem neuen Fonds ist es gelungen, diese Lücke um 100 Mrd. Euro zu verkleinern. Was zeigt uns das?

Erstens: Der Fonds ist nützlich, er hilft. Aber zweitens: Er reicht bei Weitem nicht aus, um den zusätzlichen Investitionsbedarf in der Europäischen Union zu befriedigen. Deswegen brauchen wir die verbundenen Anstrengungen in den Mitgliedstaaten, und wir werden, wert Kommissionsvertreter, einen Vorschlag der Kommission für eine umfassende Investitionsstrategie brauchen. Das ist das, was unser Bericht auch fordert und was wir erwarten, dass es von der Kommission vorgelegt wird.

Dennoch lassen Sie mich heute sagen: Ich bin mit Freude und mit Stolz erfüllt, auf das, was wir gemeinsam erreicht haben. Ja, es hat Stimmen gegeben, die wollten uns den Ratschlag geben, lasst das einfach so weiterfahren. Das Geld wird ja abgerufen, es passt doch. Ja, quantitativ war auch schon die erste Etappe, die ersten beiden Jahre, erfolgreich. Aber das Europäische Parlament wollte, dass der Fonds besser wird, dass er moderner wird und dass er die Regionen erreicht, in denen der Investitionsbedarf am größten ist.

Ich möchte mich bei José Manuel Fernandes, meinem Ko-Berichterstatter und bei allen Berichterstattern, Schattenberichterstattern, den Ausschussvorsitzenden, ihren Teams, den vielen, vielen helfenden Händen im Hintergrund bedanken, die es ermöglicht haben, dass wir heute einen sehr guten Bericht, eine sehr gute Verlängerung von diesem strategischen Investitionsfonds bis 2020 beschließen können.

Denn die 91 % Unterstützung, die wir in den beiden Ausschüssen bekommen haben, sind Beweis dafür, dass hart gearbeitet wurde und dass die Kolleginnen und Kollegen hinter diesem modernen Investitionsinstrument stehen.

Was wurde erreicht: Zusätzlichkeit? Nein, zusätzlich ist ein Projekt nicht mehr nur dann, wenn die Europäische Investitionsbank berechnet hat, dass es besonders riskant ist. Das ist eine mathematische Formel, die uns nicht wirklich weiterhilft. Wir wollen, dass mindestens 40 % der Initiativen zum Kampf gegen den Klimawandel beitragen. Dazu sind wir verpflichtet, und das wird die neue große Aufgabe werden. Die Zusammenarbeit mit den regionalen und nationalen Förderbanken wird besser werden, weil davon die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen profitieren, die wir in diesem Kampf für Wohlstand und Modernisierung, für unsere Industrie, für unsere Gewerbebetriebe in der modernen Zeit, besonders brauchen.

Das System wird transparenter und die Mittelvergabe wird klarer nachvollziehbar. Ja, wir haben ein festes System von Indikatoren geschaffen, die objektiv bewerten, welches die besten Projekte sind und welche Projekte besonders unterstützt gehören. Es ist kein *business as usual* mehr möglich, auch nicht innerhalb der Europäischen Investitionsbank.

Schlussendlich: Wir werden einen *independent expert*, eine unabhängige Expertin oder einen unabhängigen Experten, in den Lenkungsausschuss entsenden, der die Transparenz und die Zusammenarbeit verbessern wird. Das alles wird uns voranbringen. Ich freue mich auf eine erfrischende Diskussion hier im Plenum, auf ein gutes Votum und dann auf einen aktiven, wirklich modernen Fonds für die nächsten Jahre bis 2020.

José Manuel Fernandes, relator. – Senhora Presidente, queria cumprimentar o Senhor Comissário e Vice-Presidente da Comissão, todas as colegas, todos os colegas, agradecer e agradecer ao meu correlator Udo Bullmann pela excelente cooperação, pela lealdade, pelos resultados que obtivemos, aos presidentes das comissões, ao presidente da Comissão dos Assuntos Económicos, Roberto Gualtieri, e também ao presidente da Comissão dos Orçamentos, Jean Arthuis, a todos os grupos políticos e aos seus relatores-sombra, uma palavra especial para Othmar Karas que deu um contributo também essencial nas questões económicas.

O Fundo Europeu de Investimentos Estratégicos é um fundo importantíssimo que tem ajudado à mobilização do investimento, à redução das desigualdades e também à criação de emprego. Já são mais de 250 mil milhões de euros mobilizados e mais de 400 mil pequenas e médias empresas foram apoiadas. É impressionante o seu sucesso, o que não significa que a ambição não continue no sentido de melhorarmos a distribuição geográfica, e daí o termos reforçado o *Advisory Hub*, que é uma plataforma de aconselhamento ao investimento para que territórios que tenham mais dificuldade possam ser apoiados.

Eu recordo que esta plataforma de aconselhamento ao investimento é gratuita para as entidades públicas. As pequenas e médias empresas só pagam um terço do custo e nós reforçamos a proatividade do *Advisory Hub*, desta plataforma de aconselhamento ao investidor.

Para além disso, alargámos também o âmbito do Fundo: a floresta, a área social e os serviços sociais, a agricultura, as pescas ficam de uma forma clara também neste Fundo Europeu para os Investimentos Estratégicos, que é um fundo adicional. E aqui a adicionalidade também foi reforçada: uma adicionalidade onde nada é automático e onde tem de se ver o impacto em termos de emprego, em termos de investimento no local, tendo em conta a realidade.

As regiões menos favorecidas tendem a ser mais apoiadas. Isto não é um fundo para a coesão territorial, mas é um fundo que deve ajudar a coesão territorial e é um fundo que não vem substituir a política de coesão, mas também exige até complementaridade com os fundos que nós temos, nomeadamente os Fundos Estruturais.

Os pequenos projetos são acarinhados, isso é também extremamente importante, e daí o trabalho que fizemos neste âmbito. As plataformas de investimento continuam a ser uma aposta, mas o papel das instituições financeiras de desenvolvimento também é reforçado e, aqui, chamo a atenção para que os Estados-Membros reforcem as suas instituições financeiras de desenvolvimento, os seus bancos de fomento, e aqueles que não as têm devem criá-las porque os instrumentos financeiros vão estar aqui para durar.

Também é extremamente importante a maior implicação que o Parlamento tem. Temos assim também um Fundo Europeu para Investimentos Estratégicos, conhecido ainda como Plano Juncker, que tem o Parlamento mais implicado. Há uma maior presença também, no fundo, do Parlamento neste plano Juncker, neste plano para o investimento.

Reforço os agradecimentos, terminando com um agradecimento à Comissão que foi criativa numa série de soluções, nomeadamente na questão do financiamento, e daí este obrigado final para a Comissão Europeia.

Eva Kaili, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy. – Madam President, the conclusion of the trilogues on EFSI showed that all parties had strong incentives to improve it by correcting its inefficiencies, namely the concentration of the funds to economies and sectors that needed it less. So I want to congratulate the success of the co-rapporteurs, Udo Bullmann and José Manuel Fernandes, for their efforts to achieve significant improvements.

On behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE), our main concerns regarding the expansion of eligible sectors in the digital economy, the funding of SMEs, extension of SMEs window, the blending of EFSI and ESIF funds, and environmental considerations were properly addressed this time. However, one point I would like to highlight, which is important for the ITRE Committee and which remains unresolved despite our efforts to emphasise it, is that the requirement of delinking the EFSI guarantee from the Member States' macroeconomic requirements under the Stability and Growth Pact.

There is also a straightforward message: reductionary fiscal policy kills the demand for lendable funds, and the EFSI is a supply side instrument. Now we know that supply cannot create its own demand, so it sends a clear message to policymakers regarding the limits of supply side financial instruments as long as the demand is weak. No significant improvements will reach the real economy. Our new challenge should be exactly this: how will an EFSI3 programme in the future manage to boost demand and produce ...

(The President cut off the speaker.)

Inés Ayala Sender, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo*. – Señora presidenta, los socialistas saludamos desde el principio este plan de inversiones para activar la economía y el empleo mediante inversiones que, por sí, los Estados miembros —incluso los que están en superávit excesivo— no emprendían. Pero pronto empezamos, de todos modos, a perder una parte del entusiasmo inicial al verificar que los fondos para la garantía iban a suponer recortes importantes y paradójicos en programas como el MEC, que ya eran de inversiones de gran valor añadido europeo.

Sin embargo, las críticas, el debate que hemos tenido, el seguimiento de los proyectos, unos buenos y otros malos, nos han llevado a que en este nuevo FEIE, el «FEIE 2», hayamos conseguido que se disminuyan los recortes en el MEC casi a la mitad mediante el uso de márgenes y de parte de los beneficios del FEIE —porque da beneficios—. Se ha podido redimensionar el tamaño y el hambre —digamos— de la garantía bancaria y, por fin, se ha reconocido que las infraestructuras viarias europeas se merecen también inversiones —si pensamos sobre todo en los automóviles eléctricos, los camiones y autobuses a gas y a GNL—, que es necesario equiparlas de infraestructuras para energías alternativas y que precisan mantenimiento. Gracias, pues, señor Katainen.

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-president of the Commission*. – Madam President, this is a great day for all of us who have participated in the EFSI project, but also and especially for those who will benefit from additional investment in our Member States and regions. I want to thank the rapporteurs, Udo Bullmann and José Manuel Fernandes for their great cooperation and also all the chairs who run our trilogues very smoothly and skilfully, like Mr Gualtieri and Mr Sarvamaa, and other MEPs who participated in this effort.

Let me take stock of the investment plan's achievements before I turn to the changes under EFSI 2.0. Up to now, EFSI has managed to trigger additional investment worth EUR 250 billion. In other terms, it will create new jobs and new financing opportunities for infrastructure, investments and SMEs. In addition to large infrastructure projects and industrial investments, some 530 000 European SMEs and mid-caps have already benefitted from EFSI financing. In other terms, according to the European Investment Bank, EFSI investments made up to now will increase European GDP by 0.67% by 2020 and this will increase the number of jobs by 690 000. This is only the result of EFSI investments up to now. The overall figure will be higher when EFSI expires later on. This is only the result of EFSI. This is not the result of the entire investment plan for Europe. There the third pillar in particular plays a role. Geographically, EFSI has also functioned very well. I will give you a list of the countries which are the five best users of EFSI and it looks quite good. Estonia is number one, Bulgaria is second, Greece third, Portugal fourth, and Spain fifth. Our idea was to address market failure and it seems to be functioning as we planned.

Let me give you some concrete examples of EFSI projects. In Poland the EIB is providing a loan of over EUR 30 million for the construction of 1 300 affordable houses for low-income earners. In Greece, the EIB is lending to a telecoms operator to roll out high-speed broadband, bringing better internet access to rural and remote areas of the country. In Finland, EFSI supports the first ever social impact points scheme in Europe. The scheme will support the integration of up to 3 700 migrants and refugees in the Finnish labour market through training and job matching assistance. In the Czech Republic, a start-up called Frusack received an EFSI-backed loan to scale up their reusable bags business. In Germany, the EIB is lending EUR 35 million to a medical device company to support the development of a new approach to treating the most aggressive type of brain cancer, and in Romania, EFSI is helping a recycling company called GreenFiber to broaden the scope of their business. Under EFSI 2.0, we ensure that all the projects continue to match the high expectations which we have set. This EFSI extension will increase the target of investment to be triggered to at least EUR 0.5 trillion by 2020.

EFSI 2.0 comes with a number of enhancements as a result of the input and commitment of the co-legislators. Let me outline some of them. First, there is a more precise definition of 'additionally', and, second, investment decisions will be better explained and the scoreboard on which they are based will be published. This is a measure of transparency and also of increased accountability. Thirdly, technical assistance to project promoters at a local level will be strengthened so that even more regions and sectors can benefit from it. Finally, EFSI 2.0 will better focus on EU political priorities, such as climate change and environmental projects.

I would now like to focus on three areas where the Parliament's constructive, but determined, pressure was key and take this opportunity to two rapporteurs, Udo Bullmann and José Manuel Fernandes. The first relates to the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Money Laundering, Tax Avoidance and Tax Evasion. Thanks to Parliament's efforts, due diligence on European Investment Bank operations under this regulation will include a thorough check of compliance with EU and international standards on anti-money laundering, the fight against terrorism, financing and tax fraud, and on tax avoidance. The second area where the European Parliament has clearly left a footprint is increased transparency. Thanks to Parliament's efforts, the scoreboard of indicators will be made public after the signature of each project and the investment committee will substantiate its decision on the granting of EU funding.

Finally, Parliament's efforts are also clearly seen when it comes to support for small-scale projects. As Mr Fernandes rightly pointed out, what is perceived as small in some countries or regions is actually a large-scale project in others. Better use of platforms, a delegation model with national promotional banks and a reinforced advisory hub will help smaller projects to benefit from EFSI more than they have been doing so far.

Before I conclude, I would like to highlight that much still remains to be done. EFSI plays a major role in catalysing private investment, but the impact of these funds would be enhanced by further addressing barriers to investment in Member States. I refer to the third pillar of the investment plan that is a joint European and national responsibility.

Thank you very much for the great cooperation.

Mercedes Bresso, *relatrice per parere della commissione per lo sviluppo regionale*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei prima di tutto ringraziare i colleghi per il buon accordo che hanno portato a casa, per il loro lavoro che ha ottenuto risultati importanti.

La commissione REGI aveva posto alcune questioni con degli emendamenti che sono stati sostanzialmente accolti, e per questo esprimiamo la nostra soddisfazione. Innanzitutto una migliore distribuzione territoriale, un maggiore coinvolgimento di regioni ed enti locali, un supporto alle regioni in transizione e a quelle della coesione, un migliore utilizzo delle piattaforme nazionali e regionali, e anche di quelle macroregionali e transfrontaliere, un controllo dell'effettiva addizionalità degli investimenti, anche valutandone i criteri a livello regionale e locale, e un maggiore coinvolgimento delle regioni e degli enti locali, in particolare in quei progetti che vedono convergere EFSI e fondi strutturali.

Per il futuro riteniamo che debba diventare uno strumento permanente di finanziamento degli investimenti in Europa e che si debba tenere conto anche delle regioni finite nella cosiddetta trappola del reddito medio, per le quali mancano proprio importanti investimenti strutturali.

Krzysztof Hetman, autor projektu opinii Komisji Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! W ciągu ponad dwóch lat swojego funkcjonowania EFIS udowodnił, że ma potencjał pobudzania inwestycji oraz stymulowania wzrostu i konkurencyjności. Myślę jednak, że musimy zwrócić uwagę na pewne kwestie, które wymagają korekty. Przede wszystkim niepokoi fakt znacznej dysproporcji w wykorzystaniu funduszy pomiędzy krajami tzw. starej piętnastki oraz państwami członkowskimi Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej. Sądzę, że łączenie EFIS z funduszami strukturalnymi i inwestycyjnymi może przyczynić się do osiągnięcia pożądanych rezultatów w zakresie poprawy tej sytuacji. Należy jednak podkreślić, że polityka spójności jako główna polityka inwestycyjna Unii Europejskiej przyniosła już potwierdzone efekty nie tylko, jeśli chodzi o tworzenie inwestycji, ale również wspieranie reform strukturalnych, rozwój kapitału ludzkiego i tworzenie trwałych miejsc pracy. Dlatego też należy zadbać o to, by także w przyszłej perspektywie finansowej EFIS w żaden sposób nie zastąpił lub nie wyparł innych funduszy i instrumentów Unii Europejskiej i aby ich odrębność została zachowana.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario.

Quiero empezar, evidentemente, felicitando a los ponentes de este informe, el señor Bullmann y el señor Fernandes, porque yo creo que han hecho un trabajo fantástico y los grupos y los ponentes alternativos hemos intentado ayudar en la medida de lo posible.

El plan de inversiones lleva funcionando ya dos años y medio. Y recuerdo que, cuando hicimos ese informe de valoración de su primer año de funcionamiento, ya detectamos algunos fallos, ciertas carencias. Y eso ha sido lo que hemos intentado solucionar en esta versión 2.0 del plan de inversiones. La primera de ellas fue el criterio de adicionalidad, y creo que con los requisitos que hemos añadido podemos conseguir una verdadera adicionalidad. Porque si utilizamos el presupuesto europeo como garantía tiene que ser para asegurarnos de que esos proyectos que se van a beneficiar del presupuesto nunca hubieran podido financiarse de otra manera y, si no, estaríamos regalando el dinero público.

También hemos hablado de una mejor distribución geográfica, y con la cooperación con los bancos nacionales de inversión y con la eliminación de las trabas a pequeños proyectos —entre otras medidas— yo creo que podemos mejorar mucho la implantación del plan de inversiones en todo el territorio europeo y también en la parte sectorial, porque habíamos detectado que algunos sectores no estaban beneficiándose suficientemente. Y por ello, con nuevos criterios específicos, vamos a hacer más hincapié en la creación de empleo, en la lucha contra el cambio climático, en las nuevas tecnologías o en el transporte sostenible y, por último, en la parte presupuestaria.

Y aquí hay que reconocer que la Comisión, que no conseguimos que nos escuchara en la parte presupuestaria en la primera parte del plan de inversiones, aquí sí que ha puesto encima de la mesa una financiación mucho más acorde. En el primer plan de inversiones ya pedimos a la Comisión que redujera de ese 50 % la necesidad de proveer la garantía y aquí en este segundo plan de inversiones sí que ha realizado una reducción y, por lo tanto, con el mismo dinero vamos a conseguir financiar muchos más proyectos.

¡Enhorabuena! Y esperemos que ahora tengamos un verdadero plan de inversiones.

Bernd Kölmel, im Namen der ECR-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Mit dem EFSI geht die EU einen großen Schritt hin zu staatlicher Wirtschaftslenkung, und das ist grundsätzlich die falsche Richtung. Wir brauchen freie Märkte, wir brauchen soziale Marktwirtschaft, aber keine staatliche Wirtschaftslenkung. Das ist falsch. Der EFSI hat auch Geburtsfehler in sich: Er möchte zusätzliche Investitionen anstoßen, und mir hat noch niemand zeigen können, wie man die wirklich seriös messen könnte. Stattdessen wird immer behauptet, dass es zusätzliche Investitionen sind. In Wahrheit müssen wir aber davon ausgehen, dass es sich hier um Fehlsteuerungen und einen Verdrängungswettbewerb handelt.

Denn wir haben doch in der EU eine Nullzinspolitik, wir haben eine Geldschwemme, es ist genügend Geld da, um sinnhafte Projekte zu finanzieren. Da muss man sich doch fragen: Was wollen wir denn eigentlich mit dem EFSI erreichen? Ich bin überzeugt davon, dass hier viele wunderbare Dinge in die Schaufenster gelegt werden, die einer näheren Betrachtung und Analyse nicht standhalten werden. Deshalb ist der EFSI abzulehnen.

Gérard Deprez, au nom du groupe ALDE. – Madame la Présidente, félicitations, tout d'abord, aux deux corapporteurs, M. Bullmann et M. Fernandes, pour la qualité de leur travail. L'accord sur le financement a été une incroyable course d'obstacles, dont je salue le résultat.

Contrairement à M. Kölmel, j'affirme que le Fonds Juncker, même s'il faut l'améliorer, est un bon instrument. Il poursuit de bons objectifs et il donne de bons résultats. Dans mon pays – la Belgique –, à l'heure actuelle, le volume du financement s'élève à 1,2 milliard d'euros, ce qui devrait générer in fine 5,8 milliards d'euros d'investissements supplémentaires. Seize projets d'infrastructures et d'innovations ont déjà été approuvés et plus de 4 400 petites et moyennes entreprises devraient en bénéficier.

Un bon instrument qui poursuit de bons objectifs et donne de bons résultats mérite d'être prolongé et amélioré. Je salue donc la décision de prolonger le Fonds Juncker pour trois ans, je salue l'objectif de fixer à 500 milliards le montant total des investissements à mobiliser, grâce à l'effet de levier, et je me réjouis des améliorations apportées au dispositif initial pour le rendre plus performant.

Grâce à l'ajout de nouveaux secteurs susceptibles de bénéficier du financement de l'EFSI, davantage de PME porteuses d'idées nouvelles pourront en profiter dans le domaine de l'agriculture, de la lutte contre le changement climatique, dans les industries culturelles et créatives, dans l'économie sociale et solidaire. Grâce à l'amélioration du dispositif de conseil et d'assistance, le Fonds pourra mieux répondre aux réalités du terrain et soutenir des projets dans toutes les régions d'Europe. Grâce au renforcement de la gouvernance et à une plus grande transparence, le comité d'investissement devra justifier publiquement les décisions prises, ce qui est à la fois une exigence et une garantie.

En un mot, mon groupe votera ce rapport avec conviction.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Tal como afirmámos início, nós não acompanhamos a lógica e os objetivos deste fundo de investimento. Pensamos que, no atual momento, o que se impunha era um plano de investimento público, amplo, destinado a todos os Estados-Membros e com critérios de discriminação positiva para regiões fortemente deprimidas. Recursos não faltam, conforme pode ser deduzido da política de expansão quantitativa do BCE.

Este plano Juncker, com o seu carácter competitivo, favorece acima de tudo as regiões mais ricas, não garante a adicionalidade e promove a entrega de infraestruturas públicas a parcerias público-privadas. Mas, se olharmos para os resultados em Portugal, observamos que é a própria lógica subjacente ao plano que não se verifica. O que temos no fundamental são empréstimos do Banco Europeu de Investimento que poderiam ser concedidos sem o plano Juncker. Por maioria de razão, nós não apoiamos o prolongamento deste plano. Não acompanhamos a ideia de criar mais um instrumento de constrangimento para os Estados nacionais, um fundo de investimento que decide de forma antidemocrática quais os investimentos a realizar e em que país.

Pela nossa parte continuamos a defender um orçamento solidário, com fundos públicos, mas em que sejam os governos nacionais a decidir a forma como o investimento deve ser realizado por forma a responder às necessidades das populações e arrastando depois o investimento privado contra o qual nada temos.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank the co-rapporteurs, Mr Fernandes and Mr Bullmann, for their hard work on this file. As with EFSI 1, we continued our work on EFSI 2 and with good results. The point is still that there are success stories, and the Commissioner rightfully put them out. There are also a lot of projects about which people are raising doubts. Is this now really what EFSI should be subsidising or supporting?

For that reason, we also had a very critical report which Parliament adopted at the beginning of this year which claimed that EFSI 1 was not functioning yet. If you look now at the improvements that we made in EFSI 2, you will see that we have made some big improvements. Firstly, on the definition of additionality: we made sure that additionality really means something that otherwise would not have happened at all, and not only something that follows the European Investment Bank (EIB) definition of additionality.

On the scoreboard, that it is really going to help in prioritising what EFSI is going to promote, and not just a kind of well-being there that does not really help in prioritising transparency, how our decision is being taken, or the earmarking of climate action to make sure that EFSI 2.0 is more going in the direction of real climate action.

In the end, what is important for us as Parliament is to keep our control on the EIB. There are improvements on governance, but we as a Parliament need to be more serious in monitoring how the EIB is reaching their decisions, and certainly in the context of EFSI 2.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταρχήν θέλω πραγματικά να εξάρω την προσπάθεια, την πρωτοβουλία αλλά και το έργο το οποίο κατέβαλαν οι δύο εισηγητές συνάδελφοι, ο κ. Fernandes και ο κ. Bußmann. Πραγματικά είναι μια αξιοθαύμαστη εργασία, που υποβοηθά όλες τις χώρες μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Θεωρώ πολύ σημαντικό να αναφέρω, ειδικά με αφορμή την παρουσία του επιτρόπου, του κ. Katainen, ότι είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό αυτή η νέα πρωτοβουλία, με την επέκταση του σχεδίου αλλά και με την αναθεώρηση του, να επικεντρωθεί και σε μικρές χώρες. Φαίνεται ότι οι μικρές χώρες δεν είχαν τα εργαλεία και τα μέσα να μπορέσουν να ανταπεξέλθουν και να υποβάλουν συγκεκριμένες προτάσεις. Εάν πραγματικά υπήρξε μια τέτοια τεράστια απήχηση σε αυτό το σχέδιο, δεδομένου ότι για πρώτη φορά στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρόκειται να επωφεληθούν πέραν των 535.000 μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων, αποτελεί πρόκληση και για τη δική μου χώρα, την Κύπρο, να υπάρξει αξιοποίηση.

Θεωρώ ότι η διεύθυνση και η διοίκηση του ευρωπαϊκού σχεδίου δράσης στρατηγικών επενδύσεων πρέπει να αναλάβει πρωτοβουλίες για να υποβοηθήσει τη χώρα μου, η οποία έχει τη δυνατότητα να αναπτύξει ενεργειακές υποδομές, έχει τη δυνατότητα πραγματικά να στηρίξει τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις, οι οποίες βρίσκονται σε θέση δύσκολη, αλλά πολύ περισσότερο, επειδή υπήρξε αναφορά από τον κ. Katainen, σημαντική αναφορά στη Φινλανδία, ότι υπήρξαν και κοινωνικά έργα και κοινωνικά προγράμματα, θεωρώ ότι μια χώρα όπως η Κύπρος, η οποία έχει 200.000 προσφυγικό πληθυσμό, μπορεί με αυτό το σχέδιο να στηρίξει τους πρόσφυγες στην Κύπρο για τη στέγαση, την επαναδραστηριοποίηση, την ανάπτυξη και να δώσουμε ένα ισχυρό μήνυμα και παράδειγμα ότι αυτό το σχέδιο δεν είναι μόνο για μεγάλα έργα αλλά είναι και για μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις και για κοινωνικές υποδομές και για κοινωνικά έργα.

Marco Valli, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volevo chiedere al Commissario Katainen se veramente pensa che questo strumento, oltre quelli che sono i dati che cerca di promuovere in tutti modi, stia realmente stimolando la domanda all'interno dell'Unione europea, perché guardando i dati su quello che è il reale stimolo che sta portando questo strumento, più l'inflazione «core» che rimane molto bassa, i sottoccupati che stanno aumentando proprio per le riforme che Lei, da «falco» della Commissione, sta proponendo a dismisura, soprattutto nei paesi del Sud Europa, ecco, questi sono i problemi e servirebbero molti più investimenti pubblici.

Purtroppo gli investimenti privati che porterà il fondo Juncker, se andiamo a fare proprio i calcoli per dimostrare che i suoi dati sono molto gonfiati, arriveremo a 500 miliardi forse, nel 2020, di investimenti generati, quindi 100 miliardi l'anno, diviso 28 paesi: tre miliardi e mezzo l'anno per paese. Ecco, una cifra abbastanza ridicola rispetto a quello di cui necessita oggi l'economia.

Io sono a favore di una razionalizzazione della spesa pubblica su investimenti veramente produttivi, però abbiamo bisogno di allentare le briglie dell'austerità, altrimenti per alcuni paesi non ci sarà la speranza di ripagare questo mostruoso debito pubblico, che ad esempio il mio paese ha, ma non si può ripagare un debito pubblico del 135 per cento rispetto al PIL, bisogna secondo me far crescere il PIL in modo sostenibile, in modo tale che il denominatore venga abbattuto. E, utilizzando solo questo strumento, capisce che non si riuscirà a uscire da questa situazione.

Per quanto riguarda i progetti finanziati fino ad oggi dal fondo Juncker, purtroppo non vedo molta addizionalità, e all'interno delle proposte che ci sono, non capisco come mai i Verdi continuano a sostenerlo, proprio perché ci sono progetti ancora incentrati sul fossile, su fonti non rinnovabili e quindi – avevo un minuto e mezzo, signora Presidente – e quindi mi chiedo come sia possibile che non vengano finanziati dei progetti sostenibili.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az Európai Stratégiai Beruházási Alap elsődleges célja olyan projektek támogatása, amelyek társadalmi és környezeti előnyöket, magas színvonalú és tartós munkahelyeket biztosítanak. Az alapnak az Unió gazdasági kapacitását élénkítő eszközként kell működnie, hozzájárulva, hogy az utóbb csatlakozott országoknak a beruházási szakadékat föl tudják számolni. Hogyan tudja teljesíteni ezt a célját az alap, ha az infrastrukturális és innovatív támogatási keret 91%-át a régi 15 tagállam kapta.

Világos tehát, hogy a Stratégiai Beruházási Alap nem lép a kohéziós alapok és hasonló eszközök helyébe, így azok fenntartására a jövőben is szükség van, amennyiben csökkenteni akarjuk a centrum és a periféria országai közötti szakadékokat.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Doamna președintă, doresc să îi felicit pe domnul comisar Katainen și pe echipa sa pentru succesul acestui Fond european de investiții strategice. Fără îndoială, este un succes și el ne arată încă o dată ce înseamnă forța combinării atât a fondurilor publice, a fondurilor private, combinate și cu asistența tehnică, care a fost de mare ajutor.

De asemenea, îi felicit pe cei doi raportori, care au obținut o majoritate foarte mare din partea tuturor colegilor pentru extinderea fondului.

Ceea ce doresc să sugerez este importanța asistenței tehnice pentru o serie de țări care au greutate în pregătirea proiectelor, cum este, de exemplu, și țara mea, România. De asemenea, cred că experiența aceasta pozitivă a fondului ar trebui văzută cum ar putea fi folosită și la nivel național.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président, vous vous en souviendrez, c'est mon groupe, le groupe socialiste, qui a beaucoup voulu au moment de l'investiture de Jean-Claude Juncker que ce plan d'investissement existe. C'est le Parlement européen qui a voulu que l'EFSI 1 puisse être envisagé dans un prolongement.

Nous voici au point de rendez-vous. Je ne peux que m'en réjouir, tant ce plan d'investissement est une pierre dans la stratégie globale dont nous avons besoin pour l'Union européenne si elle veut faire face aux défis qui sont les siens en termes d'investissements, et d'abord d'investissements durables.

Vous vous souviendrez que, dans le premier débat, pour le premier plan d'investissement, mon groupe, avec quelques autres, avait voulu contenir une partie de l'investissement en faveur de la transition écologique à hauteur de 20 %; cela n'avait pas été possible. Aujourd'hui, nous sommes à 40 %, nous ne pouvons que nous en réjouir.

Mais je voudrais aussi saluer un effet collatéral de ce plan, qui me semble tout à fait positif: c'est la façon dont il a conduit beaucoup d'États membres à s'inspirer du modèle des banques nationales de développement et de promotion pour favoriser la capacité d'élaborer, dans chaque État membre, des plans d'investissement qui sont aujourd'hui mieux sélectionnés et en développement.

Cela a aussi conduit à faire évoluer la gouvernance de la Banque européenne d'investissement, même s'il y a sans doute une marge de progrès. C'est la raison pour laquelle je me félicite que nous continuions à mettre l'accent pour que la Banque européenne d'investissement n'utilise pas les paradis fiscaux dans ses opérations et que le Parlement européen ait un rôle actif et visible dans le comité d'orientation.

Cela me semble être des progrès qui vont dans la bonne voie. Je nous souhaite une bonne mise en œuvre de ce plan.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Przedłużenie okresu obowiązywania EFIS do końca 2020 r. i podwyższenie docelowego poziomu inwestycji, które mają przy jego wsparciu powstać, do kwoty 500 mld euro należy zdecydowanie poprzeć, ponieważ pobudzanie inwestycji realizowanych z jego udziałem przynosi pozytywne rezultaty w gospodarce całej Unii. Należy także podkreślić, że ważnym priorytetem funduszu powinna być reindustrializacja Europy, a nie tylko proponowana ochrona klimatu, a do realizacji takiego priorytetu niezbędne są stabilne inwestycje w przemysłach energochłonne. Rozważona powinna być także kwalifikowalność do wsparcia EFIS projektów z sektora obronnego, tak istotnego dla gospodarek wielu krajów Unii. Pożądanym rozwiązaniem byłoby także umożliwienie wykorzystania EFIS jako wkładu krajowego w projektach finansowanych ze środków europejskich oraz instrumentu „Łącząc Europę”. Do tej pory jest to niemożliwe, podczas gdy w przypadku tradycyjnego finansowania oferowanego przez EBI istnieje taka możliwość.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE). – Mr President, Commissioner Katainen, I welcome the compromise found on this file.

Europe has an investment gap of a minimum of EUR 300 billion a year. EFSI plays a crucial role in filling this gap and intervenes where the market fails to do so, but we must reiterate that only a comprehensive framework for investments, structural reforms and common policy will foster growth in the EU. These three dimensions are complementary and necessary to each other.

EFSI will bring EUR 500 billion up to 2020 for more projects, allowing citizens with innovative ideas to access finance more easily in order to launch new projects. This will also make EFSI bigger, greener, more local and more transparent. EFSI keeps a strict approach to the additionality concept, making sure the projects selected are risk-based and would not have been financed otherwise. This is very important, to avoid past infrastructure projects financed such as ghost airports, highways without traffic and high-speed railways without passengers. EFSI should not become a new cohesion policy instrument. I agree with geographic balance in Europe, but we are talking about investment and growth, not about new solidarity instruments.

EFSI also contributes to the COP21 objectives, to keep sustainable development and environment objectives in mind. EFSI also increases the local presence level through the reinforcing of the European Investment Advisory Hub. The decentralisation of EFSI is also a key element, in my view. Who better to identify local needs for the economy than local governments? Of course, this has always to be accompanied by European supervision in order to select projects that have a real European added value.

My congratulations again, especially to the rapporteurs.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, cé go gcuirim fáilte roimh infheistíocht mar go bhfuil géarghá leis, is léir nach bhfuil an EFSI ag obair ar son na ndaoine.

Níl sé ag obair chun fostaíocht a chruthú, níl sé ag obair ar mhaithe le seirbhísí poiblí, níl sé ag obair mar thacaíocht d'fhiontair bheaga agus mheánmhéide, agus níl aon rian den infheistíocht a bhí beartaithe don earnáil Comharchumann, nó an eacnamaíocht shóisialta. Bhí deis againn a bheith straitéiseach, bhí deis againn difríocht a dheánamh don tsochaí leis an EFSI ach arís is arís eile, feicimid gurb iad na forbróirí príobháideacha atá ag baint an méid is mó tairbhe as.

Níl an EFSI trédhearcach a dhóthain, agus tá sé fíordheacair ar sheirbhísí poiblí éileamh air. Tá os cionn 8000 duine in Éirinn gan tithíocht, 3000 páiste ina measc, agus is mór an náire nach bhfuil Rialtas na hÉireann ag éileamh ar an EFSI chun an fhadhb seo a réiteach. Tá siad níos tiomanta chun airgead dár ndóigh a chur i bpocaí na ndaoine siúd go bhfuil fuilleach acu cheana. Caithfear athrú iomlán a dheánamh ar an gcultúr infheistíochta mar a sheasann sé agus díriú orthu siúd atá i gcrúachás. Mar sin, ní féidir liom tacú leis seo agus an tslí go bhfuil sé ag feidhmiú.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Madam President, the European Fund for Strategic Investments, also known as the 'Juncker Plan', wants to overcome the investment gap in the EU by mobilising private money. For many reasons, I am not in favour of this report, nor do I wish to extend the duration of the EFSI Fund. One should ask oneself: why do we need such an investment fund at a time when interest rates are already extremely low and the market is flooded with cheap money? The answer lies in the nature of the plan. The European Fund for Strategic Investments is explicitly funding risky projects, projects that are not able to obtain funding through the financial markets at a time when money is easy. Very dodgy indeed.

The European Investment Bank and European Commission admitted many times, and I quote: 'The EFSI projects' portfolio risk profile will be higher than the average risk profile of the other EIB projects and assets. The EFSI provides a first loss guarantee so that the EIB has been able to invest in more risky projects.' Let us not forget that at least EUR 16 billion – the equivalent of more than GBP 14 billion – in the EFSI project are guaranteed through the EU budget, plus EUR 5 billion – an equivalent of GBP 4.4 billion – is coming from the European Investment Bank, which is owned by the EU Member States, including Britain, and that will be so after we leave, I should think.

Besides funding projects in the field of energy, EFSI is often used to fund semi-governmental infrastructure projects which are harmful to private business. It sets up in competition with private business. In theory, this megalomaniac EFSI project sounds like a good example of free market capitalism and wealth creation. In practice, however, it is old school Keynesianism and state intervention. This EFSI bubble economy is set to burst and that will be bad for the EU and bad for Britain.

André Elissen (ENF). – Vandaag bespreken we het voorstel om de looptijd van het Europees investeringsfonds, EFSI, te verlengen. De propagandamachine van de EU draait weer op volle toeren. Het voorstel is één grote lofzang op de heilzame werking van de EU. De binnenlandse productie is al enkele jaren op rij gegroeid en ja hoor, allemaal weer dankzij de geweldige EU, terwijl de effecten van het EFSI op de groei nog niet kunnen worden vastgesteld. Alle successen worden per definitie toegeschreven aan de EU in plaats van aan de lidstaten. Niet gewoon zeggen dat de oorspronkelijke doelen niet zijn gehaald, maar waarschuwen voor de gedrevenheid om kwantitatieve doelstellingen te willen behalen. Toerekenbaar en afrekenbaar resultaat is kennelijk niet belangrijk. In normaal Nederlands: cijfers doen er niet toe. Zwakheden en risico's worden verstopt in camouflerend taalgebruik. Of het nu gaat om het aanleggen van windmolen-

parken op de Noordpool, het aanleggen van een wateropslag in Portugal of het bouwen van dertienduizend energiezuinige woningen in Frankrijk, het blijft één peperdure EU-campagne en propaganda die de burgers klauwen met geld kost. Met mijn collega's van de ENF-Fractie heb ik een amendement ingediend om dit voorstel af te wijzen.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Weer een Nederlandse spreker maar wel met een heel ander verhaal. Het EFSI is een uitstekend initiatief en verdient dan ook deze doorstart. We hebben geleerd van EFSI 1 en een aantal punten zijn nadrukkelijk aangepast. De additionaliteit en aanvullend hoger risico.

Ten tweede, de geografische spreiding. Er komt zo'n scorebord en ik wil de commissaris daarin op de voet volgen. Dat het nou echt gebalanceerd gaat door Europa en dat niet alleen de meer ontwikkelde rijke staten er beter van worden.

En het derde punt, vandaag hebben we een akkoord bereikt over de omnibus om de structuurfondsen beter te kunnen laten samengaan, meer synergie te hebben in die investeringen, met het EFSI-fonds. Ik ben daar blij mee want daar zochten we ook naar, die synergie. De heer Fernandes heeft aangegeven dat de structuurfondsen en het cohesiebeleid in hun eigen doelstelling staan. Dit is aanvullend. En nog een opmerking: graag richting banken meer aansturing. Die zijn te terughoudend om in te stappen.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, penso davvero che sia stata una bella pagina di democrazia parlamentare, quella che ci ha portato all'approvazione di questo testo. Condivido l'orgoglio e la gioia espressi da Udo Bullmann, e vorrei anche ringraziare il Vicepresidente Katainen per il suo ruolo e anche per le generose parole che ha espresso oggi.

Non c'è dubbio, penso, che il nuovo «EFSI 2.0» possa rafforzare sia la quantità sia la qualità degli investimenti mobilitati. È stato questo un po' il nostro rovello: conciliare quantità e qualità. Più qualità con l'*earmarking* per il contrasto al cambiamento climatico, con lo *scoreboard*, con il sostegno ai piccoli progetti, più quantità e migliore distribuzione regionale con le norme sul *pricing* e in quelle sul *blending* con i fondi strutturali, e infine più trasparenza e più democrazia con i cambiamenti nella governance.

Ora ci aspettiamo coerenza nell'implementazione del regolamento, e il Parlamento europeo sarà in prima fila anche in questa fase.

Stanisław Ożóg (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Delegacja polska w grupie ECR od samego początku doceniała EFIS jako ważną inicjatywę, która w sposób efektywny może wspierać zarówno duże inwestycje strukturalne, jak i te mniejsze w sektorze prywatnym. Po raz kolejny też apelujemy do Komisji o zwiększenie środków docelowych w projekcie na rozwinięcie systemu szkoleń dla przedsiębiorców w zakresie przygotowania projektów, gdyż widzimy duże dysproporcje wydatkowania środków z tego funduszu między tzw. nową a zachodnią Europą. Sama propozycja wydłużenia okresu realizacji EFIS jest zasadna, ale mam nadzieję, że nie będzie prowadziła do osłabienia lub substytucji innych źródeł finansowania, takich jak na przykład instrument „Łącząc Europę”.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente, debemos fomentar la inversión en la Unión Europea, y el FEIE, que ya ha cumplido más de dos años, está dando sus frutos en esa dirección. Bienvenido el acuerdo para aumentar el periodo y la cuantía. Bienvenidos los esfuerzos para mejorar su transparencia y la complementariedad con otros fondos europeos. Y bienvenido su impacto sobre las pymes, que son el motor económico de la Unión.

Por el momento, se han financiado todo tipo de proyectos y en todos los ámbitos, pero permítanme que destaque de entre todos un ejemplo, un proyecto en mi tierra, en Canarias: el *Bus Rapid Transit* en Las Palmas. Un proyecto en ejecución, con un plazo de dos años y que va a crear más de mil puestos de trabajo durante la fase de construcción, antes de que entre en funcionamiento en el año 2021.

Pero no podemos conformarnos. Confío en que se cumplan las estimaciones de la Comisión de que se logren movilizar los 500 000 millones de euros en inversiones adicionales en la economía hasta 2020, y también en que el BEI colabore activa y lealmente con los bancos nacionales de promoción y los inversores privados. Terminó felicitando a los ponentes por un trabajo bien hecho.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais féliciter nos rapporteurs pour leur travail remarquable. L'EFSI a permis d'atteindre les objectifs d'investissement fixés en matière de montants. L'appel d'air de cet investissement public a permis de lever un investissement privé frileux. Cependant, sur le plan qualitatif, il fallait perfectionner l'outil. C'est chose faite. Le nouvel EFSI devrait notamment permettre que la mise en œuvre du principe d'additionnalité imprègne la sélection des projets. Cette additionnalité se comprend dans ses trois dimensions: financière, géographique et sectorielle.

Je remercie nos rapporteurs pour le renforcement du contrôle parlementaire, qui améliore sa transparence et la démocratie. Je note également, avec satisfaction, que ce prolongement ne se traduit pas, pour une fois, par de nouvelles coupes. Je regrette cependant que nous ne soyons toujours pas parvenus à revenir sur les coupes opérées ni sur Horizon 2020, ni sur le mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe.

Enfin, après 2020, ce doit être l'occasion de réorienter l'EFSI vers l'avenir, c'est-à-dire vers la transition écologique.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αντιπρόεδρε Katainen, η επέκταση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων αποδεικνύει στην πράξη ότι η Ευρώπη μπορεί να αποτελέσει ένα ελκυστικό πεδίο επενδύσεων με πολλαπλάσιες επιδόσεις για όσους αναλαμβάνουν επενδυτικό ρίσκο. Όμως μπορούμε καλύτερα. Μπορούμε καλύτερα, εάν αυξήσουμε την προσδετικότητα των πόρων· αν, δηλαδή, καταφέρουμε σε διάφορες επενδυτικές προσπάθειες να μοχλεύσουμε πόρους του σχεδίου Juncker, του κοινοτικού προϋπολογισμού –ΕΣΠΑ το λέμε στην Ελλάδα– και του ιδιωτικού τομέα. Στη νέα φάση έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία να καταφέρει το EFSI να στείλει τα οφέλη του στις μικρές και μεσαίες επιχειρήσεις.

Είπατε πριν από λίγο ότι στην Ελλάδα είμαστε πρωταθλητές. Πράγματι με 1,6 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, θα μοχλεύσουμε 5,5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Όλο αυτό όμως αφορά σε πολύ μεγάλες και μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις. Το στοιχείμα είναι πώς θα δώσουμε στις μικρότερες επιχειρήσεις πρόσβαση σε αυτούς τους πόρους και αυτό μπορούμε να το κάνουμε με την ισχυρή παρουσία του ευρωπαϊκού κόμβου επενδυτικών συμβούλων για την ταχύτερη ωρίμανση και την ομαλότερη ψηφιοποίηση των υποψηφίων επενδυτών. Μπορούμε επίσης να το κάνουμε με τις εθνικές επενδυτικές τράπεζες, που σύμφωνα με την τρίτη αξιολόγηση, δεν περιγράφεται ευκρινώς ειδικά για την Ελλάδα και την προστιθέμενη αξία που θα...

(Η Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o acordo alcançado no trípulo para a revisão do Plano Juncker é um bom acordo e quero, por isso, saudar a equipa negocial do Parlamento e os nossos dois relatores. Com esta nova versão teremos um plano de investimentos prolongado, reforçado e mais justo.

Finalmente, foi reconhecido o problema da insuficiente distribuição geográfica dos investimentos que tendem a favorecer as economias mais poderosas em vez de promover a coesão territorial.

É certo que o dinamismo dos países pode minimizar estes constrangimentos, como prova o caso de Portugal que, graças a um excelente trabalho do Governo e das autarquias locais, é hoje um dos países mais apoiados pelo Plano Juncker. Mas precisamos destas novas regras e destes novos instrumentos para melhorar a distribuição geográfica deste fundo e para que ele se possa tornar, como deve ser, mais um investimento estratégico a favor da convergência económica na Europa.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – EFSI je najbrž eden izmed najbolj uspešnih projektov tega mandata Evropske komisije. Kljub temu da je na začetku svojega delovanja marsikdo dvomil v njegovo uspešnost.

Nekateri so imeli celo prav, predvsem tisti, ki so rekli, da bodo manjše države ta sklad težje uporabljale. Vidno je namreč, da so večje in bogatejše države v prednosti. Tako pri pritegovanju zasebnih investitorjev kot tudi pri samofinanciranju določenega dela naložb.

Na nekaj pa bi rada opozorila tukaj v svojem govoru, in sicer da se še vedno, po enem letu pojavljajo kot vprašanja, ki ostajajo odprta in nerešena, tista vprašanja, na katere sem opozorila že lansko leto pri podaljšanju EFSI-ja, namreč na to, da nikjer ni bilo objavljene ocene, koliko delovnih mest je ta veliki evropski projekt prinesel in letos za Komisijo ostajam pri istem vprašanju.

Glede na to, da imam pa še čas za govor, opozorim še na eno stvar. Spet imamo manko pri financiranju socialnih storitev, ki so zelo pomembne in za današnji del družbe izjemnega pomena. Ne pozabimo na našo populacijo, ki jo sestavlja vse več ljudi z omejitvami, prebivalstvo se stara in nujno rabimo večje ravnesje v korist socialnih naložb.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'approvazione del piano EFSI e dell'EFSI 2, del piano degli investimenti europei, sono sicuramente un segno di un'Europa che è finalmente ripartita e che ha scommesso su se stessa, ma ci sono due obiettivi che noi abbiamo il dovere di perseguire, che questo Parlamento richiama sempre nel lavoro della Commissione e nel lavoro del Consiglio.

Da una parte, investire e scommettere anche sulle piccole e medie imprese, che sono l'ossatura anche del nostro continente, e dall'altra trovare le risorse e la stessa capacità, la stessa forza che abbiamo avuto nell'approvare il piano degli investimenti, anche per la lotta per avere un'Europa sociale. Un'Europa sociale significa lottare contro la disoccupazione, soprattutto contro la disoccupazione giovanile, contro le povertà.

Noi abbiamo di fronte, e ci riempiamo la bocca e siamo molto orgogliosi, di finanziare, di investire sulla cosiddetta «industria 4.0», ma continuiamo in Europa ad avere un «welfare 1.0», che non è più adeguato ai propri tempi. Gli Stati non ce la fanno più e abbiamo bisogno invece di un'Europa che sopperisca agli Stati e sia in grado finalmente di avanzare delle proposte sulle politiche sociali.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte mich zuerst für die exzellente Arbeit der beiden Berichterstatter José Manuel Fernandes und Udo Bullmann sowohl bei EFSI I als auch bei EFSI II bedanken. Wir sind hier neue Wege gegangen, und wir waren erfolgreich. Der EFSI wird dank des Europäischen Parlaments schlagkräftiger, zielsicherer und transparenter.

Wir stocken den EFSI finanziell auf, wir verlängern ihn und wir verbessern ihn nach den Erfahrungen, die wir in den letzten Jahren im Umgang mit EFSI I sammeln durften. Wir verbessern die Finanzierung, wir bauen den europäischen Hub der Investitionsberatung aus, wir verankern eine Direktvergabe der EU-Garantie, damit kleinteilige Projekte besser in große Forschungsideen eingebracht werden können, wir sorgen dafür, dass genau jene hochqualitativen Projekte gefördert werden, die im Rahmen bestehender Instrumente nicht durchgeführt werden, wir stärken die Governance, wir sorgen für mehr Transparenz, eine verbesserte Preispolitik und die Umsetzung der COP21-Klimaziele, und wir fordern weitere Investitionsanstrengungen, weil wir bei Investitionen in Regionen und als Kontinent noch immer zurückliegen. Bitte stimmen Sie zu!

La Présidente. – En raison du retard pris et parce que nos collègues sont en train de s'installer, je suis au regret de ne pas pouvoir organiser la phase des interventions à la demande (*catch the eye*).

Jyrki Katainen, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, it is very nice to see a full House here. It is a very important moment because, once you vote in favour of the extension of EFSI, it means that you will raise its firepower up to half a trillion euros by the end of 2020. It is a significant tool for improving Europe's competitiveness and for increasing the number of jobs.

I must say that the biggest challenge we still have with EFSI is the lack of awareness.

(*The President called for silence*)

Many companies, many regions, many municipalities and authorities have never heard of EFSI, even though we have been communicating massively. If you look at the countries and regions which have benefited the most from EFSI you can see that local authorities, and also private banks and MEPs, have been actively promoting the opportunities which EFSI can offer. I can give you some examples of very active MEPs. I am sorry not to mention them all but, for instance, Ms Spyrali from Greece, Mr Kelly from Ireland, Mr Gualtieri from Italy, Ms Kaili from Greece and Ms Maydell from Bulgaria have organised a significant number of events promoting EFSI opportunities for local entrepreneurs and local authorities. I encourage you strongly to promote this good example.

The second point I want to make is that EFSI has not created a division between East and West.

(The President called for silence)

If you look at the list of the countries which use EFSI most, Estonia, Bulgaria, Greece, Portugal, and Spain are the first five, then you have Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Italy, Poland, France and Croatia. So, EFSI can be used everywhere but it depends on the activism of local authorities and entrepreneurs, and also MEPs, as to how well informed people are of the opportunities.

I would like to stress the importance of combining EFSI opportunities with structural funds because this would further expand the opportunities for cohesion countries to use EFSI.

My final point is that, since EFSI is a demand driven fund, it is not the medicine for all diseases. We have to make sure that companies working in the circular economy field, in artificial intelligence, in agriculture and forestry, and in energy efficiency, to mention just a few areas, use more EFSI financing, because it can give better opportunities to invest in new innovations.

I would like, once again, to thank this House for the fruitful cooperation.

Commission statement

As a result of the political agreement between the European Parliament and the Council on the financing of EFSI 2.0 an amount of EUR 275 million will be redeployed from CEF financial instruments, which represents a reduction of EUR 225 million in comparison with the Commission proposal. The Commission confirms that the financial programming will be revised to reflect the corresponding EUR 225 million increase of the CEF programme.

In the framework of the annual budgetary procedures for the years 2019-2020 the Commission will make the appropriate proposals to ensure an optimal allocation of this amount within the CEF programme.

Udo Bullmann, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich werde angesichts der fortgeschrittenen Zeit die zwei Minuten nicht ausnutzen.

Ich werde eine Bemerkung machen, die aus meiner Sicht die wichtigste ist: Dieser Fonds für strategische Investitionen in Europa ist notwendig, und er ist nützlich. Aber dieses Haus, das Europäische Parlament, hat weder beim ersten Mal bei EFSI I, noch beim zweiten Mal, bei der Verlängerung, das Konzept einfach durchgewunken und abgenickt. Nein, wir haben es gestaltet. Es ist, es war und es bleibt bitter nötig, dass Sie, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sich einmischen in die Umsetzung dieses so notwendigen Vehikels, weil wir es zu einem Instrument für eine bessere Qualität des Lebens und des Arbeitens, für mehr Nachhaltigkeit und für die Zukunft Europas machen müssen.

José Manuel Fernandes, *relator*. – Senhora Presidente, isto é um fundo aberto que não se impõe, mas que se propõe, e propõe-se a apoiar, sobretudo, Estados-Membros e investimentos nesses Estados-Membros onde há mais dificuldade de acesso ao mercado. É também um fundo solidário e que mostra a importância da partilha na União Europeia.

Com as garantias do orçamento da União propiciamos o investimento e criamos emprego. Já foram mobilizados mais de 250 mil milhões de euros em menos de três anos, apoiaram-se mais de 400 mil pequenas e médias empresas, criaram-se mais de 600 mil empregos na União Europeia. É um fundo que vai prosseguir até 2020 com um maior acompanhamento por parte do Parlamento Europeu onde se exige mais transparência, que as decisões sejam fundamentadas e públicas.

Estou certo de que, com instrumentos desta natureza, com mais partilha, com mais solidariedade, conseguiremos o objetivo do emprego, de ajudar as regiões mais desfavorecidas. Este é um instrumento que mostra que a União Europeia vale a pena.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu dans quelques minutes.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Andor Deli (PPE), *írásban*. – Úgy gondolom, hogy az Európai Stratégiai Befektetési Alap elérte az indulásakor kitűzött célokat, ezért indokolt a program meghosszabbítása. Viszont, ha végigtekintünk a megvalósult és folyamatban lévő projektek listáján hiányérzetünk lehet. Az ESBA igazán csak a nyugati, fejlettebb tagállamokban és régiókban teljesített jól, és igen kevés befektetést fogunk találni az új tagállamokban és a kevésbé fejlett régiókban, ezért a jövőben nagyobb odafigyelést kell biztosítani a földrajzi egyensúlynak.

Továbbá az ESBA által kínált mechanizmus nem szolgálhat alapul a strukturális alapok 2020 utáni esetleges reformja során. A kohéziós politikában meg kell őrizni az alapvető célkitűzéseket az alapszerződés 179. szakaszával összhangban, és domináns szerepet biztosítani a vissza nem térítendő támogatásoknak a pénzügyi eszközök mellett a jövőben is, csak ez szavatolhatja a gazdasági különbségek hatékony csökkentését.

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), *írásban*. – Az Európai Parlament és a Tanács kompromisszumos javaslata az Európai Stratégiai Beruházási Alap által nyújtott források mögött álló EU garanciát 16 milliárdról 26 milliárd euróra emeli. Az EU garancia megemelésével 2020-ig 500 milliárd euróra nő a Beruházási Alap befektetési portfóliója. A finanszírozás kérdésében egyetértünk a kompromisszumos szövegjavaslattal, támogatjuk azt, mivel kimondja, hogy az Európai Bizottság betartja a többéves pénzügyi keret félidei felülvizsgálatában korábban elfogadott kereteket.

A kompromisszum megerősíti az Beruházási Alaphoz kapcsolódó Tanácsadó Platformot, amely így a jövőben helyi szinten alkalmazhat szakembereket, akik a beruházási források iránt érdeklődőket segítik majd döntéseikben. Ez megerősítheti a források felhasználásának diverzifikációját, azaz hogy valamennyi európai régió egyformán részesülhessen a Befektetési Alap nyújtotta támogatásokból. A Parlament és a Tanács megállapodása szerint a Befektetési Alap a jövőben a kohéziós országok autópálya beruházásaihoz is segítséget adhat majd.

Ugyanakkor sikerült elérnünk, hogy a Befektetési Alap esetleges 2020 utánra vonatkozó meghosszabbítása előtt egy független vizsgálatnak kell majd alávetni az Alap működését és át kell tekinteni az addig elért eredményeket. A kompromisszum érdekében el tudjuk fogadni az Európai Bizottság módosított tervezetét, mivel a megállapodáshoz egy tanácsi nyilatkozat készült, amely rögzíti, hogy a megállapodásban foglaltak nem teremtenek precedenst a jövőre nézve és tiszteletben tartják a Szerződés rendelkezéseit.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), *schriftlich*. – Der Europäische Fonds für strategische Investitionen (EFSI) wurde von den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten ins Leben gerufen, um private und öffentliche Investitionen in den Bereichen der Energieeffizienz, der erneuerbaren Energie, der Infrastruktur, dem Verkehrs- und Sportwesen, der Gesundheit und der Digitalisierung zu fördern. EFSI wurde zunächst für drei Jahre begründet, um bis 2018 mindestens 315 Milliarden Euro an zusätzlichen Investitionen in der Realwirtschaft zu mobilisieren. Die Kommission möchte EFSI nun sowohl hinsichtlich der Laufzeit als auch der finanziellen Leistungsfähigkeit verlängern. Bislang konzentrierten sich die Investitionen überwiegend auf große Mitgliedstaaten. Durch eine bessere Koordinierung werden nun mehr EFSI-Mittel in kleinere Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich Österreich, fließen. Die Investitionsentscheidungen werden durch online veröffentlichte Erläuterungen detaillierter erklärt, wodurch klar erkennbar wird, dass die ausgewählten Projekte ohne die Unterstützung aus dem EFSI nicht zur gleichen Zeit bzw. nicht im selben Ausmaß finanziert worden wären. Zudem werden die Investitionsentscheidungen transparenter. Der Investitionsausschuss wird ausführlicher erklären und angeben, warum seiner Auffassung nach die Kriterien für eine EFSI-Unterstützung erfüllt sind. Derzeit hat Österreich sechs unterzeichnete Projekte, hauptsächlich in den Bereichen Verkehr (regionale Zuginfrastruktur) und erneuerbare Energien. Diese entsprechen einem Investitionsvolumen von 2,3 Mrd. EUR. Für den Zeitraum 2018-2020 gibt es sechs weitere Projekte, darunter Investitionen in Energieeffizienz, neue Schul- und Krankenhausinfrastrukturen.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – Nous votons ce jour sur l'accord interinstitutionnel qui vise à doubler la durée et la capacité d'intervention du plan européen d'investissement. Cette initiative phare de la Commission Juncker avait été lancée fin 2014 pour faire évoluer les priorités politiques de l'UE après la crise financière en privilégiant une relance de l'investissement en Europe. Le vote d'aujourd'hui entend le poursuivre de manière à porter sa force de frappe à 500 milliards d'euros d'ici à 2020 (et 630 milliards d'ici à 2022). Je rappelle que depuis l'automne 2015, un soutien de 250 milliards d'euros aurait été apporté à plus de 500 000 entreprises, créant ainsi 690 000 nouveaux emplois. Je me félicite du fait que, dans cette nouvelle mouture, les critères d'additionnalité aient été renforcés permettant de sélectionner des projets qui ne trouveraient pas, ou uniquement dans une moindre mesure, de financements pour voir le jour. Reste à le focaliser encore davantage sur les États membres qui en ont le plus besoin. Je salue aussi bien entendu la possibilité de soutenir des projets innovants dans les industries culturelles et dans l'économie et les infrastructures sociales. Je ne peux que souligner la nécessité d'investir encore et encore dans le secteur social! Il y a urgence.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Euroopan strategisten investointien rahastolla, ESIR:llä, tavoitellaan talouskasvua ja työllisyyttä. Niiden toteutuminen riippuu muun muassa rahoitettujen projektien täydentävyydestä eli siitä, että projektit eivät olisi toteutuneet ilman ESIR-rahoitusta. Jos tarkastellaan kuitenkin esimerkiksi viimeaikaista Euroopan investointipankin, EIP:n, päätöstä rahoittaa Helsingin Pasilaan rakennettavaa Tripla-kauppakeskusta 130 miljoonalla eurolla ESIR:n takaamalla luotolla, niin ihmettelen, miten täydentävyys toteutuu. Hanke sinänsä voi olla järkevä, vaikka hankkeen pääasiallisina hyötyjinä ovat yksityiset yritykset. Kilpailukykyiseksi kehitussa rahoituspaketissa on mukana EIP:n lisäksi muita pankkeja, vakavarainen Helsinki ja runsaasti yksityistä rahoitusta. Rahoitusta näyttää riittäneen kaiken Euroopan keskuspankin rahoituksen tarjonnan keskellä runsaasti, minkä johdosta minun on vaikea uskoa, ettei hanke olisi toteutunut ilman ESIR:n tai EIP:n osallisuutta. Jos täydentävyys ei toteudu, on se ESIR-rahojen tuhlausta. Täydentävyys pitää arvioida rahoitushetkellä, ja tällaisten vaikutusarviointien puuttuminen herättää epäilyksiä. Rahojen käyttö ja toteutetut vaikutusarviot eivät riitä perusteeksi myöntää ESIR:lle jatkoa.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

5. Glasovanje

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest głosowanie.

(Wyniki i inne szczegóły dotyczące głosowania: zobacz protokół)

5.1. Održivo upravljanje vanjskim ribarskim flotama (A8-0374/2017 - Linnéa Engström) (glasovanje)

5.2. Izmjene različitih uredbi u području poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja (A8-0380/2017 - Albert Deß) (glasovanje)

5.3. Sustav EU-a za trgovanje emisijskim jedinicama (EU ETS): nastavak postojećih ograničenja područja primjene za zrakoplovne djelatnosti i priprema provedbe globalne tržišno utemeljene mjere od 2021. (A8-0258/2017 - Julie Girling) (glasovanje)

5.4. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (A8-0198/2017 - Udo Bullmann, José Manuel Fernandes) (glasovanje)

5.5. Propisi o ostvarivanju autorskog prava i srodnih prava koja se primjenjuju na određena internetska emitiranja organizacija za radiodifuziju te reemitiranja televizijskih i radijskih programa (A8-0378/2017 - Tiemo Wölken) (glasovanje)

— Przed rozpoczęciem głosowania:

Tiemo Wölken, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! Ganz kurz: Die Verordnung soll die Rechteklärung für Online-Inhalte vereinfachen und damit mehr Inhalte für Europäerinnen und Europäer zugänglich machen und Europa weiter zusammenwachsen lassen.

Die Verordnung führt, anders als diskutiert, keine paneuropäische Lizenz ein. Eine Beschränkung der Reichweite bleibt weiterhin möglich. Die Verordnung schreibt zudem explizit eine Vergütung vor. Ich hätte mir hier in der Tat stärkere Regeln für Urheberinnen und Urheber gewünscht, das war aber mit der Mehrheit nicht zu machen.

Der Bericht im Rechtsausschuss bleibt weit hinter dem Bericht des Verbraucher-Ausschusses zurück, und er bleibt zu Recht auch hinter dem Bericht oder der Stellungnahme des Kulturausschusses zurück und folgt damit dem Industrieausschuss. Einen ausbalancierten Vorschlag kann ich nicht sehen. Was wir erleben werden ist, dass Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher weiter illegale Zugänge wie VPN nutzen, um Inhalte konsumieren zu können. Dafür wird kein Kreativer in Europa einen Cent extra sehen.

Ich finde, wir Europäerinnen und Europäer sollten die audiovisuellen Medien nicht den großen amerikanischen Konzernen überlassen, sondern unsere europäischen Anbieter mit besseren Rechtere Regelungen in die Lage versetzen, Zugänge für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu ermöglichen. Ich will besseren Zugang für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, für sprachliche Minderheiten in der Europäischen Union, und ich will eine faire Vergütung für Kreative.

Ein letzter Hinweis: Die Portabilitätsverordnung, die als Erfolg gefeiert wird, hilft hier nicht, weil sie nur für zeitlich begrenzte Zeiträume gilt, weil sie nur für den Zugang aus dem Heimatland gilt. Darum sollten wir dieses Mandat hier heute im Plenum ablehnen und darüber noch einmal gemeinsam diskutieren. Die Zukunft des kreativen, digitalen Europas ist zu wichtig.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Ich bitte Sie heute, für die Erteilung des Mandats zur Aufnahme von Trilogverhandlungen über die CabSat-Richtlinie zu stimmen. Wir haben monatelang in mehreren Ausschüssen dieses Dossier beraten, und der Bericht, der im Einklang steht mit dem, was im Industrieausschuss und auch im Kulturausschuss beschlossen wurde, ist dann auch mit einer soliden Mehrheit von 15 zu 8 Stimmen im Rechtsausschuss angenommen worden.

Ich möchte zum Inhalt nur eines sagen: Worum geht es in diesem Bericht? Es geht darum, dass wir unsere Kreativen in Europa stärken, dass wir unsere Filmemacher stärken, dass wir unsere Drehbuchautoren, unsere ausübenden Künstler, unsere Regisseure stärken, dass wir unseren kreativen Content stärken. Das, was Europa ausmacht, ist unser kreativer Content. Darum geht es. Es geht nicht um eine Verbraucherschutzregelung, es wird nicht der Zugang zu Inhalten geregelt – letztes Jahr haben wir mit großer Mehrheit die Portabilitätsrichtlinie verabschiedet –, darum geht es nicht, es geht rein um die Frage des Rechteclearings innerhalb der Verwertungskette im Online-Bereich. Und ich bitte Sie wirklich herzlich: Wir haben uns monatelang intensivst mit diesem Dossier befasst, eine Kompromisslinie abgestimmt. Und wenn wir jetzt in die Trilogverhandlungen gehen, dann ist das auch noch nicht das Ende der Geschichte, dann gibt es da auch immer noch Entwicklungen. Aber lassen Sie uns die Trilogverhandlungen aufnehmen! Dann kommen wir zurück und haben auch noch mal Gelegenheit, über den Bericht zu diskutieren.

— *Po zakończeniu głosowania:*

Tiemo Wölken, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank für diese Abstimmung.

In der Tat habe ich seit ungefähr einem Jahr im Rechtsausschuss an diesem Dossier gearbeitet, versucht Europa, digitaler zu machen, Menschen weiter zusammenzubringen. Ich habe noch nie so eine Lobby-Einflussnahme gesehen wie in diesem Dossier. Das ist wirklich interessant.

Das spiegelt sich zum Beispiel auch wider in einer sehr interessanten Debatte, in den Sitzungen, die wir darüber geführt haben. Ich jedenfalls werde mit diesem Mandat nicht in die Trilog-Verhandlungen gehen und werde damit meinen Namen von diesem Bericht zurückziehen. Ich glaube, dass das digitale Europa etwas Besseres verdient hätte.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je voulais juste faire état d'un précédent qui – je pense – concerne notre assemblée et que nous devons souligner et ne pas admettre.

Pour la première fois, sur ce dossier pour lequel nous venons d'adopter le mandat, nous avons vu qu'il y avait des positions diverses, mais c'est un débat qui appartient à cette chambre. Il est fort regrettable qu'un commissaire, un vice-président de la Commission ait jugé bon d'écrire aux parlementaires pour leur expliquer quelle devait être la teneur de leur vote.

Je voulais donc ici dénoncer cette tentative d'influence. Indépendamment du résultat du vote, il est inadmissible que la Commission s'immisce de cette manière dans les délibérations de notre chambre. J'entends que soit rappelée la souveraineté de notre chambre, que ce soit là un précédent unique et que cela ne se renouvelle pas.

5.6. Zahtjev za zaštitu povlastica i imuniteta Eleonore Forenza (A8-0398/2017 - Gilles Lebreton) (glasovanje)

5.7. Zahtjev za ukidanje imuniteta Ingeborg Gräßle (A8-0397/2017 - Jean-Marie Cavada) (glasovanje)

5.8. Carine na uvoz određenih proizvoda podrijetlom iz Sjedinjenih Američkih Država (A8-0331/2017 - Jiří Maštálka) (glasovanje)

5.9. Sporazum o zračnom prometu između EU-a i SAD-a (A8-0376/2017 - Theresa Griffin) (glasovanje)

5.10. Sporazum između Europske unije i Švicarske o povezivanju njihovih sustava trgovanja emisijama stakleničkih plinova (A8-0386/2017 - Christofer Fjellner) (glasovanje)

5.11. Sporazum o pojačanom partnerstvu i suradnji između EU-a i Kazahstana (Suglasnost) (A8-0325/2017 - Liisa Jaakonsaari) (glasovanje)

— Przed rozpoczęciem głosowania:

Liisa Jaakonsaari, esittelijä. – Arvoisa puhemies, monta vuotta kestänyt prosessi on nyt päättymässä tähän parlamentin äänestykseen. Mielestäni on sen suuren työn merkityksen korostamista vedota vielä kerran Kazakstanin viranomaisiin, jotta vapautettaisiin poliittiset vangit ja vahvistettaisiin jo käynnissä olevaa ihmisoikeusdialogia. Jos näin tapahtuu, voimme olla Euroopan parlamenttina ylpeitä näistä äänestyksistä.

5.12. Sporazum o pojačanom partnerstvu i suradnji između EU-a i Kazahstana (Rezolucija) (A8-0335/2017 - Liisa Jaakonsaari) (glasovanje)

5.13. Obnova mandata predsjednice Jedinstvenog sanacijskog odbora (A8-0393/2017 - Roberto Gualtieri) (glasovanje)

5.14. Izvješće o građanstvu EU-a za 2017.: Jačanje prava građana u Uniji demokratskih promjena (A8-0385/2017 - Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea) (glasovanje)

5.15. Ususret strategiji digitalne trgovine (A8-0384/2017 - Marietje Schaake) (glasovanje)

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam głosowanie.

6. Образložенја гласованја

6.1. Izmjene različitih uredbi u području poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja (A8-0380/2017 - Albert Deß)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Lo que más nos preocupa de este informe es la desaparición de la figura obligatoria del agricultor activo, porque esto supone que los campos de golf puedan volver a recibir ayudas y que el dinero acabe en manos de quienes acaparan la tierra y no generan riqueza para el pueblo. Tememos, también, la vía libre para que el dinero de la PAC vaya a las compañías financieras, algo que entendemos solo va a ayudar a continuar aumentando la especulación del mercado con la comida, mientras que en el mundo mueren cada día cuarenta mil personas de hambre.

Dicen que quieren fortalecer el papel de los productores en la cadena de valor. Sin embargo, establecen controles para no anular la competencia, no vaya ser que los productores tengan realmente algún poder para poner en jaque las ganancias de las grandes distribuidoras. Pero claro, eso sabemos que no interesa.

Necesitamos una política agroalimentaria común que ponga en el centro la defensa de los derechos de los campesinos y la visión de las mujeres. Más valor a quienes pueden mitigar la lucha contra el cambio climático y menos poder para las grandes corporaciones y el agronegocio. Así de sencillo.

Una PAC en ese sentido sí que podría cambiar las cosas, pero ya sabemos que a ustedes no les interesa.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, мерките, които приехме в рамките на пакета „Омнибус“ днес, имат реален шанс да дадат нов импулс на европейското земеделие. Организациите на производителите все още не са достатъчно атрактивни в някои държави членки, като моята – България. Надявам се, че с новите улеснени правила производителите ще успеят да извървят пътя към секторно обединение.

По-гъвкавите правила при прилагането на мярката „Млад фермер“ също ще спомогнат за ангажиране на повече хора в сектор „Селско стопанство“. Като докладчик относно пчеларския сектор съм изключително доволен, че земите под угар, засадени с медоносни култури, вече ще могат да бъдат признати като екологично насочени площи. Това е добра новина за пчеларството в България и в Европейския съюз.

Мерките, които също подкрепих, включват и по-силна позиция за производителите в сектор „Мляко“. Недопустимо е отношението към тях, особено към овцевъдите, козевъдите и говедовъдите. Договорите за закупуване на суровината ще дадат повече сигурност и ще направят сектора по-стабилен, а оттам – и по-атрактивен.

6.2. Sustav EU-a za trgovanje emisijskim jedinicama (EU ETS): nastavak postojećih ograničenja područja primjene za zrakoplovne djelatnosti i priprema provedbe globalne tržišno utemeljene mjere od 2021. (A8-0258/2017 - Julie Girling)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, I voted against this. I voted against it because, in reality, the Emissions Trading System (ETS) has been an absolute, complete failure. Now, it is a very good report. I am not criticising the author; I am criticising the aspect that the ETS system is fundamentally flawed. It has got little to do with lowering emissions. It is designed to raise revenue as a stealth tax, and it is also designed as a protectionist measure. The net effect of the proposed changes to the ETS in aviation policy will mean more taxes on tourists, more taxes on business travellers, and it will push up the price of imports. That helps European Union-based manufacturers and farmers, but ultimately does not help the aviation sector.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I was pleased to vote in favour of this report. Up until last year, obstacles were continually posed by third countries to European legislation being applicable to their airlines, and this was to the extent that aviation had never been applied to the emissions trading system (ETS) in its original scope.

EU provisions on flights between the EU and third countries have been suspended twice with a view to encouraging the International Civil Aviation Organization process to agree on a global strategy to decrease aviation emissions. It is imperative that we take measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions, particularly from international aviation. This is essential to keep global warming below the two degrees above pre-industrial levels as agreed in the 2015 Paris agreement on climate change, where I had the honour of representing this Parliament.

As the international aviation sector is a rapidly developing source of greenhouse gas emissions, this report marks a welcome step in Parliament's work on the EU ETS, and I support the progress on the same.

6.3. Produljenje trajanja Europskog fonda za strateška ulaganja (A8-0198/2017 - Udo Bullmann, José Manuel Fernandes)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, once again I voted in favour of this report, which proposes to extend the duration of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), which is indeed a very welcome development.

I must thank also Commissioner Katainen for specifically mentioning me in relation to my promotion of EFSI in my country. The fact it is being extended now is an indication of its success. If it wasn't successful, we would not be extending it. Sometimes I think people in this House are too slow to give credit where credit is due.

This is a wonderful development. It has been used in my country and in many other countries and will continue to be used into the future, for which Commissioner Katainen and President Juncker deserve great credit.

One thing I would say, though, is that in extending it they should look at smaller projects, especially in smaller countries, because a small project in a small country can be relatively big in the overall context. This is a great development. I look forward to further promoting it in my country in the new year through public hearings.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο βίος και η πολιτεία του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων στην Ελλάδα έχει εγείρει έντονες αντιδράσεις, κι αυτό γιατί, αντί να συμβάλει στην αύξηση των επενδύσεων, αντί να συμβάλει στην προσθετικότητα, έχει μετατραπεί σε εργαλείο χρηματοδότησης της αρπαγής της ελληνικής δημόσιας περιουσίας από τις πολυεθνικές των δανειστών και κυρίως της Γερμανίας. Έτσι η Fraport, στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων, χρηματοδοτήθηκε με δάνειο 280 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, ποσό που με τη μόχλευση έφτασε τα 400 εκατομμύρια ευρώ, προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί έτσι η Fraport να αρπάξει αντί πινακίου φακής 14 ελληνικά περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια. Ομοίως η Cosmote, η θυγατρική της κρατικής Deutsche Telekom, χρηματοδοτήθηκε στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων με 450 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Με τα μνημόνια λοιπόν επιβλήθηκαν ιδιωτικοποιήσεις ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων, τις οποίες λεηλατούν κρατικές γερμανικές επιχειρήσεις με δανειακά κεφάλαια από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων. Ντροπή!

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, danas sam podržala nastavak EFSI-ja jer je važno održavati razinu ulaganja u Europskoj uniji, ali posebno u privatne, inovativne i rizične projekte.

EFSI nije dovoljno prisutan u manje razvijenim državama članicama, a posebno u susjednim državama kandidatkinjama. Razlog za to nije nedostatak projekata u tim državama, kako se često zna čuti, već nedostatak administrativnih kapaciteta. Upravo zato u nastavku EFSI-ja moramo ojačati ulogu Europskog savjetodavnog centra za ulaganja, koji treba povećati svoje aktivnosti u slabije razvijenim državama i ojačati ulogu nacionalnih razvojnih banaka te raditi na stvaranju teritorijalnih platformi za pomoć.

U odnosu na druge instrumente iz Europskog proračuna, EIB-a, EBRD-a ili drugih institucija, EFSI treba biti nadogradnja, a nikako zamjena, i mora djelovati u sinergiji, a ne miješati se, ispreplitati i preklapati s drugima.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, antes de la crisis, la inversión de la Unión Europea rozaba el 23 % del PIB. Hoy apenas llega al 20 %, amenazando la viabilidad de nuestro modelo productivo. Debido a los recortes la inversión pública se ha desplomado un 25 %, una situación que el FEIE no ha hecho nada por resolver.

La Unión Europea dispone de instrumentos para hacer llegar la financiación a la economía real. Por un lado, el BEI, cuya estructura debe reforzarse para que sus recursos contribuyan a estimular el crédito a las pymes y a los proyectos de interés general. Por otro lado, el Banco Central Europeo, que debería reformarse para eliminar cualquier condicionalidad en su intervención en los mercados de deuda pública.

De lo que carece la Unión Europea es de un presupuesto a la altura de sus necesidades, capaz de cohesionar territorialmente a Europa y de asegurar la solidaridad entre los europeos. El FEIE no solo sustituye a la inversión pública europea, al contrario, la reorienta exclusivamente en interés de los inversores privados. Así no se puede construir un proyecto para Europa, exclusivamente en manos de los mercados, y por eso mismo mi voto ha sido en contra.

Thomas Mann (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wann immer wir die Frage stellen: „Was machen wir in Europa eigentlich? Ist das sichtbar, ist das erlebbar?“, dann stelle ich fest, EFSI gehört dazu. Jean-Claude-Juncker-Plan nennen wir das Ganze; Dafür zu sorgen, dass strategische Investitionen stattfinden können. Ich freue mich über diesen Solidaritätsfonds. Ich freue mich darüber, dass wir sagen können: Wir haben eben keine Trennung zwischen Ost und West.

Herr Marias arbeitet ja seine Wortmeldungen ständig an dem Motto „Immer gegen Deutschland“ und am Thema Austerität und dergleichen mehr ab. Das ist doch völlig falsch. Auch solche Unternehmen müssen gefördert werden. Es sollte auch den Griechen sehr wohl zugutekommen.

Also ich denke, der EFSI ist wirklich ein wichtiger Meilenstein. Noch hat in vielen Details nicht alles gestimmt, aber die Richtung stimmt. Die Grundlinie ist deutlich zu machen. Wir lassen die Menschen dabei nicht allein, damit wirklich strategische Investitionen mit Zukunftscharakter realisiert werden können. Wenn wir in auf einem solchen Weg weitermachen, wird man mehr spüren: Europa ist dafür da, die Menschen nicht allein zu lassen. Das ist Jean-Claude Juncker meiner Meinung nach absolut gelungen. Ich bin froh, dass wir heute eine klare Abstimmung hatten. Ich habe natürlich für den exzellenten Bericht der Kollegen Bullmann und Fernandes gestimmt.

6.4. Izvješće o građanstvu EU-a za 2017.: Jačanje prava građana u Uniji demokratskih promjena (A8-0385/2017 - Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, I have just voted for, and we have just adopted, a very important report on strengthening citizenship. There is a group of people, though, who would love their citizenship rights to be strengthened. Right now, that said, they would give everything for those rights just to be respected, maintained and guaranteed.

In adopting this report today, Mr President, I believe we have made very clear again in this Parliament that citizens' rights, the rights of EU citizens in the UK, are not there to be negotiated. They are not negotiating currency; they are not there to be offered to people or for concessions to be made to people. They are much more important than that.

This Parliament will have to continue to be vigilant against that and against threats to that in these coming months, and I am sure it will be. We have already seen the so-called agreement unravel very quickly from the end of last week. Citizenship rights, the rights of citizens across Europe are not there to be negotiated away by politicians.

Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I voted against this report because many important things have been pushed out and, on the contrary, some off-topic things like rejection of unilateral changes in internal borders were voted in this report. In my opinion, it is scandalous that this citizenship report says almost nothing on the existence of so-called non-citizens – of which there are about 300 000 in Latvia, my country, and 100 000 in neighbouring Estonia.

These people are deprived of a number of rights and, despite having filed with the Committee on Petitions a petition bearing more than 10 000 signatures from Latvia and Estonia on voting rights for non-citizens, this problem is not tackled in this report. Eight years ago, this problem was mentioned in a similar resolution, and Parliament voted for this. This problem is still not resolved, and the rights of 400 000 people – permanent residents of the European Union – are still being denied.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, well for me when Mr Timmermans addressed the Committee on Constitutional Affairs meeting recently and stated that petitions should not be seen as a tool of direct democracy, this underlined the farce of the European Union guarantee of citizens' rights and democratic voice. When there are European Union calls from this Chamber to ban a national referendum, as the Green Party leader did only a short while ago, and when the European Union has made the application of rights such a critical part of the Brexit talks, actually it is all about control and has got nothing to do with delivering rights because they will not offer a reciprocal deal for United Kingdom residents living in Europe.

I could not support this report. If those issues had been included, addressed and reviewed there might have been a chance.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rozmawiamy na temat praw obywatelskich w 25. rocznicę zagwarantowania prawa obywateli w traktacie z 1992 r. Ta wspaniała unijna idea dotyczy 500 mln ludzi. I to też jest dla nas bardzo ważny cel, choć trzeba wyraźnie zaznaczyć, że jeszcze nie w pełni zrealizowany. W tym miejscu warto bowiem podkreślić, że idea obywatelskości w Unii Europejskiej oznacza również osiągnięcie i utrzymanie w zjednoczonej Europie i w państwach członkowskich podstawowych wartości Unii Europejskiej, do których należy zaliczyć wolność, równość, demokrację, równouprawnienie, niedyskryminację, i to między innymi z takich powodów jak płeć przynależność państwowa, orientacja seksualna, wiek, język, pochodzenie etniczne, religia czy niepełnosprawność. Mówiąc o prawach obywatelskich, należy także pamiętać o zagwarantowaniu obywatelom Unii Europejskiej prawa do ochrony zdrowia i zabezpieczenia emerytalnego, i to bez względu na to, gdzie mieszkają i z jakiego państwa członkowskiego pochodzą, o ile są na terytorium Unii Europejskiej, na terytorium zjednoczonej Europy.

6.5. Ususret strategiji digitalne trgovine (A8-0384/2017 - Marietje Schaake)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Mr President, most of our trade rules date back to the analogue time. We urgently need to make them fit for the digital age. Decent working conditions, privacy and fair competition are all being challenged whilst the rules of the game are outdated.

I welcome this report, which complements the work of this Parliament, which we already did on issues including, in particular, the Trade in Services (TiSA) negotiations. I am particularly pleased with the fact that a consensus is emerging on excluding data transfer rules from investment protection provisions. This report strongly reaffirms the conditions that we have laid down in relation to the TiSA negotiations and any future agreement. It is now up to the Commission to rise to the challenge of digitalisation. We need strong rules to synch technological with social progress, ensuring really fair trade for all.

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

7. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono o godz. 12.59)

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

8. Nastavak zasjedanja

(Ședința a fost reluată la ora 15.00)

9. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik

10. Stanje u Afganistanu (rasprava)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este Declarația Vicepreședintelui Comisiei/Înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate referitoare la situația din Afganistan (2017/2932(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, dear colleagues, Afghanistan and its people are a priority for the European Union and we definitely care about peace in that country, and the possibility of a national renaissance. The Brussels Conference on Afghanistan was a turning point in our cooperation. We Europeans have stepped up our engagement with Afghanistan, both financially and through a new diplomatic push with regional and international players.

Now, one year later, we can see progress in a number of areas. Key achievements include the National Strategy for Combating Corruption, and also the successful work of the Citizens' Charter, Women's Economic Empowerment National Priority Plan, and managing migration in the country. Progress has also been made on budget and fiscal reform; and the government has taken several measures to create a more competitive, export-oriented and job-creating economy.

But the work is not finished. The security situation remains fragile. There have been a number of attacks in Kabul and other areas against security forces and places of worship affecting innocent civilians, including women and children. We are alarmed by the high level of violence and the number of civilian casualties – and, frankly, reconciliation and sustainable peace are the absolute priority for Afghanistan and also for us as the European Union – but a peace process can only be successful if it is led and owned by the Afghans themselves.

The Afghan Government can count on the EU to be a partner in its search for peace. We will not stop working to create the right environment towards a negotiated settlement, including through the work of the recently appointed EU Special Envoy for Afghanistan.

We want to support the country in the areas where it needs it the most. And precisely to discuss these priorities, last February we have signed a Cooperation Agreement on Partnership and Development with the Afghan Government. The Cooperation Agreement is a political commitment to set up a constant dialogue on all the issues we care about, from the economy to migration, from women's empowerment to human rights.

First, we are with the government as it tries to bolster the country's fragile economy. This includes support to the rural economy, but also to the fight against drugs as well as illegal mining. Helping to strengthen Afghanistan's regional connectivity is also quite important for us.

Second, there can be no sustainable development when human rights and fundamental freedoms are not respected. Whilst some progress has been achieved in this field, a lot still needs to be done to improve women's and children's rights, to abolish the death penalty, to prevent torture and ill-treatment, to guarantee access to justice and the freedom of expression and to support human rights defenders.

The development of Afghanistan also requires women and girls to be able to contribute in full to the country's social, economic and political life, as well as to the future peace process. So we are working to empower women in Afghanistan – helping girls go to school, training policewomen, and supporting innovative projects by female entrepreneurs.

Third point, we have started a comprehensive dialogue with Afghanistan on migration. Let us be clear on this: managing human mobility is an interest we share with the Afghan people. We both want the Afghan youth to find better opportunities at home. We both want to prevent that the people of Afghanistan risk their lives in dangerous journeys across the world. We both want also that those who return home can have the opportunity to a better life.

To this end, we have already mobilised almost EUR 200 million to ensure the returnees' reintegration into society, and we will continue to work in the framework of the Joint Way Forward (JWF), a common political engagement for managing migration in a sustainable way, based on solidarity and dialogue. Finally, we are working to strengthen democracy in the country, and also the rule of law and promoting good governance.

Part of this work is the fight against corruption. The Afghan Government has stepped up its anti-corruption measures and adopted in October a national anti-corruption strategy. Implementation of this strategy is now what truly matters.

We also as the European Union continue to support the civilian aspects of the security sector reform: a new police advisory project will be launched soon.

Next year, in 2018, Afghanistan is expected to hold parliamentary and district elections, followed by presidential elections in 2019. These elections need to be transparent, credible and inclusive, including for women. The Afghan authorities still need to implement a thorough electoral reform to ensure the trust of the electoral stakeholders in the process. We have already committed around EUR 19 million to support and accompany a democratic electoral process.

My dear colleagues, the Afghan people deserve democracy and human rights; they deserve peace and prosperity. The European Union will continue to work with its partners in the Afghan Government to achieve this. It is not an easy goal. At the same time, we will further develop our engagement with our international partners, to make Afghanistan and our common region more peaceful and more prosperous. Our commitment to Afghanistan and its people is here to stay.

Tunne Kelam, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, the EU and its Member States have cooperated with Afghanistan since 2001 in a joint effort to counter the terrorist surge and create the conditions for stability and sustainable development. Without a stable and secure Afghanistan, there can be no peace and stability in the region as a whole. It has proved a difficult and controversial but also a rewarding task, with encouraging progress in some areas like the economy and education, and renewed problems in others.

Recently, security has been weakened by the increased terrorist activities of the Taliban and the resurgence of al-Qaeda and ISIS groups. Last year, there were about 600 000 newly displaced persons internally.

Our message today is that there is no alternative to the continuation of the strong international engagement under the auspices of the UN. The EU is an important and constructive part of that engagement. It is also crucial to keep the 39 nation NATO-led Resolute Support Mission operating as it is vital for building and strengthening Afghanistan's security forces and institutions.

Second, striking out the financing of terrorism. The continued production and trade of opium has a devastating impact not only domestically, but also for security internationally. Only an all-inclusive Afghan-led peace and reconciliation process will be a viable way towards a sustainable resolution of the conflict, and I would draw attention to the need to include disarmament and the reintegration of former insurgents as part of that.

Ana Gomes, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Lamento, Comissário, mas é uma vergonha a estratégia da União Europeia para o Afeganistão, assumindo como uma das prioridades um acordo de readmissão assinado sem qualquer escrutínio democrático por este Parlamento. Indo a reboque da retórica anti-imigrantes da extrema-direita na Europa, a estratégia ofusca a realidade trágica no Afeganistão, marcada pelo conflito, ataques terroristas, falhas de governação estruturais num país onde grassa a corrupção, o narcotráfico, onde a violação dos direitos das mulheres, das crianças e da minoria Hazara é sistemática.

Este acordo é desumano, viola os valores da União Europeia. O Afeganistão não é ainda país seguro para ninguém e ainda menos para os requerentes de asilo que estão a ser deportados. Saúdo os pilotos alemães que se vêm recusando a transportá-los de volta. Salvam mais do que a segurança dos voos, salvam a memória e a honra perdidas por tantos na Alemanha e na Europa.

Ao contrário do que a Comissão e o Conselho pretendem, os deportados não regressam a casa, mas são atirados, sem escolha, para a exclusão, deixados à mercê de terroristas e da criminalidade organizada. É no combate ao narcotráfico por boa governação, por educação, justiça, desenvolvimento económico que promova emprego e oportunidades para os jovens que se deve centrar a estratégia da União Europeia para o Afeganistão, assentando sempre no respeito pelos direitos humanos de todos os afegãos, em especial da maioria dos cidadãos violentados que são mulheres e crianças.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the situation in Afghanistan does show some signs of improvement, but we must not shy away from the very clear gaps in security that still persist. GDP does still continue to grow. Life expectancy has been extended, and more and more young girls are finding their way into education for the very first time.

The Taliban, nevertheless, poses a sustained and credible security threat, with ISIS and the Haqqani network among the terrorist groups compounding the problem. Attacks against the Supreme Court in February, as well as a blast in the diplomatic quarter of Kabul in May, illustrate this problem only too clearly. Across the country, 2017 has seen a record high in terms of terrorist-caused civilian deaths, the highest number for 16 years.

The link between security at home and security in Afghanistan cannot be ignored, and it is important that this link is continually underlined, particularly in the face of a sceptical public opinion throughout the European Union. It is vital, therefore, that the EU and Member States remain engaged and at the forefront of international efforts to support the Afghan Government in its efforts to stabilise the country in terms of both the economy and security.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, last year the Brussels Conference on Afghanistan showed an exceptional international commitment to the country. Today, we have not moved much closer to the overarching goal, which is to achieve Afghanistan's self-reliance. The EU, together with its Member States, is Afghanistan's largest donor and this in itself brings us extraordinary responsibilities. However, there is no other solution than that of building a coalition with other international and regional partners, the government and civil society that works even more effectively.

I strongly believe that we should focus on four crucial pillars. To begin with, it is fundamental to continue promoting peace, stability and security. We must aim to achieve an inclusive peace process, as only a regional solution can be sustainable. Secondly, ahead of next year's elections, we have to advance with the difficult task of state building, with special attention given to women's rights and the uncompromised fight against corruption. Moreover, we need to accelerate economic and social development. For example, we can explore the ways in which Afghanistan could use its vast mineral potential. Finally, regarding the EU engagement on migration challenges, those coming back home from Europe or its neighbouring countries must find a safe environment with real opportunities to restart their lives. This is essential.

The people of Afghanistan deserve our support and cooperation. We must carry on our common work for each and every one of them and their future, as well as for our success.

Sabine Lösing, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Tägliche Anschläge seit über 16 Jahren, Tausende zivile Opfer, alljährlich Zerstörung der Lebensgrundlagen, Hunderttausende Menschen auf der Flucht, NATO-Truppenaufstockung und unbegrenzter US-Militäreinsatz – klingt das für Sie nach einem sicheren Land, einem sicheren Herkunftsland? Es ist sogar das zweitunsicherste Land der Welt. Um es mit den Worten von Pro Asyl zu sagen: Afghanistan ist kein sicheres Land. Und dennoch werden trotz der desaströsen Sicherheitslage Sammelabschiebungen von EU-Mitgliedstaaten nach Afghanistan durchgeführt, so erst wieder letzten Donnerstag in Deutschland. Was für eine groteske, menschenverachtende Logik!

Auch wenn durchaus manches besser geworden ist, ist doch nichts wirklich gut. Die militärische Seite des Konflikts hat nicht nur zahlreiche Todesopfer mit einer riesigen Dunkelziffer verursacht, sondern auch riesige finanzielle Summen verschlungen. Die Souveränität des afghanischen Staates ist nach über einem Jahrzehnt von den USA und der NATO geführter Interventionen noch immer nicht gewährleistet. Im Gegenteil: Das Land ist höchst abhängig von seinen externen Gebern, die Sicherheit verschlechtert sich weiterhin, die Budgets für zivilgesellschaftliche Aufgaben und Demokratisierung werden gekappt, und die militärische Präsenz, insbesondere die offensiven Operationen, heizt den Konflikt weiter an. Und dennoch soll mit dieser erfolglosen, zerstörerischen Strategie weitergemacht werden.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Säkerhetssituationen i Afghanistan har förvärrats igen och enligt FN finns över 1,8 miljoner internflyktingar i Afghanistan. I genomsnitt flyr 1 500 personer per dag internt. Bara år 2016 var det en ökning med 650 000.

Afghanistan är också ett av de fattigaste länderna i världen och situationen förvärras av de sociala och ekonomiska svårigheterna att integrera alla internflyktingar och tusentals afghanska flyktingar som återvänder från närliggande länder dagligen samtidigt som alla afghanska ungdomar också ska in på arbetsmarknaden.

Bara i Pakistan lever 1,7 miljoner afghanska flyktingar och i Iran 1 miljon som myndigheterna där vill skicka tillbaka. Till det ska läggas att också EU-länder, som egentligen bidrar med att ta emot en väldigt liten del av de afghanska flyktingarna, skickar tillbaka t.o.m. ungdomar som varit flyktingar i hela sitt liv och aldrig satt sin fot i landet.

Och hur är det tänkt att Afghanistan ska återhämta sig, nå fred, komma ur fattigdom, korruption, narkotikahandel och klara utmaningen att skapa arbetstillfälle för både dem som redan bor där och dem som återvänder, när den stora faran är att de som sänds tillbaka fångas upp av talibaner, Daesh eller andra kriminella gäng som enda utväg att försörja sig.

Det här löser vi inte genom att bara utöka våra militära insatser eller för den delen de civila. Det som för mig är väldigt problematiskt i vår politik är det motsägelsefulla att samtidigt som medlemsstaterna utökar den militära närvaron i landet p.g.a. försämrade säkerhetsläge så skickar vi afghaner tillbaka mot bakgrund av ett förbättrat säkerhetsläge.

Hur ska vi ha det egentligen? Är det så säkert att man kan åka tillbaka utan problem borde det inte finnas något behov av att skicka fler soldater.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel libro *Eršād al-zerā'a – Guida all'agricoltura*, di uno studioso del quattordicesimo secolo, si racconta come in Afghanistan, solo nella zona di Herat, crescessero oltre cento varietà distinte di vite, mandorle, albicocche, melograni, gelsi, pistacchi e fichi. L'Afghanistan era un Eden, con un clima particolarmente favorevole rispetto ai propri vicini.

Oggi l'ONU ci dice che l'Afghanistan ha battuto ogni record di produzione dell'oppio: 9 000 tonnellate di papavero coltivate su 328 000 ettari di terreno; più 87 % di produzione, più 63 % di superficie rispetto al 2016. La maggior parte arriverà sulle nostre strade, trasformato in eroina, e finanzia l'eterno conflitto afghano, che a distanza di 17 anni dal primo intervento statunitense non accenna a placarsi.

Nel paese si combattono infatti almeno tre guerre parallele: quella contro la droga, quella contro l'insorgenza talebana e quella contro la corruzione. E tutte e tre si stanno perdendo, prova ne sia la decisione di Trump di impiegare 4 000 nuovi uomini in Afghanistan, dopo un 2017 complesso, dove all'insorgenza talebana si è affiancato l'Isis, sempre più attivo e pronto, secondo diversi analisti internazionali, a costruire la propria prossima roccaforte nel paese.

L'Europa invoca giustamente un processo politico a guida afghana, nel quale tutte le parti si possano sedere a un tavolo negoziale: soluzione difficile, soprattutto fino a quando il conflitto continuerà ad essere una gallina dalle uova d'oro per tutte le parti coinvolte; per le forze afgane, che attraverso ufficiali corrotti dirottano verso i ribelli, dietro lauto pagamento, le armi e gli aiuti ricevuti dagli alleati occidentali; e per i talebani stessi, che attraverso la coltivazione dell'oppio, lo sfruttamento delle risorse naturali e diversi altri traffici illeciti, stanno accumulando fortune dell'ordine di miliardi di dollari.

Ci sono però alcuni dati positivi: il PIL pro capite del paese sta crescendo, l'aspettativa di vita si sta allungando, l'accesso alla sanità e alla scolarizzazione aumenta, seppur di poco. Su questi dati bisogna costruire puntando soprattutto sui giovani, che stanno lottando faticosamente per cambiare l'immagine e la gestione del paese.

L'UE dovrebbe attivarsi mettendo in campo politiche che puntino alla loro valorizzazione, che contribuiranno a una maturazione dell'intera società afghana, togliendo, nel contempo, terreno fertile al reclutamento terroristico. Serviranno forse vent'anni, ma è l'unica strada percorribile.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la situation en Afghanistan est un véritable désastre. Elle est d'autant plus dramatique que ce pays est en théorie libéré et démocratique depuis seize ans.

Au niveau sécuritaire, en dehors des grandes villes, le gouvernement de Kaboul est toujours face aux seigneurs de la guerre.

Aux niveaux économique et social, comme mon collègue l'a dit, 9 000 tonnes de drogues sont produites, deux fois plus que du temps des talibans, soi-disant le pire des régimes – et c'était le pire des régimes. Faut-il dire que la production de drogues se fait aussi avec la complicité de l'Occident? Le pavot équivaut à 35 % du PIB, emploie deux millions d'Afghans et, pourtant, il y a plus de 40 % de chômage.

Au niveau géopolitique, le désordre afghan s'est déplacé au Pakistan et, depuis la chute de Musharraf, cette puissance nucléaire, qui avait droit, elle, à sa bombe, est également en totale dérive dans la région.

L'Union ne doit pas rajouter du désordre au désordre en voulant intervenir à tout prix. En réunissant les acteurs régionaux – Iran, Russie, Chine – et en soutenant les équilibres des puissances, elle fera œuvre de paix, et non en intervenant directement.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, nebezpečí vzniku extrémisty řízeného teokratického jaderného celku Afghánistán – Pákistán stále trvá. Části Pákistánu, jaderné velmoci, Tálibán ovládá. Tentýž Tálibán ohrožoval a ohrožuje sousední Afghánistán. Zejména proto je i dnes zapotřebí, dámy a pánové, mezinárodní kontrola a mezinárodní vojenská přítomnost v Afghánistánu.

Vztahy mezi Evropskou unií a Afghánistánem upravuje dohoda o partnerství a rozvoji. Nová strategie Evropské unie vůči Afghánistánu byla představena letos v červenci. Jsou to užitečné dokumenty podporující stabilitu a regionální bezpečnost. Přesto se však domnívám, že se dostatečně nezabýváme palčivým problémem bývalých afghánských spolupracovníků. Jsou to často občanští zaměstnanci cizích armád. Patří mezi ně i tlumočníci. Spolupracovali s cizí armádou a tím vystavili sebe i svoje rodiny ohrožení. Tisíce afghánských tlumočnicků se po odcházejících koaličních jednotkách ocitly bez ochrany.

Potřebujeme pro ně speciální vízová a azylová řešení. Nemůžeme si dovolit hodit je přes palubu, jak se často i v mé zemi, České republice, děje. Mám na mysli tlumočnický u českých jednotek v provincii Lógar. Dáváme je tím na pospas extremistickým islamistickým silám, které využívají pocitů křivdy našich bývalých spolupracovníků.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono state più di 8 000, nel corso del 2017, le vittime civili registrate in Afghanistan, e uno su tre è un bambino. E basterebbero questi numeri, colleghi, a raccontare di un paese che vive una realtà di guerra quotidiana. Basterebbero questi numeri a raccontarci di come la situazione in Afghanistan rimane gravemente e altamente instabile.

Continuano gli attacchi ad ospedali, continuano gli attacchi ai centri per gli aiuti umanitari, la corruzione rimane a livelli altissimi, così come è incessante il traffico di droga e il traffico illegale di armi, in particolare, dobbiamo dirlo, verso organizzazioni terroristiche. E quindi certamente non possiamo definire l'Afghanistan un paese stabile, non possiamo definire l'Afghanistan un paese sicuro, soprattutto per i suoi stessi cittadini, soprattutto per i bambini, per le donne, e il rientro nel paese di rifugiati, in particolare di coloro che non hanno più una rete sociale o familiare, equivale ad una condanna a morte. Ed è bene ribadirlo anche oggi, è bene ribadirlo in quest'Aula.

Patricia Lalonde (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, l'Afghanistan est à un tournant. Depuis quelques mois, les combattants de Daech se sont installés dans les provinces de Nangarhar, de Logar et maintenant de Djôzdjân dans le nord de l'Afghanistan. Ils sont entrés dans ces provinces pour aider les combattants talibans et utilisent les femmes et les enfants comme boucliers humains. Un combattant français et un combattant algérien font d'ailleurs partie des combattants de Daech qui viennent juste d'arriver de Syrie, ce qui est très inquiétant.

Le gouvernement d'unité nationale n'est actuellement pas stable et est accusé de corruption. Le président Ashraf Ghani et le premier ministre Abdullah Abdullah doivent trouver un moyen de travailler ensemble plus efficacement. C'est pourquoi il est important que le poste de premier ministre soit officiellement créé dans la Constitution.

Fort heureusement, la décision américaine de rester en Afghanistan est une bonne décision, mais l'ancien chef de guerre Gulbuddin Hekmatyar est entré à Kaboul il y a six mois, accueilli – fait troublant – par le président Ashraf Ghani. Hekmatyar était supposé établir un accord avec les talibans, mais personne ne peut nier que, depuis son arrivée avec ses combattants venant du Pakistan, la situation sécuritaire se détériore très rapidement et aucun progrès n'a été fait sur les négociations avec les talibans afghans. Je parle de ceux qui souhaitent accepter la Constitution actuelle, garantissant notamment les droits de l'homme, la démocratie et surtout les droits des femmes.

La déstabilisation de l'Afghanistan passe aussi par le Pakistan, qui, via ses services de renseignement, renvoie de force les migrants afghans dans leur pays et continue de soutenir les groupes islamistes alliés aux talibans, tels que le réseau Haqqani. La démocratie afghane est, elle aussi, dans une grande instabilité puisque de forts soupçons continuent de peser sur la commission électorale indépendante et la commission des plaintes électorales. L'insécurité du pays et la recrudescence des attaques à Kaboul et dans les provinces nous font craindre que le pays puisse être au bord de la guerre civile et tomber dans les mains des extrémistes.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, our policy in relation to Afghanistan has proved an abject failure. Whilst the last military campaign was relatively successful, the UK has been heavily involved in this country since 2001 and our state-building efforts must now take second place to the ability of the Taliban to use the narcotics trade to build up a huge war chest. Since the retreat from Kabul in 1842, my country has faced various painful interventions here, and it could be reasonably argued that very little has been achieved. Humanitarian intervention has seen much blood and financial expenditure on my country's part, with little improvement to the lives of many Afghan citizens.

The UK must continue to contribute to international security, attempt to combat the supply of narcotics and of course secure our national interests. Judging by last year's record opium poppy yield and heroin production figures in Afghanistan, the means by which we do this are not currently working. It is time for a radical rethink.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, in October, the European Council adopted the new EU strategy for Afghanistan. The Council wants an inclusive peace process although the security situation is worsening. Taliban attacks on both civilian and military targets continue. Given this, it is not acceptable that the Council refrains from mentioning the role of neighbouring Pakistan in harbouring Taliban fighters. Contrary to Pakistani claims that it has solved this problem, the commander of the NATO forces in Afghanistan stated just two weeks ago that Pakistan had yet to act against Afghan Taliban.

As an example, the Haqqani network is still operating from Pakistan. Owing to its brutal attacks on innocent civilians and foreign embassies, Haqqani is considered the most ruthless terrorist network in Afghanistan. Combating Taliban terrorists is imperative for the whole region. Pakistan must take its responsibility for regional stability. Pakistan must not be a safe haven for the Taliban. The EU should say this, and we should say it loud and clear.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, the European Union and its Member States have engaged in a partnership with Afghanistan together with the international community, a partnership underpinned by a common strategic interest in fighting terrorism and extremism. Nowadays, Afghanistan's situation has improved in terms of economic and social development compared to 2001. However, the progress made so far is threatened by a difficult security situation, with a high level of violence and a high number of casualties, by weak democratic institutions, with an administration in Kabul that controls less and less territory, coupled with a fragile economic framework and difficult state of human rights.

Our commitment to supporting an Afghan-led and Afghan-owned peace process has to remain unabated. I fully welcome the new EU strategy on Afghanistan, which focuses on the necessary conditions for a political solution to the conflict and on developing the country's institutions and economy while also tackling migration-related issues.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Mr President, in the last decade, significant progress has been made in Afghanistan. Millions of children go to school, infrastructure has been built and, despite the resistance of conservative powers, women have far more rights than they did under the Taliban. The recently provisionally applied Cooperation Agreement on Partnership and Development will further strengthen the areas of human rights – particularly the rights of women and children – and rule of law.

However, the war in Afghanistan is returning. The Taliban is again gaining control and influence in parts of the country. With more violence on both sides, the number of civilian casualties is increasing. Judges, government officials and even mullahs are being killed. Corruption and the illicit drug trade are still uncontrollable. Many people stopped looking at Afghanistan years ago – the typical fate of long-lasting conflicts – but Afghanistan still remains at the bottom of the World Peace Index, together with Syria.

The number of Afghan people in Europe is increasing rapidly. Therefore, the international community and the European Union in particular has to continue its engagement in Afghanistan to help rebuild the country, develop its economy and fight terrorism. The progress already achieved is very fragile and its sustainment requires further reforms and continuing international support for security and stability in Afghanistan and the entire region.

Boris Zala (S&D). – Mr President, despite many improvements, Afghanistan certainly cannot be counted as a clear success story of international intervention. Sixteen years after toppling the Taliban, we are no closer to a negotiated political settlement that would bring lasting peace. What is now clear is that such a settlement must include Pakistan, which has a huge stake and influence in Afghan stability.

So far Pakistan has failed to play its part. Many Taliban militants still have a safe haven in Pakistan. This must end. This is also where the EU should insert its diplomatic clout, as a partner for democratic governance in Afghanistan, but also as a political power that can help induce Pakistan to be more constructive. The EU can no longer limit itself to economic and developmental aid, but must act as a strategic player in the wider region.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Αφγανιστάν εδώ και 17 χρόνια, μετά την εισβολή των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών, βρίσκεται σε μια συνεχή εμπόλεμη κατάσταση. Έτσι έχει μετατραπεί σε προσφυγική βόμβα. Ήδη 1,5 εκατομμύριο αφγανοί πρόσφυγες βρίσκονται στο Πακιστάν, 450.000 βρίσκονται στο Ιράν, πάνω από το 20% των προσώπων που κατέκλυσαν την Ελλάδα το 2015 και τους τελευταίους μήνες προέρχονται απ' το Αφγανιστάν. Επομένως πρέπει να ενισχυθεί η σταθερότητα, πολιτική και οικονομική, στο Αφγανιστάν, αλλά να αναλάβουν οι χώρες του NATO που διεξάγουν εκεί πολεμικές επιχειρήσεις να φιλοξενήσουν τους πρόσφυγες. Αυτό ισχύει και για την Κίνα και για τη Ρωσία και για το Ιράν.

Από εκεί και πέρα είναι δεδομένο ότι 10.000 τουλάχιστον Αφγανοί εγκλωβισμένοι στην Ελλάδα πρέπει να μετεγκατασταθούν σε χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Κι όμως ο κύριος Tusk κλείνει τα μάτια και τώρα πλέον ζητά την κατάργηση των υποχρεωτικών ποσοστώσεων κατανομής των προσφύγων στα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Αυτό είναι απαράδεκτο.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – We hebben hier een uitvoerig debat gehoord over de toestand in Afghanistan. We hebben vorig jaar die conferentie gehouden en we zien allemaal dat de situatie eigenlijk niet verbeterd is. Europa is één van de grootste donoren, dus we hebben daar toch wel een belangrijke rol te spelen.

Collega's, ik heb 2 à 3 weken geleden anderhalf uur lang gesproken met een Afghaans vluchtelingenjongetje dat naar Europa werd gesmokkeld door mensensmokkelaars. Het verhaal van zijn route – als ik u dat hier moet vertellen – gaat door merg en been. Gesmokkeld in de koffer van een auto, dagenlang in Turkije over de bergen, kinderen vermoord onderweg, volwassenen vermoord. We moeten inzetten op die mensensmokkelaars. We moeten zorgen dat we die kunnen bestrijden. Meer nog, we moeten natuurlijk zorgen dat de situatie in Afghanistan genormaliseerd wordt en dat mensen daar in vrede met een goede economische ondersteuning hun leven kunnen uitbouwen. Dat is onze verantwoordelijkheid, collega's.

Τάκης Χατζιγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχει περιγραφεί επαρκώς από πολλούς συναδέλφους και από όλους η τραγική κατάσταση στο Αφγανιστάν. Συνεχής ένταση, πόλεμος πατριών, πρόσφυγες, φτώχεια και διαφθορά. Η αποκλιμάκωση μπορεί να επέλθει μόνο με αποκλιμάκωση της στρατιωτικής παρουσίας. Φεύγουν χιλιάδες άνθρωποι, οι οποίοι δυστυχώς στη συνέχεια επαναπροωθούνται από χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Πρέπει να κοιτάσουμε και λίγο ευρύτερα, για να λύσουμε το πρόβλημα στον βαθμό που θα μπορέσουμε. Το Πακιστάν είναι η χώρα στην οποία βρίσκουν καταφύγιο και εν πολλοίς ασφάλεια τα μέλη των τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων. Να ρίξουμε μια ματιά σ' αυτή τη χώρα και να λάβουμε μέτρα κυρωτικά, αν θέλουμε να δούμε βελτίωση της κατάστασης. Τέλος, ο πόλεμος κατά του εμπορίου οπίου αποτελεί κλειδί για την όποια εξομάλυνση στη χώρα.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da quanto tempo dura la guerra in Afghanistan? Va avanti da 17 anni, è una guerra infinita di cui neanche si parla più nei nostri media, se non in modo sporadico e marginale. È una guerra che si può definire in qualche modo dimenticata. Neanche l'avvento di Trump ha cambiato la tendenza, e il ritiro delle truppe NATO e dei suoi alleati, che inizialmente era stato previsto per il 2014, è stato procrastinato al 2020 e oltre.

Molti dicono che non è giusto lasciare il lavoro prima che sia terminato. Ma di quale lavoro stiamo parlando? La disoccupazione è passata dall'8 al 40 per cento, Kabul è passata da un milione a cinque milioni e mezzo di abitanti, e l'unica attività rilevante è la produzione di oppio. Molti ragazzi si arruolano perché non hanno altra scelta per guadagnarsi da vivere, ma appena possono disertano e vanno via.

Oggi è importante qui accogliere con favore l'iniziativa della Corte penale internazionale di iniziare un'investigazione indipendente sui crimini di guerra e contro l'umanità perpetrati durante il conflitto afghano. Ritengo doverosa e auspicabile una trasparente attribuzione di responsabilità, indipendentemente dalle parti in causa, considerando che c'è il rischio che se ne aggiunga una terza, ossia Daesh.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο πόλεμος στο Αφγανιστάν αποτελεί καθαρή ήττα για τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και τους συμμάχους των με μεγάλες απώλειες σε ανθρώπινο δυναμικό και κατασπατάληση χρημάτων. Αποτελεί πεδίο έρευνας της στρατηγικής επιστήμης (και δεν αφορά βέβαια άμεσα το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο) η αναζήτηση των αιτιών που τρεις χρονικά διαφορετικές υπερδυνάμεις, η βρετανική αυτοκρατορία, η Σοβιετική Ένωση και οι ΗΠΑ ηττήθηκαν στο Αφγανιστάν. Πρόσφατα, ο πρόεδρος Τραμπ ανακοίνωσε την αύξηση της στρατιωτικής παρουσίας στη χώρα. Πρέπει λοιπόν να αναρωτηθούμε τους λόγους για τους οποίους αποφασίστηκε αυτό, την ώρα που οι απώλειες των συμμαχικών δυνάμεων είναι σε καθημερινή βάση τεράστιες, ενώ συνεχίζεται το λουτρό αίματος αιώνων αφγανών πολιτών και κυριότερα η αθρόα λαθρομετανάστευση προς την Ευρώπη.

Οι λόγοι πασιφανείς: Οι δυτικοί δεν επιθυμούν να αποχωρήσουν αφήνοντας το πεδίο ελεύθερο σε Ρώσους και Κινέζους. Σε μια χώρα πλούσια σε κοιτάσματα σιδήρου, κοβαλτίου, χαλκού, υδρογονανθράκων και κυρίως λιθίου, αλλά και τεράστιο παραγωγικό κέντρο οπίου και λοιπών ναρκωτικών ουσιών. Σε αυτό το διεθνές παιχνίδι εξουσίας η Ευρώπη θα πρέπει να έχει ξεκάθαρη ηγετική θέση στη λήψη αποφάσεων, τον σχεδιασμό για την εκτέλεση των απαιτούμενων ενεργειών σε πολιτικό, στρατηγικό, επιχειρησιακό επίπεδο, επ' ωφελεία των κρατών μελών και των ευρωπαίων πολιτών.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär! Igår flögs ett plan från Sverige. Det skulle ha varit 20 människor på det planet, men tack och lov, tack vare aktivister, advokater och modiga människor som satte stopp, så var det bara 5 personer som åkte med det planet. Men dessa 5 är en sorg.

De åkte till krigets Afghanistan. De skickades dit och jag tycker att det är en skam för EU och för Sverige att dessa utvisningar, dessa tvångsdeportationer får fortsätta, och att EU:s samarbete med Afghanistan till så stor utsträckning går ut på att villkoras med dessa utvisningar.

Jag skulle bara vilja säga tack till de över 200 tyska piloter som har vägrat att lyfta med sina plan till krigets Afghanistan. Varje plan som inte lyfter och landar i Afghanistan med deporterade flyktingar är en seger för oss alla och för medmänskligheten.

Så min fråga är – när kommer ni att sätta stopp för den här politiken, kommissionen? När kommer ni att välja mänskliga rättigheter, hopp och medmänsklighet istället för den här typen av rasism och deportationspolitik?

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Αφγανιστάν είναι μία από τις πλέον ανασφαλείς χώρες του κόσμου. Για 17ο συνεχόμενο χρόνο συνεχίζονται οι πολεμικές συγκρούσεις στη χώρα αυτή, η οποία έχει μεγάλη στρατηγική αξία και στην οποία συγκρούονται τα συμφέροντα πολλών και διαφόρων δυνάμεων. Η κυβέρνηση της χώρας δεν ασκεί ουσιαστικό έλεγχο. Οι Ταλιμπάν και ο ISIS είναι ισχυροί και απειλούν με κατάληψη της εξουσίας. Επιπλέον, δεν υπάρχει καμία δυνατότητα στρατηγικής αντιμετώπισης αυτού του κινδύνου. Πρόσφατα το NATO ανακοίνωσε την αύξηση της δυνάμεως που διατηρεί εκεί κατά 3.000 στρατιώτες.

Η όλη κατάσταση οδηγεί σε λουτρό αίματος στο Αφγανιστάν. Σκοτώνονται κυρίως άμαχοι και η κατάσταση βρίσκεται εκτός ελέγχου. Γι' αυτούς ακριβώς τους λόγους και επειδή αυτό θα συνεχιστεί, δεν είναι φρόνιμο για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αυτή τη στιγμή να παρέμβει. Θα πρέπει να περάσει ένα χρονικό διάστημα, να εξισορροπηθεί η κατάσταση, να εξομαλυνθεί, και κατόπιν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να επέμβει πολιτικά και διπλωματικά.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I believe this has been a very useful exchange and I thank you so much for your interventions and your contributions in this debate. From this debate I conclude that we all share a common interest in using EU diplomatic power and EU financial instruments to their full potential in support of a peaceful and prosperous Afghanistan.

In 2016 the Afghan Government made strong commitments towards self-reliance, responsibility and ownership of its political course and development policy. The European Union, as part of the wider international community, remains firmly committed to supporting the Government and the people of Afghanistan in this endeavour. The Government of Afghanistan's continued engagement and appropriation of its commitments will be essential for this to be successful.

Our European support to Afghan refugees has been demonstrated in many areas and in many aspects. I personally visited Iran twice to show the tangible European solidarity on the ground in various areas there. In particular, I witnessed in a very demanding field, education in emergencies, our tangible solidarity there. So I strongly believe that, as the European Union, we are fully committed in order to provide any assistance to the Afghan people, not only inside Afghanistan but also outside Afghanistan.

A few words about irregular migration. Irregular migration to Europe is a reality and it needs to be addressed. Together with the country of origin, we do address it from a comprehensive angle in the spirit of the partnership framework, looking in the wider context at the causes of migration: poverty, conflict, insecurity. We are trying to remedy those causes with our instruments, political and diplomatic security, and development cooperation. In our discussions and actions we pay particular attention to sustainable reintegration of returned persons, not only from Europe, but also from the region, from where the biggest numbers of returns take place. It is about creating opportunities in the country of origin so that young Afghans find reasons to build their lives there, and not choose the dangerous irregular migration

route and become victims of human traffickers.

Finally, let me thank you and the European Parliament as a whole for your continued support of all efforts leading towards lasting peace, stability and prosperity in Afghanistan.

Președintele. – Propunerile de rezoluție care vor fi depuse în conformitate cu articolul 123 alineatul (2) din Regulamentul de procedură vor fi anunțate ulterior.

Dezbaterea a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc joi, 14 decembrie 2017.

11. Položaj naroda Rohingya (rasprava)

Președintele. –Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind Declarația Vicepreședintelui Comisiei/Înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate referitoare la situația populației Rohingya (2017/2973(RSP)).

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, last month I was in Bangladesh together with the Foreign Ministers of two Member States, Germany and Sweden. This was another way of showing teamwork and the joint action of European Union institutions plus Member States.

I was in Bangladesh in one of the largest camps hosting Rohingya refugees. When you see the camps with your own eyes, when you talk to the people there, when you hear the stories, and when you see the reality on the ground, it makes quite a difference. The thing that struck me the most was the number of young children – I have to say children of my little daughter's age, six or seven years old – taking care of younger children who were two or three years old. These were children who were travelling together. The older ones were raising the little ones, but we are talking about children we normally consider very, very, very little. It is hard to imagine what that must feel like because these kids are forced to grow up. They are stripped of their right to childhood, and this is going to stay for the rest of their lives.

I also met a group of women and heard from them about the violence they had suffered and the violence against their children. When you have heard these stories once, you will never ever forget them. When you hear these stories, action is no longer just a political priority, but it becomes a sort of moral imperative. I am telling you this because sometimes we have to link the political dynamics to stories, faces and people.

That same night, I met with the Prime Minister of Bangladesh, not only to express the European Union's support for the country, but also, and most importantly, to discuss possible solutions to the crisis. Since the camp is in an area where it is certain that when the rainy season starts, the situation will become impossible to manage. It is a camp hosting some 650 000 people in one place.

The day after that visit – the day after I talked to the Prime Minister of Bangladesh – I was in Myanmar for the Asia-Europe meeting. Right before the summit, we asked to set up a special meeting with all the ministers who were there, including Aung San Suu Kyi, to discuss the situation of the Rohingyas and to find a way forward together. It was a quiet meeting with no cameras and no publicity, but it was a very important one. We agreed at that meeting on a shared perspective to start facing the crisis, step by step, but with commitments and with strong regional and international involvement. Just a few days later, – actually, if I am not wrong, three days later – a deal between Myanmar and Bangladesh was announced and signed. We had discussed that deal during that meeting. We had encouraged the two parties to discuss together the first steps that could be made.

We know very well that it is still an extremely difficult situation and that implementation of that agreement will have to be accompanied and monitored extremely carefully by the international community, but this is finally a first step in the right direction after months, if not years or decades, of inaction or actually, even worse, sometimes of turning a blind eye. It could be an entry point to address the crisis from a bilateral point of view between Bangladesh and Myanmar and, together with the agencies, starting from the UNHCR.

For us, this comes after several months of intense engagement. I was here when you adopted your last resolution in September. One month later, we adopted conclusions on the crisis in the Foreign Affairs Council. In the light of the disproportionate use of force by the army, we also decided to suspend invitations to the Commander in Chief of the Myanmar Armed Forces and other senior military officers, and to review ongoing practical defence cooperation.

Meanwhile, we have been active at the UN Human Rights Council. First, we supported the extension of the fact-finding mission's mandate. Second, we supported a special session on Myanmar last week and the resolution proposed by Bangladesh. We also supported the resolution at the UN General Assembly's Third Committee. Beyond public statements and beyond the political and diplomatic work we have carried out in these months, we stepped up our humanitarian assistance and co-hosted the UN Pledging Conference in October in Geneva.

As usual, the European Union has pledged more money than anybody else. If you look at the European Union and Member States together, we pledged more than the rest of the world combined. Let me add that our pledges always turn into real money and real projects that help real people, meaning that we always deliver on our pledges.

But the humanitarian work alone is not enough. We have to solve the problem. It is now up to Myanmar to improve the situation in the Rakhine State so that everyone can go back to their homes in a safe and dignified way. The rule of law and full humanitarian access must be granted as a first step. So far the Government has granted access to the Red Cross and the World Food Programme in Rakhine State, but we will continue to press for full access to the broader UN and NGO community. At the same time, the people of Rakhine must be guaranteed the right to education and basic social services, and the difficult issue of citizenship must be addressed, all in line with the Annan plan.

Let me say that this is perhaps the most important political point to me. The authorities of Myanmar have declared their intention to fully implement the Annan plan. Aung San Suu Kyi has expressed her willingness and commitment to do so, not only in our private meetings, but also in our common press activities and publicly several times. We know very well that she faces an extremely complex situation in the country. The democracy of Myanmar is a very young one. The country is still somehow in a democratic transition, and the path towards an inclusive and pluralistic democracy is never easy, particularly after so many years of military rule.

I believe that Aung San Suu Kyi needs and wants our support to implement fully the Annan plan, to translate the political commitment into real action, and to do it, step by step, accompanied by the international community and other countries in the region.

In the coming days and weeks, we will continue to work for dignified voluntary returns based on the bilateral agreement between Bangladesh and Myanmar. We will push for humanitarian access in Rakhine State, based on the first openings made by the Government, and we will work to address the root causes of the crisis and push for the full implementation of the Annan report.

I am sure that the European Parliament will continue to contribute to such work that will hopefully bring results, although probably not within a very short time period. However, I believe that the first steps in the right direction have finally been taken even if, again, I am not hiding all the limits, difficulties and shortcomings that we will still be facing in the months ahead. This is why we have to continue working in that direction together.

Werner Langen, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Danke, Frau Mogherini! Ich möchte mich im Namen der Europäischen Volkspartei ausdrücklich für Ihr Engagement bedanken. Sie haben nicht nur mit Worten für die Rechte der Rohingya gekämpft, sondern Sie haben sich vor Ort überzeugt und internationale Vereinbarungen gefördert. Herzlichen Dank von unserer Seite!

Damit sind auch die Forderungen des Parlaments vom September auf dem richtigen Weg. Ich glaube, dass wir als Europäische Union in Myanmar insbesondere dazu beitragen können, dass die Gewalt, die Einschüchterung und die Vertreibung der muslimischen Minderheit der Rohingya beendet wird.

Ich möchte mich als Vorsitzender der ASEAN-Delegation ausdrücklich für Ihren Brief von gestern bedanken, in dem Sie die Maßnahmen, die Sie ergriffen haben, nochmals aufgelistet haben. Wir stehen an der Seite der Kommission, und ich bin Ihnen besonders dankbar für die Schlussbemerkung, in der Sie gesagt haben: Myanmar ist eine junge Demokratie. Ich bezweifle, dass es schon eine Demokratie ist. Das Militär hat die Obermacht und Aung San Suu Kyi ist leider keine vollwertige Regierungschefin, sondern ist Sonderbeauftragte des Präsidenten und Außenministerin. Deshalb sind ihre Einwirkungsmöglichkeiten leider beschränkt.

Wir haben sie im Frühjahr besucht und haben uns davon überzeugen können, wie schwierig der Prozess ist. Heute steht es auf der Tagesordnung. Es ist richtig, die militärische Führung zu sanktionieren. Es ist richtig, die Rückführungen nach Bangladesch durchzusetzen. Es ist richtig, den Rohingya humanitäre Hilfe zu geben. Es ist richtig, im Februar die verheerende Situation erneut in Augenschein zu nehmen.

Deshalb unterstützen wir alle Ihre Aktivitäten, Frau Mogherini, und wir hoffen, dass es bald eine vernünftige Lösung für die Minderheit der Rohingya geben wird.

Soraya Post, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, the situation of the Rohingya people is our grave concern. As people, as politicians, as human rights defenders, it is our obligation to take immediate action. I am happy to hear the Commissioner talking about the action taken, but I do not think it is enough. We have to speed up. It is our obligation to end the ongoing genocide in Myanmar. We have to use every tool available – arms embargo, punitive sanctions, trade agreements – and we have to strive for justice for the Rohingya people. Six hundred and fifty thousand Rohingyas have fled their homes, their villages set on fire with petrol bombs. They have endured rape as a weapon of war; they have seen sex trafficking of women and the kidnapping of children who are being sold as sex slaves. The military forces cannot have impunity. They need to be put on trial. As for the Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, her prize should be withdrawn if she does not stop her silence.

The Rohingya people need to be recognised as an ethnic minority in Myanmar and should be compensated for all the violence they have been facing. It is now up to us, the international community, to give justice to the Rohingya people. As human rights are universal, so also our solidarity should be universal.

Amjad Bashir, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, if anyone questions whether what is happening in Myanmar is ethnic cleansing, I say look for the hallmarks. Men and boys separated and murdered, women and girls raped and disfigured as a means of subjugation and control, homes and crops burnt, whole villages destroyed overnight and left smouldering and stinking of death.

At the last plenary I called for a point of order to have another debate and another resolution, but this time should be the last. Last week, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights said that an act of genocide cannot be ruled out. Last week, Alex Crawford, this extraordinary Sky News correspondent who went under cover in Myanmar, testified at my conference that of all humanitarian crises this is probably the worst she has ever witnessed. And still the world wrings its hands over how to respond.

We cannot let this suffering be met with only shrugged shoulders and bleeding hearts. The EU can be powerful in galvanising a global response, but to do so it must lead, not look for middle ground. That voice must roar not whisper. There can be no repatriation of the one million refugees unless they are recognised first as citizens of Myanmar and unless the UN is present as well as the media and humanitarian NGOs. That is why I hope that our motion can persuade the Commission and Council to use their good offices in calling for an international summit on the Rohingya. One day, our grandchildren may ask how we used that power, when a whole population has been killed and persecuted. Please let us choose to have an answer that is decent and honourable.

Urmas Paet, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the situation in Myanmar is horrific. The Rohingya people are being killed and repressed, their rights denied, their homes burnt, people are starving and stuck at the border and those that have managed to flee to Bangladesh are in dire need of help.

The killings and violence must stop immediately. Those responsible must be held accountable by international tribunal. Even though an agreement has been signed between Bangladesh and Myanmar, more is needed. Before any Rohingya refugees can return, there must be credible assurances that they can do so voluntarily, safely and under full UN oversight. Landmines must be removed immediately, if needed with the help of the international community. There needs to be a time frame for the provision of citizenship rights. Monitoring of the situation of the Rohingyas in Myanmar by human rights bodies and helping them by NGOs and relief agencies should be allowed. Humanitarian aid must continue, the EU, its Member States and the international community must increase financial and material support for the refugees and their accommodation. And we need to increase the pressure on Myanmar. The European Union should adopt punitive sanctions against those responsible for human rights abuses in Myanmar, prolong the existing arms embargo and suspend trade preferences and the negotiations on the EU-Myanmar investment treaty.

One more thought: the role of Aung San Suu Kyi has been extremely disappointing. We should seriously start a discussion on the possibility of reversing international awards – the Nobel Prize, the Sakharov Prize – in these kinds of situations. It makes no sense that a person that has received such an honorary award is now also responsible for ethnic cleansing.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, «Je m'appelle Kamal, j'ai sept ans. Dans le village où je vivais, les policiers et les soldats sont venus, ils nous ont ordonné de rentrer dans nos maisons et ils ont tiré. Les balles ont traversé les murs. J'ai reçu plusieurs balles dans le corps. Puis, ils ont mis le feu à nos maisons. Mon père, paniqué, nous a pris, mon frère de cinq ans et moi, dans ses bras pour nous cacher dans la cour et il est retourné dans la maison pour chercher ma sœur jumelle et mon grand frère, mais mon père est ressorti seul. Aujourd'hui, nous vivons, lui et moi, dans un camp. Nous avons peur, nous avons faim. Ma mère, mon frère et ma sœur jumelle me manquent terriblement».

Madame la Vice-présidente, j'espère que ces enfants, pour grandir, pourront un tant soit peu oublier ces horreurs, qui hanteront à jamais leurs souvenirs d'enfance. Mais c'est à nous, aujourd'hui, d'agir et de clamer notre indignation pour tous les Kamal, les Mohammed, les Nacira, les Yasmine, pour tous les enfants nés Rohingyas, pour que cette indicible injustice et ce nettoyage ethnique au Myanmar cessent enfin. En Birmanie, en Libye, au Yémen, en République démocratique du Congo et dans tant d'autres pays, l'horreur est devenue quotidienne. Ne nous y habituons pas.

Barbara Lochbihler, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, almost four months have passed since the operations by the military in northern Rakhine State started. The ethnic cleansing campaign has not stopped, and refugees are still arriving in Bangladesh. The Council stated in October that it may consider additional measures if the situation does not improve, and we urge you, High Representative, to put more pressure on the Myanmar authorities. This includes imposing travel bans and targeted financial sanctions on military and police commanders that are suspected of being responsible for the crimes committed. Just last week, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights warned that even genocide cannot be ruled out.

The EU also needs to pressure the civilian government to refer jurisdiction over the crimes committed since 25 August to the International Criminal Court. Self-referral is possible under Article 12(3) of the Rome Statute. The perpetrators of the grave human rights violations in Myanmar must be held accountable, including those who hold high military rank. The civilian government has the responsibility to fight impunity as best it can.

The current situation in Rakhine State does not allow safe and sustainable returns, according to the UNHCR's assessment, and there is a huge threat that refugees may be forcibly returned. Any returns can only take place when safe and dignified conditions can be guaranteed. Independent human rights monitoring, as well as full humanitarian access on the ground, must be a prerequisite for any repatriation.

Finally, High Representative, let me add that you showed us the step-by-step approach now being taken, but none of the steps referred to fighting impunity. I think it is essential not to do this any later.

James Carver, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, no one can look at the plight of the Rohingya and feel anything but a great deal of sympathy for their situation. One would have hoped that the slow transition to democracy in Burma would have improved their position within Burmese society. Alas, such hopes have been proven wasted. Abstract discussion over the history of the Rohingya has no place in modern discourse and cannot be used to justify the persecution of these poor people.

Amongst this misery, it should not be forgotten that militant groups have fought the Burmese state since shortly after the Second World War. And there are allegations that some are connected to Islamic extremists. The UK should do all it can to facilitate dialogue and hopefully restore their place in Burmese society. If that democratisation proves to be a success, perhaps, and only then, it would be time to rethink Burmese membership of the Commonwealth, certainly not before.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Mr President, exactly one year ago we sat in this same room and we discussed the same topics. We made it very clear to the Government of Myanmar at that point that we expected respect for the basic human rights of all its people, and for it to make significant steps towards an inclusive democracy. Today, we have to conclude that we have seen absolutely none of this. Instead, what we have seen in 2017 is the systematic use of force and violence; murder, sexual harassment and rape and the destruction of houses, livelihoods and shelters.

Hundreds of thousands of Rohingya refugees have fled the border to Bangladesh, and the United Nations have called it a textbook example of ethnic cleansing. This disgraceful situation needs to end and it needs to end now. I would like therefore to echo the words of Pope Francis during his visit there: 'Let us continue to act so that their rights may be recognised. Let us not close our hearts and let us not look the other way.' And I sincerely hope that the Government in Myanmar, but in particular also Sakharov Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, listen to these words, open their hearts and finally start to act, because as Desmond Tutu has said in a direct call on Aung San Suu Kyi, if the political price of your ascension to the highest office in Myanmar is your silence, then that price is surely too high.

Linda McAvan (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to thank the High Representative for everything she has told us, for going there, for listening to the women and the people she met, and for coming here and bearing witness and giving them a voice in our Parliament. That is extremely important.

Ms Mogherini, we can hear that that you have been doing what you can. I am a little bit sceptical about the returns process, unless there are independent monitors there to make sure that it really is voluntary and that human rights are respected. There have been some problems for human rights organisations and NGOs both in registering in Bangladesh and in getting access. If you could, please tell us more about whether those issues have been resolved.

I do not have a lot of time, but to pick up on the impunity issue, it is 70 years since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was signed. I do not know about you but I am getting sickened by hearing, year after year, the reports about the awful violence against women and girls. Last year we gave a Sakharov Prize to two young women who were abused and raped in the Syria/Iraqi conflict by ISIS. Now we hear these appalling stories of what is happening to women. We have an initiative with United Nations Women. Can we not do something at the United Nations to get some global action on this issue, and not come here next year to hear more awful stories about abuse of women?

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Georganiseerd, gecoördineerd en systematisch, zo worden de aanvallen van het Birmees leger en boeddhistische groepen op de Rohingya omschreven in een rapport van het VN-mensenrechtenbureau. Sinds augustus joegen etnische zuiveringen 620 000 Rohingya op de vlucht naar Bangladesh. Hun platgebrande dorpen en vermoorde familieleden lieten ze achter.

De intentieverklaring tussen Bangladesh en Myanmar over hun repatriëring is een stap vooruit, maar doet toch ook nog vragen rijzen. En, mevrouw Mogherini, u heeft er in uw verklaring zelf naar verwezen: op welke manier zal die repatriëring verlopen? Waar zullen die mensen worden hervestigd en hoe zullen ze worden opgevangen in een land dat hen decennialang heeft achtergesteld? Kan dat wel op een op een waardige manier? Kijk, er is maar één echte menselijke oplossing voor deze crisis. De Rohingya een wettige en veilige status bieden door hun een nationaliteit te geven. We mogen toch niet aanvaarden dat mensen als verworpenen moeten leven op basis van hun geloof of van hun afkomst of wat dan ook. Ik dank u oprecht, mevrouw Mogherini, voor uw inzet. En ik vraag u om u blijvend om het lot van deze mensen te bekommeren.

Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I am speaking in my capacity as Chair of Parliament's Delegation for relations with countries of South Asia, including Bangladesh. Our delegation visited some years ago now the camps at Cox's Bazaar of the Rohingya who were currently there. The EU has been a consistent funder for those camps over the years and indeed has worked with the Government of Bangladesh to try to find solutions for the situation of the Rohingya people.

Over the years, I think it has been pretty clear that Myanmar has been playing games over this. They say that they will take back people with appropriate ID documents but they do not issue appropriate ID documents, so how is this supposed to happen? If we get a return this time it has to be with people who can be safe when they get back.

So what can we do to change the mind of the government in Myanmar? I fully support those who have been urging sanctions. The international community had sanctions against Myanmar in the past. I think this latest effort at ethnic cleansing, of wiping out a people and their history, deserves at least sanctions now.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Mr President, the Rohingya are still facing serious human rights violations of all sorts, and systematic discrimination and persecution. The situation does not seem to be improving. The European Parliament tried to draw attention to this situation several times, most recently with the Resolution of last September, a few days after the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid bin Ra'ad Zied al-Hussein, declared that the situation in Myanmar seemed to be a textbook example of ethnic cleansing.

As the governments of Myanmar and Bangladesh have signed the agreement to repatriate close to a million Rohingya refugees currently in Bangladesh, these people are facing the prospect of a return with absolutely no guarantee of safety. I have some major concerns about where these people will go after repatriation, as they will most likely be deported from one camp to another and we will probably face once again the horrific crimes we all know about. These people in need probably don't even have a house to go back to as most houses were burned down by the military and villages were burned to the ground.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Kedves Kollégák! Az 1989 óta Mianmar nevet viselő Burma figyelemre méltó átalakulásokon ment át a 2011-ben elkezdődött reformok óta. A több évtizedes katonai diktatúra megdöntését követően, a 2016 áprilisában demokratikus úton hatalomra került új kormány történelmi lehetőséget jelent az ország számára. A változások folyamatában, a maga sajátos eszközeivel, az Európai Unió döntő szerepet játszott.

Az utóbbi hónapokban azonban jogos aggodalomra ad okot a Rakhine államban élő, népes rohindza közösség elleni hatósági erőszak, mely a pusztító állampolgársággal sem rendelkező üldözött népcsoport tagjainak százezreit teszi földönfutóvá és kényszeríti őket a szomszédos Bangladesbe menekülni. Az ENSZ emberi jogi főbiztosa a kialakult tarthatatlan helyzetet méltán minősítette etnikai tisztogatásnak.

Idén szeptemberben az Európai Parlament sürgősségi határozatban ítélte el a mianmari kormánynak a rohindza kisebbséggel szembeni minősíthetetlen bánásmódját. Az országban végbemenő demokratikus átalakulások sikerének, valamint az Unió további támogatásának előfeltételeként szabta meg a súlyos emberi jogi és etnikai jogsértések haladéktalan kivizsgálását, a bűnelkövetők felelőssége vonását.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, the words of this strong resolution need to be translated into urgent action. The climate of impunity must end as it only serves to perpetuate the cycle of abuse. The EU must immediately impose targeted economic sanctions and travel restrictions on military personnel involved in these atrocities and refer them to the International Criminal Court.

We need major regional actors to put pressure on Myanmar to stop these heinous crimes, allow humanitarian access and a UN fact-finding mission in Rakhine State, as well as ending the institutionalised system of segregation. Assisting Bangladesh with this humanitarian challenge is crucial to provide a safe space for the Rohingya for as long as they need it, as well as psychological support and child protection for women and girls affected by these evil crimes. Indeed, there are no shortages of options for pressurising the Myanmar military to stop this campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Rohingya. If we cannot action this now in an effective and timely manner, then this resolution is not worth the paper it is written on, Madam High Representative.

Sajjad Karim (ECR). – Mr President, for many years now, Member after Member of the European Parliament has stood in this Chamber and highlighted the plight of the Rohingya. It seems that those calls have fallen on deaf ears. Today we arrive in a situation where even the Pope cannot go there and call these people by their true identity. It is clear that, whilst there is much that is being done by the European Union today, unless and until we insist on a regularisation and status for these people, they are going to continually find themselves in this position time after time.

Madam High Representative, when you speak about Aung San Suu Kyi – and I hear from many that there is a willingness from her to cooperate with us – the fact of the matter is this: if somebody who holds a prize given by this House, the home of human rights – the Sakharov Prize – finds herself unable to speak for her own people, then this House must review its relationship with her. Silence is no longer an option. It is not good enough. It must stop. She must speak out now.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, we are facing one of the worst humanitarian and refugee crises in the world. We hear on a daily basis of acts of unprecedented ethnic and religious violence against the Rohingya in Myanmar. As part of the international community, it is our duty to express our deep concern about the grave violations of human rights, the ethnic and religious assaults, and the displacement of people from the Rohingya community in Rakhine State.

We have to be united in our calls and actions to end the violence against the Rohingya and bring the crisis to an end as soon as possible. We should also continue our attempts to bring aid to Rakhine State, and to those who found shelter in Bangladesh. We need to appeal more strongly to the Myanmar Government to cease all military actions and provide full access for humanitarian organisations and UN agencies in that country.

The crisis really deserves our full attention. We see the most vulnerable and poorest countries in the region at the centre of the crisis, and its deepening could reach far beyond the region. We need, therefore, to make use of our diplomatic means on the international scene and within the region, firstly to find an immediate solution to the crisis and, secondly, to tackle post-crisis development.

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Vielen herzlichen Dank, sehr geehrte Hohe Vertreterin, meine sehr verehrten Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal herzlichen Dank an Sie für Ihre bisherigen Bemühungen, die Situation zu befrieden, Frau Mogherini.

Ich denke, es handelt sich hier um eine jahrzehntelange, strukturelle Diskriminierung und Segregation der Rohingya. Ich bin im Übrigen nicht der Meinung, dass es ausschließlich ein bilaterales Problem ist; ich glaube vielmehr, dass es ein weltweites Problem darstellt.

Die Frage stellt sich: Was können wir tun? Ich glaube, dass es hierzu zunächst einmal einer *fact finding mission* bedarf, dass es hier auch einer dringenden humanitären Hilfe bedarf und dass wir auch dringend internationale Beobachter dafür benötigen.

Im Übrigen: Ich denke, dass es erforderlich ist, gezielte Sanktionen gegen Angehörige des Militärs und der Sicherheitsapparate, die sich eben dort schuldig gemacht haben, zu verhängen. Ich denke, wir müssen unser Möglichstes tun, und wir dürfen nicht glauben, dass es ausreicht, irgendetwas zu tun.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι η έκτη ομιλία που πραγματοποιώ εδώ, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, για τους πρόσφυγες Ροχίνγκια. Ήδη από τον Μάιο του 2015 το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο συζητά περίπου μία φορά κάθε έξι μήνες γι' αυτή την τραγική κατάσταση που βιώνουν οι Ροχίνγκια. Αυτό αποδεικνύει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συζητά πολύ και λαμβάνει ελάχιστα μέτρα.

Η κατάσταση των Ροχίνγκια πλέον είναι δραματική. Στη Βιρμανία οι βουδιστές διώκουν μουσουλμάνους. Αλλού οι μουσουλμάνοι σφάζουν χριστιανούς. Οι θρησκευτικές συγκρούσεις είναι πρόσχημα: είναι προπέτασμα καπνού, για να συγκαλύψουν τα οικονομικά συμφέροντα τα οποία κερδίζουν από αυτές τις συγκρούσεις.

Εν προκειμένω η εθνοκάθαρση των Ροχίνγκια γίνεται για οικονομικούς λόγους, προκειμένου να αρπάξουν τη γη τους εκεί όπου κατοικούσαν οι κοινότητες των Ροχίνγκια, διότι εκεί υπάρχει ενδιαφέρον από τις πολυεθνικές να γίνουν εξορύξεις. Ταυτόχρονα έχουν ενδιαφέρον και να τους αρπάξουν τα ύδατα τα οποία εκμεταλλεύονταν. Επομένως πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα. Πρέπει να επιβληθούν κυρώσεις στο στρατιωτικό καθεστώς. Πρέπει να παραπεμφθούν οι υπαίτιοι στο Ποινικό Δικαστήριο της Χάγης, για να επιβληθούν κυρώσεις.

Joachim Zeller (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Hohe Vertreterin! Die UNO spricht von den Rohingya als der am meisten verfolgten Minderheit der Welt. Dabei ist ja die Verfolgung, Ermordung und Vertreibung von Rohingya keine Entwicklung der letzten Jahre, nur hat die Welt anscheinend bis vor kurzem nicht richtig hingesehen. Seit der Unabhängigkeit Birmas im Jahre 1948 hat es 20 Militäraktionen in das Gebiet der Rohingya gegeben. Hunderttausende mussten ihr Land verlassen, 1,5 Millionen Rohingya leben bereits im Exil, ihre Dörfer und Ortschaften wurden verwüstet, Zigtausende sind ermordet worden, und ihr Eigentum ist an Burmesen übergeben worden.

Nach der Revolution buddhistischer Mönche und der Entlassung der Nobelpreisträgerin Aung San Suu Kyi aus dem Hausarrest vor sechs Jahren gab es die leise Hoffnung auf eine vorsichtige Demokratisierung des Landes. Allerdings änderte sich an der Lage der Rohingya bislang nichts. Im Gegenteil: Das Militär zeigte seine Macht, mordete weiter, verwüstete weiter die Dörfer und Heimstätten der Rohingya und zwang wieder viele Hunderttausende zur Flucht.

Humanitäre Hilfe für die Geflüchteten tut not in den Elendslagern, in denen sie sich befinden. Aber gleichzeitig braucht es politische Lösungen. 700 Millionen Euro Entwicklungsgelder stellt die EU seit 2014 Myanmar zur Verfügung. Diese sind an die Bedingung zu knüpfen, dass die Rohingya endlich als Staatsbürger anerkannt werden. Auch auf regionaler Ebene muss es zu politischen Lösungen kommen, denn auch die Nachbarländer wie Bangladesch sind von den Massenvertreibungen betroffen. Da braucht es jetzt den Einsatz der gesamten internationalen Gemeinschaft.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, almost two-thirds of a million Rohingya have fled their homes. Nearly half a million of them are in need of health and food assistance, and many of them are children under five. The UN Human Rights chief said last week that the atrocities committed by state forces may amount to genocide.

Knowing this, I am baffled that the Foreign Affairs Council yesterday once again failed to adopt decisive measures to bring pressure to bear on the authorities and military in Myanmar – failed even to discuss the situation of the Rohingya, despite calls from me and many colleagues from this House and from civil society.

My questions to you, High Representative, are: will Myanmar be on the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Council on 22 January? Will the Council adopt targeted sanctions against those murdering and raping men, women and children? What steps will you take to achieve a unified position vital to ratchet up pressure vis-à-vis China and Russia, who are blocking action in the Security Council?

The repatriation deal between Myanmar and Bangladesh is a replication of the 1992 Agreement which already proved to be untenable. The EU needs to ensure the Rohingya are not forcibly returned, and prioritise implementation of the Annan Commission recommendation.

Procedura „catch the eye“

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní komisařko, já se připojuji ke svým kolegům, kteří zde vyjádřili určitou skepsi k dané situaci. To, že je uzavřena dohoda mezi Myanmarem a Bangladéšem, situaci Rohingyů stále neřeší. Pokud se podíváme na výpovědi těchto uprchlíků, pak většina z nich se bojí vrátit do své původní země. Chtějí jasné záruky. Bude hodně na nás, na evropské diplomacii, také na Vás, abychom tlačili Myanmar k tomu, aby poskytl jasné záruky, že na těchto lidech se násilí dále nebude opakovat.

To násilí tam trvá desítky let a jedna dohoda ho určitě nevyřeší. Je třeba také tláčit na to, co tu říkali někteří kolegové, aby zločiny proti lidskosti byly vyšetřeny. Není možné říci, máme nyní dohodu s Bangladéšem a vše se vrací do původní situace a zapomeňte na to, že někde byly zavražděny tisíce lidí. Je třeba, aby tyto hrůzné zločiny byly vyšetřeny, a já jsem také pro to, abychom vůči Myanmaru řešili otázku sankcí.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mevrouw Mogherini, u zegt terecht: “We moeten deze afschuwelijke situatie koppelen aan verhalen en gezichten”. Wel, ik geef er u één: Shadi Babiran, een 16-jarige meisje. Op een dag komt het leger het dorp binnen. Ze vermoorden de mensen, ze branden de huizen plat en zij wordt ontvoerd samen met andere meisjes. U heeft die verhalen ook gehoord. Urenlang verkracht, geschopt tot ze erbij flauwviel. Dat meisje is haar jeugd afgenomen.

Eigenlijk blijft het voor mij dan toch veel te stil. De VN zegt niets. Onze Nobelprijswinnares laat niets van zich horen. En ik vind eigenlijk dat Europa ook te stil is. U heeft wel gezegd: “Ik was daar, er is een akkoord”, maar de Europese Raad heeft er geen aandacht besteed. Ik denk dat we meer moeten doen. Er is een genocide aan de gang. Laten we eens echt actie ondernemen. Wapenembargo opvoeren, pleiten om de landmijnen weg te halen, zorgen dat de schuldigen gestraft worden. Laten we ervoor zorgen dat de kinderen daar hun jeugd terugkrijgen.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση των Ροχίνγκια είναι τραγική. Είναι μια κόλαση. Έχει περιγραφεί από όλους τους συναδέλφους. Έχει περιγραφεί όμως και από την ίδια την αντιπρόεδρο με τα πιο σκληρά λόγια, δεδομένου ότι εμείς περιγράφουμε αλλά η ίδια έχει δει αυτή την κατάσταση, ίσως μάλιστα και μερικοί από μας. Σημειώνω τη φράση περί «γρήγορης μετακίνησης από την παιδική ηλικία στην ενηλικίωση» για παιδιά των πέντε ετών, που αναγκάζονται να προστατεύουν τα πιο ανήλικα αδέρφια τους.

Είναι ηθική μας υποχρέωση και όχι πολιτική υποχρέωση –έχει λεχθεί– να υπερασπιστούμε αυτούς τους ανθρώπους. Έχω όμως δύο-τρία ερωτήματα, κυρία Mogherini: Συμφωνήσατε, είπατε, και θα ήθελα να ξέρω κάποιες περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες αυτής της συμφωνίας μεταξύ της Μιανμάρ και του Μπανγκλαντές. Τέλος, θα ήθελα να ξέρω τι ακριβώς είπε η κυρία Αούνγκ Σαν Σούου Κι, την οποία τιμήσαμε σε αυτό το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο για τους αγώνες της για ελευθερία. Δεν νομίζω ότι θα λύσει το πρόβλημα εάν της πούμε κάτι πίσω, αλλά σίγουρα οφείλει να υπερασπιστεί τα δικαιώματα των ανθρώπων της χώρας της.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, «rohingya»: una parola che a molti suonava sconosciuta, il nome di un'etnia, di una minoranza islamica perseguitata dai Tatmadaw, i militari buddhisti birmani. Un popolo che nessuno vuole, che ha visto la sua identità negata, i suoi diritti brutalmente calpestati.

I bengalesi – così li chiamano in Myanmar – sono stati privati della loro cittadinanza, della loro libertà e persino della loro dignità e umanità. Torture, violenze, stupri e massacri: nulla è stato risparmiato loro negli anni, specialmente in questi mesi. Le Nazioni Unite parlano già di pulizia etnica, e Al Hussein, l'Alto commissario per i diritti umani, dichiara che le azioni commesse dai militari potrebbero essere classificate come genocidio. Non a caso il numero dei rifugiati, circa 650 000, è comparabile alle persone in fuga dal Ruanda nel 1992.

Lancio quindi una richiesta al premio Sacharov e Nobel per la pace Aung San Suu Kyi, che finora è stata colpevolmente silente, affinché il governo autorizzi la missione di accertamento del Consiglio dei diritti umani dell'ONU e permetta ad agenzie di aiuto e osservatori di accedere al territorio birmano. Chiedo che l'accordo con il Bangladesh per il rimpatrio venga implementato solo a condizione di un pieno riconoscimento della cittadinanza a questo popolo martoriato.

Coraggio, coerenza e impegno è quello che stiamo chiedendo ad Aung San Suu Kyi e a tutti noi. Restiamo umani.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, caros Colegas, os Rohingya de Myanmar, a maior comunidade de apátridas do mundo, são, desde a independência daquele país em 48, vítimas constantes de tortura, negligência e repressão. As atrocidades de que esta minoria tem sido alvo desde o passado mês de agosto já causaram mil mortos e provocaram o êxodo de mais de meio milhão de refugiados para o Bangladesh onde atualmente se encontram numa situação que o meu compatriota António Guterres, Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, descreveu como um pesadelo humanitário e de direitos humanos.

Caros colegas, esta casa não pode deixar de condenar veementemente esta limpeza étnica e de apoiar o acordo entre o Bangladesh e Myanmar para que o regresso dos repatriados Rohingya possa ser feito de forma segura e sustentada sem mais segregação e com controlos militares, aliás, como disse aqui a Senhora Alta Representante que, desde já, quero felicitar pelo seu excelente trabalho. Já quanto à Sra. Aung San Suu Kyi, líder de facto de Myanmar, esta tem, enquanto laureada do Prémio Nobel da Paz, especiais responsabilidades na promoção da tolerância religiosa e ética e não pode desresponsabilizar o exército birmanês por esta violenta campanha de terror e ódio.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, no wonder that the flight of over 700 000 Rohingya to Bangladesh was the quickest exodus of people the world has seen since the genocide in Rwanda. Those fortunate enough to get to Bangladesh alive now live in squalid camps in miserable conditions and with limited access to food, clean water and healthcare.

Despite what they went through, most Rohingya want to go back to their homeland. This, however, should not happen until there are solid international guarantees that the violence and repression in Rakhine State has completely stopped. Another precondition should be that the Myanmar authorities return all looted property and compensate returnees for the loss of lives and goods during the violence. To avoid past mistakes, no returns should be forced or take place in the absence of strong assurances that Myanmar would respect the dignity and rights of the Rohingya who return.

(Înceierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, first of all, let me say that it is always useful to hear Members' views, take them into consideration for the continuation of our work on the ground, and continue to use all the instruments we have.

As many Members said, there is a certain amount of work we can do. There are other things that are not in our power or our hands to solve, but the fact that we are by far the largest humanitarian donor, literally keeping people alive in very difficult conditions, is already a very important component of our work on stabilisation and development assistance and on political dialogue.

I would like to stress the fact that the bilateral agreement was reached after we applied pressure and after our meetings together with both the Bangladeshi and the Myanmar sides. We will continue with the monitoring of the implementation of this agreement and with the support specifically for human rights, democracy and – let me mention one point that was raised by one of you and that I believe is extremely important – the work we do on accountability and the fight against impunity. This has to be part of the commitments that are taken by the Myanmar authorities.

We know very well – as I said at the beginning and as you are all extremely aware – that Myanmar is, even more than a young democracy, a country in transition still, and we have to be aware of the fact that we have to do two difficult exercises at the same time. On the one hand, we have to find a solution to the issue of the Rohingya that is sustainable and in full respect of all of their rights. This is doable with the full implementation of the Annan report, to which Aung San Suu Kyi has committed herself. On the other hand, we have to strengthen the democratic process in Myanmar, knowing very well that there is a political fight in that country and things are complicated, to say the least. So we also have to prevent the clock turning backwards in Myanmar itself, and after so many years of military rule this is always a risk. So this is the exercise we are doing and, with a strong commitment and strong engagement from the European Union side, we will continue to do so.

On returns, these obviously have to happen in a dignified and safe manner, in full respect for all rights and international standards. This is not an issue that is going to be solved easily – on the contrary – but I believe that one first extremely small but encouraging step has happened. It is not just a bilateral issue between Myanmar and Bangladesh, but without that first bilateral step, the international work to try to solve the problem would not be possible. We will continue to work and to push the international community and in particular, as I said, the UNHCR and international NGOs towards a full role in this process. It will be a long process that will require all our political determination.

The Council for sure will come back to this point: we adopted Council conclusions in October, and I am ready to put this issue on the agenda again any time to try to help and push for a solution to this issue.

Thank you very much for keeping this issue high on the agenda. I believe this is useful and I count on your full support in the continuation of our work on this.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto sette proposte di risoluzione conformemente all'articolo 123, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 13 dicembre.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Mario Borghezio (ENF), per iscritto. – Un'occasione per Papa Francesco durante il suo viaggio in Myanmar, dove avrebbe potuto ricordare espressamente la minoranza cristiana birmana che rappresenta la minoranza religiosa più importante e che viene discriminata e molestata da oltre mezzo secolo. Discriminazioni e vessazioni, durante le quali, negli anni, l'esercito ha sistematicamente bruciato villaggi, massacrato i loro abitanti e costretto decine di migliaia di sfollati a cercar rifugio nei campi profughi in Thailandia. Nonché chiese espropriate per far posto ai templi buddhisti tanto che, pur di avere un luogo dove professare la loro religione, alcuni fedeli sono costretti a rilevare e mettere a disposizione proprietà o abitazioni private. Nella quasi totale impunità, i militari continuano a commettere gravi abusi sui diritti umani, come le violenze sessuali all'interno dei complessi religiosi e la tortura di pastori, fedeli e ordinari cittadini. Inoltre, i cristiani impiegati nel servizio civile e in altri settori governativi sono solitamente trascurati nelle promozioni, a spese dei buddisti e, se detengono posizioni governative, rischiano sanzioni se non sostengono le inizia-

tive buddiste, quindi le autorità spesso attingono al pagamento dei cristiani scivola per il finanziamento. Purtroppo non si è elevato alcun grido di condanna. Un vero peccato!

12. Godišnje izvješće o provedbi zajedničke sigurnosne i obrambene politike – Godišnje izvješće o provedbi zajedničke vanjske i sigurnosne politike – Stalna strukturirana suradnja – otvaranje novoga poglavlja u europskoj sigurnosnoj i obrambenoj politici (rasprava)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta,

— la relazione di Michael Gahler, a nome della commissione per gli affari esteri, sulla relazione annuale sull'attuazione della politica di sicurezza e di difesa comune (2017/2123(INI)) (A8-0351/2017),

— la relazione di David McAllister, a nome della commissione per gli affari esteri, sulla relazione annuale sull'attuazione della politica estera e di sicurezza comune (2017/2121(INI)) (A8-0350/2017), e

— la dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla cooperazione strutturata permanente (CSP) – aprire un nuovo capitolo nella politica europea di sicurezza e di difesa (2017/2121(INI)) (2017/3004(RSP)).

David McAllister, rapporteur. – Mr President, in her global strategy of June 2016, Ms Mogherini defined the times we live in today as 'times of predictable unpredictability' and I believe, dear Federica Mogherini, that you were right in your analysis. The different situations we are facing in our eastern neighbourhood, in our southern neighbourhood, in the Middle East, in large parts of Africa, in North Korea, or – and how we will be able to convince ourselves at tomorrow's Sakharov Prize ceremony – in Latin America, as well as our challenging relations with Russia and China, are all emerging as huge political challenges for our Union and our Member States.

With this annual report on the common security and defence policy, we try to identify the major issues our Union faces and outline a possible way forward.

According to the last survey conducted by Eurobarometer, 65% of Europeans are in favour of a common European foreign policy, while even 75% are in favour of a common security and defence policy. The European Union ought to deliver on the expectations of its citizens.

In my report, the first report I have presented, I focused on the three 'c' s. Firstly, coordination of an assessment of the profound threats and challenges within the EU. We have to scrutinise the current political and security environment and take measures to guarantee the security of our people and our territory. This will for most be achieved by stabilising our direct neighbourhood, such as the Western Balkans, by promoting reforms and tackling the root causes of armed conflicts.

The second 'c': consolidation and deepening of the European project through enhanced EU capabilities. The European Union – as we all know – is the biggest market in the world, a major political and diplomatic power, the first trade partner for most of the countries and regions in the world, and the first humanitarian and development donor worldwide. I am convinced that only a coherent coordinated action across these EU policies can harness the EU's collective force.

Finally, the third 'c': cooperation within coalitions and with institutions delivering security. The European Union must continue to develop its strategic autonomy and to create its own capabilities to better address regional and international conflicts. In an increasingly conflict-ridden and unstable international environment, only a combination of effective multilateralism, our soft power and our credible hard power can be capable of confronting those major security threats.

A final remark: yesterday's agreement to establish the permanent structured cooperation marked a huge step forward towards an independent and strong EU security and defence policy, and thus to a certain degree of hard power.

Finally, I would like to thank my shadow rapporteurs for the good and fruitful cooperation. It was a pleasure to witness the largest political groups in this House collaborate closely towards a stronger common foreign and security policy for our Union.

Michael Gahler, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! *Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum: Habemus PESCOM.* Nach acht Jahren endlich weißer Rauch: Das ist ein Anlass zu feiern, da unsere langjährige parlamentarische Forderung – Start der ständigen strukturierten Zusammenarbeit – endlich vom Rat umgesetzt wurde.

Ich erinnere Sie, Frau Mogherini, daran, dass Sie mit den Mitgliedstaaten nur ein paar Monate daran arbeiteten, PESCO ins Werk zu setzen. Wir im Europäischen Parlament arbeiten daran seit 2009, seit Inkrafttreten des Lissabon-Vertrags. 2010 wurde im GSVP-Jahresbericht vom Kollegen Danjean erstmalig die parlamentarische Forderung erhoben, PESCO zu starten. Bei diesem Thema haben wir dann auch nicht mehr losgelassen. Wir haben Unterstützer in vielen Fraktionen gefunden, sodass 2016 im Bericht zur Europäischen Verteidigungsunion des Kollegen Paet PESCO als zentraler Baustein der Verteidigungsunion identifiziert wurde.

Die Verteidigungsunion dient dazu, unser Schicksal ein Stück weit selbst in die Hand zu nehmen und die Sicherheit unserer Bürger und der Union selbst zu organisieren und zu garantieren. Bei der Verteidigungsunion steht das EP hinter dem im Lissabon-Vertrag dargelegten Weg, von der aktuell stattfindenden progressiven Festlegung einer gemeinsamen europäischen Verteidigungspolitik in die gemeinsame Verteidigung einzusteigen. Mit dem Lissabon-Vertrag haben dies 28 Regierungen bereits verabschiedet und 28 nationale Parlamente ratifiziert. Hierzu brauchen wir also keinen neuen Vertrag, wir müssen nur umsetzen, was wir bereits vor Jahren vereinbart haben.

An die Transatlantiker unter uns gewandt, sage ich klar, dass die Möglichkeiten des EU-Vertrags sehr wohl mit unseren NATO-Verpflichtungen vereinbar sind. Wir stehen zur NATO und wollen mit der EU dazu beitragen, den europäischen Pfeiler innerhalb des Bündnisses mit konkreten Maßnahmen zu stärken. Dabei ist es sehr gut, dass das Reflexionspapier der Kommission zur Verteidigung realistischerweise von EU-Angeboten zur Unterstützung von Kooperationen spricht. Der EU-Beitrag zur Stärkung der Verteidigungsfähigkeiten liegt in der Tat darin, Anreize zu schaffen, damit die Mitgliedstaaten bei Forschung, Fähigkeitenentwicklung und Beschaffung mehr kooperieren. Dies nutzt auch der NATO, da die Mitgliedstaaten bekanntlich ja nur über ein *single set of forces* verfügen, das sie sowohl der EU als auch der NATO oder einer Koalition der Willigen zur Verfügung stellen können.

Es ist sehr gut, dass die Kommission ihre Planungen für EU-finanzierte Verteidigungsforschung weiter ausführt. Das Europäische Parlament hatte die erste Haushaltszeile für Verteidigung und Verteidigungsforschung bereits im Rahmen eines Pilotprojekts in den Haushalten 2015 und 2016 auf die Schiene gesetzt. Das übergeordnete Ziel bleibt, ab 2021 — dem Beginn der nächsten Finanzperiode – 500 Millionen Euro pro Jahr für Verteidigungsforschung bereitzustellen. Die Überlegung hierbei ist sehr einfach: Wer bereits bei der Forschung miteinander kooperiert, wird dies auch bei Entwicklung, Beschaffung und militärischer Nutzung tun.

Lassen Sie mich auf den Gesetzentwurf über das Europäische Verteidigungsindustrie-Entwicklungsprogramm EDIDP zu sprechen kommen. Für dieses Programm sollen 2019 und 2020 500 Mio. Euro bereitgestellt werden. Grundsätzlich ist der Vorschlag zu begrüßen, da die Kommission mit diesem Schritt die Gefahr minimiert, dass die Mitgliedstaaten nach EU-finanzierter Verteidigungsforschung die Lust an gemeinsamen Programmen verlieren könnten. Der Vorschlag bietet die Chance, dass die nationalen Verteidigungsministerien und Beschaffungsämter tatsächlich in kooperative Programme einsteigen.

Zurück zur PESCO: Gemeinsam mit meinem Kollegen González Pons habe ich im März dieses Jahres unsere parlamentarischen Vorstellungen zu PESCO auf den Tisch gelegt. Diese sind ambitionierter als die hier vereinbarten Projekte. PESCO ist mehr als PEPCO – *permanent project coordination*. Ich freue mich gleichwohl, dass der Rat im gestrigen PESCO-Beschluss unsere zentrale Forderung aufgegriffen hat, die Kosten der strukturierten Zusammenarbeit aus dem Unionshaushalt zu bezahlen, das heißt Verwaltungskosten und operative Kosten außerhalb militärischer Operationen. Ich bin gespannt auf den Vorschlag unseres Haushaltskommissars Oettinger zur Finanzierung der PESCO. Gemeinsam mit dem Rat sind wir im Parlament aufgefordert, die Haushaltsmittel zügig zur Verfügung zu stellen. Der Rat sollte bei der Gelegenheit aber auch den Athena-Mechanismus zur Finanzierung militärischer Operationen endlich nutzerfreundlich gestalten, das heißt mit weitaus mehr gemeinsam zu tragenden Kosten.

Mit den jüngsten Vorschlägen von Kommission und Rat wurde der Countdown für die Europäische Verteidigungsunion gestartet. Jetzt ist es an der Zeit, all die losen Enden in einem EU-Weißbuch für Sicherheit und Verteidigung zusammenzuführen, damit wir gegenüber unseren Bürgern das Ziel und den Weg zur Verteidigungsunion nachvollziehbar darlegen. Ich freue mich beim Beschreiten dieses gemeinsamen europäischen Weges auf Ihre Unterstützung!

Federica Mogherini, *vicepresidente della Commissione/alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza*. – Grazie signor Presidente, sa che di solito mi siedo dal lato della Commissione, ma effettivamente per questo dibattito credo che sia istituzionalmente più corretto che io mi rivolga a quest'Aula da questo lato. Verrò poi al tema del doppio o triplo cappello del mio ruolo.

Let me start by thanking David McAllister and Michael Gahler for their great work and the entire Parliament for its excellent and long-standing work.

Looking at your reports, I see first of all a very strong consensus amongst us on how crucial our unity has become for our European citizens and for the entire world. There is a need for the European Union as a force for peace and security; there is a need for us to be a credible and reliable power on the global scene – a rational, wise and calm one. So I am glad that your reports also demonstrate a great ambition, the ambition to make our Union even stronger so that we can fully take up this role, because this is exactly what the situation requires. When we look at the world around us, we see not just uncertainty, not just unpredictability, but confusion and sometimes very dangerous confusion. This is why we are becoming more and more of a point of reference for so many around the world, because we are reliable and our partners know where we stand; we are predictable because we are open about our interests and values; we are cooperative, and our friends know that they can always count on us.

When others have put into question the United Nations and multilateralism, we have decided to invest even more strongly in them. Not only have we supported António Guterres in his work on reforming the UN system, but we have also worked with UN agencies all around the world, and particularly with UNHCR and the International Organisation for Migration.

When we set up our own initiative for the future of Syria and the region with the Brussels process, we did it to support the Geneva talks led by the United Nations through all possible means and in strong coordination with them.

We have stood by the nuclear deal with Iran and we are working for a peaceful solution to the crisis with North Korea.

We have invested in the UN Agenda for Sustainable Development.

We have put our relationship with Africa on a more equal footing, with so many joint initiatives, from our support to the G-5 Sahel Joint Military Force to the European External Investment Plan.

We have invested in resilience, for instance with our eastern partners, working on our youth, on the fight against corruption, on energy sector reform, and on strategic communications.

And we have continued to be a force for peace and reconciliation, starting with our own region, Europe, with the Western Balkans and a credible path towards our European Union.

We have become an indispensable partner for peace and reconciliation for a more effective multilateralism, for sustainable development. We have also become an indispensable partner and power for international security and a global security provider.

In today's world, security and development go hand-in-hand. So hard and soft power must also go hand-in-hand. Our work on security and defence is part of this broader picture. It has nothing to do with the militarisation of our Union, we are not turning our Union into a military alliance. But if we want to help our African partners whose growth is hampered by insecurity or if we want to make sure that instability abroad does not affect our own citizens, then we also need to be a credible military actor, using all our tools, including military ones, and using them the European way – which means for peace, for development, for people's rights, wisely and in a cooperative manner.

This year our common defence policy has taken steps forward that seemed unthinkable just a few months ago. The Gahler report is very ambitious, and I think these are the right times to be ambitious and daring.

Today the main building blocks of a European Union of security and defence are finally there. We can now research and develop our defence capabilities together. We can buy together to ensure that we have the capabilities we need, while spending efficiently. We can act together to manage or prevent crises, to strengthen our partners, to make our citizens more secure. To get there, we have set up in just one year – even if this is built on many long years of parliamentary work, and not only in Parliament – an impressive number of new tools and initiatives, all of which would have seemed impossible just a few months ago – just last year, when we were holding this same debate in this hemicycle.

We have done that while bringing our cooperation with NATO to an unprecedented level. Last year, we announced 42 joint actions with NATO, we have implemented them – I was reporting about that implementation with NATO Secretary-General Stoltenberg just last week and, by the way, let me take this opportunity to congratulate him on the extension of his mandate to 2020 — and last week at the NATO ministerial meeting we agreed together 32 more actions, so our NATO partners know that a stronger European Union makes NATO stronger because our Member States and NATO allies have one set of forces as you mentioned that can be used in different environments, different frameworks and our organisations can only be complementary.

And now I come to the tools we have put in place during this year of work. First, we created the first ever command centre for our military training and advisory missions. I have the impression that the demand for our military and civilian missions can only grow in the future, and now we have the right structures to plan and command our missions.

Second, with the European Commission – and here perhaps I should jump over to the other side of the Hemicycle – we have set up a European defence fund. For the first time ever, the European Commission is committing common resources to invest in defence – not to militarise our budget, but on the contrary to help Member States spend better on defence by spending together.

Third, we have established a coordinated annual review on national defence budgets for which a trial run has just been launched, and the first progress report is planned for November next year.

And of course, the most historic step: just yesterday, the Foreign Affairs Council activated a Permanent Structured Cooperation on defence. This was unimaginable just a few months ago, let alone at the beginning of my mandate. I remember very well that at my hearing before your joint committees – and many of you might remember it as well – I replied to a question from Mr Danjean that I would work to use all of the instruments that the Lisbon Treaty gives us, and we have. We did it in the most ambitious and inclusive manner, with 25 Member States from the very beginning launching PESCO together. The 25 have taken binding commitments to improving their cooperation, and the progress on these commitments will be assessed regularly. We will start with the first set of 17 projects. These are very practical programmes. They will facilitate cooperation between our armed forces, fill some gaps in our capabilities, and make our European defence spending much more efficient. I have mentioned this several times, we have an investment gap across the Atlantic: the Europeans invest 50% of what the Americans invest on defence, but the output gap is much more impressive because what we get out of our investment is 15% of what the Americans get, so here is where we can act at the European Union level to make our investments in defence more efficient.

These projects range from common military training to new technologies for protecting our critical infrastructures, to providing medical support to our operations, and I could continue. The possibilities of the Permanent Structured Cooperation are immense and they will be even greater if we manage to make the Permanent Structured Cooperation work together with all our new defence tools. The Member States that launched the Permanent Structured Cooperation have committed to fully participate in the comprehensive annual review on defence, and they will use the European Defence Fund whenever possible. The defence fund could be used to create a bonus for projects undertaken in the Permanent Structured Cooperation framework. The coordinated review will help us identify new fields for cooperation so that Permanent Structured Cooperation can step in. Obviously these initiatives will have to be developed coherently and using all possible synergies, but I believe that is exactly what the Lisbon Treaty had in mind when creating the not double, but triple-hatted High Representative, Vice-President of the Commission and Head of the European Defence Agency. Actually, this is why I should deliver my speech somewhere in the middle of my speaking positions in the hemicycle, because I think that the work we have done this year also has an institutional value, to show that the different institutions we have can join forces in a coordinated manner towards one objective and delivering results that were considered impossible to achieve.

I must confess that at this moment I am torn between two different personal feelings: on the one hand, I think «Habemus Papam» – white smoke, mission accomplished – but there is no time to celebrate. It is true that we made it, it's historic, it's big, but at the same time the real work is just about to begin. I think we have to be aware that this is a new chapter in the history of the European Union, but today we have the paper, we have the ink, and we have a good story to tell. So we have work to do and I think we have to look immediately from today, the day after the decision on the Permanent Structured Cooperation was formally taken in the Council and look immediately at the next steps.

So it is not only about the Permanent Structured Cooperation and its possibilities, the concrete projects and many more other things, but other fields of action will also be on our agenda in the year to come. The work on our battle groups, for instance, is not finalised yet, and I hope and I encourage Member States to be ambitious and to achieve progress in the Athena Committee by the end of this year or early 2018.

On top of that we are also working on new proposals on how to fund together our work on security and defence. Together with NATO we are also working to improve military mobility inside the European Union, and this project also fits very well in our defence cooperation agenda.

Last but not least, I would also like to see in the next few months progress on our civilian missions and capabilities, because security threats have changed and this makes our civilian engagement even more important. Think of our new mission to support security sector reform and stabilisation in Iraq, or our long-standing civilian commitment in the Balkans or in Eastern Europe, and you realise that these are key elements of our work on security. So the European way to security and defence lies precisely in the careful and wise mix between targeted military and civilian actions. That is what makes the European Union a unique security interlocutor and player in the world.

In three years of common work since I started, our European Union of security and defence has advanced enormously. I would say we have achieved more in these last three years than in the previous 30 or 60 years and it makes me proud, also as an Italian, that this happens in the year of the 60th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome. That was part of the dreams of our founding fathers and mothers. But again, we have to look at the next 60 years. This should make us proud and it should make us more aware of our potential and give us the energy, the determination and the hope that we will need to continue strengthening the European Union as a global player.

Let me finish with this. I have always been convinced, and am even more so today, that the European Union is what we make of it. We decided to change things together in this field and we did, and now we are ready to work and shape our next steps towards a European Union of security and defence and I am sure we will continue to work together and do it, now and in the years to come.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señora alta representante, señorías, quisiera, en primer lugar, reconocer y saludar el trabajo de nuestros ponentes, los señores McAllister y Gahler. Creo que si hay una conclusión que se puede extraer de los dos informes es que en estos tiempos de incertidumbre —como nos lo decía la alta representante— ningún Estado miembro puede por sí mismo resolver los retos que tenemos por delante.

Esta tarde abordaremos también la situación del acuerdo nuclear con Irán o la decisión de los Estados Unidos de trasladar su embajada en Israel. Quiero decir con esto que esta misma tesis vale para los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea y para el resto del mundo. Hoy, el unilateralismo, incluido el de los más prósperos o el de los más poderosos, es un sueño completamente imposible. Creo que el camino a seguir es la recomendación que nos hace el señor McAllister en su informe: tenemos que hacer un diagnóstico compartido y un diagnóstico lúcido de los retos y de la nueva configuración de las amenazas, especialmente de la guerra híbrida con su dimensión cibernética.

Tenemos que profundizar y consolidar el proyecto de Unión Europea a través del desarrollo de nuevas capacidades —la felicitó, señora alta representante, por los proyectos que ha puesto encima de la mesa, fundamentalmente por la estrategia de cooperación reforzada—, y al mismo tiempo reforzar nuestras alianzas con los socios estratégicos y con la organización atlántica. Y creo que —como usted decía muy bien, señora Mogherini— no tenemos que dormarnos en los laureles, aunque sean merecidos, sino que nos queda todavía mucho por hacer.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I should like to call the High Representative ‘dear Federica’, or perhaps I should call you ‘Ms Ubiquity’, because you have to run from one corner to another.

Today we are debating two of the most important reports this Parliament has ever debated, namely the reports by Mr McAllister and Mr Gahler. As the complex security challenges are becoming more and more serious in our neighbourhood and beyond, the EU remains –as you rightly mentioned recently, Madam High Representative – the most predictable, credible and humane global power necessary to the whole world. Yes, we are expected to act in a united and effective manner inside and outside the Union to protect our citizens, to support our partners and allies, and to be able to prevent and manage rapidly the external threats from conventional to hybrid warfare, cyber and terrorist attacks. Therefore, strong cooperation in the context of the CFSP and CSDP is the best answer. Only this will allow the EU to enhance our defence capabilities and prevent duplication.

It goes without saying that these commitments require adequate Member State and EU budget adjustment and funding. I welcome the progress made since the adoption of the EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security policy, including the adoption of the European Defence Fund and the legislative proposal on the European defence industrial programme, as well as the notification of the activation of PESCO last November, which is a major victory for the Union and for our future defence and security capabilities. I would like this to become the most inclusive and ambitious project possible for our Union.

Finally, I would like to stress the importance of our transatlantic relations and our strategic and complementary partnership with NATO, as well as the importance of the enlargement process towards the Western Balkans for the security and stability of the Union. So I recall the necessity for all candidate countries from the region to align themselves with the foreign and security policy of the Union and I encourage the opening, as soon as possible, of Chapter 31 of the negotiations.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, on all sides of the EU’s external borders, we are now faced with political and security instability. Events in Libya have seen large tracks of its territory fall into the hands of armed militias. The illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 has sparked fresh tensions with the European Union, whilst war still goes on, sadly, in the east of Ukraine.

President Erdoğan of Turkey, meanwhile, presses ahead with his reorientation of Turkey in a Middle Eastern direction, seeking a dominant role in regional politics and hollowing out democratic institutions at home. Furthermore, despite continued progress and improvements in the Western Balkans, Euro-Atlanticist integration of that region still remains challenging. This is set against a wider backdrop of increased global threats such as terrorism, climate change, migratory fluxes, cyber attacks and a less engaged and isolationist America following the election of President Trump.

It is no surprise, therefore, that we see a renewed focus in demand by Member States to work together more closely at EU level in the realms of foreign security and defence policies.

The 2016 global strategy set out a bold vision for the EU in this regard, and a concrete example seen this year in the form of permanent structured cooperation on security and defence (PESCO), with 25 out of 27 EU Member States now having joined, and the launch of a European defence fund, prove that this is now a reality.

Despite Brexit, it is clear that the United Kingdom, my country, understands the need and has a desire to remain fully engaged with the EU in these areas, and will remain a member of NATO and seek a strong NATO common security and defence policy (CSDP) cooperation. I sincerely hope that phase two of the negotiations between the EU 27 and the UK will deliver such a deep and special partnership.

Jozo Radoš, *u ime kluba ALDE*. – Gospodine predsjedniče, godina 2017. je godina niza vrlo konkretnih koraka nakon višegodišnjih zastoja i pukih deklaracija u razvoju zajedničke europske sigurnosne i obrambene politike. Ti konkretni koraci su osnivanje Europskog obrambenog fonda, pripreme za zajednička obrambena istraživanja i osnivanje europskog obrambenog industrijskog razvojnog programa, kao i formalno zasnivanje stalne strukturirane suradnje. No ipak, ako želimo da 2025. godine imamo stvarnu, snažnu europsku obrambenu uniju, ti početni koraci trebaju biti praćeni pretvaranjem privremenih u trajne mjere, jednako tako znatnim povećanjem financijske potpore tim mjerama, uključujući i stvaranje klasničnog obrambenog budžeta Europske unije.

U tom smislu posebno pozdravljam nacionalne provedbene planove, kao i redovite strateške preglede obrane koji će omogućiti da se pomaci, ti konkretni koraci, i nove mjere koje ćemo postaviti, pozorno prate i da se tim praćenjem doista 2025. godine nađemo u situaciji da imamo stvarnu europsku obrambenu uniju.

Sabine Lösing, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Mit Siebenmeilenstiefeln in die gerüstete Union.

Gerüstet wofür? Gerüstet für die militärische Durchsetzung wirtschaftlicher Interessen und die Abwehr der externalisierten Folgen einer rücksichtslosen Umsetzung dieser Interessen, des eigenen sogenannten *way of life*, möglichst nutzerfreundlich, wünscht Herr Gahler.

Vor Kurzem redete ich hier noch gegen die Wunschlisten der Waffenindustrie und flugs sind das in diesem ESVP-Bericht schon Bestelllisten und gewünschte Budgetrahmen. Wie mühsam und zumeist vergeblich ist es, Gelder für echte Entwicklungshilfe und Armutsbekämpfung zusammenzukratzen. Das EU-Förderprogramm für Rüstungsvorhaben in Milliardenhöhe – Forschung, Entwicklung und Beschaffung – stand innerhalb von sechs Monaten, dem Finanzierungsverbot in Artikel 41 Absatz 2 zum Trotz.

Lesen wir im McAllister-Bericht von friedlicher und diplomatischer Konfliktlösung und unteilbaren Menschenrechten, so sehen wir zugleich die Realität: All die Desaster nach militärischen Interventionen, von der EU finanzierte Flüchtlingsabwehr und Gefängnisse für Geflüchtete, Tote im Meer und in der Wüste. Diese Politik der EU wurde gerade von Amnesty International massiv kritisiert. Mit PESCO – im Übrigen unter Führung von Deutschland und Frankreich und unter Aushebelung des Konsensprinzips – als weiterem Schritt zur Militärunion verabschieden wir uns gerade endgültig von einer EU, die vorgeblich für den Erhalt des Friedens geschaffen wurde, und nach uns die Sintflut. Frohe Weihnachten!

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Vi lever i en tid med nya säkerhetsutmaningar för Europa och det innebär med automatik att vi måste anpassa vår politik till det förändrade läget.

Men samtidigt så måste vi ha is i magen och inte låta oss skena iväg med en mängd ogenomtänkta förslag och åtgärder som till och med ibland strider mot fördraget, och där befinner vi oss idag.

Vi gröna menar att i stället för att EU ska ta på sig nya uppgifter ska vi bli bättre på dem vi redan har idag. Det handlar bland annat om olika typer av fredsinsatser och arbete före, under och efter en konflikt, inklusive bistånd.

Vi vill också reformera EU:s battlegroup så att den faktiskt kan komma till användning i EU:s eller FN:s fredsinsatser och vi vill se mer samarbete mellan EU-länderna, inte minst vad gäller försvarsmaterial. Därför ser vi mer positivt på det frivilliga samarbetet i Pesco som ju sen länge finns inskrivet i fördraget.

Vi motsätter oss däremot mycket starkt ett kvantitativt mål för medlemsstaternas försvarsbudgetar, och menar att målen ska vara kvalitativa, dvs. en budget för de verkliga behoven med fokus på ökad försvarsförmåga.

Tvåprocentsmålet är inte en garanti för ökad försvarsförmåga. Den enda klara vinnaren är vapenindustrin. Investeringar som görs måste vara smarta och effektiva för att få ut mer säkerhet för pengarna, istället för att riskera att bidra till kapprustning och ökade spänningar.

I dag spenderar EU:s medlemsländer mest i världen efter USA på försvar, men vi får förhållandevis lite för pengarna, precis som fru Mogherini sa, eftersom varje land håller sin egen försvarsindustri under armarna med ineffektiva subventioner. Resultatet är att vi har en överproduktion av försvarsmateriel i EU.

Det driver länderna att sälja överskottet utomlands till ibland tveksamma köpare. Och kommissionen har nyligen räknat ut att vi kan spara mellan 25 och 100 miljarder euro på ökat samarbete på försvarsmaterielområdet, och genom ökat samarbete och samordning kan frigiorda medel återinvesteras i stärkt försvarsförmåga och dessutom göra det lättare för medlemsstaterna att samverka i EU:s fredsinsatser.

Sammanfattningsvis så är vi gröna för utökat samarbete kring materiel och för större gemensamt engagemang i konfliktförebyggande och fredsfrämjande insatser. Vi är däremot emot att stegvis flytta makten över försvarspolitiken till EU. Vi vill inte se en EU-budget för försvar eller en försvarsfond, försvarsindustriprogram, EU-försvarsdepartement eller en EU-armé. Vi vill att EU ska fortsätta att vara ett fredsprojekt, inte att unionen ska bli en militärallians eller ges ansvar för Europas territoriella försvar.

Sen har jag en fråga till fru Mogherini, och det handlar också om det brev som 4 partigrupper skickade till höga representanten om ett vapenembargo till Saudi-Arabien –något som vi här i parlamentet har tagit ställning för redan 3 gånger. Händer någonting? Tas några initiativ på EU-nivå för att stoppa vapenexporten till Saudi-Arabien?

Florian Philippot, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, aujourd'hui encore plus que d'ordinaire, je suis fier d'appartenir au peuple français. C'est le peuple qui, dès 1954, par la voix de ses représentants, rejeta la Communauté européenne de défense. Dans la continuité des députés français, je m'oppose aujourd'hui à la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense commune et à sa nouvelle avancée fédérale, dont les peuples ne veulent pas plus maintenant qu'autrefois.

Le rapport qui nous est présenté aujourd'hui montre combien l'Union européenne se fait en dépit et contre la volonté des peuples et de leurs intérêts. Longtemps, cela s'est fait en catimini, mais c'est devenu évident depuis l'infâme traité de Lisbonne, qui a été imposé aux peuples d'Europe, et particulièrement au mien, alors que les votes populaires avaient été extrêmement clairs.

Nous contestons déjà le bien-fondé de l'OTAN, organisation qui met les moyens militaires de ses membres sous le commandement d'une volonté politique qui n'est pas celle de leur peuple. L'Union européenne se place sous la dépendance de l'OTAN, donc des intérêts américains, alors que la politique étrangère de Trump est marquée par l'incertitude et qu'il est plus que jamais nécessaire que chaque pays conserve sa liberté d'agir.

Oui, coopérer avec des alliés et mener des opérations militaires communes est utile, mais constituer une force unique commandée par l'Union européenne, certainement pas. À quoi peut servir une force européenne? À mener des guerres extérieures? Mais il n'est nul besoin d'une défense commune pour cela.

Des actions politiques menées contre ceux qui osent se rebeller contre l'Union européenne nous montrent le véritable danger. Lorsque les eurocrates disposeront du commandement sur des forces armées, ce n'est pas contre des ennemis extérieurs qu'ils le tourneront, ce sera contre les peuples d'Europe. Ils ne se contenteront plus de bafouer les référendums, d'imposer des actions et d'adresser des remontrances. Ils enverront les chars faire régner l'ordre à Varsovie, à Rome, à Paris et, partout, les peuples opprimés par Bruxelles voudront se battre pour retrouver leur liberté.

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, voilà deux rapports intimement liés puisqu'ils portent, respectivement, sur la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune (PESC) et la politique de sécurité et de défense commune (PSDC).

Ces deux rapports ont été confiés à des députés du parti de M^{me} Merkel. Ce n'est donc pas étonnant d'y lire quelques contre-vérités. Ainsi, l'un des rapporteurs ose dire, par exemple, que la Russie empêcherait la résolution du conflit en Syrie, puis, au paragraphe suivant, que la priorité serait – je cite – «de consolider», pour les migrants, «une voie légale et sûre d'accès à l'Europe». Revenons à un peu de sérieux, si vous le permettez!

S'agissant de la PSDC, il faut se rappeler, je cite, que «la plupart des pays européens sont incapables d'assumer leur propre défense. L'armée nationale est souvent tout juste bonne pour les défilés et quelques missions en mode multinational d'intensité et de portée moyennes». Madame Mogherini, ce constat, c'est Nicolas Gros-Verheyde qui le fait en introduction du livre qu'il a publié en avril dernier et que vous avez vous-même préfacé.

Si les armées de nos différents pays s'apparentent de plus en plus à des tigres de papier, c'est d'abord parce que l'on n'a cessé de réduire les budgets de la défense, alors même que la Chine, l'Inde, l'Indonésie, mais aussi la Russie ou les États-Unis augmentent leurs dépenses dans ce domaine, qui conditionne évidemment toute politique étrangère crédible. En 2016, avec 664 milliards de dollars, le budget américain représente trois fois le budget de tous les Européens réunis.

Dans son rapport, M. Gahler réclame la création d'une force européenne intégrée. Mais au lieu d'une superstructure artificielle, si nous voulons que nos armées coopèrent efficacement, il faudrait d'abord favoriser la concertation opérationnelle et logistique: c'est par la multiplication d'exercices militaires conjoints entre armées reconnaissant mutuellement la disparité de capacités et d'ambitions que des perspectives stratégiques communes pourront être définies. Seule la conduite d'opérations par des coalitions aux périmètres variés à trois, à quatre, à cinq, ou même davantage, constitue un objectif réaliste. En somme, des coopérations souples et volontaires.

Enfin, à quoi sert-il de faire de grands discours sur l'Europe de la défense si c'est pour continuer à acheter du matériel américain? Après le Brexit, la France sera le seul pays européen à disposer à la fois de l'arme nucléaire et d'un siège au Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU, mais aussi d'une industrie militaire performante. Derrière des grands groupes comme Dassault, Thales ou MBDA, il existe une myriade de PME innovantes qui méritent d'être soutenues. La robotique et le biomimétisme, voilà des secteurs de défense dans lesquels nous devons investir pour ne plus nous laisser distancer par nos concurrents, qu'ils soient américains ou asiatiques.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, από τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως μόνο η Ελλάδα και η Κύπρος αντιμετωπίζουν πραγματική απειλή για την ασφάλειά τους προερχόμενη από την Τουρκία, η οποία ευθέως και επισήμως εγείρει αξιώσεις κατά της εδαφικής της ακεραιότητας. Η κατάσταση αυτή τους επιβάλλει να δαπανούν μεγάλα χρηματικά ποσά για την άμυνά τους. Οι υπόλοιπες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως αντιμετωπίζουν κινδύνους και απειλές από τη διεθνή τρομοκρατία, το οργανωμένο έγκλημα και τις επιθέσεις στον κυβερνοχώρο. Οι απειλές όμως αυτές δεν είναι τόσο ισχυρές ώστε να τους επιβάλλουν την υποχρέωση να αυξήσουν τις αμυντικές τους δαπάνες. Επιπλέον, δεν υπάρχει κάποιος πανίσχυρος εχθρός ο οποίος απειλεί την Ευρώπη. Άλλωστε την άμυνα κατά αυτού του εχθρού την έχει αναλάβει το NATO, στο οποίο ανήκουν οι περισσότερες χώρες της Ευρώπης.

Άρα επί της ουσίας δεν υπάρχει λόγος για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να αυξήσει τις αμυντικές της ικανότητες. Εάν συμβεί κάτι τέτοιο, αυτό θα εξυπηρετεί άλλους σκοπούς, όπως την παρέμβαση στα εσωτερικά τρίτων χωρών, πωλήσεις όπλων και χρηματοδοτήσεις διεφθαρμένων καθεστώτων. Τέλος, θα ήθελα να επισημάνω ότι δεν πρέπει να μεθοδευτεί η παράκαμψη της αρχής της ομοφωνίας μόνο και μόνο για να υπερκεραστούν οι αντιδράσεις κάποιων χωρών οι οποίες επιμένουν να μην αποκλίνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση από τις αρχές και τις αξίες της.

Presidente. – Adesso apriamo il dibattito vero e proprio, e possiamo accettare le «blue card», però il tempo deve essere rispettato da tutti gli oratori perché siamo in grande ritardo.

Arnaud Danjean (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, nous avons trop souvent, Madame la Haute représentante, regretté ici dans cette assemblée la faiblesse et la lenteur des progrès dans la mise en œuvre du traité de Lisbonne pour ne pas nous réjouir aujourd'hui de voir qu'enfin, la plupart de ces dispositions sont adoptées et vont être mises en œuvre.

Nous vous félicitons donc de ce travail, tout en étant conscients qu'il reste beaucoup à faire. Nous avons beaucoup de déclarations d'intention tout à fait vertueuses, mais le diable sera dans les détails et dans la mise en œuvre pratique de toutes ces recommandations.

Depuis la publication de votre stratégie globale en juin 2006 jusqu'au lancement de la coopération structurée permanente hier, beaucoup de progrès ont été accomplis, témoignant d'une prise de conscience, la prise de conscience par les Européens eux-mêmes que leur sécurité les concernait et qu'ils devaient faire plus pour l'assurer.

De ce point de vue-là, permettez-moi de balayer certains arguments que nous venons d'entendre, selon lesquels les peuples européens ne voudraient pas de cela. C'est toujours les groupes minoritaires qui parlent au nom des peuples, comme s'ils étaient les mieux placés pour les représenter dans leur globalité et leur diversité.

En tout cas, ce que les peuples européens veulent, c'est plus de sécurité. Les politiques qui sont aujourd'hui mises en œuvre vont dans ce sens et, de ce point de vue, elles n'empiètent pas non plus sur la souveraineté des États. Chacun conserve ses propres forces armées, chacun en dispose comme il veut.

La France – cela a été redit ici –, qui reste aujourd'hui la nation militaire la plus active en Europe, a des troupes déployées dans l'ONU, dans l'OTAN, dans l'Union européenne et en capacité strictement nationale. Cela n'empiète en rien sa souveraineté, mais garantit un peu plus celle des Européens.

C'est cela qu'il faut travailler aujourd'hui: du pragmatisme, de la flexibilité et, surtout, de l'efficacité. Je pense, de ce point de vue, que les mesures prises sont bonnes. Il faut veiller à ce qu'elles soient très opérationnelles, et nous vous faisons confiance pour mener ce travail.

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

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), blue-card question. – Mr President, I noticed in Mr Danjean's speech that he spoke about the Lisbon Treaty and the Union. Would it not be fair to say that this combined defence is really a united defence, leading towards the United States of Europe, very much as former President Schulz outlined in his recent speech and all this is, primarily, is a political project, to bring the peoples of Europe together in the United States of Europe?

Arnaud Danjean (PPE), réponse «carton bleu». – Mon cher collègue, vous faites référence au traité de Lisbonne – l'avez-vous lu? – dans ses dispositions sur la politique de sécurité de défense commune. Parce que les dispositions du traité de Lisbonne sont particulièrement précises et explicites: elles ne parlent pas d'armée européenne ni d'armée intégrée, elles parlent de compatibilité avec d'autres engagements dans d'autres alliances, notamment l'OTAN. Tout cela est parfaitement pragmatique.

Vous faites donc des procès d'intention parce que vous voulez des vues idéologiques et parce que cela sert votre propagande. Simplement, la réalité des faits est plus forte que votre propagande. Ce dont nous débattons aujourd'hui est quelque chose d'extrêmement pragmatique, bien loin de l'idéologie que vous essayez de promouvoir pour mieux la contrer.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente. Lo cierto, señora Mogherini, es que me gusta mucho verla sentada en ese sitio. Debería usted sentarse más veces. A mí, por lo menos, me tranquilizaría mucho.

A veces, para saber si uno acierta en política no hay como escuchar a los adversarios. Los adversarios de Europa están realmente molestos con este avance innegable en la política exterior y de seguridad común. A veces es reconfortante escucharles justamente porque nos asegura que estamos en el buen camino. Creo que estamos en el buen camino y quiero felicitarla, señora Mogherini, porque probablemente esto ha sido posible gracias a su esfuerzo y no solo a su esfuerzo sino, sobre todo, a su compromiso.

Hay que decir a los colegas que no entienden Europa que la ambición europeísta es la paz, la seguridad. Y solo así es posible la prosperidad. Y lo que defendemos dentro de nuestras fronteras debemos defenderlo de la misma manera fuera. También conviene decir —ahora que se cita la soberanía como problema— que no hay mejor manera de defender la soberanía de cada uno de nuestros Estados, y sobre todo la soberanía de nuestros ciudadanos, que compartiendo los problemas que son comunes.

Porque los problemas que encara la ciudadanía europea no tienen fronteras. No tienen fronteras. El terrorismo no tiene fronteras. Los problemas de la migración no tienen fronteras. Los problemas más graves que enfrentamos no tienen fronteras: el cambio climático. Por lo tanto, necesitamos una política exterior y de seguridad que asegure efectivamente que nuestros valores son defendidos en el contexto de un mundo ampliamente globalizado.

Y a mí me tranquiliza que podamos defender el multilateralismo. A mí me tranquiliza que podamos trabajar en operaciones de estabilidad, de paz, en resolución de conflictos, en un apoyo muy directo a nuestra vecindad, África como gran elemento central de la política exterior y de seguridad europea, Libia, Túnez, los refugiados, la defensa de los derechos humanos. Eso está en el espíritu europeo, en el espíritu europeísta que aquí defendemos la mayoría de los que nos sentamos y que algunos han venido a combatir, pero van a perder.

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). – Mr. President, I am always amused by the use of opinion polls. I wonder if the people across Europe were asked if, for their defence they would prefer to rely on the EU institutions or on the NATO alliance that engages the United States alongside the European nations. I wonder what they would answer. I have to say that this is not a question you would like, absolutely. I have to say I that I don't agree with most of Mr Gahler's report, but there are three phrases that I do actually agree with. The western democracies do indeed face unprecedented threats and challenges; the United States' commitment to European security is welcome, and I would say essential; and that Brexit means the European Union could lose Britain's military capability and expertise and there is a need for a new UK-EU defence cooperation relationship.

The logic of all this is to underline the need for western solidarity and for us all to put our energies into revitalising the alliance that binds the United States and Britain to the security of Europe. It is called NATO, but instead the European Union is creating an entirely separate European defence union separate from NATO but still involving most of the NATO allies. It's all about political integration and the long-standing desire of a certain Member State for so-called strategic autonomy. Actually we don't need PESCO, we don't need EDU; what we need is for all the Europeans to spend more on defence to address crises alongside all their key allies and to have the political will to participate in military action when required.

Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE). – Mr President, I would like to say that our common foreign and security policy should be about hard power. It should be about defending our borders and providing peace and security. Not only by peacekeeping, it should also be by peace enforcing, and the UK should be fully integrated in that. That is why European defence aspirations should be integrated in NATO. Of course, if it is not possible for NATO to act for whatever political reason, we should be able to act ourselves. That is also in the defence of our interests. But again, let's try to get on one line with NATO, that is the best option.

If we look at security threats, I also understand that seen from Washington DC a threat from Russia is different than if you look from Tallinn, from Kyiv or from Georgia, or from Moldova – that is a different way, a different angle. If we look at the situation in the Middle East, of course this is a global concern which concerns the United States as well, but it is directly on our border, so we have a specific extra interest and therefore we should put our money where our mouth is. We should really invest and, again, those countries which would like to be members of the European Union should also adopt our views about security and defence.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Idėja sukurti nuolatinį struktūrinį bendradarbiavimą saugumo ir gynybos srityje iš pirmo žvilgsnio tikrai atrodo sveikintina. Neseni įvykiai Rytų kaimynystėje rodo, kad Europa po šaltojo karo netapo saugesne vieta. Kita vertus, ar tikrai esame įsitikinę, kad einame teisingu keliu? Ar nekuriamo naujos institucijos be konkrečių poveikio instrumentų? Ir kas svarbiausia, ar ne dubliuosime ikišiolinio saugumo garanto, NATO struktūros ir pajėgumų? Ar visi jau esame įvykdę įsipareigojimus NATO dėl gynybos finansavimo? Tai yra klausimai, į kuriuos iki šiol nesu gavęs aiškaus atsakymo.

Pastaraisiais metais matau tendenciją bet kokias problemas spręsti ne mąstant apie jų priežastis, o tiesiog sukuriant naujas Europos Sąjungos institucijas. Ar tikrai tai geriausias būdas?

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, in last June's UK referendum the British people wisely voted for our independence from the European Union, yet the British Government, through a lack of intent and preparation, seems to be doing a good job in messing it up. Indeed, last week's announcement was nothing short of scandalous.

Yet something that is yet to achieve detailed public scrutiny in the UK is the apparent willingness to sell out British defence and foreign policy by sticking as closely as possible to EU policy. Indeed, the same could be said about the traditionally neutral EU members, Austria, Sweden and the Republic of Ireland. I have to wonder whether the political classes there are being deliberately quiet on this critical issue.

The EU has nothing to contribute that cannot be better achieved via existing institutions such as NATO, or of course through bilateral relations. It is time for the European Union to roll back its ambitions in this area. At the very least, the UK should have no further part in propagating them.

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Mr President, a fully-fledged EU army is in the making. Brussels is aiming to have its own military apparatus backed by a joint defence budget of billions. It fits in perfectly with the EU's ambition of constructing a European superstate, replacing the nation states of Europe, as openly admitted by Verhofstadt. It has always been in the Treaties, yet you all lie to your constituents. You said it was a right-wing Eurosceptic fantasy, as did the sacked UK Remainer, Nick Clegg. At last we on this side of the House have been proven right.

This army provides the ultimate grandeur of fully-fledged statehood, as unveiled by Martin Schulz this weekend. All the taxpayers' money the EU will be spending on defence will not be going into useful capabilities. It will definitely not be used to beef up the NATO alliance. Instead, the EU will be expanding its bureaucracy with designer uniforms, shiny new buildings and headquarters. It has already got an anthem and a flag.

So let's be clear. Instead of President Trump undermining the credibility of NATO, it is clear that the EU is undermining NATO.

I was in Washington last week. Senior politicians up on Capitol Hill said to me: 'the army will be used to shore up your external EU borders, right? Or clamp down on radical Islamic extremism, those men raping and assaulting women and Jews, those terrorists that are blowing you up. Is that what your money is going to be used for?' I said no, it won't be to protect the citizens. It will be spent on vanity sabre-rattling by Verhofstadt, Juncker and that gender-quota recycled Communist, the high priestess Ms Mogherini. Be afraid! Yeah, I've got your attention now. Be afraid when they get their hands on the weapons!

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Czytam to sprawozdanie i dowiaduję się, że grozi nam, a nawet toczona jest przeciwko nam jakaś wojna hybrydowa. Ja nie wiem, co to jest wojna hybrydowa, nigdzie tego nie znalazłem, ale wiem, że robi ją podobno Rosja. Otóż Rosja w Syrii nie robiła żadnej wojny hybrydowej, tylko posłała po prostu samoloty, pomogła rozbić samozwańczy kalifat i po prostu samoloty zabrała, wycofała swoje wojska, o czym w ogóle sprawozdanie nie wspomina.

Ale mam drugie pytanie: Jeżeli wojna hybrydowa jest taka niebezpieczna i groźna, to dlaczego my nie robimy wojny hybrydowej? Nie widzę planowania wojny hybrydowej przez Unię Europejską. Dlaczego Unia Europejska nie robi jakiejś wojny hybrydowej, nie odpowiada wojną hybrydową na wojny hybrydowe? Po prostu nic takiego nie istnieje, chodzi po prostu o zamówienia wojskowe i podejrzewam, że chodzi po prostu o to, żeby znów wziąć łapówki za dostawy, a to czołgów, a to czegoś mniej lub bardziej potrzebnego, byle były łapówki dla polityków. I to chyba jest celem powołania tego PESCO.

Julia Pitera (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Z ostatnich badań Eurobarometr wynika, że Europejczycy są głęboko zaniepokojeni geopolitycznymi wydarzeniami na świecie. 68 % ankietowanych chce, by Unia Europejska więcej działała na rzecz bezpieczeństwa i obrony. Niestabilna sytuacja na świecie wymaga bardziej świadomej i odpowiedzialnej Unii zorientowanej na politykę zagraniczną i bezpieczeństwo. Zarówno sprawozdanie posła McAllistera, jak i posła Gahlera podkreślają, że w coraz bardziej skonfliktowanym i niestabilnym otoczeniu międzynarodowym istotną rolę odgrywa połączenie skutecznych projektów i działań unijnych w celu podjęcia poważnych wyzwań. Istotne jest również utrzymanie twardego stanowiska Unii w sprawie sankcji wobec Rosji.

Tym samym z zadowoleniem przyjmuję zawarcie przez Radę Europejską porozumienia w sprawie wdrożenia mechanizmu stałej współpracy strukturalnej PESCO oraz stworzenie europejskiego programu rozwoju przemysłu obronnego. Obie te inicjatywy są szansą na zwiększenie zdolności wojskowych państw europejskich i wzrost inwestycji przeznaczonych na obronność.

Na koniec pozwolę sobie zadać pytanie o spójność nowych projektów i większego zaangażowania państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej ze zobowiązaniami wobec NATO.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst herzlichen Dank an David McAllister und Michael Gahler für vertrauensvolle und produktive Zusammenarbeit.

In dem McAllister-Bericht wird es auf den Punkt gebracht: Es geht um eine Kombination aus effektivem Multilateralismus, gemeinsamer Softpower und einer glaubwürdigen Hardpower. Genau darum geht es: die Kombination aus Softpower und Hardpower.

Wir können auf unsere Softpower stolz sein, und wir müssen sie auch in Zukunft weiterentwickeln. Denn es geht ja nicht um ein Pendel, das jetzt von Softpower auf Hardpower schwingt, als ob das eine sozusagen Schnee von gestern wäre und das andere unsere Zukunft, sondern es geht um beides. Aber ohne Hardpower geht es eben auch nicht.

Es ist viel zu tun. Wie können wir besser arbeiten in der EU? Effizienter zum Beispiel, durch gemeinsame Beschaffung und Forschung. Ich lasse es einfach nicht so stehen, wenn Frau Lösing von der GUE-Fraktion jedes Mal wieder die gleichen falschen Behauptungen aufstellt, als ob wir hier eine Rüstungsspirale in Gang setzen wollten, und anschließend den Saal verlässt, weil die Debatte sie in Wirklichkeit gar nicht interessiert. Insofern sollten wir uns das nicht widerspruchslos bieten lassen.

„Die Welt ist aus den Fugen geraten“, hat ein früherer Außenminister Deutschlands gesagt. Wir können uns nicht mehr auf die USA allein verlassen. Wir müssen die Sicherheit in Europa und um die EU herum in die eigenen Hände nehmen. Das ist fair gegenüber den USA und leider auch notwendig, zumal der US-Präsident sich vom Garanten für Sicherheit zunehmend zum Sicherheitsrisiko entwickelt.

Wir werden noch Weiteres viel diskutieren müssen. Welchen finanziellen Beitrag werden die Mitgliedstaaten leisten? Welche Rolle muss das Parlament im Konkreten spielen, und wie werden wir das gemeinsame Projekt der Begrenzung und Kontrolle von Rüstungsexporten gestalten?

Wir haben einen guten Anfang gemacht. Im Wesentlichen haben wir das Ihnen, Frau Mogherini, zu verdanken, Ihrer klaren, geraden Linie und Ihrer Hartnäckigkeit. Das Vertrauen der großen Fraktionen für die nächsten Schritte haben Sie, auch wenn sie nicht kritiklos sein werden.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Rada zdecydowała, że PESCO ma być inkluzywne i ambitne, czyli angażować we współpracę wiele państw, a jednocześnie przynosić wymierne rezultaty. Jak to osiągnąć? Otóż moim zdaniem trzeba wynegocjować kryteria uczestnictwa i zasady zarządzania PESCO zapewniające równy wpływ państw na kierunki rozwoju współpracy, zwłaszcza programy rozwoju zdolności wojskowych oraz zrównoważony rozwój przemysłu obronnego wszystkich państw Unii. Po drugie, nie do przyjęcia są dokonywane próby zasłaniania się PESCO w celu zmiękczenia zobowiązań przyjętych w NATO. To oraz brak synchronizacji PESCO z procesem planowania obronnego w NATO może istotnie podważyć spójność polityczną sojuszu. A z punktu widzenia bezpieczeństwa flanki wschodniej należy poddać większej analizie projekty wsparcia mobilności wojsk i sprzętu inicjowane w ramach PESCO. Harmonijne działanie i szybkość podejmowania decyzji w tej sprawie jest kluczowa dla bezpieczeństwa Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mevrouw Mogherini, ik ben heel erg blij dat we in het jaar van de zestigste verjaardag van het Verdrag van Rome heel concrete stappen vooruit kunnen zetten in ons gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid. En laat ons eerlijk zijn, dit was nodig, hoogstnodig, want als we gewoon maar uittelden, gaven we met de 28 landen samen 45% van het Amerikaanse defensiebudget uit met een output – u heeft het zelf gezegd – van maar 15%. Dan weten we allemaal dat we veel meer en het veel beter kunnen doen als we het samen doen. De laatste twee jaar hebben we meer vooruitgang geboekt dan in de afgelopen 30 jaar. Dat is natuurlijk het gevolg van de veiligheidsuitdagingen aan onze grenzen, maar ook van de verkiezing en de verklaringen van president Trump. Natuurlijk, ook de brexit zal meespelen.

Ik ben vooral heel erg blij, mevrouw Mogherini, met PESCO. Wij zeggen bij ons: “De schone slaapster is ontwaakt”. Samen investeren, samen onderzoeken, samen ontwikkelen, samen inzetten. Dat is wat Europa moet en kan doen. Heel concrete projecten met 25 landen samen. Maar wij zouden ALDE niet zijn, en ik zou ik niet zijn, als ik niet nog ambitieuzer zou willen zijn. Mevrouw Mogherini, ik heb het hier al vaak gezegd: “*I have a dream*”. Ik heb een droom dat we binnen tien jaar een Europees leger hebben in plaats van dan waarschijnlijk 27 nationale legers. Ik hoop dat u mee aan die kar gaat trekken. *Go for it!* Onze steun heeft u.

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

James Carver (EFDD), blue-card question. – Mrs Vautmans, thank you for taking my question. To quote what you have just said: ‘Sleeping Beauty has finally woken up’. Does that not underline the military ambitions, the federal ambitions of this place? What would you say to the citizens? My country, thankfully, is leaving the European Union, but what would you say to the citizens of Sweden, of Austria, of the Republic of Ireland – neutral countries, traditionally neutral countries – what would you say to them about the direction of the European Union?

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE), “blauwe kaart”-antwoord. – Laat me eerst en vooral natuurlijk antwoorden dat ik het nog altijd enorm betreurt dat jullie land de Europese Unie verlaat en dat ik er ook van overtuigd ben dat de nieuwe, jonge generatie in Groot-Brittannië binnen tien jaar terug naar Europa zal willen komen. Daar ben ik van overtuigd en dat hoop ik. En, tweede punt, wat ik zeg tegen die neutrale landen is heel erg eenvoudig. We gaan met 25 van de 28 landen heel concrete projecten uitvoeren die ook hún veiligheid ten goede komen.

Bill Etheridge (EFDD). – Mr President, my family knows a little about common European defence: my grandmother saw Zeppelins over Tipton in the West Midlands; my great-grandfather left Lancashire to be a tunneller in the First World War; my grandfather Herbert Etheridge served in a tank and helped to liberate Europe from oppression in the Second World War. We know that the UK has never, ever shirked its responsibility to Europe. Whilst we may be leaving the EU, we will never shirk our responsibility to keep Europe free. We have an excellent defence alliance: it’s called NATO. We work with the last remaining superpower in the world, the United States, to protect freedom in Europe and other places. Despite the fact that our treacherous United Kingdom Government is deliberately and systematically running down our defences, we still do not require a union such as this. This is purely a political union to create a United States of Europe that the people of Europe were never consulted about.

What I would say to you is very simple: No British Government should ever commit to this. No British money should ever be spent on this. And not one single drop of British blood should ever be spilled in a cause that is not directly in the remit of ‘for Queen and country.’

Michał Marusik (ENF). – Panie Przewodniczący! Politycy bardzo chętnie mówią to, czego ludzie lubią słuchać. I czymś takim jest właśnie temat wspólnej polityki obronnej. Ale powiedzmy coś o realiach tego tematu. Polityka to przecież rywalizacja, a więc zagrożenia i konflikty są w jakimś sensie jej naturą i istotą. Co więcej, w skali globalnej to polityka jest właśnie tą dziedzina, która generuje konflikty i zagrożenia. A zagrożenia te są bardzo różne dla różnych krajów: zupełnie inne dla Grecji, inne dla Polski, inne gdzieś w Belgii czy w Holandii. Zatem realizowanie czegoś takiego jak wspólna polityka obronna jest tylko kolejnym krokiem na drodze do likwidacji suwerenności państw europejskich. I to jest prawda o procesie, który zaczynamy. Odebrano już europejskim państwom możliwość decydowania o polityce monetarnej, fiskalnej, o ustawodawstwie. Jeszcze odbierze się politykę zagraniczną i obronną i państwa europejskie staną się fikcją. Europa będzie przypominać Stany Zjednoczone, ale tylko w tym sensie, że kraje europejskie będą podobne do jakiegoś zbioru rezerwatów amerykańskich Indian. W każdym rezerwacie będzie można śpiewać inne piosenki i nosić inne stroje, ale to już nie będą państwa. I niestety w polityce jest tak, że nie biją tylko tego, kto poddaje się bez bicia. Taką właśnie ofertę Europie przedkłada Unia Europejska. Katastrofa!

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε όσες πτώσεις κι αν κλίνετε τις λέξεις ειρήνη και άμυνα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν μπορεί να κρυφτεί. Δεν μπορείτε να κρυφτείτε ότι εντείνεται τις προετοιμασίες για νέους ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους και επιθέσεις σε βάρος των λαών. Ένα επικίνδυνο πολυπλόκαμο δίκτυο ευρωστρατιωτικής Ένωσης οικοδομείται συμπληρωματικά με το NATO και αυτοτελώς, με ξεχωριστό ταμείο, μηχανισμούς χρηματοδότησης και αξιολόγησης επιδόσεων κυβερνήσεων στο να γδέρνουν τους λαούς και να ενισχύουν τους στρατιωτικούς εξοπλισμούς, με αναβαθμισμένη, διαρθρωμένη στρατιωτική σύμπραξη κρατών στο πλαίσιο της PESCO και δικό της στρατηγείο, με ευέλικτες μονάδες για άμεση στρατιωτική δράση όπου επιτάξουν τα κέρδη των ευρωπαϊκών ομίλων στον εντεινόμενο ανταγωνισμό τους με ΗΠΑ, Κίνα, Ρωσία όσο και στο εσωτερικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Στο έδαφος αυτό οι εστίες που βράζουν πολλαπλασιάζονται: Συρία, Ιράκ, Λιβύη, Ουκρανία, Υεμένη και πάλι η Παλαιστίνη, η προκλητικότητα της Τουρκίας είναι μόνο μερικές από αυτές. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δίνοντας βάσεις, γη και ύδωρ στα ιμπεριαλιστικά σχέδια επιδιώκει αναβαθμισμένα κέρδη για τους ελληνικούς ομίλους, αναβαθμίζοντας τους κινδύνους για τους λαούς. Καμία επανάπαυση μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το NATO! Λαϊκός αγώνας, επαγρύπνηση, για να μη χυθεί αίμα λαών για τα ιμπεριαλιστικά συμφέροντα.

Michèle Alliot-Marie (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, je me réjouis tout particulièrement que les différentes institutions de l'Union européenne aient enfin pris conscience des dangers qui nous menacent – les dangers actuels et les dangers futurs – et donc du besoin urgent de se doter d'une politique de sécurité et de défense qui soit à la fois forte, crédible et structurée.

Nous pouvons nous féliciter que, grâce à votre engagement, grâce également aux actions des uns et des autres, nous puissions présenter aujourd'hui des mesures concrètes, à travers notamment les deux excellents rapports qui ont été faits sur ce sujet: le renforcement des capacités de l'Union de la défense, la coopération structurée permanente, la mise en place d'un Fonds européen de défense ou encore le lancement du programme européen de développement industriel dans le domaine de la défense. Mais le plus important, c'est, effectivement, que l'Europe avance concrètement et de façon pérenne dans cette direction, pour enfin pouvoir mieux protéger ses concitoyens face à l'avenir. Le problème – c'était souligné, notamment, par la commission des budgets –, c'est que les fonds affectés à cela soient effectivement, réellement mis en œuvre.

Alors, Madame la Haute représentante, je voudrais vous demander une chose: est-ce que vous êtes prête à faire, devant ce Parlement, le bilan annuel de ce qui aura été fait, à travers un rapport de la Commission au Parlement, ce qui nous permettra de suivre ce qui aura été réellement concrétisé et ce qui aurait été détourné, parce que des fonds auraient été utilisés, comme au cours de ces dernières années, pour d'autres politiques que celle de la défense et de la sécurité ?

Janusz Zemke (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Wysoka Przedstawiciel! Co roku na tej sali oceniamy europejską politykę zagraniczną, a jednym z elementów tej polityki jest oczywiście polityka bezpieczeństwa i obrony. Z zasady oceny te były ostrożne i krytyczne. Gołym okiem było widać, że możliwości Unii nie odpowiadają ani coraz większej skali zadań, ani coraz bardziej złożonemu wyzwaniu, jakim jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa Unii i Europie. W końcu w tym roku można stwierdzić, że jest szansa na przezwycięzenie tej niemocy, na rzeczywiście i silniejszą współpracę. Potwierdza to między innymi ustanowienie wreszcie stałej współpracy strukturalnej PESCO. Jeśli zastanawiamy się, co ta współpraca może przynieść, to chciałem zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że w dłuższej perspektywie szczególnie ważne mogą być efekty w zakresie prac badawczo-rozwojowych i wdrażania nowoczesnych technologii. Dzisiaj bowiem mamy dwa problemy. Pierwszy polega na tym, że nakłady na obronność są w Europie za niskie, a drugi – że te zbyt małe pieniądze wydawane są bardzo źle. Ilustruje to fakt, że wszystkie państwa unijne co roku wydają 40 % budżetu obronnego Stanów Zjednoczonych, efektywność zaś mamy niestety tylko na poziomie 15 %. Dlatego jeśli ta współpraca będzie efektywna i rzeczywista, a nie pozorna, to myślę, że mamy szansę na przełamanie tych tendencji, że Europa ma szansę na większą autonomię w zakresie bezpieczeństwa i obrony. I gdyby udało nam się to razem osiągnąć, to byłby duży wspólny sukces.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Die Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der EU hat viele Facetten. Ich begrüße eine vertiefte Zusammenarbeit im Bereich der Beschaffung ebenso wie im Bereich der Forschung. Da ist es sehr sinnvoll. Es ergibt auch sehr viel Sinn, dass wir innerhalb der EU unsere unterschiedlich ausgeprägten Fähigkeiten im Bereich der Verteidigung sinnvoll ergänzen; nicht jeder muss jede Spezialisierung haben. Aber das Ganze hat absolute Obergrenzen.

Ich sage ausdrücklich, dass ich bei dem derzeitigen Zustand der EU – diesem Zustand der Zerstrittenheit – überhaupt nicht erkennen kann, wie wir denn derzeit von einer gemeinsamen EU-Armee reden können. Das ergibt derzeit keinen Sinn, davon sollten wir uns lösen. Das wäre sogar gefährlich, denn es suggeriert, dass wir eine Schlagkraft haben, die wir dann nicht hätten. Stattdessen müssen wir die Zusammenarbeit in der NATO stärken. Die NATO war und ist der Garant für Frieden und Freiheit insbesondere in Europa. Deshalb müssen wir uns darauf konzentrieren und nur die Schritte unternehmen, die wir auch tatsächlich in eine vernünftige Richtung gehen können.

Urmaz Paet (ALDE). – Mr President, common EU action is needed to safeguard Europe's security, tackle complex challenges, protect its interests and its citizens, and to defend its values. EU defence cooperation is necessary and the timing is right for this.

That is why yesterday's decision by the Council to adopt the decision establishing PESCO is of the utmost importance. It creates the much-needed opportunity for 25 Member States to work together on defence projects, to cooperate more in defence and security, to invest in shared projects, and to enhance the operational readiness and contribution of their armed forces.

Cyber defence has become one of the most critical issues in debates about defence modernisation and Europe's common defence efforts. This needs cooperation and it is good that the newly established PESCO foresees projects in the cyber defence domain. In addition, joint training exercises between the EU Member States are vital in the area of cyber defence to build trust and understanding of possible cyber threats and challenges, as demonstrated by the training organised by the Estonian Presidency. The EU needs to have a clear plan that encompasses EU-NATO cooperation on cyber defence, cyber defence training and exercises, the promotion of civil military cooperation and the applicability of international law to cyberspace.

Marcus Pretzell (ENF). – Herr Präsident, Frau Mogherini, meine Damen und Herren! In Deutschland haben wir eine Verteidigungsministerin, Frau von der Leyen, die die deutsche Bundeswehr in einen Zustand versetzt hat, in dem U-Boote nicht tauchen, Hubschrauber nicht fliegen, genauso wie Kampfflugzeuge und Panzer ausgefallen sind.

Der einzige Fortschritt, den man bei der deutschen Bundeswehr in den vergangenen Jahren vermelden konnte, war die Einführung von Schwangerschaftsuniformen für Soldatinnen. Nun sind ausgerechnet zwei Vertreter derselben Partei wie Frau von der Leyen, nämlich Herr Gahler und Herr McAllister, damit beauftragt worden, Ihnen europäische Verteidigungspolitik näherzubringen. Na dann mal prost!

Die NATO soll bislang als Verteidigungsbündnis die Sicherheit Europas mit sichern, und das hat sie als Verteidigungsbündnis auch getan. Dort, wo sie allerdings nicht verteidigt hat, sondern aktiv in Drittstaaten eingegriffen hat, hat sie mehr Probleme verursacht als gelöst.

Es ist ja viel von hybriden Kriegen die Rede. Die Antwort auf hybride Kriege sind nicht klassische Armeen. Es wäre im Gegenteil die Wiedereinführung des Wehrdienstes, auch in Deutschland.

Ein Verteidigungsfonds, das klingt nett. Was hier tatsächlich geplant ist, ist etwas anderes: Aggressive Kapazitäten in den Händen einiger EU-Funktionäre. Das lehne ich ab.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς η προωδούμενη κοινή πολιτική ασφάλειας και άμυνας δεν διαθέτει την απαιτούμενη δημοκρατική νομιμοποίηση και δεν εκφράζει τη λαϊκή βούληση των πολιτών των κρατών μελών. Όσοι την ευαγγελίζονται και την υποστηρίζουν λειτουργούν ως αυτόκλητοι πληρεξούσιοι, στερούνται της λαϊκής συγκατάδεσης και καταστρατηγούν τις βασικές αρχές που διέπουν το δίκαιο των Συνθηκών, όπως οι αρχές της ισότητας των λαών, της κυρίαρχης ισότητας και ανεξαρτησίας των κρατών και της μη επέμβασης σε εσωτερικές υποθέσεις αυτών.

Θέλω όμως ειδικά να επισημάνω δύο βασικές προϋποθέσεις οι οποίες διέπουν στρατιωτικές συμμαχίες και οργανισμούς. Κατά πρώτον, δεν γίνεται αναφορά στα κείμενα ποια θα είναι η θέση της Ένωσης σε περίπτωση θερμού επεισοδίου ή και κρίσης/σύρραξης μεταξύ κρατών μελών. Κατά δεύτερον, αν η Ένωση θα διαφυλάξει την εδαφική ακεραιότητα και συνοχή κράτους μέλους, σε περίπτωση που αυτό δεχθεί επίθεση από τρίτη χώρα. Αν δεν απαντηθούν αυτά τα δύο βασικά ερωτήματα, δεν διαβλέπω κανένα λόγο για τον οποίον τα κράτη μέλη θα πρέπει να συναινέσουν στη συμμετοχή τους και να επιδιώξουν την κοινή ευρωπαϊκή άμυνα και ασφάλεια.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, my appreciation and thanks to both distinguished rapporteurs for a very good job. I am glad that we have moved quickly over the last year on security and defence policy. Earlier this year, we launched the European Defence Fund and yesterday we launched the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO). To this end, I would like to welcome yesterday's Council decision on establishing PESCO and the commitments given by the Member States. I would like to congratulate the High Representative for her work and dedication to this important project.

Security and defence has once again become the underlying issue of the EU integration project. It is clear that no single Member State can tackle the complex security challenges we are facing today alone. In order for the EU to be able to respond in internal and external challenges, we need to step up cooperation, pool our resources and focus on strategy priorities. I am aware that it will take time to reach full cooperation. However, the first projects to come out of the initiative, especially in the areas of training, capacity development and operational readiness, seem to be promising. In order to make full use of this cooperation, we will need to care about the seeds which we already sowed. This would also mean establishing fully-fledged EU civilian-military strategic structures, support from the Union budget and trust and cooperation on the side of the Member States.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodo predsjednice, čestitam izjaviteljima na poticajnim izvješćima. Na temelju više inicijativa u protekloj godini članak 50. Lisabonskog sporazuma, koji je zajednički nazivnik današnje rasprave, postaje sve sadržajniiji. Na sastanku 25 ministara članica dogovorena je zajednička suradnja u obrani, predstavljen je prijedlog Fonda za obranu, usvojili smo Izvješće o instrumentu za stabilnost i mir.

Ti značajni pomaci gotovo su premašili očekivanja i najvećih optimista među nama koji smo radili na Izvješću o europskoj obrambenoj uniji. Želim istaknuti važnost nastavka vjerodostojnog procesa proširenja kao najboljeg jamca sigurnosti na jugoistočnim granicama Unije, ali i unutar Europske unije. Također, naglašavam i potrebu jasnog komuniciranja ovih postignuća.

Nije riječ o militarizaciji europskog projekta ni europskoj vojsci. Radi se o ispunjavanju očekivanja više od dvije trećine naših građana koji baš sigurnost izdvajaju kao prioritet. Predugo smo duplicirali akcije i nekoordinirano trošili resurse. Potrebe za Europskom obrambenom unijom su, dakle, opravdane i treba podržati inicijative koje daju stvaran sadržaj.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie i Panowie! W naszej dzisiejszej dyskusji tak naprawdę bez przerwy powraca jeden wątek: zbudowania alternatywnych, a w pierwszym etapie może po prostu równoległych struktur militarnych wobec przymierza atlantyckiego w Europie. Jedni się z tego bardzo cieszą, inni się tego bardzo boją. A ja proponuję zadać jedno realistyczne pytanie: czy takie nawet alternatywne – już nie mówiąc o tych równoległych – struktury wojskowe zastąpią Stany Zjednoczone w tych najbardziej zapalnych, najbardziej wrażliwych dla bezpieczeństwa europejskiego punktach? Na razie na wschodniej Ukrainie widzieliśmy co innego. W czasie mińskich rozmów pokojowych najważniejsze państwa w Unii Europejskiej bardzo chętnie przystały na życzenia Rosji, żeby nie było tam ani Polski, ani żadnego innego spośród jednej czwartej państw Unii Europejskiej, które bezpośrednio sąsiadują z Rosją albo z Ukrainą. Najpierw zadbajmy o solidarność. Potem będziemy budować instrumenty.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, quiero comenzar felicitando a los señores McAllister y Gahler por sus buenos informes. Coincido con ellos en la necesidad de una política común y coherente de la Unión en el plano exterior para defender los intereses y principios de los europeos y afrontar eficazmente los complejos retos y amenazas del mundo actual.

El peso e influencia políticos de la Unión no se corresponde con nuestro importante peso económico, comercial, en materia de cooperación al desarrollo y ayuda humanitaria. Una eficaz implementación de la Estrategia Global aprobada el año pasado me parece el camino a seguir para el pleno desarrollo del potencial de nuestra acción exterior y la profundización en el ámbito de la defensa.

Celebro, como ya muchos han dicho, los importantes progresos realizados en los últimos meses y, en particular, el lanzamiento ayer de la cooperación estructurada permanente en el Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores. Seremos así más fuertes y tendremos más capacidad de respuesta como demandan nuestros ciudadanos. Por eso la felicito, señora Mogherini.

Una de nuestras principales prioridades en el plano exterior es la inestabilidad en la vecindad, tanto meridional como oriental. También tenemos intereses globales y no podemos dejar de actuar en ninguna región. El eje transatlántico es un elemento clave de nuestra acción exterior. Por eso, como reclama el informe del señor McAllister, es preciso preservar los importantes vínculos con los Estados Unidos. También es relevante aumentar nuestra presencia en el vasto espacio de Asia-Pacífico, cuya estabilidad también necesitamos.

Estamos en tiempos de cambios acelerados, de incertidumbre y de graves amenazas como el terrorismo y el cambio climático. La Unión debe ser capaz de dar respuesta a las inquietudes y a los intereses de sus ciudadanos y ser un actor global comprometido con el multilateralismo que ayude a generar paz, estabilidad y prosperidad.

Clare Moody (S&D). – Madam President, these reports are very timely reflections on the progress that is being made at a European level on foreign policy, security and defence. Both the McAllister and Gahler reports highlight the effectiveness of working together at an EU level towards peace and security in our increasingly troubled world.

Contrary to earlier statements by europhobic politicians, it is in the interests of all of us that the EU strengthens its position on the world stage. I also welcome the fact that both reports are looking to achieve a defence cooperation relationship between the EU and the UK in future. I sincerely hope that this will be achieved in both the industrial sphere, but also in the political decision-making sphere in these areas.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodo predsjednice, želim se zahvaliti našim izjaviteljima, gospodinu Michaelu Gahleru i Davidu McAllisteru, koji su napravili izvršno izvješće, a vama gospodo Mogherini, želim Vas i ja jedan put citirati. Točno je, kao što ste nekoć rekli, da su ovo vremena predvidljivih nepredvidljivosti. Nalazimo se zaista pred velikim izazovima.

Zapadne demokracije su pred velikim izazovima. Puno je tema, od stanja odnosno odnosa s Rusijom, Kinom, istočno susjedstvo, zatim odnosi u samoj Latinskoj Americi (jučer smo govorili o nagradi Saharov vezano za Venezuelu), zatim Sjeverna Koreja, Krim, Ukrajina... Za sve ono što se događa trenutno moramo naći odgovore i stoga zaista podržavam ove najnovije inicijative odnosno inicijative koje traju već nekoliko godina, ali ipak vraćam se na govor o stanju Unije koji je iznio gospodin Juncker u mjesecu rujnu ovdje u ovom Parlamentu u kojem je najavio kompletiranje Europske obrambene unije. Ja mislim da ćemo zajedno s Europskim obrambenim fondom i zajedno s ovom inicijativom o PESCO-u do 2025. godine sigurno uspjeti kompletirati Europsku obrambenu uniju.

Ono što me posebno veseli je da je Lisabonski sporazum na snazi, da nam je on ovo omogućio, a isto tako da se ova inicijativa događa u vrijeme obilježavanja 60. obljetnice Rimskih sporazuma i na neki način je zaokružena cjelina.

Isto tako, želim reći da moramo odgovoriti na brige naših građana. Njihova glavna briga je sigurnost, što su i pokazali anketom Eurostata i moramo im odgovoriti ovakvim inicijativama. Stoga podržavam ovu inicijativu.

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Fru talman! Fru Mogherini! Det är viktigt att det finns en beslutsförmåga i EU när det sker snabba kast i samhällsutvecklingen och när risker uppstår eller växer fram. Det kan handla om flyktingkriser, klimat-kriser, men naturligtvis också säkerhetspolitiska kriser.

Eftersom vi lever i ett Europa med stor mångfald även på detta område är det dock minst lika viktigt för denna sammanhållning och denna reaktionsförmåga att samarbetet inom Pesco förblir mellanstatligt.

Nya institutionella strukturer måste undvikas. Uppdrag inom den s.k. gemensamma försvars- och säkerhetspolitiken måste handla om fred och förebyggande av konflikter utanför EU.

Jag skäms inte ett dugg över att säga att jag kommer från ett land där vi har levt i fred i drygt 200 år. Det har inneburit att vi har tagit stort ansvar för dem som inte har kunnat leva i fred, och jag skäms alltså inte ett dugg över det, och jag kräver mellanstatlighet på detta område. Varför ska vi tvingas in i krig?

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Czy mamy prawo do optymizmu? Według mojej oceny nie. Mamy obowiązek bycia realistami i warto przy tej okazji zobaczyć, jak wyglądały poprzednie sprawozdania, jak wyglądały głosowania i czym kończyło się przyjęcie poprzednich sprawozdań. Prawdopodobnie w pewnym sensie będziemy mieli identyczną sytuację, czyli przyjmujemy sprawozdanie, z pewną satysfakcją odnotujemy pewnego rodzaju postęp, natomiast to, co będzie kluczowe, to ten dzień następny, czyli dzień realizacyjny. Muszę powiedzieć, że w Parlamencie Europejskim dziś de facto debatujemy nad trzema zagadnieniami jednocześnie: Nad tworzeniem wspólnej polityki obronnej praktycznie na nowo – po doświadczeniach na Krymie, po doświadczeniach na Ukrainie, po doświadczeniach związanych z emigrantami i z terroryzmem. Po drugie, zwracamy uwagę, jak potrzebna nam jest nowa technologia, własne programy badawcze, własne wzmacnianie przemysłu obronnego i jak istotna jest ta nowa technologia do poprawy bezpieczeństwa nas, Europejczyków. I trzeci element to jest kooperacja z NATO. Bez wątpienia to, o czym mówimy dziś, nie zastępuje NATO, nie jest dublowaniem funkcji, jest właściwym, tym dodatkowym komponentem, który ma budować politykę bezpieczeństwa. I ostatnia rzecz – to, co mnie martwi na sali. Za często polityka bezpieczeństwa jest utożsamiana z polityką obronną. Wydatki na bezpieczeństwo, na obronność to nie zawsze i niekoniecznie wydatki na wojsko.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fa bene Federica Mogherini ad essere soddisfatta, e noi, il Parlamento, lo siamo con lei. Perché oggi il sogno di Altiero Spinelli di una difesa comune europea è a portata di mano, dopo anni in cui qualsiasi ambizione veniva bollata come politicamente impraticabile. Oggi la Francia, che bocciò un tempo la proposta, è fortemente europeista come lo è l'Italia e molti altri paesi. La Gran Bretagna non è più un ostacolo e gli Stati Uniti di Trump hanno abdicato al loro ruolo di stabilizzatori del mondo, anzi, al contrario.

Dunque oggi è l'Unione europea ad avere la leadership morale della diplomazia internazionale, ed è un titolo suggellato dal Nobel per la pace del 2012, dall'ottimo lavoro di Mogherini sul campo, e anche dalla volontà che Lei oggi qui ha ribadito – è stato questo un punto molto difficile, ma per noi del nostro gruppo importante – di utilizzare questi strumenti di potenza, anche militare, «alla europea», così è stato detto, cioè nel rispetto dei nostri valori. È storica la firma dei ministri della Difesa, il via alle cooperazioni strutturate, il piano di azione, ma sappiamo che siamo ancora molto lontani, che tanti ritardi vanno colmati e vanno colmati bene.

E io penso anche alla ricerca, per un'autonomia strategica dell'Europa. Termino qui dicendo che sappiamo che molte potenze illiberali crescendo militarmente accrescono il loro potere in questo mondo. Sta a noi giocare una partita diversa – penso all'Africa e alla Libia – essere davvero un'Europa capace di *hard* e di *soft power*.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vítám vytvoření stálé strukturované spolupráce PESCO, která byla včera oficiálně posvěcena. Jsem rád, že se do této spolupráce zapojí i moje země, Česká republika. Řadu let jsme po schválení Lisabonské smlouvy jen přešlapovali na místě. Teprve bezprecedentní množství konvenčních a hybridních výzev nás donutilo zamyslet se nad naším společným potenciálem a začít jednat. Žádný členský stát není sám o sobě schopen řešit složité bezpečnostní problémy, před nimiž v současnosti stojíme.

Proto se ztotožňuji s jasným a ambiciózním vyzněním zprávy kolegy Gahlera. Jasně je například pojmenování hrozeb, ať už je to terorismus, pokračující válka Ruska proti Ukrajině, nezákonná anexa a militarizace Krymu či jaderné hrozba Severní Koreje. Jasně je i ve výčtu kroků, které by měly k zajištění naší společné bezpečnosti následovat.

Příkládám velkou důležitost posílení mandátu misí společné bezpečnostní a obranné politiky i reformě jejich financování. Součástí jejich mandátu by měl být i boj proti terorismu a podpora programu deradikalizace. Musíme se také zabývat větší spoluprací těchto misí s agenturami Europol a Frontex. To je důležité zejména pro boj s mezinárodním převaděčstvím.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta. Discutimos hoy dos informes muy importantes para definir el futuro de esa unión de la defensa, justo el día después de que veinticinco Estados de la Unión acordaran poner en pie esa cooperación permanente con el liderazgo de la alta representante, la señora Mogherini.

Coincide con el impulso por parte de la Comisión y de este Parlamento para promover ese Fondo Europeo de Defensa que permita mejorar la inversión en investigación y consolidar un mercado único para mejorar la capacidad industrial de la Unión. Y yo creo que no debe tomarse esto como una escalada militar o como una vocación militarista de la Unión Europea, sino todo lo contrario. Porque si somos capaces de gestionar conjuntamente la defensa podremos, en muchos casos, reducir el volumen de financiación, haciéndolo más eficiente.

Y yo creo que es muy importante que en esta nueva agenda seamos conscientes de que la defensa es ya una parte directamente unida a las políticas de seguridad. O dicho de otra manera, que las políticas de seguridad y las políticas de defensa no son radicalmente distintas. Y esa línea en la que trabajan la estrategia global y la alta representante es una parte muy esencial del futuro de la Unión.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to say to Ms Mogherini that these impressive and constructive reports are first of all about implementation. For that, our foreign policies need to be based on fundamental values. Mainstreaming human rights and EU values in relations with third countries, and making any progress in economic and political relations conditional on a convincing improvement in partner countries' human rights records, should be a key element of the CFSP. There is, for example, a striking imbalance from that perspective in current Iran-EU relations.

Second, a credible common policy means speaking with one voice and without delay. Our report concludes that the current decision-making process in the EU Council is the main obstacle to effective and timely external EU action. That means that qualified majority voting should also be applied for common foreign, security and defence policies.

Third, we call on the EU institutions to enhance their ability to anticipate conflicts and rely more on long-term impact assessments of EU policies. This is especially relevant to hybrid warfare and disinformation. This means turning the StratCom Task Force into a fully-fledged unit within the EEAS, giving it all necessary support.

Finally, sanctions are part of efficient EU policies. I propose that we should make these more efficient, targeting concrete individuals responsible for breaking international laws and human rights violations – a type of Magnitsky list.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, finalmente foi inaugurada a cooperação estruturada permanente com 25 - Estados-Membros, incluindo o meu, comprometendo-se a investir em sinergias na defesa, uma área em que a União Europeia tem de responder como exigem os cidadãos.

Nenhum Estado-Membro tem recursos para se defender sozinho quando se multiplicam ameaças transnacionais num mundo dependente da tecnologia digital, o que torna premente investir nas dimensões cibersegurança e ciberdefesa, incluindo na proteção de infraestruturas críticas e na resiliência das nossas democracias, face ao terrorismo e à guerra híbrida.

Esta cooperação tem de se traduzir num reforço da autonomia estratégica da União Europeia e da base industrial da defesa europeia e em mais valor pelo dinheiro que os nossos contribuintes já gastam em equipamentos e capacidades militares nacionais.

Este Parlamento tem que assumir a responsabilidade do controlo democrático para garantir confiança, eficácia e respeito pela legalidade internacional, na PESC, na CEP e na Política Comum de Segurança e Defesa.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Gyvename įtemptu laikotarpiu, kuris išorės grėsmių prasme yra ypatingai sudėtingas: terorizmas, kibernetiniai išpuoliai, agresyvūs Rusija, nestabili Šiaurės Afrika ir karo bei konflikto apgaubti Artimieji Rytai. Dėl to NATO šiuo metu išlieka svarbiausiu saugumo ir gynybos garantu Europoje. Tačiau Europos Sąjunga taip pat turi investuoti į savo narių saugumo stiprinimą, nes įtempta saugumo situacija reikalauja proaktyvaus Europos Sąjungos atsako.

Nuoširdžiai džiaugiuosi, kad vakar jau dvidešimt penkios valstybės narės priėmė oficialų sprendimą įsteigti naują gynybos ir saugumo bendradarbiavimo tinklą – Nuolatinį struktūrizuotą bendradarbiavimą (PESCO), kad pavyko susitarti dėl pradinių septyniolikos konkrečių projektų įgyvendinimo. Sveikinu Jus, p. Federica Mogherini, ir dėkoju. Šie sprendimai tai ženklas, kad valstybės narės yra pasiryžę plėtoti gynybinius pajėgumus ir didinti investicijas į gynybą. Neabejotina kita, būtina išnaudoti ir stiprinti realų NATO ir Europos Sąjungos bendradarbiavimą. Tarp prioritetinių bendradarbiavimo sričių matau karinį tranzitą, kibernetinę gynybą, atsaką į hibridines grėsmes ir koordinaciją strateginės komunikacijos srityje.

Saugumas ir gynyba yra ta mūsų gyvenimo sritis, kurioje Europos Sąjunga savo likimą privalo stipriai laikyti savo rankose.

Dėkoju kolegoms Davidui McAllisteriui ir Michaeliui Gahleriui už puikiai parengtus pranešimus.

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich bedaure sehr, dass der Bericht zur Umsetzung der gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteilungspolitik nur sehr marginal auf die Problematik der Rüstungsexporte eingeht.

Gestern hat Bundeskanzlerin Merkel öffentlich Interesse bekundet, die Rüstungsexportkriterien bzw. richtlinien in Europa zu vereinheitlichen. Ich finde es gut, dass sie das Thema aufgreift, und erwarte aber von ihr, dass wenigstens die bereits bestehenden europäischen Exportkriterien auch von Deutschland eingehalten werden.

Wir können keine kohärente europäische Außenpolitik entwickeln, wenn die EU-Mitgliedstaaten weiterhin unkoordiniert Waffen und Munition in Drittstaaten ausführen. Ich habe diesbezüglich Änderungsanträge eingereicht, die leider vom Berichtersteller nicht in den Bericht aufgenommen wurden. Darin forderte ich die Mitgliedstaaten auf, gemeinsam im europäischen Rahmen zu entscheiden, an welche Länder sie Rüstungsexporte tätigen.

Bei Entscheidungen über den Export von Rüstungsgütern, die zukünftig im Rahmen des Europäischen Verteidigungsfonds aus dem EU-Haushalt kofinanziert werden sollen, sollte zudem das Europäische Parlament involviert sein. Das entspricht auch einem Reflektionspapier der S&D-Fraktion zur Sicherheits- und Verteilungspolitik vom November dieses Jahres.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitam kolegama McAllisteru i Gahleru na odlično pripremljenim izvješćima u kojima se ukazuje na značaj osnaživanja zajedničke vanjske, sigurnosne i obrambene komponente Europske unije.

Događanja i napetosti u našem susjedstvu te aktualne sigurnosne ugroze, proistekle iz terorističkih prijetnji, kao i migracijske krize koje podižu tenzije u državama članicama pozivaju i na učinkovite odgovore našim građanima. Krajnje je vrijeme za poboljšanje zajedničkih koordiniranih kapaciteta država članica naše Unije. Europska unija mora imati aktivniju ulogu u zaustavljanju potencijalnih otvorenih sukoba na svojim granicama koji bi posljedično mogli izazvati nove valove izbjeglica, kao i nestabilnosti u budućnosti.

Ukoliko želi osnažiti svoju globalnu ulogu, diplomacija Europske unije mora pokazati svoju snagu u najbližem susjedstvu poput Bosne i Hercegovine, gdje ni nakon dvadeset dvije godine nemamo rješenje za izlazak iz frankensteinske strukture ustava koji je zamrznuo rat i donio nesavršen mir, u kome tri naroda imaju različita viđenja prošlosti, a budućnost je i dalje na čekanju.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, eurooppalainen puolustuspolitiikka on tänä vuonna ottanut konkreettisia askeleita eteenpäin ja se on erittäin myönteistä ja tervetullutta. Euroopan on aikakin ottaa enemmän vastuuta myös itse omasta puolustuksestaan. Voimme saavuttaa epäilemättä merkittäviä taloudellisia ja turvallisuuspoliittisia hyötyjä nimeamaan suunnitteleamalla entistä paremmin puolustusta yhdessä, suuntaamalla hankintoja enemmän yhdessä ja vastaaamalla laajan turvallisuuspolitiikan haasteisiin Naton toimintaa täydentäen.

Haluan kuitenkin puuttua erityisesti yhteen kysymyksen, joka tässä ansiokkaassa Gahlerin mietinnössä on myös nostettu esiin: se on tuo yhteistä puolustusta koskeva artikla 42.7. Sen sisältö on edelleen täysin määrittelemättä, ja tiedämme, että jäsenmaat tulkitsevat sitä hyvin eri tavoin. Euroopan parlamentti edellytti jo kaksi vuotta sitten, että komission on käynnistettävä valmistelu, jossa määritellään selkeästi vastuut, toimintaprosessit ja suuntaviivat sille, miten tuota artiklaa tulkitaan. Kysynkin nyt korkealta edustajalta Mogherinilta, onko komissio käynnistänyt mitään tällaista työtä? Jos tuota artiklaa joudutaan näes käyttämään ja halutaan käyttää, prosessi olisi varsin sekava, koska mitään valmista toimintamallia ei ole.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, effectivement, l'instabilité au Moyen-Orient, la pauvreté en Afrique, la folie de quelques dictateurs et bien d'autres sujets, dont la montée du terrorisme et les cyberattaques, doivent nous alerter encore davantage sur les questions de défense européenne. J'ajoute que l'attitude de Donald Trump aux États-Unis nous oblige à avoir une nouvelle réflexion, car l'Union européenne ne peut rester sans défense.

Même si nous sommes tous profondément pacifistes, nous ne vivons malheureusement pas sur la planète des bisounours. Il nous faut libérer tout le potentiel du traité de Lisbonne dans ce domaine et nous assurer d'une coopération structurée permanente, prélude à une véritable défense européenne commune, dont la cyberdéfense.

Deux projets méritent d'être soulignés: l'action préparatoire sur la recherche et, évidemment, le projet de mise en commun de matériel militaire afin de faire des économies. Ce sont des premiers pas importants, mais il faut aller plus loin. Bien entendu, il faut trouver de l'argent frais et ne pas puiser sur les politiques structurelles de l'Union européenne.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, Hohe Vertreterin! Wer mich kennt, der weiß: Ein plumpes „Mehr Europa“ ist nicht mein Ding. Ich will ein Europa, das liefert. Und genau deshalb begrüße ich das Mehr an europäischer Verteidigungspolitik ganz ausdrücklich – für Frieden, nicht als reiner Waffenlieferant. Den wehrpolitischen Experten der Freien Wähler danke ich ganz ausdrücklich für den fachlichen Input.

Ich begrüße PESCO. Heute sind schon 25 der 28 Mitgliedstaaten an Bord. Ich begrüße die vereinbarten Schwerpunkte von der Cybersicherheit über die Ausbildung bis hin zum gemeinsamen Notfallzentrum. Wichtig ist für mich auch, die technischen Strukturen auszubauen, um sich in der Vielfalt der Sprachen zu verstehen. Kritisch dagegen sehe ich das Headquarter in Brüssel. Wir haben bereits Kommandozentralen, unter anderem in Neu-Ulm, die Erfahrung haben und erfolgreiche Arbeit leisten. Diese Strukturen soll man stärken.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la cooperación estructurada permanente se presentó como «el no va más» en cuanto a la defensa independiente europea. A mí me parece que va a ser un bluf más en cuanto a independencia y, por lo menos, tan bluf como fue el Eurocuerpo. ¿Se acuerdan ustedes de aquel ejército europeo creado en 1991 por Francia, Alemania, Bélgica y España? Y hoy no es más que una parte de la Fuerza de Respuesta de la OTAN.

No lo digo yo, lo dicen ustedes: reforzar el pilar europeo de la Alianza; profundizar la cooperación con la OTAN. O, como dice la alta representante, cooperamos más que nunca con la OTAN.

La UE réplica y repite como un papagayo lo que dice la OTAN. Nos piden un 2 %: lo damos. Nos piden movilidad militar, un Schengen militar: decimos que vamos a trabajar junto a la OTAN.

Miren, no vamos a tener más seguridad con la OTAN; al revés, es la negación de un espacio común de seguridad europeo. Más gasto militar será más carrera de armamentos. Tenemos casi 507 millones de personas, y lo que hacen es ponerle un tutor, hacer una Unión Europea subalterna de los intereses geopolíticos del otro lado del Atlántico.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Lata 2016 i 2017 są w istocie przełomowe z punktu widzenia wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony. Dziękując współsprawozdawcom, chciałbym w tym miejscu powiedzieć, że wszyscy jesteśmy przekonani, że polityka obronna i bezpieczeństwa nie będzie w kontrze do tego, co robi NATO. Uważamy, że te działania należy koordynować. Dziś, przy rosnących napięciach, odnowiona wspólna polityka bezpieczeństwa i obrony może być brakującym wspólnym mianownikiem dla wielu krajów. Fakt, że podpisuje się pod nią 25 państw członkowskich stanowi jawny tego dowód. Ponadto wydaje mi się, że inicjatywy wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony muszą szanować specyfikę państw członkowskich, szeroko je włączać, a niekoniecznie dzielić, choć często w niektórych obszarach istnieją różnice.

Odnosnie do funduszu chciałbym powiedzieć, że powinien on dawać szansę nie tylko wielkim koncernom, ale również małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom. Dlatego dziękuję za zapis, który znalazł się w art. 22 sprawozdania Parlamentu Europejskiego w zakresie realizacji wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Mogherini, 25 κράτη μέλη προσυπογράψαμε την κοινή δήλωση που είναι γνωστή ως PESCO. Σκοπός: μια πιο ολοκληρωμένη συνεργασία σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο με ευρωπαϊκούς προσανατολισμούς. Τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να διατηρήσουν τη δική τους άμυνα και να ασκήσουν την κυριαρχία τους καλύτερα μέσω μιας ευρωπαϊκής συνεργασίας, μέσω των συνεργειών και της εξοικονόμησης πόρων, που θα βελτιώνουν οπωσδήποτε την αποτελεσματικότητα της άμυνας αλλά και κατ' επέκταση της εξωτερικής πολιτικής.

Φυσικά ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουμε προκλήσεις και κινδύνους, όπως η διασφάλιση των εξωτερικών μας συνόρων, η ενεργειακή ασφάλεια, η τρομοκρατία και πολλά άλλα. Για όλα αυτά μπορούμε να συνεργαστούμε και να έχουμε αποτελέσματα ώστε όλοι να είμαστε καλύτερα. Για όσους κάνουν αναφορά στο NATO κάνω μια πολύ απλή σύγκριση: Εάν συνεργάζονται κράτη μέλη εντός του NATO, είμαι βέβαιος ότι μπορούν καλύτερα να συνεργαστούν και εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I think the tone is wrong here. I have to say that this is a sad day as an Irish citizen. This was meant to be a peace project and now it is to become a never-ending military project. And you've said it yourself, Ms Mogherini, missions can only grow into the future. Will you be paying for them, or will it be the ordinary people of Europe who can barely feed themselves who will be paying for it? It will be more cost, more resources, at a time in Ireland where we have record homelessness figures, where we have record hospital waiting lists.

We then have a so-called socialist, an S&D Member, suggesting that this should become the most ambitious project of the Union. What about food security? What about climate change? But no, the most important thing is military – weapons, guns and bombs. The language used by Jean-Claude Juncker was no better. He used the word 'beauty'. What's beautiful about this? We should be spending the money on areas that need it, not on guns: on food, on housing and health. Not on death. Shame on you!

Puhemies. – Olen pahoillani, mutta täällä ei sallita tällaisia mielenilmauksia tuolta lehteriltä, että pyydän teitä noudattamaan pidättyväisyyttä.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Elégedettséggel állapítom meg, hogy a McAllister-jelentés pozitív hangnemben szól a nyugat-balkáni térségről, és megfelelő hangsúlyt fektet a régiót érintő biztonsági kihívások kezelésére. Továbbá osztom a jelentéstevő véleményét, hogy a Nyugat-Balkán stabilitása és biztonsága továbbra is prioritást kell, hogy jelentsen az EU számára is.

Az európai integrációs folyamatok nagyban hozzájárultak a regionális béke és biztonság fenntartásához. Különösen üdvözlöm a jelentés azon részét, amely javasolja a Bizottságnak az előcsatlakozási alapok, az IPA-alapok megemelésének szükségességét, hiszen nem életszerű az a helyzet, hogy az Európai Parlament többet költ éves szinten a két székhelye fenntartásáért, mint amit például amit a legnagyobb tagjelölt ország, Szerbia kap évente az IPA-ból az összes megkezdett reformintézkedés támogatására.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Az Európai Unió politikai koherenciájához tartozik az is, hogy a most tárgyalt uniós erőfeszítések célja nem lehet más, mint az európai polgárok számára a közös értékeink szerinti demokratikus jogállami keretek közötti élet lehetőségének és biztonságának szavatolása, egyúttal ebből a szempontból az Európai Unió globális iránymutató, értékadó szerepének erősítése. Mindez azonban csak akkor lehet hiteles közösségi törekvésünk, ha közben az Unión belül is közösen és hatékonyan fel tudunk lépni a demokratikus jogok megsértése, az európai értékek megcsúfolása, a korrupció és autoriter kormányzás jelenségeivel szemben.

Ivica Tolić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, sigurnost Europske unije osnovni je preduvjet razvitka u svim područjima europskog društva. Čestitke gospodinu McAllisteru, gospodinu Gahleru i gospodinu Danjeanu, koji su jako dugo, uporno i kvalitetno radili na ovom dosjeu. Čestitke gospođi Mogherini koja mudro vodi proces unaprjeđenja obrambene i sigurnosne politike.

Pokretanje stalne strukturalne suradnje zaista je važan korak naprijed. Važno je posebnu pozornost usmjeriti području zapadnog Balkana i osigurati da te zemlje već sada slijede zajedničku sigurnosnu i obrambenu politiku. Važno je, nadalje, da tvrda i meka sila idu ruku pod ruku, kako kaže visoka povjerenica, jer smo dosada naglašeno bili jači u mekoj sili.

Važno je, nadalje, ulagati u rješavanje jazova u obrambenim sposobnostima, raditi konkretnije na interoperabilnosti i operativnoj spremnosti i također je važno da nakon Brexita Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo ostaje u ovom projektu jer nam je zajednički interes obrana europskog prostora.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, thank you to the rapporteurs, and to all of you. This is the result of a common work that needs now to be continued. Let me start by saying that I count on this common work to continue in the months and the years ahead.

Some of you were asking if we can be optimistic today. I know that we are not used to that. It is about realism and pragmatism today more than optimism. To quote a great figure of the last century and partially also of this one, Nelson Mandela said that ‘it always seems impossible until it’s done’. This is exactly such a case, where everybody was predicting that this would be impossible for various reasons. The work on the European defence would be impossible because the political conditions were not there, and because of this and that, and we proved that political conditions can be created when there is determination and when there is the support of our citizens.

As some of you mentioned – I think it was David McAllister – our citizens strongly support our common work at European Union level on security and defence and also on foreign policy, and this creates the political conditions for us to deliver. On this, there is a top priority for our citizens. This has also been possible, and will continue to be possible, which is even more important because we decided at a certain moment to move from the theoretical ideological approach and debate on European defence and security work to a practical, useful and concrete approach, consisting of single actions that could improve our work on security and defence, delivering on the needs of our citizens.

Madam President, I will address most of the concerns and questions of Members of Parliament who are no longer here, which probably means that their concerns were not so urgent. It is more difficult to work with facts and practical decisions to be taken than to stick with stereotypes. However, if you look at the facts, we are not talking about creating a European Union army: all 25 Member States that are launching the permanent structured cooperation are going to continue to keep their national forces.

They are also going to continue to use their capabilities, either in European Union missions and operations or in NATO if they are NATO allies, or in UN peace-keeping missions or in other ways. What we are doing is not militarisation; we are not working on the militarisation of our Union. We are not turning our Union, which is and will remain a political union and a force mixing hard and soft power, as most of you remember. We are not turning this into a militarisation approach; on the contrary, when I say that our missions and operations will be even more needed in the months and the years to come, it is exactly because the world needs more and more missions and operations like the European Union ones, which are working for peace in a cooperative manner on the ground.

This is what is required. This is a different approach – the European way – and this is what is needed in the world today. The force for peace sometimes also requires hard force and military means, but they must always be used for the service of peace.

We have not weakened, duplicated or entered into competition with NATO. When I say proudly that we have never worked so well and so much together with NATO in the fields where NATO doesn’t have the instruments to work on some threats, and that we have useful cooperation with NATO as a military alliance, I find it a bit strange to hear that this would mean that the European Union would be subordinate to the United States.

The following two debates are going to be on the Iran nuclear deal and on Jerusalem. I have the impression that we are putting strategic autonomy in practice in these times, so maybe we might face the contrary problem down the road. But I think we have to get out of the pre-cooked ideological arguments that we are sometimes used to using in the political debate and look at the reality. Reality changes, and this reality has changed in the European Union, thanks in part to the work of this Parliament, to a lot of determination and sometimes to our stubbornness.

The last myth that we have to overcome is that it is about spending. How much Member States spend on defence is up to national governments and national parliaments. It's not even up to this parliament, but to the way in which these investments are made, whether it's an efficient or inefficient way of investing which means together or not together, in a fragmented or in a coordinated manner. For example, investing in a European manner or buying in a European manner.

Again, strategic autonomy in industry is an area in which the European Union can make a difference. So, there are national decisions, but the European Union is the only one – and NATO and our American friends have understood this perfectly well – that can change the fundamental factor of spending better on the European Union side.

My last two points are very specific ones. One is to answer Ms Alliot-Marie: I am already preparing an annual report on the CSDP, and I would be very pleased to use this opportunity for the European Parliament to include a report on progress on this specific issue. I think it is going to be very useful to carry on the work in a practical, concrete and punctual manner, including on the resources that we will have to allocate in the future to sustain the ambitions which we are defining.

The very last point, Madam President – and I am sorry to raise this – but this is a debate about European foreign security and defence policy. It's about the comprehensive approach bringing together different tools and instruments. The work of the Parliament is extremely valuable in this field – unique, I would say. I would not have made it without the work of the parliament. It is quite sad for me to see that in one afternoon this plenary has eight points on the agenda on foreign policy. This is fragmentation, and it is a waste of the visibility and working capacity of the plenary itself. Obviously, it is your autonomous choice, but if you could streamline a little more the focus of foreign policy debates, I think this would be added value for the work of the Parliament.

Michael Gahler, *rapporteur*. – *Kiitoksia paljon arvoisa puheenjohtaja, hyvät kollegat*, I would like to thank once again colleagues and a considerable majority in this House who support this policy on CFSP and PESCO. I would also like especially to thank the High Representative – sitting on the Council side she has another hat, the hat of the head of the European Defence Agency – for recognising and appreciating the contribution of Parliament today.

Apart from that, it does not make sense to repeat wrong things, it does not make them more true. Just to reiterate, it is of course not about the militarisation of the EU. We will definitely not be financing military operations out of our budget in the future. We will definitely not be buying tanks or aircraft or helicopters out of the EU budget in the future. Rightly so, this remains with the national budgets and with the national governments and parliaments. But we have to become more efficient. This exercise is primarily a 'more efficiency' exercise, because if we plan together, if we procure together, if we train together, that makes us more efficient in the tasks ahead.

There are some colleagues from the fringes, from the periphery, for instance in Greece, both the far right-wing and the far left-wing, who identify Mr Erdoğan as one of their major enemies. Well, in NATO he could block everything – if we had to rely on NATO, any veto from any Member State would definitely block our access to NATO resources. We need a certain amount of strategic and operational autonomy as the EU, in order to be able to do what we deem appropriate. And insofar as the world, unfortunately, does not consist solely of stable democracies, then we also need this tool within our foreign policy instruments that we are establishing here today.

Puhemies. – Kiitos herra Gahler, Teidän suomenkielen taitonne tekee minuun aina suuren vaikutuksen.

David McAllister, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, everything has been said, so, in the end, I would just like to thank all colleagues in the House, especially those who are still present, for an open and honest debate. Thanks for your criticism and for your positive remarks. Instead of summing up the debate – which is anyhow impossible in two minutes – I prefer to cite the EU Treaty.

Federica Mogherini, I would like to thank you, pursuant to Article 36(1) of our Treaty, for consulting the European Parliament on the main aspects and the basic choices of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and informing it of how those policies evolve. I would also like to thank you in advance for Article 36(2) ensuring that the views of the European Parliament are duly taken into consideration. I think this was a very fruitful debate. Hopefully we will have good votes on our reports tomorrow.

A final remark: the High Representative has just pointed out, correctly, that we are debating eight foreign policy issues in a row in the plenary. This is decided by the Conference of Presidents, and I would like to ask all colleagues to address this in their political groups so that we can avoid this in the future. In the meantime, we should all bring forward the good arguments that we have once again heard from the High Representative, but it is up to us to make it clear to the Conference of Presidents that we can organise this Parliament better than we are at the moment.

(Applause)

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna keskiviikkona 13.12.2017.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR), na piśmie. – W sprawozdaniu rocznym w sprawie realizacji wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony nie padło ani razu bezpośrednie odwołanie do manewrów „Zapad” czy „Słowiańskie Braterstwo”. Nie ma także ani słowa o złamaniu przez Federację Rosyjską układu INF czy rozmieszczeniu rakiet Iskander przy granicy z Polską. Proponuje się za to daleko idące instrumenty zmierzające w kierunku ustanowienia unii obronnej. Rozumiem ambicje obronne państw członkowskich UE. Od wielu lat jednak uważam, że warunkiem niezbędnym jest przybliżenie wspólnego postrzegania zagrożeń. Z tego punktu widzenia NATO pozostaje nadal wiodącym sojuszem obronnym. Dowodzą tego chociażby manewry „Rapid Trident”, w których realny wysiłek zademonstrowania jedności w obliczu rosyjskiej agresji na wschodnią Ukrainę i manewrów „Zapad” podjęła koalicja pod egidą Stanów Zjednoczonych, z udziałem Bułgarii, Estonii, Gruzji, Kanady, Litwy, Mołdowy, Norwegii, Polski, Rumunii, Turcji, Ukrainy, Wielkiej Brytanii i Włoch. Były tam państwa sojuszu z obu stron Atlantyku, były państwa mojego regionu, w tym będące od lat celem rosyjskiej agresji Gruzja i Mołdowa. Była także chętnie krytykowana przez niektóre stolice Turcja. Nie było natomiast głównych rzeczników integracji europejskiej w dziedzinie obronności i „strategicznej autonomii”.

Eugen Freund (S&D), schriftlich. – Die EU ist einflussreicher denn je, doch wenn es um die Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik geht, dominieren die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten. Vom Krieg in Syrien über die Bekämpfung von Armut in Afrika, zur Energieabhängigkeit bis hin zu hybriden Bedrohungen: Die Herausforderungen, mit denen Europa konfrontiert ist, sind gewachsen. Auch Trump und der kommende Brexit erfordern ein geeintes Europa, das mit einer Stimme spricht – und zwar laut und deutlich. Aus diesem Grund haben die europäischen Außen- und Verteidigungsminister den Gründungsakt für PESCO unterschrieben. In der nächsten Zeit soll es damit eine intensivere Kooperation im Bereich Sicherheit und Verteidigung zwischen 25 EU-Staaten geben. Es ist zu begrüßen, wenn die Europäische Union das tut, wo sie besonders stark ist, ihre Ressourcen zu bündeln und sich auf ein gemeinsames Vorgehen zu einigen. Doch einiges darf nicht außer Acht gelassen werden: Erstens sollte PESCO Synergieeffekte schaffen, eine gemeinsame europäische Verteidigung hingegen ist ein anderes Kapitel. Zweitens müssen wir darauf achten, dass PESCO nicht zu einer Zweiklassenverteidigung führt, und drittens müssen die Bedürfnisse neutraler Staaten wie Schweden oder Österreich besondere Berücksichtigung finden. Drängender als jede Diskussion um eine vertiefte Verteidigungsunion hingegen ist eine bessere Zusammenarbeit der 28 EU-Mitgliedstaaten, denn nur durch eine echte Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik kann Europa Stärke nach außen zeigen.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Ποιος μπορεί να αμφισβητήσει πως τα κράτη μέλη χρειάζονται μια καλή άμυνα; Ιδιαίτερα η Κύπρος, περισσότερο ίσως από οποιοδήποτε κράτος χρειάζεται αυτή την ενίσχυση της ευρωπαϊκής άμυνας απέναντι στην επιθετικότητα της Τουρκίας και απέναντι στην συνεχιζόμενη κατοχή. Είναι όμως η PESCO κάτι άλλο εκτός από ανάπτυξη μιας ακόμα πολεμικής βιομηχανίας; Ιδιαίτερα με απασχολεί η δήλωση της κ. Mogherini «να γίνει η Ευρώπη επιτέλους ένας παγκόσμιος παίκτης». Τι σημαίνει όμως αυτό; Αν είναι για αντιμετώπιση εξωτερικών απειλών, καλώς. Μήπως όμως είναι για να βομβαρδίζει και η ΕΕ αυτούς που βομβαρδίζουν άλλοι; Κλείνω υπογραμμίζοντας πως δεν συμφωνούμε με ένα ούτω καλούμενο πασιφισμό σε μια εποχή συγκρούσεων και απειλών, αλλά αυτό καθόλου δεν με οδηγεί στο να πιστεύω στον милитарισμό και στην επίλυση των προβλημάτων μέσω των εργαλείων του διαβόλου. Μπορούμε ποτέ να μιλήσουμε με μια φωνή και προς μια κατεύθυνση; Προς υποστήριξη ηθικών αξιών; Μπορούμε να γίνουμε η δύναμη της ειρήνης; Αυτό είναι το μέγα ζητούμενο.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), *písemně*. – Vedení EU se již od 60. let snaží vybudovat nezávislou vojenskou alianci. Projekt Západoevropské unie ale zatím vždy skončil u deklarací. K dané myšlence se také vztahovala idea společné výroby vybraných druhů zbraní. Jedním z mála takových úspěchů se staly stíhací letouny Gripen. V civilní oblasti je ještě poměrně úspěšný projekt řady letounů Airbus, vývoj raketových nosičů Ariane a slibně se rozvíjející projekt Galileo. Ministři obrany a zahraničních věcí zemí EU se pod tlakem reality ale snaží o obnovení myšlenky samostatné výzbrojní agentury a koordinace vojenských akcí. Poměrně úspěšná je stabilizační akce EU v malijských regionech Mopti a Segou. Naopak za zcela neúspěšnou lze považovat snahu o stabilizaci situace v Libyi po svržení plukovníka Kaddáfího, stejně jako pokus o likvidaci režimu Bašára Assada v Sýrii. Protože v Sýrii sehrála stabilizační roli pomoc Ruské federace, je tato zpráva prochnuta těžkou rusofobií v nejružnějších částech. Země EU se v současné době výrazně angažují v mise Eufor Althea v Bosně a Hercegovině a v misi Eulex v Kosovu. Tyto části Balkánu se potýkají s velkým počtem navracejících se bojovníků Islámského státu. Evropský obranný fond má posílit výzkum v oblasti obrany a v rámci EHS též evropského obranného průmyslu, a to nezávisle na USA

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), *γραπτώς*. – Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση υποτίθεται ότι έχει θεμελιωθεί με βάση την αξία της αλληλεγγύης μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της. Η Κοινή Εξωτερική Πολιτική και η Πολιτική Ασφάλειας θεσπίστηκε δήθεν για την προστασία όλων των χωρών της Ένωσης. Το τελευταίο διάστημα η Ελλάδα δέχεται εμφανείς προκλήσεις τόσο από την Τουρκία όσο και από την Αλβανία. Ειδικότερα, ο κύριος Ερντογάν αμφισβητεί πλέον ανοικτά τη Συνθήκη της Λωζάνης, αμφισβητεί τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα της Ελλάδας στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, τα τουρκικά μαχητικά παραβιάζουν καθημερινά τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο και σε όλα αυτά ο ελληνικός λαός δεν βλέπει καμιά ικανοποιητική απάντηση από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Παραμένει αδρανής η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Δεν τρίζει τα δόντια πραγματικά στον Σουλτάνο. Δεν του λέει ότι πρέπει να συμμαζευτεί και ότι δεν περνούν οι προκλήσεις του απέναντι στην Ελλάδα. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να καταλάβει η Τουρκία ότι δεν μπορεί να συνεχίσει σε αυτή την κατεύθυνση, αλλά σε αυτό χρειαζόμαστε και την αποφασιστικότητα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι δεδομένο ότι η Ελλάδα έχει τη δυνατότητα να αντιμετωπίσει την Τουρκία, χρειάζεται όμως και τη στήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Να αποδειχθεί στην πράξη ότι υπάρχει η δήθεν κοινοτική αλληλεγγύη!

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – I am very pleased that paragraph 35 of this report encourages the creation of a permanent 'European Integrated Force'; I have been calling for the creation of a real European Armed Forces for years now. I also warmly welcome the renewed call for Member States to ensure that their defence budgets are at least 2% of their respective GDPs. At the moment, too few Member States meet this requirement. Whereas paragraph 16 of the report calls for this goal to be achieved within a decade, I would personally very much prefer a faster and more ambitious approach to reach this important target.

13. Delegirani akti (članak 105. stavak 6. Poslovnika): vidi zapisnik

14. Dogovor s Iranom o nuklearnom pitanju (rasprava)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission varapuheenjohtajan ja unionin ulkoasioiden ja turvallisuuspolitiikan korkean edustajan julkilausuma Iranin ydinsopimuksesta.

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, it is good to be back in my place.

If we look around us – and we are doing this quite consistently today – we see a dangerous world, indeed. There is a risk that tensions will rise around the holy places of Jerusalem – we will discuss this in the next debate – Daesh has been defeated in Iraq, but the war in Syria is not over yet, Egypt has just suffered one of the worst terrorist attacks in its history, and the war in Yemen is getting worse by the day. To look a little bit further, in the Korean Peninsula there is a security challenge that potentially affects all of us: nuclear proliferation is a reality.

Against this background, preserving and implementing the nuclear deal with Iran is an absolute must. We simply cannot afford more tension in the Middle East and another nuclear proliferation crisis. We cannot afford to undermine the credibility of a multilateral agreement endorsed by the UN Security Council resolution, and we cannot afford to dismantle a deal that works and delivers on its promises.

The deal with Iran is ensuring the peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. This is vital for our collective security in the European Union, in the region and beyond, and it is even more important as we face a nuclear crisis with North Korea. With a nuclear deal with Iran, we have established the strongest monitoring system ever set up. The International Atomic Energy Agency has reported nine times that Iran is implementing all its nuclear-related commitments. It took us 12 years of extremely difficult negotiations, led by the European Union, to achieve these results. Renegotiating the deal, or parts of it, is simply not an option. No one can possibly believe, in good faith, that this is a credible path to follow.

After President Trump's announcement of a new US strategy towards Iran, we Europeans have made our position very clear. Preserving the deal is our shared security interest, and the best way for the United States to address their security concerns – which are also ours – is in close cooperation with we Europeans. We Europeans share many of our American friends' preoccupations regarding the regional situation and Iran's ballistic missile programme, which is inconsistent with UN Security Council Resolution 2231. This is why we still have some targeted sanctions and an arms embargo in place.

But these issues should not be mixed up with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with the nuclear deal and must be addressed in the appropriate formats and fora. Dismantling a nuclear agreement that is working would not put us in a better position to discuss all the rest. The opposite would happen. In fact, this is what we always do in our contacts with Iran. We discuss all the issues we have on the table, from cooperation to the difficult ones, including regional issues.

On 20 November, we held the latest EU-Iran high-level dialogue and, as you know, I meet regularly with Foreign Minister Zarif. For more than two years now, we have built a very frank relationship with Iran. We are always open about our disagreements – and there are many – and we always try to find the best way to address them. This approach has also driven our conversations on human rights. We still have substantive disagreements but, together with Iran, we have agreed to focus on tangible results. For example, we welcome the recent adoption by Tehran of the revised anti-narcotics law. If properly implemented, it could lead to a significant drop in the number of executions of drug offenders in Iran. At the last high-level dialogue I mentioned a few weeks ago, there was also agreement to continue our engagement on women's empowerment and on the treatment of prisoners.

We have also agreed to look into possibilities for cooperation on the fight against drugs and on migration. Let me remind us all that Iran has played – and continues to play – an important role in hosting millions of Afghan refugees and we are ready to increase our common work and support in this field.

Since we reached the nuclear deal, our engagement with Iran has entered a new phase. As I mentioned, it is not always easy. There are many issues where we disagree, but it is definitely a new phase. Trade between Iran and Europe increased by 94% in the first half of 2017 compared to the first half of 2016. Oil exports have reached the pre-sanctions level and billions of outstanding oil debts have been paid back. Foreign direct investment is increasing and the Iranian Government reported growth of 55% compared to the previous year. Progress in the financial and banking sector has been slower due to a number of factors, but important work is being carried out to improve the situation, also including on the Iranian side.

Civil nuclear cooperation is also an integral part of the deal, and let me stress that, as the debate refers to the Iran nuclear deal, I am focusing here on the implementation of the deal and all the nuclear-related parts of it. I would obviously be very pleased to have a ninth debate today to address all the issues that are not covered under the nuclear deal and that are issues that we are addressing and we believe need to be addressed in our relations and talks with Iran. I am thinking of the war in Syria and the conflict in Yemen, even if I touched upon some of the bilateral issues we are working on.

As I was saying, civil nuclear cooperation is an integral part of the deal. Our civil nuclear cooperation makes the nuclear deal more solid through increased transparency. The second High-Level Seminar on Civilian Nuclear Cooperation has just taken place in Isfahan and concrete cooperation activities are being rolled out. This cooperation is important for we Europeans and is even more important for the people of Iran. I would like us all to remember the images of young Iranians – girls, boys, but also not just young people – celebrating the deal in the streets of Tehran. I believe we have the responsibility to show these people and the Iranian leadership that they have an interest in making Iran more open and more cooperative, and that this brings benefits to the leadership and the people – especially to the people. It is in their interest and in our own interest.

The deal with Iran prevented a nuclear escalation in the Middle East. It showed that diplomacy is the best way to overcome longstanding problems that sometimes seem impossible to solve. This is something we have not forgotten and this is why we believe that a diplomatic, but critical, engagement with Iran can benefit the entire Middle East and prevent a regional escalation that would destabilise the whole world. At this complicated moment for the region and for the world, let me say that the European Parliament has taken part of the responsibility for our collective security and I am grateful for that.

I would like to thank you for your contacts with the US Congress and I would also mention the visit of the delegation for relations with Iran to that country. As always there was excellent cooperation and coordination with me and with all our teams that are working on these files. I think we showed teamwork and that the European institutions across the board – including the European Parliament that to me plays an essential role in European foreign policy – managed to, as we always say, speak with one voice or pass the same message. Then, when the message is passed by different players across the EU institutions, it becomes louder and clearer.

So let me thank you once again for your cooperation over the last weeks and months. Let me also say that I believe we will need this kind of cooperation even more in the weeks and months ahead, which will probably also be difficult. The work is not over, but I think that we are doing what needs to be done, again thanks also to your determined work.

(Applause)

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, on examine aujourd'hui la situation à la suite du changement de la politique américaine à l'égard de l'Iran intervenu en octobre. La position européenne, comme cela a été rappelé par la haute représentante, est inchangée: on continue à soutenir l'accord nucléaire iranien.

Mais ma conviction est qu'au lieu de rejeter d'un revers de la main toute critique, on ferait mieux de regarder en face ses faiblesses et d'essayer de les pallier. Le développement des missiles balistiques iraniens continue, et la «sunset clause» ouvre la voie de l'Iran vers un arsenal nucléaire dans dix ans, avec évidemment des conséquences importantes pour la sécurité de l'Europe, y compris pour mon pays.

Juste parce qu'on est attaché à la mise en œuvre de l'accord nucléaire, on ne doit pas mettre des œillères et refuser d'admettre le reste des aspects problématiques en Iran. On ne peut pas rester silencieux sur la situation désastreuse en matière de droits de l'homme. Depuis deux ans, les seules voix européennes qui alertent sur le nombre croissant d'exécutions, sur l'oppression des voix critiques et sur la persécution des minorités viennent de notre Parlement. Pour le reste, il y a un silence poli.

Ensuite, on ne peut pas oublier le rôle déstabilisateur de l'Iran dans la région, qu'il s'agisse de la Syrie, de l'Iraq, du Liban ou de Gaza. On ne peut pas feindre de ne pas voir le support du régime iranien pour le Hezbollah et d'autres mouvements terroristes, la négation de l'Holocauste et les appels à la destruction d'Israël. Ayons le courage de nos convictions et soulevons ces questions en travaillant avec nos partenaires outre Atlantique.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, let's set things right. Since the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) entered into force, the International Atomic Energy Agency has – as you rightly mentioned, Madam High Representative – certified nine times that Iran is in compliance with the commitments set out in the agreement. Following this, the international community has lifted the nuclear-related sanctions, whereas sanctions imposed by the EU and the US relating to human rights abuses and terrorist activities remain in place. The US non-nuclear-related sanctions are, nevertheless, much more comprehensive and have an extraterritorial effect that causes legal uncertainty and poses problems to the EU forums dealing with Iran.

The EU position is unequivocal. The US President's decision to decertify the deal is damaging US credibility and interests, especially now, considering the worsening of the North Korean crisis. This decision remains purely an internal matter for the US, as the agreement remains a multilateral agreement and cannot be scrapped by a single party. In parallel, there are a number of other issues that are not part of the agreement but should be included in our EU high-level dialogue with Iran. I am referring to the following: human rights, firing of ballistic missiles, and Iran's destabilising action in the region, notably in Syria, Lebanon and Yemen.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, the Iran nuclear deal was concluded in 2015 as the joint comprehensive plan of action (JCPOA) by the P5+1 and the European Union, and I wish to extend thanks for the excellent work of your predecessor, Ms Ashton, and yourself, Ms Mogherini. Many so-called hardliners labelled it as a capitulation. These people not only failed to appreciate that the deal was concerned with one particular aspect, i.e. Iran's nuclear weapons programme, but also they viewed the sanctions as an end in themselves rather than as a route to the negotiating table.

Iran's human rights record is atrocious. I am the first to admit to that, and we should not fail to speak out against, and I have done on many occasions. Its support for terrorist groups in the Middle East is well documented and must be thoroughly condemned. Its continued engagement in a regional, sectarian battle for supremacy with Saudi Arabia creates instability and should be strongly discouraged.

These issues are, however, irrelevant when it comes to discussing this deal. That the JCPOA be enforced and measured solely against its specific aims is integral to its negotiation. Halting and hopefully ultimately preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon is what we must remain focused on, not stoking the narrative of Iran as a pariah state deserving of sanctions. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has confirmed that Iran has kept within all of the technical parameters of the deal, even if at times, these parameters have been pushed to their limits. I am pleased, therefore, that the EU Member States and the High Representative have spoken strongly in favour of the deal, following President Trump's continued threats to withdraw from it, which I regard as unacceptable. At a time when tensions with North Korea are at a breaking point, the ability to highlight a successful nuclear non-proliferation deal is of more value than ever.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, one of the reasons why I consistently defended the diplomatic solution to the nuclear question with Iran is that I believe there are so many other key areas where we need to engage the Islamic Republic of Iran. A deal on the new looming nuclear arms challenge was a hurdle that needed to be overcome.

Firstly, the systematic human rights violations remain the priority, and should be part of every dialogue, visit and communiqué involving the EU. There can be no watering down of what we mean when we talk about human rights. They are universal, even if people pray to a different god or are born in a different culture. Executions, torture, censorship and gender discrimination without due process are unacceptable.

Secondly, Iran's role in its region is a disaster. In Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Yemen, it is clear that Iran, through the Revolutionary Guards, as well as Hezbollah, seeks to ruthlessly push its interests and influence, and I am glad that the High Representative mentioned the problematic ballistic missile firings as a key point of concern as well.

We should not be naive, and we should not be distracted either. We were warned about the potential unrest in the region as a consequence of the nuclear deal, but instead of tearing up the deal like President Trump suggests, let us do what we can to stop Iran's toxic influence. We stand by our words and will honour EU commitments, but we must never blindly defend the indefensible. Through the new challenges to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action by President Trump, I actually fear that we are again ending up in a place where all we will talk about is the nuclear deal. Instead of looking at yesterday's agreement, let us tackle today's problems and avoid more disasters tomorrow.

Σοφία Σακοράφα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η συμφωνία του 2015 και η άρση των κυρώσεων για το πυρηνικό πρόγραμμα, έβγαλαν το Ιράν από την απομόνωση που του είχε επιβάλει η Δύση. Το Ιράν, με τη σειρά του, οφείλει να αξιοποιήσει εποικοδομητικά αυτή την ευκαιρία συνεισφέροντας με τον ρόλο του στην παγκόσμια ειρήνη και σταθερότητα. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, η συμμετοχή του στην επίλυση των διαφόρων συγκρούσεων και πολιτικών κρίσεων, ιδιαίτερα στη Μέση Ανατολή, είναι απαραίτητη και κρίνεται συνεχώς.

Στα δύο χρόνια από την εφαρμογή του Κοινού Συνεκτικού Σχεδίου Δράσης για το πυρηνικό πρόγραμμα του Ιράν, ο Διεθνής Οργανισμός Πυρηνικής Ενέργειας έχει πιστοποιήσει εννέα φορές την τήρηση όλων των δεσμεύσεων που προβλέπονταν. Αυτήν ακριβώς την άρτια υλοποίηση της Συμφωνίας περιφρονεί επιδεικτικά ο πρόεδρος Τραμπ και με την απόφασή του βάζει ένα ακόμη φωτιά στη Μέση Ανατολή και τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο.

Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η Ιστορία δείχνει ότι οι ΗΠΑ δεν διστάζουν να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο την ειρήνη και την ασφάλεια μιας ολόκληρης περιοχής, αρκεί να εξυπηρετήσουν συγκεκριμένα πολιτικά και οικονομικά συμφέροντα. Ο Πρόεδρος των ΗΠΑ φαντάζει πλέον συνεχής απειλή για την παγκόσμια ασφάλεια αλλά και για την ειρήνη.

Κυρία Mogherini, η ΕΕ έχει χρέος να συνεχίσει να υποστηρίζει τη συμφωνία σε όλα τα επίπεδα και με κάθε δυνατό μέσο. Είναι ξεκάθαρο ότι η Ευρώπη οφείλει να αποκτήσει αυτόνομη εξωτερική πολιτική, αν θέλει να αποτελέσει το αντίβαρο στην καταστροφική εξωτερική πολιτική των ΗΠΑ. Προσωπικά, δεν είμαι ιδιαίτερα αισιόδοξη αλλά εύχομαι, γιατί είναι θέμα παγκόσμιας ειρήνης, να με διαψεύσετε.

Jordi Solé, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, as elected politicians, we should always set respect for human rights and democratic principles as top priorities, including when dealing with other countries. This is especially the case with a country like Iran, which happens to be the world champion in the number of executions that it carries out. One thing should be clear: Iran is a religious dictatorship where there are no free elections. Unfortunately, the EU seems to have put aside all its core values and principles just to make a deal with the Iranian regime.

Since the nuclear negotiations were started in 2013, coinciding with Rohani's election as president, over 3 000 people have been hanged by the Islamic Republic of Iran. According to the United Nations, this is the highest number of executions in Iran in 25 years. To be honest, Ms Mogherini, we really missed some words in defence of human rights when you visited Tehran earlier this year for the inauguration of Rohani's second term.

Many Iranians have the impression that the EU has forgotten its principles in exchange for getting more business and trade benefits from the Iranian market. What will the Iranian people think when they see that all the visiting politicians are there only to close business deals, while remaining silent on human rights violations, including repression of women's rights and ethnic and religious minorities? Let's think about that.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, gentile Alto rappresentante, onorevoli colleghi, il dado è stato tratto: lo scorso ottobre l'amministrazione americana ha rifiutato di certificare l'accordo sul programma nucleare iraniano. Una mossa, a mio avviso, priva di una sua logica razionale e dettata piuttosto da ragioni elettorali interne.

L'immagine dell'Iran come nemico per eccellenza e unica fonte di instabilità regionale non giova certo al futuro del Medio Oriente. Sinceramente fatico a identificarlo come l'unico responsabile dei problemi regionali: al contrario, è senz'altro in buona compagnia.

La difesa dei diritti umani è necessaria e inderogabile, ma come è stato ricordato, oltre al ruolo di Teheran nell'accoglienza dei profughi afgani, l'accordo sul nucleare sta globalmente funzionando. Sconfessarlo aprirebbe di nuovo la strada alle fazioni più radicali nel paese, aumentando esponenzialmente il rischio di un'escalation nella regione, con conseguenze imprevedibili per non dire apocalittiche.

Come Unione abbiamo il dovere di tenere il punto e di essere bilanciati nel nostro approccio. Solo così possiamo essere portatori di pace e non di ulteriori tensioni in Medio Oriente.

Franz Obermayr, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Nach zwölf Jahren Verhandlungen, zahlreichen Besichtigungen und Kontrollen durch internationale Atomenergiebehörden kündigt Präsident Trump nun mit Hüftschuss an, dieses Abkommen zu blockieren und zu ignorieren. Ich kann der Union nur raten, hier nicht mitzutun und zum Abkommen zu stehen. Es besteht sonst die Gefahr, dass dieses Vakuum, das entstehen wird, vor allem von Russland und von China ausgefüllt werden wird.

Im Gegenzug muss sich der Iran natürlich an die Verpflichtungen aus dem Abkommen halten. Ich erwarte vom Iran auch, dass er außenpolitisch aktiv wird und zu einer friedlichen Stabilisierung der kriegsgeschüttelten Region des Nahen Ostens wesentlich beiträgt. Gespräche abubrechen, Verträge nicht einzuhalten ist nicht gut, vor allem dann, wenn man Lösungen erzielen will. Und zu Lösungen gehört, auch wenn es dem einen oder anderen nicht gefällt, dass der Iran mit an den Tisch genommen wird.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Vereinten Nationen haben bestätigt: Der Iran hält sich voll an die Abmachungen.

Wir haben jetzt ein Abkommen zwölf Jahre lang ausgehandelt, und zur gleichen Zeit erklärt Donald Trump den Iran zum Feind der USA, erklärt die Revolutionären Garden zur Terrororganisation, kritisiert das ballistische Raketenprogramm und die Kooperation mit Nordkorea. Aber all dies hat ja mit dem Atomdeal nichts zu tun.

Was der Iran jetzt zwei Jahre nach dem Abschluss des Abkommens braucht, ist die Aufhebung der Sanktionen. Der Iran braucht Arbeitsplätze, der Iran braucht Perspektiven für die Jugend. Der Iran hält sich an das Abkommen. Der Iran hat den IS im Irak und Syrien mit bekämpft und mit vernichtet. Er hat zusammen mit Russland den Frieden in Syrien in erreichbare Nähe gebracht, und das Prinzip der Nichteinmischung in die inneren Angelegenheiten sollte auch wieder mehr und mehr Primat der Außenpolitik der EU werden.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señorías. Creo que en este debate se plantea una cuestión fundamental, que es la de saber si el acuerdo nuclear con Irán, que es uno de los grandes logros de la diplomacia internacional en los últimos años, en el que, por cierto, la Unión Europea ha jugado un papel muy destacado, debe ser tratado separadamente o debe ser tratado conjuntamente con la situación en la región, en Irak, en Yemen, en Siria o en Líbano.

La posición del presidente de los Estados Unidos ha sido muy clara. Este asunto tiene que abordarse conjuntamente y por eso no ha querido certificar el acuerdo y lo ha reenviado al Congreso.

Sin embargo, quiero decir que coincido con la posición de la vicepresidenta y alta representante Mogherini en el sentido de que es importante preservar los logros de este acuerdo, abordarlo separadamente y, efectivamente, tratar de evitar la proliferación nuclear en la región. Por lo tanto, apoyo y realmente comparto la opinión de la alta representante.

Sin embargo, eso no debe llevarnos a la situación de desconocer la inquietante situación —a la que otros colegas se han referido— de los derechos humanos en Irán. La alta representante se ha ofrecido a tener un diálogo crítico y a abordar esta situación en una próxima comparecencia. Nos preocupan los derechos de las minorías, la aplicación de la pena capital y la situación de la oposición.

Espero que las conversaciones de la alta representante con el vicepresidente de los Estados Unidos, Mike Pence, con el secretario Tillerson y con el Congreso puedan redundar en una posición más equilibrada y más próxima a la posición que mantenemos en la Unión Europea.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Vor noch nicht einmal einem Monat hat die Internationale Atomenergie-Organisation jetzt zum neunten Mal die vollständige Einhaltung des sogenannten Atomdeals durch den Iran bestätigt.

Die Frist für den US-Kongress, darüber zu entscheiden, was nach der Dezertifizierung durch Präsident Trump folgen soll, ist vergangene Woche ohne Ergebnis abgelaufen. Nun muss der Präsident entscheiden, ob die Aufhebung der Sanktionen bestehen bleiben soll.

Wir appellieren an unsere amerikanischen Freunde, den Vertrag aufrechtzuerhalten und mit uns gemeinsam Lösungen für die anderen aktuellen Herausforderungen mit dem Iran zu finden.

Natürlich verurteilen auch wir das Raketenprogramm des Iran. Wir verschließen unsere Augen nicht vor der Menschenrechtslage und der Einmischung des Iran in andere Konflikte der Region oder der Hetze gegenüber Israel. Aber es wird keine Neuverhandlungen geben, wie wir wissen. Es ist doch absurd zu sagen: Weil wir in anderen Bereichen keinen Erfolg haben, zerstören wir das Einzige, was bisher wirklich positiv erreicht worden ist.

Insofern ist es der Vertrag, der für uns zurzeit die einzige Möglichkeit darstellt, mit dem Iran auf Augenhöhe Schritt für Schritt eine neue Vertrauensbasis aufzubauen – Frau Mogherini hat das ja auch schon erwähnt. Nur durch Gespräche mit dem Iran können wir nachhaltige Lösungen finden, und dafür muss vor allem Europa ein ernst zu nehmender Partner bleiben.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Hoge Vertegenwoordiger, het zal u stellig niet onbekend zijn dat het abjecte regime van Noord-Korea sinds jaar en dag militair nauw samenwerkt met het Iraanse schrikbewind. Dat gebeurt op nucleair gebied, zo ook bij de ontwikkeling van ultramoderne raketssystemen. Dat brengt mij tot twee cruciale vragen aan u, mevrouw de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger. Ten eerste, hoe kijkt u aan tegen de optie, tegen het gevaar dat Teheran Pyongyang, Noord-Korea dus, gebruikt als nucleair *backdoor plan*, dus dat Pyongyang gebruikt wordt voor de voortzetting van het nucleaire programma van Iran? Tweede vraag: pleegt u over deze optie, dit gevaar, ook overleg met de Amerikaanse veiligheidsautoriteiten, die de Noord-Koreaanse-Iraanse militaire samenwerking terecht nauwlettend en met groeiende zorgen in het oog houden?

Hoge Vertegenwoordiger, het illegale nucleaire pad van Noord-Korea is ons bekend. Komt nu een Iraanse versie?

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, pour nous, cet accord est d'une importance stratégique énorme. Cet accord est le symbole que le multilatéralisme est efficace, que la diplomatie peut renforcer la stabilité et la paix dans le monde. Cet accord est le signe que, par des négociations, on peut contribuer au désarmement nucléaire. Eh bien moi, je voudrais vous féliciter pour votre travail et je voudrais encourager les dirigeants européens à vous soutenir plus fermement et publiquement pour sauver cet accord.

Mais au-delà de cet accord est posé le problème du désarmement nucléaire dans le monde. Et comme le disait Beatrice Fihn, directrice de la campagne internationale pour l'abolition des armes nucléaires (ICAN) qui vient de recevoir le prix Nobel de la paix 2017, «il faut choisir entre deux résultats: la fin des armes nucléaires ou notre fin à nous tous». Dimanche, à Oslo, elle appelait les États-Unis à choisir la liberté plutôt que la peur, et la Russie à choisir le désarmement plutôt que la destruction. J'ajouterais que l'Europe doit choisir et doit montrer la voie du désarmement nucléaire, et je compte sur vous, Madame Mogherini.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, the Iran nuclear deal was lauded by some as giving peace in our time throughout the Middle East. However, we must now ask: have we traded nightmarish prophecy for possible calamity? Or, indeed, has anything really changed at all? The deal deliberately only covered nuclear material and other components of nuclear capability, thus the immediate aftermath saw breaches of the UN Resolution on intercontinental ballistic missile testing and a bolstered Iranian foreign policy, not least including the proxy war in Yemen and further turmoil in the Middle East. And all this without even considering what happens after the sunset clause is closed in the not too distant future.

The Trump administration was correct to force a debate on this deal. Accordingly, it is time that this place looks seriously at this issue beyond its mirage as the gold standard of EU diplomacy by addressing the real effects that it is having in the Middle East.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η στάση των Δυτικών και ειδικότερα των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής στο θέμα της πυρηνικής συμφωνίας με το Ιράν είναι απλώς απαράδεκτη. Πριν από δύο χρόνια όλα τα συμβαλλόμενα μέρη υπέγραψαν συμφωνία μετά από μακροχρόνιες διαπραγματεύσεις. Τη συμφωνία αυτή το Ιράν μέχρι σήμερα εξακολουθεί να την τηρεί κατά γράμμα, χωρίς να έχει παραβιάσει κανένα σημείο της. Αντίθετα οι ΗΠΑ, παραβιάζοντας πρώτες εκείνες τη συμφωνία, επέβαλαν πρόσφατα νέες κυρώσεις εναντίον του. Ακόμη και ο πρόεδρος της Γαλλίας Μακρόν ζήτησε να συμπληρωθεί η συμφωνία με δύο νέα άρθρα. Αυτό δείχνει πόση αξία έχει η υπογραφή των δυτικών κυβερνήσεων.

Εάν δεν ήταν ικανοποιημένοι κάποιοι από τη συμφωνία, δεν έπρεπε εξαρχής να την υπογράψουν. Από τη στιγμή όμως που την υπέγραψαν, θεωρώ δεδομένο πως πρέπει να τη σεβαστούν. Το Ιράν δεν έχει δείξει πως προσπαθεί πλέον να αποκτήσει πυρηνικά όπλα ούτε πως αποτελεί κίνδυνο για τις χώρες της Δύσης.

Κρίνω λοιπόν πως κάθε νέος περιορισμός αποσκοπεί απλώς στην εξυπηρέτηση των επεκτατικών σχεδίων των ΗΠΑ και των συμμάχων τους. Ας μην ξεχνάμε πως οι χώρες που αντιδρούν σε αυτή τη συμφωνία διαθέτουν ήδη πυρηνικά όπλα, ενώ οι ΗΠΑ είναι η μοναδική χώρα που έχει χρησιμοποιήσει εν καιρώ πολέμου ατομικές βόμβες εξαυλώνοντας δύο πόλεις μαζί με τους κατοίκους τους.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the High Representative and also her Secretary General, Helga Schmid, for their tireless commitment to preserving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Be assured that you have the full support of a broad majority of this House.

As we have heard – and many speakers have pointed this out – the JCPOA is a multilateral agreement endorsed by the UN Security Council and it should be preserved by all means. In every future action, we should remember that the negotiation process took around 12 years. We should not tire of making clear to our US counterparts – and this is exactly what a Committee on Foreign Affairs mission to Washington did last month – that, firstly, Iran is in full compliance with the JCPOA, as reported repeatedly by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and, secondly, Iran's ballistic missile tests are outside the scope of the JCPOA.

However, Iran's regional posture, its ballistic missile programmes and the human rights situation remain deeply worrying. I remain concerned by the tensions in the region and the deteriorating relations between Iran and its neighbours, notably the military build-up in the region and confrontational rhetoric by all sides. Nevertheless, the international community would not be in a better place to deal with any of these issues without the JCPOA in place.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Meinen ersten Redebeitrag im Europäischen Parlament habe ich zu den Iran-Sanktionen gehalten; das war vor sechs Jahren. Ich habe gegen den Einsatz militärischer Mittel argumentiert. Vieles hat sich seither geändert, vor allem dank der Bemühungen der Europäischen Union, insbesondere von Ihnen, Frau Mogherini.

Das Atomabkommen war ein großer Erfolg, und es darf nicht gefährdet werden. Mit ihm waren viele Erwartungen verknüpft: dass die Sanktionen beendet werden und die Bevölkerung davon profitiert und dass eine Entspannung in der Region damit verbunden ist. Das alles ist nicht eingetreten. Es besteht die Gefahr des Scheiterns und damit erneuter Instabilität. Der Iran hat seinen Teil geleistet und läuft jetzt Gefahr, in geopolitischen Auseinandersetzungen aufgegeben zu werden. Was wir dringend brauchen, ist Deeskalierung in den Beziehungen der Staaten der Region zueinander, aber auch im Inneren – Stichwort Menschenrechte. Eine Konfrontationsstrategie hilft nur den Hardlinern.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Iran er en terrorstat. En stat, der terroriserer sin egen befolkning, en stat, der terroriserer sine naboer, og en stat, der sponserer terrorisme i Europa og resten af verden. Derfor kan vi ikke, når vi diskuterer Iran-aftalen, komme uden om, at den i al for høj grad er blevet brugt til at komme uden om at tale om de mange andre problemer, der spredt sig fra Iran. Problemer som menneskerettighedskrænkelser, finansiering af terrororganisationer og hele regimet omkring revolutionsgarden og ayatollahen, som er dybt problematisk ud fra alle de standarder, vi normalt i EU bruger til at vurdere vores modparters på. Derfor bør vi som Europa-Parlament holde Kommissionen op på, at Iran-aftalen ikke kan stå alene. Presset skal også ligge på alle de andre områder, hvor Iran bliver ved med at overtræde helt basale krav om human opførsel og basale menneskerettigheder.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Im mniej przewidywalna jest polityka prezydenta Trumpa, tym większa odpowiedzialność spoczywa na Unii Europejskiej. Rozmawiamy dzisiaj o najbardziej zapalnym regionie świata, gdzie rodzą się rozmaite zagrożenia dla naszego bezpieczeństwa. Cieszy mnie jako szefa Delegacji do spraw stosunków z Iranem, że Unia Europejska mówi jednym głosem w sprawie tak fundamentalnej jak porozumienie nuklearne. Nie ma więc problemu z ustaleniem numeru telefonu do Europy. Uważam, że ten układ jest zwycięstwem cierpliwej, wytrawnej dyplomacji i rzeczywistym filarem międzynarodowej strategii nierozprzestrzeniania broni jądrowej, a także zwycięstwem tych sił w Iranie, które opowiadają się za stopniowym otwieraniem tego wielkiego kraju i za jego modernizacją. I właśnie w tym duchu – *engagement*, a nie *disengagement* – rozmawialiśmy podczas niedawnej wizyty w Teheranie z władzami parlamentu i przedstawicielami rządu. Rozmowy dotyczyły nie tylko spraw, które mogą zbliżyć, ale też zdecydowanie podnoszono kwestie sporne, czyli przede wszystkim dwuznaczną rolę Iranu w tak zapalnym regionie, po drugie nadużywanie kary śmierci, po trzecie szeroko rozumiane prawa człowieka. Pan Ahmadreza Djalali też był na mojej liście tematów poruszanych przy okazji rozmów z rozmaitymi oficjalnymi tego kraju. Jutro zresztą będzie również możliwość poruszenia tego problemu podczas wideokonferencji z ambasadorem Iranu przy Unii Europejskiej. Zwycięża jednak dialog. Taką mam nadzieję.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, o acordo nuclear estabelecido com o Irão em 2015 teve o efeito de gerar um compromisso multilateral onde antes não existia senão antagonismo, desconfiança mútua e uma preocupante escalada retórica.

O programa nuclear iraniano passou de uma situação de grande opacidade para uma situação que permite a sua monitorização e até aplicação de restrições e recorde-se que ele foi assinado numa altura em que se acreditava que esse país estava mesmo à beira de obter secretamente a bomba nuclear.

Constatado o falhanço do embargo, que se estendeu por muito tempo, e que castigou sobretudo o povo iraniano, esse acordo apoiado pela União Europeia desde o primeiro momento, constituiu um notável sucesso diplomático e, como tal, foi saudado pela generalidade da comunidade internacional.

Na sua vertigem incendiária, o Presidente Trump propôs ao Congresso dos Estados Unidos a aprovação de novas sanções contra o Irão com o argumento de que este acordo não vai ao encontro dos interesses norte-americanos. Perante isto, a União Europeia tem de deixar claro que não vacilará no apoio a este acordo. O seu eventual fracasso implicaria um retrocesso de décadas, devolveria o programa nuclear à situação de opacidade em que se encontrava e traria de volta o temor de que o Irão poderia desenvolver armamento nuclear, contribuindo, assim, para criar ainda mais instabilidade em todo o Médio Oriente.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Mr President, it seems that Ms Mogherini is overdosing on some unjustifiable optimism vis-à-vis Iran. This Treaty does not work. It was set to help to improve the situation, particularly in the sphere of human rights and to make Iran more peaceful. What we have seen instead was the number of executions rising, doubling in just three years, and we have seen Iran continuing its anti-Western policy. Iran never gave up its nuclear ambitions and was launching ballistic missiles instead, it supported terrorists – like Hezbollah – and it tried to achieve the status of a regional power, penetrating Iraq, Syria and Yemen, which could shake the very fragile regional balance of power.

It seems, therefore, that Iran is rather encouraged by this deal, not curbed by it, and therefore I do not see any reason why we should be worried about preserving the deal. It is a failure. We should in fact change it, or scrap it.

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

Arnaud Danjean (PPE), question «carton bleu». – J'ai une question très simple et très précise à poser à notre collègue. Dans quel article du plan d'action global commun a-t-il lu que l'accord sur le nucléaire faisait peser des contraintes sur les autres domaines de contentieux avec l'Iran, comme celui qu'il a nommé, par exemple, les droits de l'homme? Je n'ai aucune sympathie pour le régime iranien, mais j'aime bien qu'on soit précis, donc je me demande dans quelle partie du plan d'action global commun figurent les dispositions dont M. Zahradil vient de parler.

Jan Zahradil (ECR), blue-card answer. – I can only tell you that this deal was supposed to create a certain atmosphere, and it has been said that while it deals with a particular issue, the nuclear ambition of Iran, it could help to change the atmosphere in Iran and pave the way for improvement in the sphere of human rights, for instance. So, regardless of whether there is an article or not, it seems that the overall atmosphere and those implications that were expected to happen, simply did not. That is the whole thing.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, der Iran ist eine Diktatur. Der Iran ist verantwortlich für die Stellvertreterkriege, gemeinsam mit Saudi-Arabien, insbesondere in der Region. Der Iran führt Raketentests durch, die nach den UN-Resolutionen nicht stattfinden sollten, und er verletzt auf dramatische Weise die Menschenrechte. Das ist alles wahr. Aber dennoch muss dieser Atomdeal da sein. Dieser Atomdeal ist nämlich, um eine Verbreitung der Atomwaffen zu vermeiden, auch ein Signal in Richtung Nordkorea. Wenn dies aufgekündigt wird, wie kann man mit jemand anderem dann eine Vereinbarung treffen, dass der keine Atombomben baut? Und wenn der Iran Atombomben baut, werden Saudi-Arabien und alle Länder in der Region auch Atombomben bauen. Das ist bisher vermieden worden. In der Vereinbarung steht, dass in dem Augenblick, in dem sie die Regeln verletzen, die Sanktionen jederzeit wieder eingeführt werden können – sodass wir hier entweder Zeit gewinnen oder auf Dauer vielleicht Atomwaffen im Iran völlig vermeiden, um auf diese Art und Weise nicht zu einer dramatischen Veränderung in der Region – und weit darüber hinaus – zu kommen.

Präsident Trump hat jetzt den Ball wieder in seinem Garten. Frau Mogherini, ich hoffe, dass es in den Gesprächen gelingt, ihn doch dazu zu bringen, dass er nicht die Schritte vollzieht, die er jetzt wieder vollziehen kann, nachdem es im Kongress keine konstruktiven Entscheidungen gab. Ich stelle fest, wie so viele: Der Iran hält sich an die Vereinbarung. Wir sollten uns an die Vereinbarung halten, diese Vereinbarung ist Teil des internationalen Rechts. Nur die Amerikaner wollen aussteigen, sonst niemand. Aus diesem Grunde sollten wir unsere Politik vorantreiben, dieses Abkommen zu sichern, um einen weiteren Ausbau von Atomwaffen in dieser Welt zu verhindern.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie Alto rappresentante Mogherini per la bella relazione con cui ha introdotto questo dibattito.

L'accordo sul nucleare iraniano è stato un successo diplomatico dell'Unione europea. Con i recenti sviluppi legati alle dichiarazioni del Presidente degli Stati Uniti, che ha espresso la volontà di ritirare gli USA dall'accordo, lo sforzo diplomatico dell'Unione europea deve essere ancora più forte.

Sono d'accordo con l'Alto rappresentante nel ribadire che il piano di azione congiunto globale è un accordo multilaterale adottato con una risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite, e che perciò non appartiene a nessuno Stato e non può essere modificato unilateralmente.

Dobbiamo confermare il nostro supporto all'accordo: oltre a essere alla base di un rinnovato rapporto economico con l'Iran, l'implementazione del JCPOA, con il conseguente alleviamento delle sanzioni, sta avendo un impatto politico positivo sui cittadini iraniani. Inoltre, credo che l'apertura dell'Iran a una dimensione internazionale possa essere di stimolo al miglioramento della situazione interna e un'opportunità unica per dare inizio a un processo di pieno inserimento dell'Iran in un contesto internazionale e globale.

L'Unione europea, naturalmente, deve perseguire l'instaurarsi di un dialogo strategico e strutturato, che deve anche andare oltre gli aspetti di facciata, e che quindi deve affrontare anche le questioni legate alla violazione dei diritti umani. Non si può ignorare il preoccupante ricorso alla pena di morte, la persecuzione delle minoranze, gli arresti degli attivisti e la discriminazione nei confronti delle donne. Ma per questo ritengo fondamentale che proseguano gli sforzi per un rapporto con l'Iran stabilito come negli accordi.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – 247 executies in de eerste helft van dit jaar, van wie 3 vrouwen, 3 kinderen en 12 openbare terechtstellingen. Het rapport van de VN over Iran leest als een thriller.

De laatste naam die mag worden toegevoegd aan de lijst van mensen die wachten op hun executie is die van Ahmadreza Djalali. Arts, Europees staatsburger, vader, echtgenoot. Ook in mijn land bekend door zijn medische gastcolleges aan de Vrije Universiteit van Brussel. Ter dood veroordeeld op basis van dubieuze bewijsvoering. Zijn advocaat liet na om beroep aan te tekenen waardoor zijn executie uitvoerbaar is. Ik citeer de rector van de VUB vandaag in de Vlaamse pers: "Als bevlogen arts en gedreven expert in de rampengeneeskunde had hij slechts één drijfveer: mensenlevens redden. Vandaag is het zijn eigen leven dat aan een zijden draadje hangt. En er is geen arts die hem kan redden".

Daarom, mevrouw Mogherini, deze dringende oproep, een emotionele oproep: gebruik al uw invloed, gebruik de hefboomen die u heeft om het leven van deze man te redden! De nucleaire deal met Iran mag uw ogen niet sluiten voor de gruwelijke mensenrechtenschendingen, want dat zou neerkomen op schuldig verzuim en op medeplichtigheid.

Arnaud Danjean (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, il n'y a aucune sympathie à avoir vis-à-vis de la théocratie iranienne, et la fermeté constitue sans aucun doute la meilleure des attitudes à avoir vis-à-vis de Téhéran.

Je viens d'un pays qui a été – et j'en suis fier – le plus dur dans la négociation sur l'accord nucléaire iranien. Mais si nous ne parlons qu'avec les pays avec lesquels nous partageons les valeurs, les intérêts de sécurité et de la sympathie et si nous ne nous engageons diplomatiquement qu'avec ces derniers, nous n'allons pas parler à grand monde. Nous allons finir bien seuls dans ce monde réel tel qu'il est.

Aujourd'hui, il ne s'agit pas d'être naïf sur l'Iran, ni d'être confus non plus. Il faut aborder ce sujet de façon très rigoureuse et sérieuse les problèmes et les contentieux pour en parler ouvertement et – comme je l'ai dit – avec fermeté.

Sur le plan d'action global commun, c'est un accord de compromis dont rien ne permet de dire aujourd'hui qu'il est violé ou qu'il comportera de mauvaises conséquences. Nous devons donc aujourd'hui appliquer le plan d'action global commun, point barre! L'attitude européenne de ce point de vue-là est exemplaire.

Sur le balistique, il y a – vous l'avez dit, Madame la Haute représentante – violation de la résolution 2231 du Conseil de sécurité. Donc, là-dessus, il faut être ferme et réagir.

Sur la recomposition régionale, oui, bien sûr, l'Iran progresse du Yémen au Liban, mais l'Iran progresse aussi sur nos erreurs, sur nos indécisions et sur nos velléités. L'Iran est donc un acteur, qui n'est ni meilleur ni pire dans l'absolu que bien d'autres acteurs dans la région. Là aussi, nous devons faire preuve de réalisme.

Nous avons des lignes rouges sur lesquelles il faut être totalement intransigeant, notamment la sécurité d'Israël. Pour le reste, je pense que nous avons intérêt à engager l'Iran – comme je l'ai dit – avec la plus grande fermeté, mais aussi avec le plus grand réalisme.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Mr President, I give full support for High Representative Mogherini's efforts in implementing the nuclear agreement with Iran, which is strategic for the EU and global security.

The EU should encourage Iran to play a responsible role in its region and beyond, in contrast with the Wahhabism fuelling terrorism and escalation by Saudi Arabian proxies. But the EU should also demand that Iran stops supporting the military butcher Assad in Syria.

The EU cannot also be silent about human rights concerns in Iran, but to be credible and effective it must not turn a blind eye to the provocative activities of sects such as the MEK (Mojahedin-e Khalq), which act within this Parliament, and last week even physically assaulted an opponent just outside the Parliament. This criminal act happened when the MEK leader Maryam Rajavi was in the Parliament. I demand from President Tajani the expulsion of MEK agents who work on EP premises. This is also a security matter for all of us.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, today, more than ever, the EU needs a comprehensive, value-based and principled approach to the Iranian dictatorship. The nuclear deal has to be kept – it should not be abandoned, let us be clear – but it is not a substitute for such a principled approach. We should not be hypercritical, clinging formally to the letter of the Treaty and taking it as an excuse to look away from the real situation. The two belong together.

Regarding the Iranian Dictatorship, the Treaty has also provided a breathing space for the dictatorship to strengthen its hold on the population, and Iran continues to be the biggest exporter of terrorism and conflict in the Middle East. It has continued with its ballistic missile programme, and our biggest worry is a dramatic worsening of the human rights situation. The EU cannot continue to keep a moderate and low-profile protest. We should take a very principled approach to this: the hundreds of people hanged find no relief whether their butchers have been called moderates in the West or not.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, el acuerdo con Irán, apoyado por unanimidad por el Consejo de Seguridad en su Resolución 2231, representó un importante éxito diplomático. Despejaba la grave amenaza de un Irán nuclear y evitaba la escalada armamentística en una de las regiones más inestables del mundo. Además, sirvió para subrayar el papel de la Unión Europea como actor global, dado el importante papel desarrollado durante la negociación.

Ya se ha dicho en este debate que, según el Organismo Internacional de Energía Atómica, —así lo ha manifestado de forma reiterada— Irán está cumpliendo los términos del acuerdo. Por todas estas razones, debemos apoyar el mantenimiento del acuerdo. Sin embargo, esto no puede ocultar las preocupaciones que a día de hoy despiertan el programa balístico de Irán y su negativa actuación en el plano regional, pese a las esperanzas creadas por el acuerdo de una actitud más constructiva de Irán en el escenario regional. Su importante influencia sobre diversos actores de la región es conocida. Necesitamos un Irán mucho más constructivo en Oriente Próximo. Un Irán que no contribuya a la polarización y al enfrentamiento en una región asolada por la violencia y en la que se entrecruzan divisiones nacionales, religiosas y étnicas.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal celou tu debatu a dovoluji mi, paní vysoká představitelko, několik vět. To vaše vystoupení mi připadlo mimořádně optimistické.

Já na jedné straně podporuji, aby tato dohoda byla zachována, ale na druhé straně nemůžeme relativizovat to, že Irán je dneska teokratická diktatura, kde nejsou respektována lidská práva, kde je obrovské množství poprav, destabilizace regionu a mnohá a mnohá negativa tohoto zločineckého režimu. Nežlobte se, tváří v tvář tomuto mít radost z toho, že nám roste obchod s touto zemí, že nám narůstají investice, mi připadá, že tímto v zásadě relativizujeme, jak zločinný režim dnes v Íránu existuje.

Takže buďme pro to, aby ona dohoda existovala, já ji považuji za velký úspěch i Vaší diplomacie, ale na druhou stranu, buďte pořád obezřetní, protože dohoda s takovýmto režimem může v jednu chvíli existovat, ale takovýto režim ji může kdykoliv vypovědět.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Sinds de nucleaire deal blijft het eigenlijk oorverdovend stil over de talrijke mensenrechtenschendingen in Iran. Ik wil het hier vandaag hebben over de cijfers. Sinds de laatste 4 jaar zijn de executies verdubbeld. In 2016 spreken we over 567 executies. Ik wil het hier vandaag over één naam hebben, die van een arts en gastdocent van de VUB in Brussel, Ahmadreza Djalali. Hij is één van de mensen die momenteel ter dood veroordeeld zijn. Zijn advocaat heeft geen verzet aangetekend en zijn doodvonnis is vanaf nu uitvoerbaar. Vandaag hebben alle universiteiten van Vlaanderen ertoe opgeroepen om te pleiten voor zijn vrijlating. Mevrouw Mogherini, ik maak van dit momentum gebruik om uw hulp te vragen. Help onze professor en arts vrij te krijgen. *Help us! Thank you.*

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Mr President, we have to admit that the agreement limiting Iran to civilian nuclear activity was a major achievement of European and international multilateral diplomacy and will guarantee peace and stability. The deal works and delivers on its promises, fully or partially, and this agreement should be preserved.

Despite this milestone in practical cooperation between the European Union and Iran, the scope of our bilateral relations is well below potential, and we have to ask ourselves, is it not high time to focus more on the situation of ordinary Iranians? To speak about the deteriorating human rights situation and the grievous condition of activists, about poverty, about corruption, the crackdown on the opposition, repression of women and religious minorities, as well as the role Iran plays in Syria and some other countries of the region.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συμφωνία με το Ιράν πρέπει να στηριχθεί και να υλοποιηθεί. Δεν υπάρχει καμιά δυνατότητα επαναδιαπραγμάτευσης. Μια τέτοια προοπτική θα φέρει πολύ μεγαλύτερους κινδύνους από όσους θέλει να αποφύγει. Ιδιαίτερα η θέση του προέδρου Τραμπ μαζί δυστυχώς με μερικές ακόμα τοποθετήσεις του μας φέρνει όλους μπροστά σε νέα δυσεπίλυτα προβλήματα.

Τούτων λεχθέντων δεν πρέπει να ξεχνάμε πως στο Ιράν παραβιάζονται βασικά ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και πως η μάχη κατά των ναρκωτικών χρειάζεται και την ιρανική υποστήριξη. Κλείνω τονίζοντας, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, πως ο κίνδυνος ενός πυρηνικού Ολοκαυτώματος είναι σήμερα υπαρκτός και οξύνεται και από τη δράση της Βορείου Κορέας και θα πρέπει άμεσα η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να αναλάβει διεθνή πρωτοβουλία για τον πυρηνικό αφοπλισμό.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, o acordo nuclear com o Irão constituiu, seguramente, um dos maiores feitos diplomáticos da última década. No entanto, a decisão do Presidente Trump em não validar este acordo implicará um grave retrocesso na luta contra a proliferação nuclear e tornará, certamente, o mundo mais inseguro. Cabe-nos a nós, por isso, a nós europeus, continuar a liderar a luta contra a proliferação nuclear.

Contudo, a implementação do plano de ação conjunta geral e o seu impacto nas relações institucionais e comerciais devem ser estritamente condicionados à defesa intransigente dos direitos humanos e ir muito mais além das visitas relâmpago dos líderes europeus com agendas centradas nas oportunidades de investimento ou na promoção de alianças energéticas.

Mas, Senhora Alta Representante, não nos esqueçamos que o Irão não é uma democracia e que a Europa não pode fechar os olhos às constantes violações dos direitos humanos do regime ditatorial dos aiatolás, mantendo esta inaceitável postura do *business as usual*, face a um regime opressor que detém um triste recorde de violações dos direitos humanos e a liderança mundial na aplicação da pena capital.

Caros colegas, termino, repetindo o que disse há mais de um ano: os direitos humanos não são negociáveis, eles fazem parte da nossa responsabilidade coletiva enquanto seres humanos e europeus.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Razumem vaše stališče, gospa visoka predstavnica, da je sporazum z Iranom, nuklearni sporazum, nujen. Razumem tudi, da ocenjujete, da celo dela v nekaterih segmentih, ampak ne razumem pa tega, zakaj ne bi imeli do Irana nekoliko bolj celovit, holističen pristop, ko ocenjujete njegovo vlogo v regiji in pa tudi v samem Iranu.

Veste, da ta teokracija praktično sistematično in sistemsko krši človekove pravice, slišali smo na desetine vsak mesec usmrčenih in tako naprej, vi pa v molk. Istočasno tudi režim iranski deluje kot destabilizator v regiji, razvija balistične rakete, financira Hezbolah in druge teroristične organizacije, pere denar za terorizem, podpira Asada s krvavimi rokami in tako naprej. Skratka, Iran ni država, ki bi bila faktor stabilnosti, demokracije in miru, ampak ravno nasprotno, nekaj bo treba spremeniti.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, premda je namjera Iranskog nuklearnog sporazuma bila dobra u smislu zaustavljanja širenja nuklearnog naoružanja i postizanju mira, taj sporazum nije do sada dao željene rezultate.

Riječ je o sporazumu s nedemokratskim režimom, režimom koji je posljednjih godina i više nego udvostručio broj smaknuća te dosegao najviši stupanj u posljednjih 25 godina.

Kršnja ljudskih prava, narušavanja prava žena, kao i manjinskih prava, ostala su po strani u postizanju dogovora o nuklearnom programu te su i danas u drugom planu, dok iranske vlasti donose još strože zakone protiv prava žena, a Iran je i dalje vodeći egzekutor maloljetnika koji su počinili prijestupe.

Prema godišnjem izvješću State Departmenta, Iran je i dalje vodeći svjetski financijer terorističkih organizacija i njihovih aktivnosti te djeluje kao destabilizirajući faktor na području Bliskog Istoka. Iran nije učinio gotovo nikakav napredak, a stranke sporazuma to prešućuju zbog straha da Iran ne aktivira nuklearni program, što nikako ne možemo nazvati partnerskim odnosom.

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

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, let me clarify a couple of things that most of the speakers here have underlined, but which I think might be usefully remembered for others. First of all, the purpose of the nuclear deal with Iran – the name says it very clearly – is nuclear, and only nuclear. Was this a right or wise choice or not? It was taken 14 years ago at the beginning of the negotiations, and I don't believe I disclose a secret if I say that it was the decision of the Gulf countries and the American administration at the time to limit the negotiations to purely nuclear issues. It was Iran at that time insisting on having a negotiation that would have included other aspects.

Was it a wise choice or not? Not for me or for you to judge it today, but the decision back then – not by Iran, by the way – was of a different kind. Since it was purely nuclear, we have facts certified by an agency that has proven to be crucial and will continue to prove to be crucial in other nuclear proliferation issues like the IAEA, certifying that nuclear commitments of the nuclear deal have been met constantly. It would not be wise to weaken the credibility of the agency, of the IAEA, when a few months or years from now we will hopefully need to push for the IAEA to enter and monitor other nuclear programmes. So if the agency testifies and certifies nine times after inspections, after technical work – and that needs to be happening in fully independent, non-political arguments for that on all sides – that the nuclear commitments under the nuclear agreements are met, then the deal is working. Full stop. That is a fact.

Then, second, does this mean that we are positive about Iran, that we trust Iran, that there is an optimism about the atmosphere? It is exactly because it is a country like Iran that you need to have a nuclear deal, because you do not want a country like Iran in that region to develop a nuclear weapon. If it was Switzerland, maybe we would be in a different position. It is not about being naive; it is the contrary. It is the lack of trust that makes the deal indispensable. And this was the reasoning of all the years of negotiations. This was the reason why the US administration engaged in this at that time, not having diplomatic relations with Iran, which is something that on the contrary most of the European Union Member States have. And there is one fundamental argument that some of you have raised: if we start saying that, with any change of administration, agreements and international commitments are put into question, we are not doing ourselves a favour, because nobody would accept negotiating any agreement, any international agreement with any administration of the future or of the present. In Latin we say: *Pacta sunt servanda*. That is the basis of any legal system of the world.

So it is exactly because there is and was no trust that an agreement was needed. Then it is true, not in an article of the JCPOA – I know it almost by heart by now – but in the preamble of the 104 pages of agreement, that there is a reference, half a sentence, that suggests that this agreement could open the way, could form the basis for a different kind of engagement, a more constructive engagement in the region. That sentence – here maybe I disclose a secret – was introduced at Iran's request, because the Iranian leadership at the time, which is the same that has been reconfirmed today, intended to use the agreement as a way to ask their own population, their own public opinion, for a mandate to engage with the rest of the world in a political battle which we know very well has happened inside Iran and is continuing to happen. Some of you referred to the fact that undermining the full implementation of the nuclear deal also weakens those in Iran's political scene who are trying to commit in their own way – which is not ours – towards an opening and an engagement with the rest of the world.

Weakening or putting into question the JCPOA is a way to strengthen the hardliners in the political scene in Iran. Is it convenient for us? Not for us, for sure. Having said that, what would happen if the deal was not there? Imagine that tomorrow the deal was no longer there. Would the human rights situation in Iran improve? Probably not; on the contrary, hardliners would be stronger. Would the regional behaviour of Iran improve? For sure it would not. Would the Iranian nuclear programme continue to be monitored? No. Would the IAEA have the means to be in the country? No. Would we be sure that Iran would not develop a nuclear programme that is purely peaceful? Definitely not, and enrichment would go up again tomorrow.

So is it convenient to keep the nuclear deal in place? Yes. This is the very simple argument that is keeping the entire world committed to the full implementation of the JCPOA, and I am confident that the United States of America will also remain committed to the full implementation of the JCPOA. This is what we discussed with Secretary of State Tillerson last week in Brussels, and this is the message we got from him. We are continuing to implement the agreement, and just today in Vienna the Secretary-General of the EEAS, Schmid, who has played a crucial role in these negotiations together with an excellent team from the European Union side, is chairing at deputy level the Joint Commission of the JCPOA once again. We do it regularly, sometimes at ministerial level. We did it last time in September with all the parties around the table. So I believe it is a matter of convenience; it is not a matter of being naive or 'liking' a system or a country. On the contrary.

Two points I would like to clarify: one is related to the agreement. There is no sunset clause in the agreement – I know that this is often referred to. Read all the 104 pages of the agreement; there is no sunset clause to the agreement. The agreement has many different provisions with many different durations. Most of them last for a long, long time. Most of them last forever. And in the very beginning of the agreement there is the most important commitment taken by Iran: of never developing a nuclear weapon. This is a commitment that is there for ever as an NPT part.

So let's stick to the facts. The nuclear deal, the nuclear commitment, fulfils more safety in the region and for us. That is why I said to our American friends that this is a matter of strategic relevance for European security. It is not about business, and it is not about the region; it is about security, because we do not want to see a region that is already troubled enough in a nuclear arms race. We miss just that. And then, good luck with North Korea: if we dismantle the only working deal on non-proliferation in the nuclear field, I want to see how we manage to peacefully solve the nuclear proliferation crisis that is currently ongoing. We have one deal that is preventing a nuclear proliferation, and we want to dismantle it? We must be crazy.

So I think, and I am confident, that we can continue to work to ensure that Iran continues to fulfil its commitments under the deal in full. That is the key point.

The last point I would like to mention is on human rights, because it hurts me enormously when I hear voices saying that we stay silent on human rights. Actually, we are the ones that are more vocal on human rights when it comes to Iran. Look at President Trump's speech. Look at the American discourse on the death penalty and compare it with the credibility on the death penalty that Europe has. Sorry to be blunt, but we have entered into a time where diplomacy has a different language. We are the ones raising individual cases, and we do it even today; in Vienna, issues were raised on individual cases. We are the ones who have started a human rights dialogue with Iran that regularly takes place. We are the ones, not others. And we are the ones raising this issue constantly. I don't see others doing this. We never, ever avoid raising issues on human rights because of other reasons. We always do that, constantly and consistently, and sometimes – most of the time – we are the only ones. So let's at least support and recognise the work we do. That is going to continue to be a very important aspect of our engagement with the country.

But again, I would say the most important thing for me are the social and the political dynamics inside the country. The Iranian population was celebrating the Iran deal, not because of nuclear issues, but because it was representing the opportunity to open up the country to international engagement. That is the investment that is smart to do as Europeans, and that is why I would like to thank this Hemicycle in its vast majority and the parliamentary delegations that travelled both to Iran and to Washington to support what is a fully united European Union position, when the entire world is looking at us to guarantee that the full implementation of the agreement is maintained by all sides.

Presidente. – Grazie Vicepresidente Mogherini. La Sua maratona non è finita e Lei resterà con noi anche per le prossime discussioni.

La discussione su questo punto è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Ramona Nicole Mănescu (PPE), in writing. – Apparently, the Iran Nuclear Deal follows its course, and its implementation is flawless. I always viewed the Nuclear Deal as a pressure valve that would pave the way to a more cooperative and less belligerent Iran, more stability in the region, better life for its people, fewer human rights abuses, and more democracy.

These things are not happening! On the contrary; a much more well off Iran acts aggressively at regional level, from Yemen to Lebanon, and from Syria to Iraq. The EU is failing to raise any questions on matters like human rights or democratic principles in its relation with Iran. Our leniency towards Iran's actions, before providing the alleged benefits, offers Teheran's dictatorship regime the means to wreak havoc over a wide area. I believe it is in the EU's interest to be more adamant in its relations with Iran. We must be clearer in stating the reasons for which we are backing the Nuclear Deal. We must also state the reasons for which we might back out from this deal. Iran's answer to France's request of dialogue, threatening Europe with an enlarged missile range is completely unacceptable. This is not a wise reaction and will not help in any way.

15. Najava američkoga predsjednika Trumpa da će priznati Jeruzalem kao glavni grad Izraela (rasprava)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione e Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sull'annuncio del presidente americano Trump di riconoscimento di Gerusalemme capitale d'Israele (2017/3012(RSP)).

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the voice of the European Union has been heard loud and clear in all corners of the world after President Trump's announcement on Jerusalem. We believe that Jerusalem shall be the capital of two states: West Jerusalem for the state of Israel and East Jerusalem for the state of Palestine. We believe that the only way to achieve this goal is through direct negotiations between the parties based on the 1967 borders and that there is no alternative solution that would be both viable and sustainable, meet the aspirations of the two sides and address the legitimate concerns. This is the position of the entire European Union and this is what all 28 Foreign Ministers said yesterday morning to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, one by one, in full unity. Our position is built on the most solid foundations. It is based on the Oslo Accords between Israeli and Palestinian leaders and on the international consensus embodied in UN Security Council Resolution 478. Our partners know very well where we stand and we have made it very clear – always, and during these last very difficult days.

As a partner and as a friend, we have always been clear in our contacts with the United States, before and after the decision was taken. Exactly one week ago, I met with Rex Tillerson, the US Secretary of State, together with the 28 - Foreign Ministers of the European Union Member States, and we invited the United States to carefully consider the repercussions that such a decision may have had on public opinion in the region and all around the world, because what happens in Jerusalem has global repercussions for good and for bad. This move risks strengthening radical forces in the region and weakening forces of wisdom and moderation, being completely counterproductive. We discussed these arguments with our American interlocutors, including a couple of days ago with Jared Kushner, President Trump's Middle East adviser, and our contacts with our American friends will continue in the coming days and weeks.

The Israelis and the Palestinians also know where we stand and this makes us a credible, predictable and indispensable partner for them to restart a meaningful peace process. It therefore comes as no surprise that our meeting yesterday with Prime Minister Netanyahu was very open and frank. We did not hide our disagreements because this is what good friends and partners, as we are, should always do. We have made it clear that we will continue to respect the international consensus on Jerusalem as Europeans, including on the location of our embassies, until the final status of Jerusalem is resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

At the same time, we understand Israel's security concerns and we want to see them properly addressed. I took the opportunity of the visit of Prime Minister Netanyahu – the first one for more than 20 years – to condemn in the strongest possible terms all attacks against Jews everywhere in the world, including in Europe, and all attacks against Israeli citizens. At the same time, we believe that Israel's security interests are best served by having a stable, viable, independent Palestinian state living in peace and security at the side of the Israeli state. This is what many great Israeli leaders have rightly believed throughout the years and this is what led Yitzhak Rabin to sign the Oslo Accords.

I presented the very same position, very openly and very clearly, to our Palestinian and Arab friends. Last week, I spoke with President Abbas and guaranteed that the European Union will continue to work for Jerusalem to be the capital of both the state of Israel and the state of Palestine. We agreed with President Abbas that he will join us in Brussels on the occasion of the January Foreign Affairs Council, and we will have a similar discussion with him on the perspectives of the relaunch of the Middle East peace process that we had yesterday with Prime Minister Netanyahu. I also asked President Abbas to do all he can to make sure that all demonstrations remain peaceful.

On Friday, in Brussels, I met with my Jordanian counterpart, and also my friend, Foreign Minister Ayman Al Safadi, and with him contacts have continued on a daily basis, actually several times a day. We are in contact with what we consider to be a key player at this moment because Jordan plays a very special role when it comes to Jerusalem. His Majesty the King of Jordan is the custodian of the holy sites, as agreed in the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. He is also a very wise man and I believe all of us remember the very wise words he addressed to this very Chamber a couple of years ago. I thank the Minister for the restraint and the wisdom shown by Jordan in this difficult situation, including the work done by Jordan and others during the League of Arab States Ministerial Meeting in Cairo last Saturday, where the Arab Peace Initiative was recalled as a useful framework to re-advance the possibility to start negotiations. The steps taken by the Arab states in these days and in the coming days, in the near future, will be particularly important: to show leadership, wisdom, restraint and moderation, keeping the clearly defined position that we are backing in full consistency with our consolidated position and role.

I can say that I believe that, in these hours and days, the European Union is an important point of reference for the Arab world. Regardless of all the narratives and the rhetoric about the Arab world and the West, Europe constitutes an important point of reference to uphold the principle and the consensus developed on Jerusalem. For us Europeans this situation is a call to mobilise with even greater conviction for peace between Israel and Palestine. We are determined to play an even more active role in trying to provide, first, a political horizon for the two-state solution – there is no realistic alternative to two states – and, second, to work to create the appropriate international and regional framework to relaunch direct negotiations. So we will keep working. We are continuing to work at this time with both parties and with the Middle East Quartet, which means together with the United States, Russia and the United Nations. This format, as I have said in recent days, could possibly be enlarged to include key regional players such as Jordan and Egypt, but we could also involve other important partners, such as Norway, who could play an important part in supporting this process. The United States should – and could – continue to play an important role in that framework.

It is in the darkest hours, such as these, that the work of peacemakers becomes more difficult – yes – but more important. We must first of all engage to prevent any escalation around Jerusalem, which could have terrible consequences for the region and beyond, and we must engage to preserve the objective of two states and recreate the conditions for the peace process to restart – the key to restart the engine.

Let me conclude by saying that Jerusalem is not just a city. Jerusalem is the cradle of three faiths. Our ancestors believed that it was the centre of the entire world and the whole world still looks at Jerusalem. It can be a reason for division and even war or it can be the most powerful symbol of peace and reconciliation. The region and the world count on Europe – count on the European Union – to stay engaged with a clear, united message and clear, determined work and this is exactly what we are doing in the clearest and most united manner.

Presidente. – Grazie Vicepresidente Mogherini. Adesso ascoltiamo il parere dei gruppi politici. In questa fase non accetteremo «blue card» perché siamo in grande ritardo. Onorevole Preda a nome del gruppo del Partito popolare europeo.

Cristian Dan Preda, au nom du groupe PPE. – Monsieur le Président, en 1995, le Congrès américain a déclaré que Jérusalem devait être reconnue comme capitale d'Israël et que l'ambassade américaine devrait être déplacée. Les administrations Clinton, Bush et Obama ont constamment fait jouer la clause dérogatoire du *Jerusalem Embassy Act* pour retarder la mise en œuvre de la décision, sans toutefois la contester. La déclaration du président Trump ne devrait pas nous surprendre, d'autant plus qu'il l'avait annoncé durant sa campagne électorale.

Selon les termes de la déclaration, «les États-Unis n'ont pas pris position sur les questions finales liées au statut, y compris les limites précises de la souveraineté d'Israël sur Jérusalem». Cela ne contredit donc pas notre position sur la solution des deux États, avec Jérusalem comme capitale. Mais je crois que l'on devrait regarder de façon réaliste le rôle de l'Union européenne dans la résolution du conflit. La réalité, c'est que notre position est malheureusement faible. On l'a bien senti sur le terrain, en début d'année, avec la mission AFET en Israël et dans les territoires palestiniens. À Jérusalem, on nous a dit qu'on était trop pro-palestinien et, à Ramallah, on nous a dit qu'on n'avait rien fait pour la Palestine. Répéter qu'on est pour la solution des deux États ne la fera pas magiquement se matérialiser. Il faut donc faire plus pour un accord de paix durable et la reprise des négociations directes.

Enfin, il faut condamner sans équivoque la violence et les actes antisémites qui ont suivi l'annonce du président Trump: tirs de roquettes du Hamas en Israël, étoiles de David brûlées et drapeaux du Hamas brandis à Berlin, cocktails Molotov contre une synagogue à Göteborg et appels à «fusiller les Juifs» à Malmö; c'est vraiment inacceptable!

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, a complaint: this is the fifth debate in which blue cards have been denied to people like myself in the last three parliaments that I have been here. On an issue such as this, when there are so few people here who are able to speak, when there is going to be very few people supporting the idea of Jerusalem being the capital of Israel, I am absolutely appalled that once again a Member of this House is denied the access to have a speech on this. The fifth occasion I have had to face no blue cards. Thank you very much.

Presidente. – Mi scusi, innanzitutto nessuno Le ha impedito di intervenire, in questo momento stanno parlando i gruppi politici, stanno esponendo le loro valutazioni, subito dopo sarà possibile usare il «cartellino blu». Nessuno Le ha vietato o Le vieterà di usarlo. Per cui facciamo attenzione quando riceviamo alcune comunicazioni.

Onorevole Valenciano, a nome del Gruppo dell'Alleanza progressista di Socialisti e Democratici, prego.

Elena Valenciano, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, lo cierto es que el presidente de los Estados Unidos de América, probablemente por cálculo electoralista, ha venido a incendiar el fragilísimo *statu quo* que rige entre Palestina e Israel. Esta declaración es claramente una violación del Derecho internacional, es una ilegalidad sobre otra ilegalidad desde el principio. Israel lleva mucho tiempo saltándose las normas internacionales y, desgraciadamente, no solo en relación con Jerusalén.

Los Estados Unidos, que han sido hasta ahora garantes e intermediarios del proceso de paz en Oriente Próximo, han preferido renunciar a ese papel. Es muy difícil que sigamos confiando en los Estados Unidos como garantes de nada después de haber desequilibrado la balanza de esta manera.

Le hace el presidente Trump un flaco favor a la causa de la paz y, desde luego, a sus compromisos internacionales. Creo que es el momento de que la Unión Europea tome el liderazgo. Lo hemos dicho muchas veces, pero esta debe ser la más oportuna en este momento y creo que la respuesta a la acción de Donald Trump es justamente el reconocimiento de Palestina como Estado. Esa es la respuesta que merece la provocación de Donald Trump y sobre todo es lo que le debemos al pueblo palestino.

Esta es una decisión grave e irresponsable y es hora de que la Unión Europea haga una demostración de fuerza: de fuerza política y de fuerza moral. Yo entiendo muy bien la prudencia de la alta representante, pero, realmente, es una gran ocasión para dar una lección política y moral tanto a Israel como a los Estados Unidos. No sé a qué más tenemos que esperar. Es el momento de reconocer el Estado palestino.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Wie de geschiedenis kent, kent de verbondenheid van het Joodse volk met Jeruzalem. De EU en haar lidstaten weigeren klare wijn te schenken over de Joodse staat Israël en zijn hoofdstad Jeruzalem. Zo anders het woord van Israëls god en dat weegt voor mij en vele christenen in Europa toch echt het zwaarst en niet het woord van mevrouw Mogherini.

Hoge vertegenwoordiger, u hebt voor januari 2018 de Palestijnse leider, Mahmoud Abbas, naar Brussel uitgenodigd. In dat verband wil ik een recent rapport over radicalisering in het Palestijns onderwijs onder uw aandacht brengen. Ik heb het hier bij me, ik zal u een kopie geven. Het is zeer ernstig dat Palestijnse schoolkinderen les krijgen uit schoolboeken die aanzetten tot haat en geweld. Ik vraag dan ook dringend dit ernstige rapport te bespreken met Mahmoud Abbas. Hoge vertegenwoordiger, de flagrante Palestijnse ontkenning van de eeuwenoude Joodse connectie met het Heilige Land en zijn heilige hoofdstad Jeruzalem blokkeert ten enenmale elke vreedzame oplossing van het Israëlisch-Palestijnse conflict. Hoe ziet u trouwens zelfs deze connectie van volk, land en staat en stad?

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Het leek gisteren wel dat president Trump ons beloofde om het conflict in het Midden-Oosten op te lossen. Hij liet uitschijnen dat het “een makkie” zou zijn. Hij zei: “I will be a great solution”, hij zou zorgen voor een geweldige oplossing. Wat hij nu doet is natuurlijk compleet het tegenovergestelde. Hij gaat met zijn verklaring grandioos in tegen het internationaal recht. Hij heeft angst, verdeeldheid en haat gezaaid. Hij heeft eigenlijk, zoals wij zeggen, met een lucifer naast het kruitvat gespeeld en ik vrees een beetje dat hij met zijn uitlatingen en met zijn beslissing de doodsteek heeft gegeven aan het vredesproces. Dat moet ons meer dan ooit aanzetten om onze rol op te nemen. Ik ben het met u eens, we hebben een sterk en eendrachtig Europa nodig. Onze rol is meer dan ooit van belang om terug te gaan naar de tweestatenoplossing, om te pleiten voor respect voor de mensenrechten, om een onderhandelde oplossing te vinden.

Maar mevrouw Mogherini, we voeren dit debat hier al maandenlang en u zegt zelf: “ja, ik moet de sleutel vinden om die auto te starten”. Wel, ik heb een paar heel concrete vragen voor u. Maar u moet weten dat de ALDE-fractie u echt wil ondersteunen en u wil aanmoedigen opdat Europa hierin haar rol vervult. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat dit conflict voor eens en voor altijd wordt opgelost, dat er een onderhandelde oplossing komt. U zegt heel duidelijk: “Kijk, wij willen onze rol spelen. We willen een grotere rol spelen”. Wat betekent dat concreet? Wat zullen we doen als de VS die koers voortzet? Hoe gaan we dat aankaarten bij onze “vrienden in de Verenigde Staten”, zoals u het zei? Wat gaan we doen met de schendingen van de mensenrechten, de nederzettingen, het terugvorderen van de vernielde bezittingen? Ik heb het daar al vaker over gehad. Hoe zullen we daarmee omgaan?

Mevrouw Mogherini, ik wens u heel veel moed, heel veel kracht, heel veel sterkte toe. Laten we hopen dat we in 2018 vrede in het Midden-Oosten kunnen bereiken. Het is misschien een verre droom, maar op ons kan u alvast rekenen.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταδικάζουμε απερίφραστα την απόφαση των ΗΠΑ για αναγνώριση των Ιεροσολύμων ως πρωτεύουσα του Ισραήλ. Αυτή η απόφαση υπηρετεί μόνο τη διαιώνιση της κατοχής της Παλαιστίνης και την πολιτική αστάθεια στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Μέσης Ανατολής και προκαλεί νέο κύκλο αιματοχυσίας με νεκρούς και χιλιάδες τραυματίες κυρίως αμάχους και παιδιά. Το καθεστώς της Ιερουσαλήμ αποτελεί ένα κεντρικό ζήτημα για μια συνολική λύση του Παλαιστινιακού. Η θέση της διεθνούς κοινότητας είναι ότι η Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ θα πρέπει να είναι πρωτεύουσα του ανεξάρτητου παλαιστινιακού κράτους. Η απόφαση των ΗΠΑ για μετακίνηση της πρεσβείας τους στην Ιερουσαλήμ φανερώνει την απροκάλυπτη ιμπεριαλιστική τους επιθετικότητα ενάντια στον παλαιστινιακό λαό και την πλήρη σύμπτωση τους με το κατοχικό κράτος του Ισραήλ. Παραγνώνει τα νόμιμα δικαιώματα του παλαιστινιακού λαού και την ανάγκη ύπαρξης ενός ανεξάρτητου, κυρίαρχου, βιώσιμου παλαιστινιακού κράτους στα σύνορα του 1967 με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ.

Το ψήφισμα 181 του 1947, της Γενικής Συνέλευσης του ΟΗΕ, καθόρισε το ειδικό διεθνές καθεστώς για την Ιερουσαλήμ. Επίσης, η απόφαση 478 του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ ορίζει ότι όλα τα νομοθετικά και διοικητικά μέτρα και ενέργειες που το Ισραήλ έλαβε ως κατοχική δύναμη και μετέβαλαν ή προσπάθησαν να μεταβάλουν τον χαρακτήρα και το καθεστώς της Ιερουσαλήμ είναι άκυρα, ουδέποτε γενόμενα και πρέπει να αρθούν αμέσως. Όμως το κατοχικό Ισραήλ συνεχίζει και σήμερα τη συστηματική επέκταση παράνομων, παράνομες κατεδαφίσεις υποστατικών, σχολείων και σπιτιών και την εκδίωξη των Παλαιστινίων από την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ. Ταυτόχρονα, συνεχίζει εγκληματικά ανενόχλητο τις κατάφωρες παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων των Παλαιστινίων, του διεθνούς δικαίου και όλων των ψηφισμάτων του ΟΗΕ, τα οποία προβλέπουν αποχώρηση των κατοχικών στρατευμάτων από όλα τα εδάφη.

Με την πολιτική των ίσων αποστάσεων, κυρία Mogherini, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει βαρύτερες ευθύνες για τα συνεχιζόμενα εγκλήματα του Ισραήλ σε βάρος του παλαιστινιακού λαού. Χαιρετίζουμε μεν τη θετική στάση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κρατών μελών, όμως η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να πάρει δραστικά μέτρα, να απαιτήσει συμμόρφωση του Ισραήλ και να αναγνωρίσει το παλαιστινιακό κράτος.

Margrete Auken, *for Verts/ALE-Gruppen*. – Hr. Formand! Tak, og tak til fru Mogherini! Vi håber, at vi kan holde sammen på denne sag. Folkeretten er det eneste fælles sprog, vi har i verden, og derfor er Donald Trumps erklæring om Jerusalem dramatisk. Ifølge en række FN-resolitioner, senest 2334 fra sidste år, er der ingen tvivl: Østjerusalem er besat af Israel, og løsningen er to stater med Jerusalem som delt hovedstad. Den amerikanske strategi er farlig og destabiliserer regionen, og det må omsider være klart for alle, at USA hverken kan eller vil være en ærlig mægler i konflikten.

Nu er det op til EU at tage reelle diplomatiske skridt, så vi omsider får en fredsproces i gang. Jeg gentager gerne, hvad De sagde før, fru Mogherini: Der er intet acceptabelt alternativ til tostatsløsningen! Vi har flere retlige midler til rådighed, som bør bruges. EU er Israels vigtigste handelspartner. Derfor bør associeringsaftalen suspenderes indtil videre. Israel bryder klart sin del. Så er der adskillelsesstrategien – »differentiation« - hvor alt samkvem med de ulovlige bosættelser stopper. Denne strategi nævnes i FN's resolution 2334 af Ministerrådet og også af Parlamentet. Og så vil jeg også minde om anerkendelsen. Endelig er det altså på høje tid at sætte en stopper for Netanyahu's »impunity« og kræve, at Israel betaler os tilbage for sine ødelæggelser af EU-finansierede nødhjælpsbyggerier på Vestbredden, som snesevis af medlemmer af Europa-Parlamentet har forlangt i europæiske og israelske aviser i de seneste dage.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, someone in the end launched a bomb, and it was not Kim Jong-un. The decision by President Trump to recognise Jerusalem as Israel's capital is the diplomatic equivalent of using a nuclear weapon. It is a choice that is reckless, irresponsible and indeed damaging for both the Israeli and the Palestinian people and is detrimental to the prospects for an already difficult peace process. The consequences are in front of all of us: six consecutive days of clashes, four Palestinians dead so far, and more than 1 200 wounded, one Israeli stabbed. Tens of thousands are demonstrating in a range of Middle Eastern and Muslim nations. Daesh is probably rejoicing for the free propaganda.

What saddens me the most is that these casualties happened just for Trump's electoral purposes: they were totally avoidable. That is why they are even more unjustifiable. Jerusalem cannot just be the capital of Israel, or even less just the capital of Palestine. It must be the capital of both states, and we must recognise Palestine as a state, as provided for in the Oslo agreements. I dare to say, given its unique status as a holy city for the three great monotheistic religions, that Jerusalem should be the heritage and capital of all mankind.

Marcus Pretzell, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Frau Mogherini, Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Die DDR war von der Bundesrepublik Deutschland als Staat nicht anerkannt.

Deshalb eröffnete man dort keine Botschaft, sondern eine Ständige Vertretung. Ostberlin war nicht vollwertiger Teil der DDR. Berlin unterlag als Gesamtstadt dem Vier-Mächte-Status. Aber niemand kam auf die Idee, die Ständige Vertretung nicht in Ostberlin zu errichten. Alle EU-Staaten haben ihre Botschaften selbstverständlich in Ostberlin gehabt und nicht in Dresden oder Leipzig oder sonstwo.

Es ist deshalb recht bemerkenswert, dass ein Staat wie Deutschland und auch andere EU-Staaten, die Israel als Staat anerkennen, – mit einer Kanzlerin, die sagt: Die Sicherheit Israels ist die deutsche Staatsräson –, dass ein solches Land seine Botschaft nicht in die Hauptstadt, in die selbstgewählte, souverän gewählte Hauptstadt eines Staates legt. Und es ist des Weiteren bemerkenswert, dass die Hohe Vertreterin die Einstaatenlösung für ganz Europa und ihre Unterstützer die Zweistaatenlösung für Israel propagieren. Das ist falsch, und Sicherheit gibt es in dieser Region erst dann, wenn auch die Palästinenser anerkennen, dass Jerusalem die Hauptstadt Israels ist.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η απόφαση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών να αναγνωρίσουν την Ιερουσαλήμ ως πρωτεύουσα του Ισραήλ έχει ανάψει ακόμα μια φωτιά στην εύφλεκτη Μέση Ανατολή, με νεκρούς Παλαιστίνιους, τραυματίες και τη μαζική καταδίκη των λαών της περιοχής. Οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες επιδιώκουν να νομιμοποιήσουν την ισραηλινή κατοχή, το διαρκές έγκλημα σε βάρος του παλαιστινιακού λαού με δολοφονίες, φυλακίσεις, τείχη, εποικισμούς. Πρόκειται για εξέλιξη που συνδέεται με γενικότερους ιμπεριαλιστικούς σχεδιασμούς στην περιοχή για αλλαγή συνόρων, με στόχο τον έλεγχο των ενεργειακών πηγών και των δρόμων μεταφοράς τους. Οι ανταγωνισμοί αυτοί υπαγορεύουν και τις διαφοροποιήσεις Γερμανίας, Βρετανίας και Γαλλίας.

Μεγάλη είναι ευθύνη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, κυρία Mogherini, που αναβαθμίζει τις σχέσεις της με το Ισραήλ, ταυτίζοντας τον θύτη με το θύμα και αναγορεύοντας σε τρομοκρατία τη δίκαιη πάλη του λαού της Παλαιστίνης. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, που εξωραϊζει ως διαβολικά καλή την επιθετική πολιτική των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών, αναβαθμίζει τις σχέσεις της με το Ισραήλ, μην προχωρώντας στην αναγνώριση του παλαιστινιακού κράτους. Αλληλεγγύη, λοιπόν, στον παλαιστινιακό λαό, στην πάλη του για άμεση αναγνώριση του ανεξάρτητου παλαιστινιακού κράτους, με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ στα σύνορα του 1967!

Presidente. – Adesso nel dibattito saranno accolte anche le richieste di «blue card». Onorevole Petir, un minuto e trenta.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, postizanje mira na Bliskom istoku jedan je od vrlo visokih prioriteta čijem ostvarenju dosadašnjim aktivnostima nismo doprinijeli, niti Europska unija niti Amerika. Postizanje mira na Bliskom Istoku ne ovisi o statusu Jeruzalema, već o tome da se tamošnja društva deradikaliziraju i da se uspostavi demokracija i poštivanje ljudskih prava.

Moramo primijetiti da se niz država koje se danas protive priznavanju Jeruzalema kao glavnog grada Izraela u biti protive postojanju države Izrael kao židovske države. To dobiva i dodatnu dimenziju u svjetlu nedavnih terorističkih napada na židovsku zajednicu u Jeruzalemu, ali i u Švedskoj gdje je održan antisemitistički prosvjed i bombaški napad na sinagogu. To su stvarni problemi čijem rješavanju moramo pristupiti s dužnom ozbiljnošću jer je Europska unija predugo bila indiferentna prema situaciji na Bliskom Istoku, kao i prema radikalizaciji koja se događa na njenom tlu.

Vjerujem da je predsjednik Trump, odlučujući se za proaktivnu američku politiku na Bliskom Istoku, sagledao sve aspekte svoje odluke i da je u suradnji sa Saudijskom Arabijom i drugim sunitskim državama postignuo određenu razinu dogovora priznajući Jeruzalem glavnim gradom Izraela.

Takvu odluku ne treba gledati kao suprostavljenu poziciji Europske unije i rješenju o dvije države za dva naroda. Dapače, želim se nadati da će to potaknuti sve strane na brže i efikasnije djelovanje i da će Jeruzalem i dalje prije svega biti i ostati sveti grad kršćana, židova i muslimana.

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

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), blue-card question. – Dear colleague, I would kindly to ask you to name one Member State of the European Union which is opposing the existence of the State of Israel.

Marijana Petir (PPE), odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice. – Hvala vam lijepo na pitanju koje ste uputili. Sve ove rasprave kojima svjedočimo proteklih dana koje su uslijedile kao reakcija na priznanje Jeruzalema kao glavnog grada Izraela mislim da su ishitrene, da prejudiciraju moguće buduće situacije, a neke od njih, nisam govorila o europskim nego sam govorila načelno o državama koje vrlo burno reagiraju, sasvim sigurno u korijenu svoje reakcije imaju i antisemitski stav i pozadinu.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la risposta che l'Unione europea ha dato alla scelta provocatoria di Trump di riconoscere Gerusalemme come capitale di Israele è stata chiara e netta, ed è giusto e doveroso per questo Parlamento riconoscerlo.

Del resto la mossa dell'amministrazione americana non solo infrange il diritto internazionale, ma rischia di minare lo stesso principio di «due Stati due popoli», che è alla base di qualsiasi processo di pace. Il prezzo di questo trasloco può essere alto, come dimostrano sia le reazioni palestinesi sia quelle del mondo arabo, e può travolgere il già fragile equilibrio nella regione.

Dunque, risposta chiara e netta quella fornita da Lei al primo ministro israeliano ieri a Bruxelles, ma non penso sia sufficiente. È venuto il momento di far sentire ancora di più a Netanyahu e al suo governo la pressione dell'Unione europea, e penso che per evitare che il nostro si trasformi solamente in un gridare alla luna, sia indispensabile dire al Consiglio di rendere coerente questa nostra posizione con le stesse politiche verso Israele.

Si usi l'accordo di associazione e le stesse politiche commerciali per introdurre severe condizionalità. E io penso che sia venuto il momento ora di farlo.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det er på sin plads i dag at ønske jøder verden over glædelig Hanukkah. Og netop Hanukkah og en masse andre historiske fakta binder jøderne til Jerusalem og staten Israel. Den moderne stat Israels overlevelseskamp imod den aggression, der har været vist fra alle nabolandene, og i trods, gør nu, at amerikanerne efter over 10 års tilløb, efter 10 år efter at det er blevet vedtaget demokratisk i det amerikanske parlament, nu endelig flytter ambassaden til Jerusalem.

Det er beklageligt, at ingen EU-lande har turdet erkende det samme. Det er beklageligt at høre al det hykleri, der finder sted her i salen. Det er den samme sal, som – mener vi – fuldstændig uden betingelser skal anerkende en palæstinensisk stat. Og derfor er der kun at sige til det jødiske folk: Der er nogen, der stadigvæk står med jer, og Jerusalem er ubetinget den rigtige hovedstad for staten Israel!

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, que dire encore qui n'ait été déjà dit depuis l'annonce du président américain mercredi dernier? Répéter, d'abord, même si cela a été dit et répété ce soir, que nous condamnons avec la plus grande fermeté tous les actes et tous les appels à la violence contre les Juifs de ces derniers jours.

Pour le reste, j'ai deux convictions aussi profondes l'une que l'autre. Oui, Jérusalem est la capitale d'Israël depuis plus de 60 ans, l'alpha et l'oméga, l'horizon des Juifs depuis 150 générations. On ne peut pas dire autre chose, sauf à réécrire l'histoire. En cela donc, le président Trump ne fait que rappeler, rétablir même la vérité. En cela, et sur le fond, il a raison.

Maintenant, sur la forme et sur le moment, contrairement à beaucoup ici, je n'ai pas de boule de cristal et je ne sais pas si, passé le moment des émotions, cette décision américaine sera porteuse de violence à long terme ou si elle a peut-être une chance de faire bouger les lignes.

Force est de constater quand même que la diplomatie américaine risque de perdre son statut de médiateur pour les quelques années à venir, et c'est sans doute là la chance et le devoir des Européens: inventer maintenant de nouveaux chemins pour relancer le processus de paix. Un meilleur équilibre, Madame Mogherini. L'équidistance européenne est loin d'être reçue comme telle en Israël. Un nouveau tempo autour de pistes qui sont connues, toujours les mêmes dans le fond, depuis les paramètres Clinton à Camp David.

C'est Hanukka, ce soir, Monsieur le Président. Une excellente fête de Hanukka aux millions de Juifs dans le monde, qui allument la première bougie pour célébrer – je conclus – la lumière et la victoire de l'esprit sur la violence, une belle ponctuation pour notre débat.

Martina Michels (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident! Herr Trump hat sich mit seinen Jerusalem-Plänen als Brandstifter betätigt, mutwillig Hass geschürt und den Friedensprozess im Nahen Osten bewusst ernsthaft gefährdet. Neue Gewalt ist die Folge. Aber ich sage auch: Brennende Israel-Fahnen und antisemitische Attacken dürfen dabei keine Antwort sein.

Die EU braucht jetzt mehr denn je eine gemeinsame Stimme der Vernunft und der Besonnenheit für eine Zweistaatenlösung, für die Macht der Verhandlung gegenüber der Macht des Krieges. Europa muss dabei eine noch aktivere Rolle im Vermittlungsprozess spielen. Denn Herr Trump hat sich soeben als Vermittler aus diesem Prozess verabschiedet. Jetzt muss die EU handeln. Frau Mogherini, was meinen Sie, wenn Sie einerseits stärkere Bemühungen für einen Friedensprozess ankündigen, aber zugleich betonen, es werde keine spezifische EU-Initiative geben? Genau das braucht aber jetzt die Welt.

Pascal Durand (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, c'est un député européen qui vient de se voir interdire l'entrée en Israël qui s'adresse à vous.

Je salue les efforts que vous faites et l'équilibre que l'Union européenne a toujours essayé de porter dans ce conflit, et je partage en totalité les éléments que vous avez portés ainsi que ce qui a été dit par nombre de mes collègues. Simplement, la difficulté que nous avons à ce stade, c'est que vos appels à la raison, vos appels à la paix, vos appels à la négociation ne sont pas entendus, que ce soit par M. Trump – c'est une évidence maintenant –, mais également par M. Netanyahu.

Je vous ai demandé, il y a un an, ès-qualités bien sûr, si nous entendions entrer avec Israël sur la question des négociations des dommages de guerre, des destructions de ce que l'Union européenne finance. Je sais que vous êtes préoccupée par cette question, je reviens donc vers vous un an plus tard. Vous savez qu'Haaretz vient de publier la facture que 57 eurodéputés ont adressée, au nom de l'Union européenne, pour ces destructions. Je souhaiterais donc que nous puissions entrer aussi dans un dialogue sur cette question-là, qui touche la vie de milliers de civils qui n'ont rien à voir avec la violence, mais simplement avec leur dignité qu'ils souhaitent retrouver.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo la guerra del 1967, Israele ha occupato Gerusalemme Est e i territori della Cisgiordania in aperta violazione del diritto internazionale. Ci sono 320 000 palestinesi solo a Gerusalemme, i cui diritti civili vengono compressi dalle autorità israeliane.

Il riconoscimento dagli Stati Uniti di Gerusalemme occupata come capitale di Israele è un pericoloso atto unilaterale che mina alla base diversi principi di diritto internazionale. Ignora sia le risoluzioni dell'ONU, che enfatizzano lo status speciale di Gerusalemme, sia la sentenza della Corte internazionale di giustizia del 2004, che definisce Israele come potenza occupante in alcuni territori che comprendono Gerusalemme Est. Ma soprattutto indebolisce drammaticamente ogni speranza di una soluzione a due Stati, innesca ulteriori tensioni e violenze, con drammatiche conseguenze in termini di scontri, feriti e vite umane.

La posizione della mia delegazione, il Movimento 5 Stelle, sulla questione israelo-palestinese è sempre stata coerente ed in linea con le disposizioni del diritto internazionale: «due popoli due Stati», rimozione delle colonie illegali israeliane nei territori occupati e rispetto da parte di Israele delle infrastrutture finanziate con i soldi europei in Cisgiordania e nella Striscia di Gaza.

Concludo con una citazione di uno scrittore israeliano, Grossman: «Israeliani e palestinesi non hanno bisogno di erigere un muro che li separi, hanno bisogno di abbattere il muro che li divide».

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, let me start with some facts. Except in some periods under the Crusaders, Jerusalem has never been the capital of any country other than Israel, and never for any other people except the Jewish people. The US demands to move its embassy to West Jerusalem, which has been part of the State of Israel since its foundation. Having said this, it would have been preferable if this US decision had been taken as a result of direct negotiations between the parties, so it is therefore a correct decision in principle but with adverse timing.

According to the High Representative, the EU as a whole stands behind the position of not recognising Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Ms Mogherini calls the unilateral decision of the US very worrying. Fair enough. However, why is it that the High Representative did not denounce another unilateral decision, about recognising the Palestinian State, taken by the Swedish Socialist Government in 2014? Why is it that the High Representative is expressing deep worries regarding one unilateral move, but not another? Where is the consistent and balanced approach towards Israel, Ms Mogherini?

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Herr Talman! Frågan är: Vem har äganderätten över Jerusalems status? Ja, Donald Trump han ansåg tydligen att det är han som har det. Han infriar bara ett vallöfte, säger han, och så bestämmer han i ett slag att Jerusalem är Israels huvudstad.

Beslutet är inte förenligt med folkrätten, inte med FN:s säkerhetsråds resolutioner, och det har lett till starka reaktioner, till ökad instabilitet, till våld och oro. Men inget av detta behöver Trump bekymra sig över.

Istället är det synagogor som brinner. Israeler och palestinier som skadas, stenas, dödas, och i mitt land, i Göteborg och Malmö, har synagogor också angripits, vilket är fruktansvärt.

Jerusalem tillhör judar, muslimer, kristna, palestinier och israeler. En tvåstatslösning med Jerusalem som huvudstad för både Palestina och Israel är kärnan i en sådan lösning.

Nu måste EU ta ledningen. Nu måste vi få ordning och reda på detta innan det får ännu värre konsekvenser än dem vi redan sett de senaste dagarna.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Mr President, I wish a happy Hanukkah to all those who celebrate this feast of lights. The statement by President Trump recognising Jerusalem as Israel's capital is basically repeating what the US Congress and Senate already said with an overwhelming majority in 1995. It does not threaten the peace process and does not change anything about the accessibility of the holy sites, but simply recognises the fact that it has been a most important place for Jews for 3 000 years and the capital of the state of Israel since 1949. For Israel it is a confirmation of what in fact already exists and nothing more.

However, we have notoriously seen an aggressive reaction from the Palestinian Government and Hamas. They call for a third intifada, they shout anti-Semitic slogans, fire rockets on Israel and so on. They attack innocent civilians. So, Madam High Representative, President Trump's announcement might be seen as politically insensitive, but the response is outrageous. I therefore call on you to condemn this response in strong words and to call on these undemocratic Palestinian leaders to react to this US statement by addressing President Trump, not Israel, to refrain from calling for violence and to restore democracy in Palestinian areas. I think this would be a solution.

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). – Predsednik Trump je objavil namero, ki daleč presega kompetence, ki jih je dobil kot predsednik svoje države in eden izmed vodilnih voditeljev svetovne politike. Za sedaj je z napovedjo priznanja Jeruzalema kot glavnega mesta države Izrael sprožil kritike in ogorčenje mednarodne javnosti.

Ne samo to, dodatno je neodgovorno in brez upoštevanja dolge zgodovine poskusov reševanja tega problema obremenil odnose med Izraelom in njegovimi arabskimi sosedami, izzval je muslimane, ponižal Palestince.

Če je iskreno verjel, da lahko v času svojega mandata prispeva k rešitvi palestinsko-izraelskega problema in trajni pomiritvi narodov, ki morajo najti pot do mirnega sožitja in medsebojnega priznanja, potem poteza, ki jo je napovedal, zagotovo ne bo prispevala k doseganju tega cilja.

Prav je, kolegi, da podpremo stališče, ki ga je visoka predstavnica Mogherini, poprej pa tudi predsednik Macron in mnogi drugi evropski voditelji, sporočili izraelskemu premierju Netanjahuju.

Bil bi čas, da Evropa svojo zavezanost miru na Bližnjem vzhodu in pravični rešitvi spora podpre s priznanjem države Palestine in z odločnim nasprotovanjem enostranskim potezam, ki onemogočajo edino možno, na mednarodnem pravu temelječo rešitev dveh držav, Izraela in Palestine. Vemo, da alternativa mirni rešitvi na tem področju predstavlja preliva-nje krvi in to se danes že dogaja.

(Govornik se je strinjal, da bo sprejel vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka (člen 162(8))

Steven Woolfe (NI), blue-card question. – You have just said that Mr Trump went beyond his competencies as the President of the United States in recognising Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Were you one of those who voted in this Chamber to recognise Palestine as a country, which went beyond the competencies of this Parliament when it did not have the powers under any treaty to recognise that country, or is it simply that you are pro-Abbas and Palestine and anti-Israel? One rule for one and one rule for another.

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), *Odgovor na vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka*. – Spoštovani kolega, jaz sem veliko manj enostranski in čustven, kot ste vi, ko branite nek svoj *case*. Jaz mislim, da bi bilo absurdno, če bi predlagal, da naj bo prestolnica Združenih držav Amerike na primer Dallas v Texasu ali pa Anchorage na severu Amerike.

Skratka, mislim, da to nima nobene zveze s kompetencami predsednika ene izmed oziroma katere koli izmed držav.

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, je vous remercie de votre déclaration liminaire, mais dès lors que M. Trump prend le risque de mettre les États-Unis à l'écart du droit international, je crois que c'est à vous, c'est à l'Union européenne, du fait de nos liens géographiques, historiques et culturels avec les peuples israélien et palestinien, de prendre le flambeau d'initiatives diplomatiques, politiques, voire économiques si nécessaire.

Premièrement, au-delà du Quatuor, ne faut-il pas chercher à réunir une conférence internationale sur la base du droit international, de la justice et de la paix? Deuxièmement, ne faut-il pas produire un acte politique important conforme au droit international, c'est-à-dire celui de reconnaître l'État de Palestine dans les frontières définies en 1967, avec Jérusalem-Est comme capitale, et non pas un État croupion comme on nous le propose? Troisièmement, vous disposez d'un atout à faire valoir: l'article 2 de l'accord d'association et tous les textes qui sont des accords de partenariat entre l'Union européenne et Israël. Le moment n'est-il pas venu, au nom du droit, de les brandir et de les activer?

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

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le député, pourquoi est-ce que la France n'a pas reconnu la Palestine? Je ne parle pas de la France du président Macron, mais de la France de M. Mitterrand, que vous avez soutenu à l'époque.

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – François Mitterrand a fait beaucoup de discours à l'égard de la Palestine et pour la reconnaissance de la Palestine, mais je vous informe que les deux chambres du Parlement français ont voté pour la reconnaissance de l'État de Palestine, comme cela est conforme dans quatre résolutions des Nations unies et à l'opposé de ce que vous avez dit tout à l'heure.

Eugen Freund (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Mogherini! Die Entscheidung Präsident Trumps war ein Fehler. Sie hat auch nichts mit dem Friedensprozess zu tun. Sie soll allein seine Koalition aus ultrakonservativen Juden und radikalen Christen ruhigstellen.

Ich bin nicht dagegen, dass Jerusalem die Hauptstadt Israels ist. Aber wir spielen hier nicht Monopoly, wo der, der Geld hat, sich eine Stadt kauft. Wenn Jerusalem als Hauptstadt anerkannt wird, dann auch als solche für die Palästinenser. Aber nicht aus Lust und Laune, sondern als Teil eines umfassenden Friedensprozesses.

Apropos: Die USA haben ihre Rolle als unparteiischer Vermittler verspielt. In diese Leere muss die EU nun stoßen. Sie hat die wirtschaftliche und politische Macht und das Ansehen, sich zur Lösung dieses Konflikts einzubringen. Denn wie wir gesehen haben, spüren wir hier die Auswirkungen der Konflikte im Nahen Osten immer öfter und immer stärker. Auch das sollte ein Antrieb sein.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA*varapuhemies*

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, Hohe Vertreterin! Jerusalem ist die Hauptstadt Israels. Hier geht es Millionen Europäern um die Achtung vor 3 000 Jahren jüdischer Geschichte, die Achtung vor 70 Jahren Staatsgeschichte Israels. Es geht nicht um die Erfindungen der Neuzeit.

Benennen wir ein anderes Problem: In Berlin, in Paris, europaweit demonstrieren aktuell Palästinenser und deren Verbündete gegen Israel. Sie verbrennen Israel-Flaggen, stecken Banner mit dem Davidstern in Brand, und die Polizei lässt es zu. Ich schäme mich dafür. Wer Flaggen verbrennt, der verbrennt damit mutmaßlich jeden Anstand, jede Toleranz, und verbreitet menschenvernichtenden Hass. Der Hass darf nie unser Partner sein!

Stehen wir geschlossen auf gegen all die neue antisemitische, antizionistische Gewalt! Haben wir Mut! Setzen wir als Europäer Zeichen! Stehen wir zur einzigen Demokratie im Nahen Osten – zum Existenzrecht Israels, zur jüdischen Kultur! Als Europäer müssen wir ein klares Zeichen setzen: Jerusalem ist die Hauptstadt Israels.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the dangerous decision taken by the Trump administration illustrates that no matter what the cost, they will do whatever it takes to deflect attention from trouble at home. It is shameful and wrong that they are playing fast and loose with a region already unstable. Palestinians have suffered at the hands of Israel for decades, and now the Trump administration is rubbing salt into their wounds.

The US can no longer claim to act as a neutral player in the region, but the UN and the EU must show leadership, and the EU must apply sanctions and end business as usual. This means an arms embargo on Israel and an immediate suspension of the EU-Israel Association Agreement until Israel upholds human rights and international law. The Irish Government must also take on a role of leadership. Criticising the decision will make little impact on the long-suffering people of Palestine. The Irish Government needs to recognise the State of Palestine immediately, especially as a response to the unacceptable action of the Trump administration.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, même si je suis de celles qui pensent que la rencontre d'hier avec Benyamin Netanyahou n'aurait jamais dû se tenir dans ce contexte, je vous remercie particulièrement pour votre attitude ferme à son égard.

J'aurai, malgré tout, trois questions, par rapport à cette rencontre et par rapport à la déclaration de M. Trump. Après l'annonce unilatérale et irrationnelle de M. Trump, qui est plus que regrettable – elle est condamnable, car elle bafoue les lois internationales –, êtes-vous prête, Madame la Haute représentante, à jouer le rôle de médiatrice pour relancer les pourparlers de paix sur la base des résolutions des Nations unies? Je pense que l'Union européenne en a les outils – on a parlé de l'accord d'association –, elle en a la force, mais elle en a surtout la responsabilité politique pour la paix au Moyen-Orient, mais aussi pour le vivre ensemble en Europe.

Deuxième question: outre l'idéologie de la colonisation du gouvernement Netanyahou, soutenue par M. Trump, la politique de destruction d'infrastructures palestiniennes financées par l'Union européenne et les États membres démontre l'arrogance du gouvernement israélien actuel. Êtes-vous prête, Madame la Haute représentante, à exiger des compensations?

Enfin, la troisième question: partagez-vous l'idée que le conseil d'association ne peut se réunir tant que nous n'avons pas des avancées du côté d'Israël?

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Federica Mogherini! Trumps jetzige einseitige Anerkennung Jerusalems als Hauptstadt Israels läuft einer Zweistaatenlösung und einem Friedensprozess im Nahen Osten zuwider.

Ich unterstütze ausdrücklich die klare Haltung der EU-Außenbeauftragten, die die Entscheidung des US-Präsidenten mehrfach mit deutlichen Worten kritisierte. Federica Mogherini verstärkte damit die Botschaft der EU-Mitgliedsstaaten, die sich bereits am letzten Freitag bei den Vereinten Nationen gemeinsam öffentlich gegen die einseitige Entscheidung der USA zu Jerusalem ausgesprochen haben.

Ein starker Auftritt, der seine Wirkung nicht verfehlt hat. Gerade in so wichtigen Fragen, wie dem Nahost-Konflikt können und müssen wir Europäer gemeinsam – ohne nationale Alleingänge – ein Gegengewicht zu Staaten bilden, die das Völkerrecht missachten und gegen UN-Resolutionen verstoßen. Damit beziehe ich auch die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten hier heute in diesem Plenarsaal ein, die sich ebenfalls dagegen ausgesprochen haben.

Herzlichen Dank, Frau Mogherini, für Ihre unermüdlichen diplomatischen Aktivitäten. Gerade in dieser Region – wie beispielsweise in Jordanien – ist es wichtig, jetzt nicht nachzulassen, sondern mit Nachdruck tätig zu werden, weil die USA eine Lücke gelassen haben.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Madam President, I think the two-state model is actually the reason why the so-called peace process has made so little progress over the past 23 years. Firstly, Israel will not withdraw their military from the West Bank. One only needs to look at the map to understand why. Secondly, Israel will not evacuate half a million Jews from the West Bank and East Jerusalem, as that would result in a civil war. With the Israeli military presence and the settlements, a viable Palestinian State is hardly possible. Any serious plan should be based on what is possible and realistic. I think the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by Mr Trump could be the first step out of this deadlock.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Mogherini, έχω την ελληνική υπηκοότητα αλλά έχω και την παλαιστινιακή υπηκοότητα. Χθες υποδεχθήκατε τον κύριο Νετανιάχου ως φίλο και συνεργάτη στην προοπτική της λύσης των δύο κρατών. Αυτός ο φίλος σας είναι γνωστό παγκόσμια ότι είναι υπεύθυνος για την κατάσταση που απεικονίζεται σε αυτό τον χάρτη, που δείχνει την Παλαιστίνη –από εδώ ξεκίνησε– εδώ σε κουκίδες με χωριά περικλειστά και κατεστραμμένα. Εδώ απεικονίζεται πραγματικά η κατοχή ενός κράτους, ποιος είναι ο κατακτητής και ποιος ο κατακτημένος.

Αυτός ο χάρτης είναι ύβρις για την παγκόσμια κοινότητα. Πραγματικά πιστεύετε, κυρία Mogherini, ότι μπορεί να υπάρξει μια λύση των δύο κρατών; Όλα αυτά τα είπατε στον κύριο Νετανιάχου χθες που τον συναντήσατε, στον φίλο σας τον κύριο Νετανιάχου; Του είπατε πραγματικά ότι πρέπει να είναι persona non grata για την Ευρώπη, ακριβώς για τα εγκλήματα που έχει διαπράξει; Αυτά, κυρία Mogherini!

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta. Señora Mogherini. Creo que es bastante evidente que la decisión de Trump supone una flagrante vulneración del Derecho internacional, una acción unilateral, rompiendo todos los consensos de la comunidad internacional, un desprecio también a los acuerdos hechos en el pasado y una decisión, además, que está generando, como ya estamos viendo, más inestabilidad en la región. Una decisión, además, que contradice lo propiamente acordado por Israel en 1993 en los Acuerdos de Oslo de encontrar un estatuto negociado para Jerusalén.

Yo soy de los que creen que la visita de Netanyahu esta semana, señora alta representante, ha sido un error, pero quiero reconocer la firmeza con la cual ha respondido a la decisión de Trump. Y quiero también agradecerle su iniciativa de que el presidente Abás venga en enero también a Bruselas.

En cualquier caso, es momento de pensar qué podemos hacer como europeos. Y desde este punto de vista, yo creo que apostar por una solución de dos Estados —como ha dicho—, apostar por los instrumentos que tenemos —como se ha mencionado, utilizando por ejemplo los artículos del Acuerdo de Asociación—, apostar también finalmente por una política de diferenciación, algo que llevamos reclamando desde hace algún tiempo.

Es el momento de pasar a la acción y a la ofensiva diplomática.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, President Trump has recognised Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This announcement, and the decision to move the US embassy, is a counterproductive measure that will damage the chances of peace. He has completely disregarded East Jerusalem and any reference to Palestinian aspirations for a capital of their own in the city. He is putting the US in violation of UN resolutions 476 and 478 by recognising part, or all, of East Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This poorly judged announcement has triggered words of concern and condemnation from around the globe. The entire Middle East has braced itself for the prospect of social unrest. How on earth can this decision be a constructive step towards peace? The sheer incompetence coming from the President of the US is unprecedented in my lifetime.

On our side, I thank the High Representative for her statement. We are here to reaffirm that the two-state solution is the only scenario we will ever accept for Israel and Palestine. Let us seize the moment to re-launch negotiations between Israel and Palestine for a lasting solution that works for all of the people. Finally, to our Jewish brothers and sisters, Happy Hanukkah.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, I will try to address most of the questions and the comments with two or three observations.

One: our role and the US role. Is this move from the United States a possibility for the European Union to play the mediator role alone? Is the US discredited as an honest broker, as many think in the Arab world? Can we go forward alone? I want to be very clear: I believe that it is not in anyone's interests to see the United States' role discredited. It is in everybody's interest to make sure that we create the appropriate regional international framework that can accompany the restart of talks.

This is not the situation today, but I believe it is the responsible role of the European Union to try to help moving in that direction. Peace will not happen with the United States working alone on a plan, but peace will not happen without the United States being credibly engaged. I believe it is first of all an interest that our Palestinian and Arab friends share that we get to a point where together – and this is why we are engaging in the Quartet and with others in the region – we join forces. It is not either/or. It is not either a European Union initiative or a US initiative or anybody else's initiative. We have to join forces. This is why I said there is not going to be a European Union-specific initiative or a specific mediating role that I am going to take or that we are going to suggest. No, we need to unite and join forces because this is not an easy conflict to solve, and we need all the relevant players to be engaged, but on a clear political horizon: two states, Jerusalem the capital of both, and steps that can be accompanied by this regional international framework to help the parties get there.

This is also why I did not say to Prime Minister Netanyahu that he is *persona non grata* – definitely not. He is the Prime Minister of Israel. I made it very clear – very clear – that we disagree on many different things, and I was probably clear even beyond what is normally done in diplomatic terms, because this is the way in which things should be. The European Union has a clear position. It states very clearly, it is consistent, and all its Member States are consistent with it: we are not going to move embassies, we are not going to recognise Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel until the final status of Jerusalem is determined through direct negotiations, and we want to see two states where Jerusalem is the capital of both.

We are very clear on that but we talk to everybody, starting with the parties. The European Union is well positioned, and is credible. I know that sometimes it is not perceived like this, but it is a credible interlocutor and partner for the two parties, the regional relevant players and the international community. Otherwise Prime Minister Netanyahu would not have been in Brussels yesterday morning, meeting the European Union and discussing the perspective with us. Even if I disagree with him on many things, I appreciate the fact that he visited and I think it is useful that we engage first of all with the parties on the way forward. And, by the way, it would be a little bit strange to play the mediator role and not talk to one of the parties. This is not even in nature, I have to tell you.

The second point: what is the priority now? First, to keep the situation on the ground calm, and this is why I am insisting on this report, which we need to give it to Jordan and to His Majesty the King of Jordan. Keep the situation calm in and around Jerusalem, and not to allow violence or escalation to take root. Second – and this goes together with it – to support the forces of wisdom in the region and to avoid a vacuum on the political scene, which would open the way for radical forces to benefit from this development. This is a specific role that the European Union can play because of our position; that is very clear and loud. The risk that I see is that the discourse gets polarised and that the forces that have always worked for peace, including in the Arab world, get isolated and marginalised, and that radicals take the leading role. This is a risk that Israel cannot afford, and that the Palestinians cannot afford either. The Palestinian leadership has always been ready to engage in dialogue for peace, in direct negotiations, and it would be damaging to both the Palestinians and the Israelis, but it is a risk that we are running.

Third, as I said, keeping the political horizon, the political objective, very clear: two states with Jerusalem as the capital of both. Fourth, building an international and regional framework that can accompany the restart of direct negotiations. And last but not least – this is our own homework – I was pleased to see full unity in the Foreign Affairs Council yesterday (we always underline whenever we have a little comma that is different one from the other); 28 Member States fully in line, singing with different voices exactly the same song, consistent with the united position we have and have constantly had. This is what makes us powerful in passing the message, and I believe that this is going to be key for the continuation of our work.

Last but not least, I took the opportunity of Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit yesterday in Brussels to wish him a Happy Hanukkah already, but please do not turn a religious celebration into a political argument. This is very dangerous, and it is not respectful to religions. Maybe it is because I was born a few hundred metres away from the Vatican that I think this. This should not be done, and especially this should not be done when we are discussing the situation in Jerusalem. It is dangerous; religion should never ever be used for political purposes on either side.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – El presidente de los Estados Unidos de América, por cálculo electoralista, ha incendiado el fragilísimo *statu quo* que rige entre Palestina e Israel. Esta declaración es una violación clara del Derecho internacional. Una ilegalidad sobre otra ilegalidad, sobre la apropiación que hizo Israel en su Ley Básica en 1980, declarada nula por el Consejo de Seguridad. El Estado de Israel desde su nacimiento incumple las normas internacionales y, desgraciadamente, no sólo en relación a Jerusalén. Estados Unidos, hasta ahora garante e intermediario del proceso de paz en Oriente Medio, prefiere perder esa condición y pasa ahora con Israel al lado de quienes se saltan las reglas. La Unión Europea debe tomar el liderazgo moral en el proceso de paz y asegurar de manera definitiva el reconocimiento de Palestina como Estado. Esa es la respuesta a la declaración. Los Estados miembros deben reaccionar apoyando al nuevo Estado. La Unión Europea puede hacer una demostración de fuerza política y moral, acompañando el reconocimiento del nuevo Estado con apoyo económico intensivo, para que sea viable el acuerdo de reconciliación entre los palestinos y sacar a Gaza de la desolación.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – El anuncio del presidente Trump sobre la capitalidad de Jerusalén no sólo es una bomba contra la paz en Oriente Medio, sino que supone una afrenta contra el Derecho internacional y contra toda la comunidad mundial. Según las Naciones Unidas, Jerusalén Este es la capital de Palestina y la pretensión de Israel de apropiarse de toda ella solo se entiende desde una óptica racista y de limpieza étnica de los palestinos. Es la negación del otro por medio del desprecio a la legalidad y por la fuerza. La Unión Europea debe reforzar con firmeza las resoluciones internacionales, reconocer al Estado palestino con capital en Jerusalén Este y, al menos, mostrar ante los que violentan el mundo la misma firmeza que demuestran con los pequeños países. La UE debería estar presente diplomáticamente en Jerusalén Este para mostrar el apoyo a un Estado palestino frente a los que buscan la imposición de un estado de *apartheid* como en el pasado fue la Sudáfrica racista.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), *por escrito*. – El presidente de los Estados Unidos de América, por cálculo electoralista, ha incendiado el fragilísimo *statu quo* que rige entre Palestina e Israel. Esta declaración es una violación clara del Derecho internacional. Una ilegalidad sobre otra ilegalidad, sobre la apropiación que hizo Israel en su Ley Básica en 1980, declarada nula por el Consejo de Seguridad. El Estado de Israel desde su nacimiento incumple las normas internacionales, y desgraciadamente no sólo en relación a Jerusalén. Estados Unidos, hasta ahora garante e intermediario del proceso de paz en Oriente Medio, prefiere perder esa condición y pasa ahora con Israel al lado de quienes se saltan las reglas. La Unión Europea debe tomar el liderazgo moral en el proceso de paz y asegurar de manera definitiva el reconocimiento de Palestina como Estado. Esa es la respuesta a la declaración. Los Estados miembros deben reaccionar apoyando al nuevo Estado. La Unión Europea puede hacer una demostración de fuerza política y moral, acompañando el reconocimiento del nuevo Estado con apoyo económico intensivo, para que sea viable el acuerdo de reconciliación entre los palestinos y sacar a Gaza de la desolación.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – El presidente de los Estados Unidos de América, por cálculo electoralista, ha incendiado el fragilísimo *statu quo* que rige entre Palestina e Israel. Esta declaración es una violación clara del Derecho internacional. Una ilegalidad sobre otra ilegalidad, sobre la apropiación que hizo Israel en su Ley Básica en 1980, declarada nula por el Consejo de Seguridad. El Estado de Israel desde su nacimiento incumple las normas internacionales, y desgraciadamente no sólo en relación a Jerusalén. Estados Unidos, hasta ahora garante e intermediario del proceso de paz en Oriente Medio, prefiere perder esa condición y pasa ahora con Israel al lado de quienes se saltan las reglas. La Unión Europea debe tomar el liderazgo moral en el proceso de paz y asegurar de manera definitiva el reconocimiento de Palestina como Estado. Esa es la respuesta a la declaración. Los Estados miembros deben reaccionar apoyando al nuevo Estado. La Unión Europea puede hacer una demostración de fuerza política y moral, acompañando el reconocimiento del nuevo Estado con apoyo económico intensivo, para que sea viable el acuerdo de reconciliación entre los palestinos y sacar a Gaza de la desolación.

Tokia Saïfi (PPE), *par écrit*. – La décision de Donald Trump de reconnaître Jérusalem comme capitale d'Israël est un véritable obstacle à la construction de la paix. Cette décision unilatérale pourrait avoir des conséquences dramatiques sur le terrain au Moyen-Orient.

Je tiens à rappeler, une nouvelle fois, que la solution à deux États sur la base des frontières de 1967 est le seul moyen de parvenir à une paix durable entre les Israéliens et les Palestiniens. Il n'existe pas d'alternative! Cette coexistence doit être pensée avec Jérusalem comme capitale commune d'Israël et de la Palestine.

Je suis heureuse que les ministres des affaires étrangères des États membres aient montré, lundi dernier, avec la haute représentante, leur unité en rappelant unanimement leur attachement pour la solution à deux États. L'Union doit s'engager pleinement au sein du Quartet et en coopération avec les acteurs régionaux afin de prendre des initiatives et de favoriser la reprise du dialogue entre les autorités palestiniennes et israéliennes.

L'Union européenne doit redoubler d'efforts pour obtenir des résultats concrets pour la résolution du conflit en rappelant qu'il demeure une priorité de la diplomatie internationale.

16. Položaj migranata u Libiji (rasprava)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission varapuheenjohtajan ja unionin ulkoasioiden ja turvallisuuspolitiikan korkean edustajan julkilausuma maahanmuuttajien tilanteesta Libyassa

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, as you can see, for this debate I am pleased to be joined by Commissioner Avramopoulos as we were asked to cover both the external side of this situation and the internal work of the European Union. As Commissioner Avramopoulos is responsible for our internal work on migration, he will complement my introduction and will stay for the conclusions as well.

We have all seen the images on CNN of the detention centres in Libya. Unfortunately, what the media has reported is not new. We have discussed this in this Chamber several times and this is not the first time that I am telling you about it personally.

I first heard the stories about the detention centres and the unthinkable violations of human rights a few years ago in Lampedusa; I was surprised that the rest of the world was not strongly reacting to stories that had been well known, not just for a couple of weeks, but for years. I heard them from people who had been tortured or had lost their loved ones. I heard them from the NGOs, from doctors and humanitarian workers who had been in those centres. If any of you have seen the film 'Fuocoammare', which I believe was also shown in the European Parliament in Brussels, I have heard those stories because they are told and are shown just in a film. So unfortunately there is nothing new.

But let me tell what we did after we first heard those stories, which does not mean two weeks ago, but a few years ago. Personally, I would say that it was still too late because Europe and the European Union should have acted even earlier, but it is now two or three years since we decided to act in a situation that was not easy.

Well before the media started to report on the situation in Libya, the European Union started to act. How? We engaged with the United Nations and in particular with international organisations for migrants to provide an alternative to migrants stranded in the country. I have said many times that our goal is to close the detention centres and I remember very well saying this in this Chamber a couple of months ago. We have worked to do precisely this, but it cannot be done overnight.

We have now been working with the IOM and the UNHCR for a year, supporting their work inside Libya, which is the only way to address the situation. We need to give these people the opportunity to leave Libya safely, towards a better life, or I would rather say towards a life because in the detention centres you cannot call it life. Thanks to our work-the work of the European Union-just this year we have assisted over 15 000 migrants who were trapped in Libya and who now have been able, not only to go home with assisted voluntary returns supported by us and practically and operationally done by the IOM, but to start a new life.

I will give you one example. I was told the story of a group of ten young men from the Gambia who went home from Libya, thanks to our support, and with our funds bought a small refrigerated truck and are using it to deliver fish around the country. This is just one little story and is one example out of thousands of good stories about voluntary and sustainable returns. It is with stories like this that we also show local communities that embarking on a dangerous journey is not only a risk but is extremely dangerous and you might end up in a worse place than the one you left.

These are the kind of stories that I think we need to share and we need to tell. We believe this is the right way to do things. It is humane, sustainable and with the right international standards in cooperation with the UNHCR and the IOM. Today new partners are finally joining our work.

The summit between the European Union and the African Union ten days ago in Abidjan was a turning point. It was a turning point not only on this, but was a key political summit for the EU-African Union partnership. This is not the issue we are discussing tonight-that is the tenth debate that we can have at about one o'clock tomorrow morning. On this issue our African partners have realised that it was time to seriously engage.

I believe our African partners had had enough of seeing their brothers and sisters dying in detention centres or along the route in the desert. They want to stop it and to stop the criminal networks that are making money out of death and slavery.

We have set up a joint task force with the African Union, the European Union and the United Nations precisely to address the situation of migrants inside Libya and, already in the first ten days, the results are quite impressive. Right after we did that, in just nine days, we have assisted almost 2000 migrants in going back home from Libya voluntarily with the assistance of the IOM and there is a new awareness and a new common determination to act.

So thanks to this we now aim to transfer a further 15 000 people who are currently in detention centres. This would allow us to empty-to empty-the current population in the detention centres in the next few months. This is feasible. We have already assisted 15 000, 2000 of them in the last nine days, and we are aiming to transfer another 15 000 in the next couple of months with the practical work of the IOM and the cooperation of the African Union on the ground.

But this is not enough. For some people going back home is not an option because of war or persecution. So for those who have the right to international protection we need to open new avenues to come to Europe or other safe places. The Commission has proposed welcoming 50 000 people in need of international protection and we have just launched a new programme with the UNHCR called the Emergency Transit Mechanism. The first transfers have already taken place so that those who have the right to receive asylum can come safely to Europe instead of risking their lives.

Is this enough? Clearly it is not and we are frustrated by every single person we do not manage to reach and every single place we do not manage to go. You know the situation on the ground in Libya. It is not easy for the IOM and the UNHCR or for the NGOs simply to get around or to get access. Clearly it is not sufficient. It is not enough yet and we need to continue working together, including with the Libyan authorities. We need to overcome once and for all the system of systematic detention. We must allow the complete and proper registration of migrants and prosecute the criminal groups who are smugglers and enslavers.

I discussed this with President Sarraj this morning in order to prepare together the first meeting of this task force between the European Union, the African Union and the United Nations, which I called for at a political level for Thursday morning in Brussels. We will have this first operational meeting at a political level to accelerate our common work in Libya, but also beyond Libya because the situation further south along the route is also not at all rosy.

We, first of all the European Union, are working to put an end to death and exploitation, to reduce risky journeys, to save lives at sea and in the desert and to provide international protection to those who need it. We are also working hand in hand with the United Nations to make progress in the political process in Libya.

Let me conclude with a word on this before I give the floor to Commissioner Avramopoulos to complete my remarks. The political process in Libya is, first and foremost, for the benefit of Libyans. We sometimes tend, with our European lenses, to forget that Libya is not just a place where migrants are passing through or detained. Libya is a country that has gone through very difficult times and is still in a very difficult situation. The Libyans themselves need to see our political support to overcome the current situation, but obviously improved governance will also help address the migration challenge inside Libya.

So the European Union is actively supporting the UN action plan at every stage. I met with President Sarraj ten days ago in Abidjan and, with Special Representative Salameh in Rome ten days ago. While there is not much progress to report yet, there is some movement in the right direction, but it is fragile and we need to stay resolute, particularly to support the Libyan Political Agreement through and beyond the deadline of 17 December.

So it is clear that this job will not be done in a day. There will be bumps on the road and we will need long-term engagement, but we are on the right path. We are the only possible path to manage migration in a more humane and sustainable way and, finally, we are not alone. We will continue to work with all our determination, together with the African Union and the UN and in particular, the IOM and the UNHCR.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much for the invitation to discuss this very, very sensitive issue here tonight. I am more than happy to be here and wish to complement what my colleague, Ms Federica Mogherini, said some minutes ago.

The situation is as described, but I think on the ground it is even worse, and the images we saw on CNN recently do not reflect the reality. We are conscious of what is happening there, but let me start by making one thing crystal clear: it is not the European Union's action that has created an inhumane system in Libya. Quite the opposite. For far too long these unacceptable, appalling, conditions have existed there and it is the European Union which, together with its international partners, is coordinating the efforts to address and improve the situation on the ground. Our collective efforts cannot ensure from one day to another a result which equals our expectations, but with our joint and international cooperation we hope to achieve results in the short to medium term.

We are working in a very difficult context, as you are all aware. An inclusive political transition, along with the stabilisation and economic consolidation of Libya, remains a key prerequisite for addressing migration-related challenges in Libya in a sustainable way. Within this complex framework, we are managing to work in Libya on all possible fronts. Cooperating with third countries, especially in North Africa, is a cornerstone of the comprehensive migration policy that we propose to step up in our contribution to the Leaders Meeting this Thursday evening on the way forward in migration.

Together with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other humanitarian organisations, we are focusing first on improving the conditions of the migrants stranded in the country, secondly, on supporting their voluntarily return and reintegration back home and, thirdly, on creating legal pathways to Europe for people in need of international protection.

I am not going to repeat what Ms Mogherini has already said about registration, humanitarian assistance on the ground, and the voluntary reintegration of migrants to their own countries. I will focus on the legal pathways which should become the preferred way for people in need of protection to safely reach Europe.

In mid-November, the first group of 25 of the most vulnerable persons needing protection was evacuated from Libya to Niger for further resettlement in France, thanks to the support of the UNHCR, to EU funding and the consent of the governments of both Libya and Niger. With EU support, more evacuations from Libya to Niger will be carried out by UNHCR in the coming weeks. As announced in our roadmap presented last week, our target is to reach 1 000 by the end of February.

The continuous evacuation of people trapped in Libya depends on several factors. It is, of course, linked to the capacity of our Member States, together with other destination countries, to rapidly resettle from Niger the asylum-seekers evacuated. As you know, in September, the Commission called on the Member States to make available at least 50 000 resettlement places in the next two years for asylum-seekers located in some priority countries. This, of course, includes the countries of the central Mediterranean route. Member States replied in a very encouraging manner, offering until now almost 40 000 new resettlement pledges, and we are confident that additional pledges, from Member States which have not yet replied to our call, will be offered. Meanwhile, the moment to start fulfilling these pledges has already arrived, and I count on the support of the European Parliament in reminding them of the urgency of this. I also count on your support for the target we proposed to the Leaders – that 25 000 resettlements take place before October 2018.

In parallel, we continue to help the Sahel countries to better manage their borders and reinforce their capacities in relation to the fight against migrant smuggling and human trafficking. I understand that there are still concerns about the efficiency of our collective action on the ground, as Amnesty International today reported. Instead I would call for more, and stronger, joint cooperation between all actors and partners, since we all have the same objectives: stability in the region, unity in Libya, solidarity and practical support for the people in need. I look forward to the exchange of views with you tonight.

Santiago Fisas Aixelà, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante, señor comisario, las imágenes difundidas por distintos medios, en las que inmigrantes subsaharianos son víctimas de una suerte de subasta de esclavos a las puertas de Europa son escandalosas. La Unión Europea y sus Estados miembros hemos condenado con firmeza la situación inhumana a la que los traficantes someten a los migrantes a su paso por Libia. Se calcula que hay a día de hoy entre cuatrocientas y setecientas mil personas viviendo en estas condiciones degradantes.

Celebro por otra parte, la reacción de la Unión, la Unión Africana y las Naciones Unidas en el marco de la reciente cumbre de Abiyán, de buscar una solución inmediata a esta intolerable situación, así como el compromiso de ayudar a las autoridades libias a hacer frente a este gravísimo problema.

Es preciso desarrollar una política migratoria comprensiva con la situación de los países de origen y tránsito que, junto a la gestión de los flujos migratorios, incluya una eficaz política de cooperación al desarrollo con nuestros socios africanos: con proyectos de inversiones, de consolidación institucional, de seguridad y de protección de los derechos humanos. Una política que genere oportunidades para que no sea necesario emigrar para tener un futuro digno y que acabe con el negocio de las mafias que trafican con seres humanos.

En el caso de Libia ninguna solución podrá ponerse en marcha sin una transición política inclusiva y la estabilización del país. La Unión debe implicarse a fondo y apoyar los esfuerzos del representante de las Naciones Unidas para lograr una solución política por una Libia unida y en paz.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta. El infierno en vida, eso es Libia. Y lo cuentan quienes consiguen escapar. Tortura, violencia sexual, secuestros, esclavitud: el horror cotidiano. Lo ha explicado perfectamente la señora Mogherini, y no hoy por primera vez. El vídeo publicado por la CNN efectivamente no ha descubierto nada nuevo, pero, como aquella cruel foto de Aylán —¿se acuerdan?—, ha conseguido remover conciencias y que las reacciones se acumulen. Aprovechemos este impulso para avanzar en la dirección adecuada y también para que ustedes puedan explicar lo que la Unión Europea está realmente haciendo.

Pero es muy importante que pongamos la protección de las personas por encima de la protección de las fronteras. Esa es la gran diferencia entre quienes pensamos de esta manera y quienes solo tienen obsesión por la seguridad y el control de las fronteras sin pensar en las personas. La pregunta es cómo actuar en Libia. Si no hay Estado, no hay estructuras, no hay interlocutores, ¿cómo encontrar una solución?

Existe una enorme preocupación sobre qué estamos haciendo en Libia y con quién estamos haciendo las cosas en Libia. Y esto solo puede remediarse con más transparencia, y este debate es una oportunidad para eso. La situación del país desde luego no permite afrontar el drama humanitario y, por eso, la idea de los retornos es una buena idea, una muy buena idea. Pero vuelven a sus países, ¿con qué posibilidades?

¿Hasta qué punto estamos dispuestos nosotros a compartir la responsabilidad de este lado del Mediterráneo? ¿O vamos a sistemáticamente a tratar de alejar el problema de nuestras fronteras? ¿Cómo vamos a hacer con la migración económica que, en términos humanos, es un eufemismo? Migración económica, la gente se busca la vida, una vida soportable.

Así que, una vez más, insistimos en que Europa necesita definir con claridad, para su propia supervivencia, una política migratoria sostenible. Para eso necesitamos abrir más vías legales y seguras para la inmigración. Lo digo más fuerte, porque lo hemos dicho muchas veces. El único camino y la alta representante lo sabe bien— es construir una verdadera asociación con los países de origen y tránsito conciliando intereses, compartiendo proyectos y asumiendo responsabilidades.

Jussi Halla-aho, *ECR-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, Eurooppaan pyrkivien laittomien siirtolaisten tilanne Libyassa on traaginen. Ratkaisu ei kuitenkaan ole se, että näille ihmisille luodaan lisää laillisia väyliä Eurooppaan. Muun muassa komission puheenjohtaja Juncker on esittänyt tällaista hiljattain.

Siirtolaisia tulee Libyaan niin kauan, kuin Eurooppa houkuttelee heitä huonolla rajavalvonnalla, avokäisellä turvapaikka-politiikalla ja tehottomilla palautuskäytännöillä. Näihin vetotekijöihin tulee puuttua. Ihmisiä ajaa liikkeellä Saharan eteläpuolisesta Afrikasta köyhyys. Köyhyyttä ylläpitää ennen kaikkea valtava syntyvyys. Ennustetaan, että Afrikan väkiluku kasvaa jopa neljään miljardiin tällä vuosisadalla. Tähän juurisyyhyn tulee myös puuttua. Siirtolaisuus Eurooppaan ei ole ratkaisu. Kolmannen maailman siirtolaisten integraatio on epäonnistunut surkeasti tähänkin asti ja tilanne vain pahenee kun määrät kasvavat.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I wish to thank Ms Mogherini – who has left in the meantime – and Mr Avramopoulos for his introduction. I insisted particularly on his presence here because we have to make it very clear that what we are talking about is not external policies, it is migration policies. It is politically relevant that we show that this is a migration debate and that we are not outsourcing the problem, although that is exactly what Member States want to do.

We have all been shocked by the images of Amnesty International, but as Ms Mogherini rightly said, this is not the first time. Every time, like you said, we express our horror, we are shocked and then we basically move on. I know, Mr Avramopoulos, that you are personally very committed to a proper EU migration policy, but there is one thing that you said that I disagree with, which is that you basically said we are not to blame for this. It is true that the atrocities are committed in Libya by Libyan people and not by Europeans. However, it is also a consequence of our policy choices. We also know that a lot of funding from the EU, but also from Italy, is going into Libya and ending up in the pockets of God knows who: militia, terrorists, corrupt politicians. We have seen the images of a boat used by the Libyan Coast Guard that has been funded by Italy. It is our money going into that misery. Let us stop funding the misery.

I also would like to hear a little bit more about the rescue operation. Where are these people going if they are not being repatriated?

Finally, Mr Avramopoulos, I would like to know something else, as remarks have been made and we are talking about human rights here. You have said a lot about legal pathways for labour migration, and I would like to know about these, because that is what we urgently need. Stop the fiction of Fortress Europe: we need legal avenues for labour migration.

Barbara Spinelli, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei fare tre domande al Commissario.

Primo: la sentenza della Corte europea del 2012 sul caso Hirsi. Ho riletto il verdetto che condannò l'Italia per respingimenti collettivi in Libia, e il contesto è identico. La Convenzione europea è violata e la Libia resta inaffidabile, non avendo ratificato la Convenzione di Ginevra. Dov'è la differenza fra il 2009 e oggi?

Secondo: la decisione presa ad Abidjan di evacuare i campi dove avvengono violenze, di attivare rimpatri volontari dei migranti, di reinsediarne alcuni. Vorrei conoscere le procedure che saranno adottate perché il rimpatriato non si trovi a dover scegliere tra la peste e il colera, e vorrei sapere il numero delle evacuazioni. Cochetel, inviato dell'UNHCR, ha dichiarato che la maggior parte dei luoghi di tortura è sconosciuta, che Sarraj controlla un territorio minimo. Ha detto ancora: le decisioni di Abidjan sono illusorie. Ogni volta che abbiamo liberato qualcuno dai campi di detenzione, qualcun altro ha subito preso il suo posto.

Ultima domanda: a che punto è la ridefinizione del concetto di *non-refoulement*, che l'Unione si propose in febbraio a La Valletta? Il proposito fu prudentemente cancellato dal comunicato. Chiedo se sia tuttora all'ordine del giorno.

Judith Sargentini, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Ik herinner me dat Commissaris Malmström toen in 2010 een bezoek heeft gebracht aan Libië om Eritrese vluchtelingen te ontzetten die in verschrikkelijke omstandigheden in Libische gevangenissen zaten. Kadhafi dreigde ze terug te sturen naar Eritrea. Er waren afspraken tussen Kadhafi en Berlusconi om migranten op zee tegen te houden en de Eritreeërs kwamen daar middenin te zitten en waren in levensgevaar. Hulde aan Commissaris Malmström die toen hemel en aarde heeft bewogen om mensen te redden.

Nu is het 2017 en zijn er weer onduidelijke deals tussen Italië en Libië. Maar er zijn ook afspraken waar de Europese Commissie en andere lidstaten bij betrokken zijn. De kustwacht van Libië is nog nooit zo goed uitgerust geweest als nu en is betaald door ons, betaald door Europa. Als zij een reddingsactie uitvoeren verdrinken er nog meer mensen.

We weten hoe het er aan toe gaat in de Libische detentiekampen. Het is er erger dan in 2010. En dit keer helpen we zelf die kampen te vullen.

Toegegeven, we redden ook mensen uit Libië. Tijdens de top in Abidjan sprak ik mensen die net terug waren uit Libië en die hadden de verschrikkelijkste verhalen. Eén man was gered op zee door de Libische kustwacht, teruggebracht naar een detentiekamp, daar verkocht en had gewerkt op het land als slaaf. En toen hij zijn moeder aan de telefoon had om hem vrij te kopen, werd hij bewerkt met machetes want dan gilte hij hard en dan kwam het geld eerder.

Europa heeft betaald voor zijn zogenaamde “redding op zee”. Hij is inderdaad niet verdronken. Europa heeft via het Europese noodfonds voor Afrika ook betaald voor zijn terugvlucht naar Ivoorkust en zal betalen voor zijn integratie. Is dat niet een beetje cynisch?

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Alto rappresentante ci ha detto solo una parte della verità nella sua descrizione del tragitto di questi migranti economici che l'Europa si era impegnata a salvare dalla triste esperienza dei viaggi, spesso, della morte attraverso il Mediterraneo.

È vero, vengono consegnati agli Stati di provenienza, che tra l'altro li accolgono perché hanno dei passaporti temporanei. Quindi vengono ricevuti e ripresi dal Ghana, dalla Nigeria, e questo va bene, questa parte della narrazione sarebbe ottima. Però l'Alto rappresentante non ci dice grazie a chi: grazie all'attività che è stata favorita dagli accordi italiani che consentono alla Guardia costiera libica di riprendere tutte queste imbarcazioni irregolari dei trafficanti che vorrebbero consegnare i poveri migranti ad altri sfruttatori.

Ma c'è l'altra parte della medaglia che non ci viene raccontata, cioè quelli che oltrepassano la linea – mi scusi e concludo – di competenza libica arrivano in Italia, sulle navi dell'Italia, dell'UE o delle ONG, e vengono dispersi nel territorio italiano e arrivano in Europa. E allora siamo da capo: avete parzialmente risolto solo metà del problema. L'altra metà degli sbarchi continua, questa è la verità che voi non dite!

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir begrüßen als ersten wichtigen Schritt das Versprechen des libyschen Ministerpräsidenten dem UNHCR und der internationalen Organisation für Migration den vollen Zugang zu den Lagern in seinem Machtbereich zu gewähren.

Doch das Versprechen aus Tripolis wird bestimmt nicht reichen, denn die dortige Regierung hat kaum Zugriff auf die Regionen, in denen es beispielsweise diese Sklavenmärkte gibt. Diesen Zugang haben andere Milizen. Beim letzten EU-Afrika-Gipfel Ende November ist über geplante Notfalleinsätze gesprochen worden und diese müssen dringend durchgeführt werden. Nach dem Plan soll die IOM offiziell nicht schutzbedürftigen Migranten dabei helfen, in ihre Herkunftsländer zurückzukehren. Dafür stellt die EU auch noch Finanzhilfen für eine – wie es heißt – gesichtswahrende Rückkehr zur Verfügung.

Das allein kann nicht reichen, denn wir müssen zusätzlich mehr Entwicklungsprogramme in den Herkunftsländern fördern und den Rahmen der legalen Einwanderung nach Europa erweitern.

Zum anderen sollen Schutzbedürftige, also Menschen, die vor politischer Verfolgung und vor Bürgerkrieg geflohen sind, unter Federführung des UNHCR zunächst in den Tschad und in den Niger gebracht werden und von dort aus weiter umgesiedelt werden in aufnahmewillige Staaten in Afrika oder in der EU.

Ich kürze es ab: Mittelfristig müssen in Libyen selbst die Schutzgründe geprüft werden und *resettlement* muss von dort aus nach Europa ermöglicht werden. Es kann nicht sein, dass innereuropäischer Mangel an Solidarität eine gemeinsame Migrationspolitik verhindert.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani wiceprzewodnicząca Mogherini powiedziała, że od dawna było wiadomo, co dzieje się w Libii, nie trzeba było oglądać CNN. Więc pytanie: Co przez ten cały czas robiliśmy? Ja pamiętam, że ponad dwa i pół roku temu Rada Europejska mówiła o tym, że rozpoczniemy walkę z nielegalnym przemytem ludzi. I czyż nie tolerancja dla tego procederu, czyż nie działalność flotylli Sorosa powodowała, że ci ludzie gdzieś w głębi Afryki byli zachęcani do tego, żeby wyruszyć w drogę do tej libijskiej pułapki?

Dzisiaj rzeczywiście potrzebne są praktyczne kroki pomocowe i dobrze, że o nich rozmawiamy. Ale jeżeli naprawdę nie przywrócimy odpowiedzialności – również odpowiedzialności politycznej – w działalności Unii Europejskiej, to takie tragedie będą zmieniać miejsce, ale będą się mnożyć. Dlatego jeszcze raz powtórzę: pora na odpowiedzialność, pora na myślenie o skutkach pięknych słów, które się czasami wygłasza.

Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, le week-end dernier, l'Aquarius, bateau affrété par SOS Méditerranée a encore porté secours à 450 personnes. Les témoignages recueillis à bord sont accablants: «sur la plage, les gens avaient peur, mais les gardes en uniforme pointaient leurs armes pour nous forcer à monter dans les bateaux». Des gardes, en uniforme, il y a quelques jours... Depuis des mois, on nous dit que l'on forme des garde-côtes, 100 à 150 nous a-t-on dit à Tunis en septembre, et le même nombre nous a été répété la semaine dernière à Bruxelles. Donc, en trois mois, rien de nouveau, malgré CNN, oserais-je dire.

Eh oui, ce n'est pas nouveau! Le trafic d'êtres humains et les tortures existent depuis des années, y compris déjà sous Kadhafi, et l'Union européenne cherchait déjà à négocier un accord. Il n'y a pas de solution miracle. Assez de beaux discours, assez de belles histoires, de chiffres dérisoires par rapport aux réalités! Le gouvernement dit officiel ne contrôle qu'une infime partie du territoire. Il n'y a donc pas d'enquête approfondie, il n'y a pas de système judiciaire. Les centres de rétention sont hors de contrôle. Comment comptez-vous évacuer ces centres? Et on va ouvrir un central d'appels à Tripoli pour mieux refouler en Libye ces hommes, ces femmes, ces enfants qui sont rançonnés, martyrisés, vendus comme des marchandises, assassinés. Combien de morts encore?

Par les financements versés, par vos politiques qui aggravent la situation, y compris au Niger, vous êtes complices de ce qui se passe dans ce pays. Un jour, vous en serez comptables et, notamment, de ces milliers de vies humaines perdues en mer comme dans le désert.

Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Um irreguläre Migration zu verhindern, arbeitet die EU mit Ländern wie Libyen zusammen, in denen grundlegende Garantien für Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Menschenrechte fehlen. Der Amnesty-Bericht von heute zeigt klar, dass es eine Mitschuld der EU an Verletzungen der Menschenrechte von Flüchtlingen in Libyen gibt, und diese werden angeprangert. Das sagt nicht nur Amnesty, das hat vor einigen Wochen auch der UN-Hochkommissar für Menschenrechte sehr deutlich öffentlich festgestellt und kritisiert.

Wenn wir also auf die Zusammenarbeit mit Libyen schauen, dann muss absolute Priorität haben, dass wir den Schutz von Flüchtlingen ins Zentrum stellen. Die EU muss hier ihre Einflussmöglichkeiten nutzen und unverzüglich die Freilassung aller Flüchtlinge und Migranten fordern und unterstützen, und zwar aller, die willkürlich in Libyen inhaftiert sind. Und auch die EU-Mitgliedstaaten müssen in ihren *Resettlement*-Programmen die Flüchtlinge direkt aus Libyen aufnehmen, und sie dürfen nicht nur dafür sein, dass sie in einem Transfer nach Niger zurückgebracht werden, wo wir überhaupt nicht wissen, unter welchen Bedingungen sie dann weiter in ihre Herkunftsländer zurückgeschickt werden. Wir haben jetzt immer wieder Berichte gehabt, in was und wo die libysche Küstenwache involviert ist. Ich denke, man muss die Zusammenarbeit mit den libyschen Akteuren einschließlich der Küstenwache grundlegend neu ausrichten. Man sollte keine Methoden entwickeln und Kooperationen durchführen, die nicht von internationalen Gremien und menschenrechtlich geschulten Gremien unabhängig begleitet und beobachtet werden.

Elnökváltás: JÁRÓKA LÍVIA

alelnök

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Ik zou willen voorstellen dat we uit die absolute Libische ramp toch conclusies durven trekken, en wel twee. Eén, we moeten onze eigen verantwoordelijkheid erkennen en twee, we moeten ons eigen belang voorop plaatsen in de buitenlandpolitiek. Sorry, collega in 't Veld, maar het gaat wel degelijk niet op om migratie en buitenlandpolitiek te scheiden.

De Europese Unie en Europese coalitie heeft zelf de Libische puinhoop veroorzaakt als gevolg van een verkeerd begrip van bondgenootschappen en door verkeerde principes te hanteren. Het eigenbelang centraal plaatsen in de buitenlandpolitiek zou geïntroduceerd moeten worden als een belangrijk principe. Wanneer we aan buitenlandpolitiek doen moeten wij, zeker in Middellandse zee-aangelegenheden, rekening houden met het immigratie-effect van de maatregelen en acties die we ondernemen. Als we die les zouden kunnen trekken, dan hebben we tenminste nog één voordeel gehad aan heel die Libische crisis.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Lei Commissario dice che i problemi non sono nati oggi, ma erano presenti già in Libia dal punto di vista delle violazioni dei diritti umani, e questo è vero. Ma dobbiamo chiederoci se le politiche attuali di contenimento risolvono o non aggravano sostanzialmente i problemi che sono esistenti.

Quello che vediamo, di fatto, è che queste politiche di contenimento producono due effetti: trattengono le persone in Libia in condizioni insopportabili e hanno determinato una vera e propria riconversione degli scafisti da gestori delle rotte dei migranti a gestori delle rotte del petrolio venduto al mercato nero, il che comporta enormi perdite economiche per le casse pubbliche libiche, con le conseguenze del caso, proprio nella gestione del problema migratorio.

Mi chiedo, e Le chiedo, se non è venuto il momento e il tempo di riflettere sulle reali conseguenze di queste politiche di contenimento e di approcciare una diversa politica migratoria verso la Libia da parte dell'Unione europea.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, yo creo que este debate no lo estamos enfocando bien: hoy no toca debatir aquí sobre cómo esclavizan, torturan y violan a las personas migrantes en Libia, porque esto está ya más que documentado. El debate es por qué todo esto se está haciendo, promovido y pagado por la Unión Europea.

Es la Unión Europea la que financia a una guardia costera libia compuesta por milicias que ha hundido barcos llenos de migrantes en el mar, que utiliza la violencia de forma sistemática y que persigue a las ONG.

Es la Unión Europea la que financia estos centros de detención donde hay violencia física y sexual, donde las personas migrantes están desnutridas y son torturadas. Y, en lugar de abrir vías legales y seguras para que estas personas puedan llegar a Europa —que lo dicen mucho pero no lo hacen—, en lugar de eso, lo que hacen es deportarlas para que vuelvan a la guerra y a la pobreza de la que huyeron.

La pregunta es: ¿Quién acompañará a los torturadores libios cuando se sienten en el banquillo de la Corte Penal Internacional por crímenes por la contra la humanidad? ¿Les acompañará el señor Tusk, el señor Juncker o será la señora Mogherini?

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Itt az előttem szólók már mind elmondták, hogy milyen drámai körülmények között élnek a menekültek Líbiában. Azt is elmondták, hogy ez az élet egyszerűen elviselhetetlen, azt is elmondták, hogy nem csinálunk semmit, hogy a helyzet nem javul, hanem egyre rosszabbodik, és azt hiszem, hogy ezen nem nagyon lehet csodálkozni, hiszen Líbia egy olyan ország, amelynek igazándiból nincs tényleges politikai hatalommal bíró kormánya. Éppen ezért a menekültek teljes mértékben ki vannak szolgáltatva a körülményeknek. A helyi hatalmak összejátszanak az embercsempészekkel, a menekültek jogait, emberi jogait lábbal tiporják.

Az a kérdés, hogy mit tud tenni az Európai Parlament, az Európai Unió ebben az esetben? És én azt gondolom, hogy nagyon világos és nagyon egyértelmű követelésekkel kell előállni. Nincs időnk további időhúzásra, beszélgetésekre, egyeztetésekre, meg kell követelni a líbiai hatalomtól, a líbiai kormánytól, hogy vessenek véget a menekültek önkényes bebörtönzésének, biztosítsák ezeknek az embereknek az emberi jogait, hogy vessenek véget az erőszaknak és a hatalmaskodásnak, tegyenek meg mindent azért, hogy ezek az emberek emberhez méltó körülmények között éljenek. Ha nem ezt az utat fogjuk járni, akkor semmi más nem történik, csak az, hogy Európa a saját lelkiismeretét veszíti el, saját értékeit árulja ki, saját értékeit gyalázza meg, és ezzel semmi más nem fog történni, csak a szélsőjobb oldali erők fognak megerősödni.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señora presidenta. Sí, señor Avramopoulos, la Unión Europea hace algo, pero me da la impresión de que hacemos algo mal. O algo, o el cómo algo, o el desde cuándo, o el para qué o el con quién.

Porque mientras apoyamos a las Naciones Unidas y a su enviado, el señor Salamá, en su hoja de ruta para que trate de estabilizar un país estallado en mil pedazos —al que tratamos en esta sala como si fuera un país con Gobierno y un país al que se le puede exigir que haga esto o lo otro, cuando ni siquiera tenemos realmente un interlocutor que gobierne el resto del país—, nos encontramos con que el otro enviado de las Naciones Unidas para los derechos humanos, o Amnistía Internacional, o Médicos Sin Fronteras, u otras organizaciones que están allí sobre el terreno nos critican ferozmente, porque nuestra política sigue siendo, por desgracia, reactiva.

No le culpo a usted solamente. Los Estados miembros también tienen mucha culpa y mucha responsabilidad. Y, de hecho, estamos acabando de aplicar o bien una agenda italiana o bien una agenda alemana o una francesa o vete a saber.

2017 era el año en el que este Parlamento quería haber estado con los libios. Quería haber ido para significar que la Unión Europea, algo más que solamente los programas financieros, tenía capacidad de dar un mensaje de futuro, un mensaje político de cara a la normalización, la estabilización del país. Me temo que no lo vamos a conseguir, porque precisamente en estos días estamos asistiendo a una situación de desgobierno —por las imágenes y por las situaciones reales de los inmigrantes— en un país al que, vuelvo a decir, tratamos desde la Unión Europea como si fuera un país con gobierno.

Y el problema de Libia es que es un país estallado en mil pedazos y al que hay que tratar de otra manera, no como si fuera un país más donde están ocurriendo cosas terribles, pero donde también los ciudadanos libios están pasando cosas terribles.

Desde la Unión Europea creo que deberíamos ser un poco más ambiciosos a la hora de hacer para Libia un programa comprensivo y no solamente reactivar si hay inmigrantes, si ahora hay esclavos, si ahora... No. Libia es un país completo con todos sus ciudadanos, con todas sus participaciones y tiene necesidad de una política comprensiva y un presupuesto comprensivo y no por partes, que lo único que hacemos es estallar en más pedazos.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Libia è un paese che non conosce la pace da troppi anni, è un paese nel caos più totale e dal futuro ignoto, ostaggio della violenza e trappola per migliaia di persone in cerca di protezione internazionale. Un paese che somma una crisi umanitaria, securitaria e politica senza precedenti e che necessita dell'azione immediata da parte dell'Unione europea e di tutta la comunità internazionale.

Dobbiamo agire con misure d'urgenza per rispondere alle atrocità di cui sono vittime i migranti, ma anche gli stessi cittadini libici, e mettere in atto politiche di lungo termine per garantire la sicurezza e la stabilità.

La sfida oggi è far sì che l'Unione parli con una sola voce in Libia, assumendo appieno il ruolo di guida che le spetta nel processo di pace. Solidarietà ed equa ripartizione delle responsabilità: nessuno Stato membro dovrebbe essere costretto ad agire da solo. Pace, riconciliazione e ricostruzione, dei presupposti ineludibili perché nel paese si possano individuare interlocutori credibili e consentire lo smaltimento delle reti di contrabbando e di traffico di essere umani. Misure urgenti che mettano fine alle atrocità di cui siamo stati tutti resi testimoni e che validissime ONG hanno denunciato. Ma anche obiettivi di lungo termine, la pace e la riconciliazione al centro delle nostre strategie per lavorare verso un dialogo politico inclusivo e il pieno rispetto dei diritti umani, per la ricostruzione della paese e la stabilizzazione di tutta l'area del Mediterraneo e la regione del Sahel.

Chiudo dicendo che dobbiamo mettere in atto uno strumento per una migrazione sicura, ordinata e regolare.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Fil-fatt, f'din l-Awla llejla smajna kif fil-Libja hemm eluf ta' persuni li ta' kuljum qed ikun torturati u abbużati. M'hemm għalfejn noqgħod nirrepeti.

Imma forsi min joqgħod fin-naħa ta' fuq tal-Ewropa, jew min ġej minn pajjiż kbir, f'tit li xejn jirrealizza.

Jiena li ġejja minn Malta, pajjiż ġar tal-Libja, nifhem li din hija sitwazzjoni kritika għall-aħħar, problema li għandha u li se jkompli jkollha effett enormi fuq ir-regjun kollu tal-Mediterran u l-Unjoni Ewropea kollha kemm hi.

L-Afrika huwa kontinent enormi, fejn mijiet ta' eluf ta' persuni qegħdin jiċċaqalqu ta' kuljum minn post għall-iehor. U dak li qegħdin naraw fil-Libja huwa biss farka tal-problema.

Ma nistgħux nibqgħu niffukaw fuq il-baħar biss. Jekk mhux se jkun hemm sforz minn kulhadd, u mhux l-Unjoni Ewropea waħedha, biex ikunu indirizzati *issues* serji ta' governanza politika, ta' tibdil fil-klima, ta' investment anke mis-settur privat, allura mhux ser nibdew nindirizzaw din il-problema.

U le, ma nistgħux nibqgħu nagħlqu għajnejna għall-immigrazzjoni illegali, għat-traffikar tal-persuni u għan-netwerks ta' kriminalità.

Fl-istess hin, għandna d-dover li ngħinu liż-żgħażaġh f'dan ir-reġjun. Huma l-katalisti tal-bidla. U għandna ntuhom l-ghodda neċessarja biex ikollhom l-oportunità li huma wkoll jibnu pajjiżhom mill-ġdid.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, prema navodima izvješća Amnesty Internationala: Libija je puna okrutnosti. Međutim, ta okrutnost je na poseban način usmjerena prema vjerskim manjinama, posebice kršćanskim migranlima i izbjeglicama koji su podvrgnuti otmicama, mučenju, krađi i fizičkim napadima od strane Daesh-a, kriminalnih bandi i krijumčara ljudi, ali i državnih službenika.

Cijeli svijet je svjedočio toj netrpeljivosti kada su na putu ka talijanskoj obali počinjena vjerski motivirana masovna ubojstva izazvana mržnjom prema kršćanima.

Čak i u trenucima smrtno opasnosti koju su svi podjednako dijelili na tim gumenjacima usred Mediterana i onda je mržnja i netrpeljivost prevladala i rezultirala smrću desetaka nevinih ljudi koji su za pomoć i spasenje svih prisutnih molili „krivog Boga”.

Ubijati kršćane na putu prema kršćanskoj Europi je više nego simbolično. Znajući da se milijarde eura konstantno slijevaju u Libiju postavlja se pitanje s kojim ciljem? Kojim grupacijama? S kojim posljedicama? Europa bi trebala biti pažljiva i voditi više računa o tome koje skupine financijski podržava.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hace apenas unos días tuve oportunidad de escuchar en Abiyán, con motivo de la Cumbre Unión Europea-África, el testimonio conmovedor de los supervivientes de la ruta hacia Libia desde todos los puntos de África. La esclavitud, la tortura y el maltrato a seres humanos no son ninguna novedad en esa región del globo, pero la magnitud, la escala y, sobre todo, la exposición al público a través de los medios de comunicación, le dice a todas luces a la Unión Europea que no es el momento de análisis, sino de acción.

La Unión Europea tiene que poner en marcha una investigación internacional de lo que constituye un crimen contra la humanidad. La Unión Europea tiene que promover con las Naciones Unidas una acción internacional que convierta los actuales centros de detención, donde se producen violaciones masivas de derechos humanos, en centros de acogida donde se respeten los derechos humanos.

Tiene que asegurar que la financiación cumple sus objetivos y tiene que abrir vías legales con corredores humanitarios y visados humanitarios que den una oportunidad a quienes arriesgan la vida y lo pierden todo en el empeño. La próxima visita de una delegación del Parlamento Europeo a Libia puede ser una buena ocasión para cambiar el rumbo, la mirada y pasar a la acción.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η διάλυση της Λιβύης είναι αποτέλεσμα των επεμβάσεων ξένων δυνάμεων σ' αυτή τη χώρα, κατάσταση που επιτείνεται και από τη στήριξη Τουρκίας και Κατάρ στους τζιχαντιστές της Λιβύης. Το χάος στη Λιβύη οδήγησε σε μαζική έξοδο τεράστιων κυμάτων προσφύγων προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να διαμορφώσει ένα σύστημα επαναπροώθησης των παράνομων μεταναστών, αλλά ταυτόχρονα να διασφαλίσει και ανθρώπινες συνθήκες για όλους τους μετανάστες οι οποίοι βρίσκονται στη Λιβύη, όπου κυριολεκτικά αντιμετωπίζονται σαν σκλάβοι.

Ταυτόχρονα πρέπει από την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, να συνεχιστούν οι μετεγκαταστάσεις στις άλλες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Μας ανησυχεί ιδιαίτερα η πολιτική του κυρίου Tusk, ο οποίος λίγο ως πολύ δήλωσε ότι επιθυμεί την κατάργηση του συστήματος υποχρεωτικών ποσοστώσεων κατανομής προσφύγων στα άλλα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι κάτι που δεν πρόκειται να ανεχθεί ο ελληνικός λαός.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, dnešní zpráva od Amnesty International bohužel dokládá to, co už nějakou dobu víme. Libye se zmítá v chaosu, důsledky válečného konfliktu, neskutečně špatná poválečná rekonstrukce a komplikovaná společenská stratifikace země způsobují, že stabilizace země se zdá v nedohlednu.

Na území Libye tak nyní dochází k mučení a dokonce i k něčemu tak neuvěřitelně barbarskému, jako je obchod s lidmi. Členové libyjské pobřežní hlídky spolupracují s převaděči a stát v chaosu tak parazituje na lidském neštěstí. Jsem přesvědčena, že země NATO, které se podílely na neuvěřitelné devastaci této země, by nyní měly přijmout odpovědnost a pomoci postavit tuto zemi zpět na nohy. Je třeba co nejdříve nalézt politickou a diplomatickou shodu na tom, jak co nejrychleji zajistit, aby libyjské instituce byly schopny v zemi vymáhat právo a pořádek.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Madam President, stop the fiction that there is a Libyan coastguard for the EU to train in Libya. What EU Member States, such as Italy, have been paying is militia who fight each other to exploit the trafficking of human beings, arms and drugs. They operate horrendous detention camps and some migrants and refugees are slaves, or 'abed' as they were called in Gaddafi days. Infighting between militia competing to take care of migrants for the EU recently destroyed the city of Sabratha. By not opening safe and controlled ways for migrants and asylum seekers, the sad story is that Europe feeds the human traffickers business, and it is big business! Al-Qaeda and Daesh are taking the profits and bring the security threat closer to us in Europe.

It is time to try to stop the fiction that there is migration management in Libya and governance, be it from President Fayed al-Sarraj or the criminal General Haftar. It is time for the EU Member States to wake up and demand action at the UN, together with the African Union, to dispatch a robust international force well inside Libya to expel terrorist groups and to bring about a society for Libyans with Libyans. Without that there will be no governance in Libya. It will have to be with European boots on the ground, many boots on the ground. But after all, it is also about our own security that is at stake in Libya. The more we delay it, the more it will cost in African lives and possibly in European lives.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Madam President, Libya is in a state of turmoil. In five day's time, on 17 December, the two-year mandate of the UN-appointed government will end. Without an official government, we can expect further destabilisation and a rise in illegal immigration, as well as terrorism-related and criminal activity.

Instability in Libya will also affect Europe. It is imperative that the EU put more effort into understanding the actual situation on the ground and more resources into the pursuit of peace and stability. One positive development, as was mentioned, is the group of different actors in Libya that has come together to form an EU-Libya friendship association that will be established in Malta in the coming months. It is important for the EU to back this effort, and I make a plea for this.

(A „catch the eye” eljárási vége)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, indeed I was listening to our colleagues very carefully and I would like to express my thanks for their contribution to this debate. What I would like to say at the beginning is that finally we are all on the same side. We share the same concerns and we are trying to find solutions. Some of these solutions are not common, but I think we have reached a level where we all understand that more action has to be undertaken, more responsibility shown, and more initiatives undertaken, in order first of all to bring back stability in Libya.

Ms Valenciano, we are still in the early stages but yes, I agree with you that we have to work, we need to work in a balanced way with our partners and also to face reality. Europe is in need of economic migrants, but for this purpose we need to enhance and open legal pathways, legal channels, while in parallel reducing irregular migration. As long as irregular migration is there, pictures like the ones we saw some days ago will be replicated.

As you know, Member States keep the right to determine the volume of admission of third country nationals coming to work in their countries. It is their national competence and responsibility. As far as the Commission is concerned, we stand ready to coordinate and propose pilot projects with selected third countries and of course provide related financial support. This would be in cases where Member States commit themselves to hosting certain numbers of migrants coming through legal channels, in particular for economic purposes. We are not discussing with the Member States, and as you very rightly said, Ms in 't Veld, my goal, the Commission's goal, is the implementation of a comprehensive migration policy. The same goes for the particular case of Libya. As Ms Ayala Sender said, we need a global solution addressing all problems and challenges.

Dear colleagues, it is clear that we are all equally aware and shocked at the terrible, appalling and inhumane conditions in Libya. Yes, this has to stop and has to stop now. The situation in those detention centres is unacceptable. The European Union is pursuing efforts to support the establishment of a standardised process by the Libyan authorities through concrete projects.

Another question you would ask me: who are these Libyan authorities? The legitimate government of Tripoli is there, recognised by the United Nations, by the European Union, but does this government have the power? Does this government have full control of the situation in Libya? The answer is clear: no.

When migrants are rescued by the Libyan Coast Guard they are disembarked and taken to reception centres that meet international humanitarian standards, and once again we have to praise and commend IOM and UNHCR for the work they are doing on the ground, even putting the lives of their people there in danger. The European Union is actually supporting the development in Libya of alternatives to detention.

Recently the Libyan Government agreed to allow UNHCR to open a transit and departures facility to Tripoli for people in need of international protection. IOM is also working with partner non-governmental organisations on pilot projects to promote safe spaces which would have the capacity to host a small group of vulnerable women and children. As regards the use of funds, we are monitoring, as in every case, how they are used. We are not aware so far of misuses but are ready to listen to concrete evidence.

Dear colleagues, fanciful statements about complicity and blame might grab headlines but they are not helping anyone, least of all the migrants themselves. The situation in Libya is not bad because of the European Union. This discourse has to stop. On the contrary, the situation is slightly better compared to the recent past thanks to the European Union, and we shall continue working on the ground in order to support these people.

You described the situation in Libya before. I will pick out some of your words because ultimately Libya is lacking all elements to be qualified as a state. The situation is chaotic. There is no strong interlocutor on the other side. The country is divided. There are approximately 20 independent militias operating uncontrolled on the ground. The country is a paradise for smugglers and an open corridor for irregular migration. We here all share the same objectives.

First and most important is to save lives and provide these desperate people with support. The European Union, its institutions and the Member States are working to achieve it, pure and simple. We do so by first stopping people drowning in the Mediterranean – and you see that the numbers have gone down drastically – evacuating them from disastrous conditions in Libya and offering them safe and legal pathways to come to Europe. I will not repeat what I said at the beginning, but it is clear that we have a lot more work to be getting on with to make it better still.

I count also on the Members of this House to help us advance, because what we have achieved in general in migration, from the very beginning of our term as the European Parliament and as this Commission, has been achieved thanks to our cooperation, and once again I would like to express my gratitude to all of you for your support. Today the European Union can be proud of its policy and of the adoption of the principles upon which this policy and this strategy is based.

The MEPs who were here in the previous Parliament know very well that there was no migration policy, there was no migration strategy, just an embryo somewhere in Brussels, but not something clear and concrete. So we can all share this effort to achieve what we have done. But yes, we have to do more, but we will do it together. This is not a national, regional or a European problem. As we said before it is a global one, and I was more than happy one year ago when I proposed to the former Secretary-General of the United Nations to hold this extraordinary General Assembly and he did it in New York. So in this way, we made this issue a global one. It has become a global responsibility and we are all responsible globally for what is happening in the Mediterranean and in Libya. The European Union has taken its part. All others should do the same.

So before I sign off, I would like to call for more and strong joint cooperation by all of us, all actors and partners, since we all aim, as I said, for the same objectives: to bring back stability to the region; to bring back stability to Libya; to be the ones that will contribute to bringing unity in Libya, because the country is divided and fragmented; to work on the principle of solidarity towards these desperate people, but also among ourselves; and finally, to produce practical results by giving practical support to the people in need.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Laura Ferrara (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – In Libia è difficile capire se l'Unione europea sta facendo la guerra ai trafficanti o ai migranti. Il Governo di Al-Sarraj riceve i nostri soldi ma non controlla il suo territorio, appaltato direttamente o indirettamente a milizie in lotta con altre milizie, gruppi che gestiscono anche il traffico dei migranti e da cui dipende l'aumento o la diminuzione degli sbarchi in Italia. La detenzione di massa, arbitraria, priva di diritti e a tempo indeterminato è il principale mezzo di controllo dei flussi migratori in quel paese. Poiché non esiste una sola autorità riconosciuta in Libia, quando si dice che stiamo addestrando la Guardia costiera libica e fornendo supporto per la gestione dei flussi migratori non sappiamo realmente chi stiamo pagando o supportando, né quale territorio libico, quale tratto di mare viene controllato e da chi. Una situazione che *Amnesty International* descrive come «un oscuro intreccio di collusione» attraverso il quale i governi europei, per impedire le partenze dalla Libia, finiscono con il sostenere attivamente un sistema di violenza, sfruttamento e violazione di diritti umani.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), *in writing*. – Undoubtedly, the reports on the Libyan slave trade shocked the world. Last year, I raised the question with the High Representative / Vice President about the situation in migrant detention centres in Libya and the issue that Libya has not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention and has no domestic refugee law or asylum procedure. Unfortunately, working long term solutions have not been found and we are seeing the results. Not only as a member of the European Parliament but as a human before all, I strongly believe that to watch a human being been sold as a commodity in the 21st century just few hundred kilometres from European shores is a despicable and shameful act. Therefore we need, together with the African Union, to demand from the Libyan authorities a full investigation of the slave trade in that country, but we also have to work on an emergency plan to dismantle human trafficking networks. Appropriate international protection of migrants in Libya is the first step to ending modern day slavery and slavery markets in Libya.

Louis-Joseph Manscour (S&D), *par écrit*. – Selon les Nations Unies, 390 000 migrants sont bloqués aujourd'hui en Libye, dont 9 000 seraient privés de liberté. Les programmes actuels de coopération de l'UE à destination de la Libye ont des impacts sur ces derniers, qui ont besoin d'une protection internationale et dont les conditions de vie dans les centres de détention ne respectent pas les droits fondamentaux.

À la suite du sommet UE-Afrique le 30 novembre dernier, une déclaration commune sur la situation des migrants en Libye a été adoptée. Elle condamne évidemment le traitement inhumain des migrants et des réfugiés par des groupes criminels, mais n'apporte aucune réponse à la crise.

Or, des journalistes ont récemment été témoins d'une vente aux enchères de migrants réduits en esclavage. Les images illustrent la situation dramatique que vivent des milliers de personnes.

Certes, les autorités libyennes ont décidé de créer un centre de transit et de départ à Tripoli pour les personnes ayant besoin d'une protection internationale. Néanmoins, il serait bon que l'enquête en cours vérifie les allégations de la presse et se conclue rapidement. L'Union doit quant à elle revoir les modalités de sa politique vis-à-vis de la Libye et mettre en place des voies légales et sûres pour ces migrants.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), *kirjalikult*. – Liibüa keeruline poliitiline ja julgeolekuolukord on tekitanud ka põgenike osas üha suureneva probleemi. Igal aastal tuleb Liibüasse kümneid tuhandeid põgenikke, kes soovivad Euroopasse pääseda. Samas on tänu tugevemale kontrollile rannikul ja merel aina raskem Liibüast lahkuda, mistõttu on põgenikud Liibüas lõksus.

Seal on inimkaubitsejad hakanud inimesi orjaks müüma, pidades oksjoneid juba ka päise päeva ajal turuplatsidel. Orjaks müüdud inimesi kasutatakse rasketel töödel, hoitakse näljas ja nende eest pressitakse peredelt välja lunaraha. Kui see jääb saamata, tapetakse inimene lihtsalt ära ja ostetakse turult uus. Orjaturgude probleemid on tunnistanud ka kõrge esindaja Mogherini. On aeg, et EL selle probleemiga ka sisuliselt tegelema hakkaks ning aitaks leida lahendusi Liibüas lõksus olevate põgenike aitamiseks.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), *par écrit*. – Nous avons déjà dénoncé ici avec fermeté la déclaration entre l'Union européenne et le Turquie car elle ne doit pas devenir un modèle à suivre mais voilà qu'un autre accord, encore une fois sans le contrôle du Parlement européen, a vu le jour en Libye. Avec ces arrangements, les États membres ne font qu'aggraver la situation des migrants sur place et se rendent complices de ces atrocités. Amnesty International a révélé que les migrants bloqués sont exposés à la détention arbitraire, à la torture, aux homicides, au viol, à l'extorsion et à l'exploitation. L'Union ne peut pas se défausser de ses obligations internationales en matière d'asile. On ne peut pas reprocher aux migrants de vouloir fuir la guerre et ils ont en ce sens le droit à la protection internationale. Je regrette

que le seul but des garde-côtes libyens, financés par des fonds européens, soit de repousser les migrants toujours plus loin de nos portes. C'est une grave erreur; d'autant plus que d'autres voies existent pour une politique migratoire humaine et volontaire! S'il y avait une réelle volonté politique, nous pourrions instaurer des voies sûres et légales vers l'Europe par la réinstallation, le regroupement familial ou l'obtention de visas humanitaires.

17. Godišnje izvješće o ljudskim pravima i demokraciji u svijetu za 2016. godinu i politici EU-a u tom području (rasprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl asszony által a Külügyi Bizottság nevében készített 2016. évi éves jelentés az emberi jogok és a demokrácia helyzetéről a világban és az Európai Unió ezzel kapcsolatos politikájáról

(2017/2122(INI) (A8-0365/2017))

Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Berichtersteratterin. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte damit beginnen, den Schattenberichterstatern für ihr Engagement und den guten Geist der Kompromissbereitschaft zu danken. Ich muss sagen, dass es eine Freude, allerdings auch recht viel Arbeit, war, mit ihnen am Jahresbericht 2016 über Menschenrechte und Demokratie in der Welt zu arbeiten. Trotz Meinungsverschiedenheiten in einer Reihe von Bereichen ist dieser Bericht das Produkt von gemeinsamen Überzeugungen der verschiedenen Fraktionen. Es verbindet uns, dass uns das Thema Menschenrechte am Herzen liegt und wir über die Menschenrechtsverletzungen in vielen Regionen der Welt zunehmend besorgt sind.

Wie es in der Natur eines solchen Berichts liegt, haben wir uns bemüht, diese Grundsorge dementsprechend zu spiegeln und ein besonderes Augenmerk auf die schutzbedürftigen Gruppen zu legen – es sind leider immer die gleichen: Frauen, Kinder, Menschen mit Behinderungen, Migranten und Flüchtlinge.

Allerdings gibt es auch noch einen zweiten Teil. Der Bericht bringt des Weiteren große Besorgnis darüber zum Ausdruck, dass die Demokratie, die Menschenrechte und die Rechtsstaatlichkeit weltweit mehr und mehr zurückgedrängt werden und bedroht sind. Ich habe versucht, dies klar und eindeutig zu formulieren und Wiederholungen zu vermeiden.

Erster Punkt: Insbesondere für religiöse Minderheiten ist das Leben in immer mehr Regionen enorm schwierig geworden. Staaten unterdrücken zunehmend diese Minderheiten durch Blasphemiegesetze. Nichtstaatliche Akteure, wie etwa der Islamische Staat, unterdrücken sie durch Gewalt und Terror. Es freut mich, dass der Bericht folgerichtig die Kommission dazu auffordert, sich insbesondere für die Achtung der Religionsfreiheit einzusetzen und sie weltweit zu unterstützen.

Zweitens: Auch die menschenrechtlichen Herausforderungen im Zusammenhang mit der Flüchtlings- und Migrationskrise des vergangenen Jahres sind keineswegs abgeschlossen – was wir gerade in Bezug auf Libyen lange gehört haben.

Sie erfordern nach wie vor deutlich größere Anstrengungen, um die Ursachen zu bekämpfen. Der Bericht findet klare Worte und fordert dazu auf, unter anderem durch eine verstärkte Nachbarschaftspolitik nachhaltige Lösungen zu finden.

Drittens: Auch die Zivilgesellschaft leidet unter einer wachsenden Zahl repressiver Gesetze. Hierbei wird die Freiheit der Meinungsäußerung sowohl online als auch offline zunehmend eingeengt und beschnitten. Und sie wird auch gefährdet, und damit ist eigentlich eine der Grundvoraussetzungen unserer demokratischen Gesellschaft, die ja manchmal baden geht, gefährdet. Der sogenannte *Human Rights Dialogue* bleibt ein besonders wichtiges außenpolitisches Instrument der EU, da Menschenrechte selten besser verteidigt werden können als durch direkte Gespräche und Verhandlungen.

Als EVP-Koordinatorin auch für die Handelspolitik freut es mich, dass der Bericht weiterhin die Praxis der Menschenrechtsklauseln in internationalen Abkommen bekräftigt und das allgemeine Zollpräferenzsystem als vorbildliches und effektives Werkzeug zur Förderung der wirksamen Umsetzung zentraler internationaler Übereinkommen über Menschenrechte hervorhebt. Und ich kann aus Erfahrung sagen: Das war eine sehr, sehr lange Arbeit über Jahre hinweg, bevor wir das durchsetzen konnten.

Zwei letzte Bemerkungen. Erstens: Wir sind der Meinung, dass wir eine andere Zeitschiene finden müssen. Ende 2017 über eine Situation von 2016 zu sprechen – das ist eigentlich zu weit entfernt von den Ereignissen. Wir wiederholen es als Abgeordnete Jahr für Jahr; Es müsste sich wirklich ändern.

Zweitens: Die Menschenrechte haben im digitalen Zeitalter eine andere Qualität bekommen. Wir sind bei den Menschenrechten nicht mehr nur abhängig von Diktaturen, wir sind auch abhängig von technischen Möglichkeiten. Ich glaube, dass dieser zweite Punkt noch nicht genug im Bewusstsein verankert ist. Daran sollten wir arbeiten.

Vielen Dank noch mal für die gute Zusammenarbeit.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, honourable Members of Parliament, I would like to speak on behalf of Vice-President Mogherini. We are living in extremely difficult times for human rights all around the world. We are facing a global problem. One could even call it a political or cultural problem. When we Europeans raise human rights issues with our interlocutors, sometimes they tell us: 'You Europeans are the only ones who still care about human rights. Why do you keep doing this?' Some countries are questioning the Council of Europe and the very idea of a continental system to watch over human rights. Some have withdrawn from the International Criminal Court, although many others have redeclared their commitment to it. Human rights may be a difficult undertaking, but by no means a desperate one. For every bad story there are also many good stories, often less reported. Let me assure you, we may sometimes feel alone as a force for human rights, but we do not intend to change course.

If you look at the European Union Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy, and the European Parliament's report, it is clear that we all agree on the analysis of the situation. The timing of the European Union Report was not ideal this year, as Antonio Panzeri pointed out in his recent letter. This year, as you know, the European Union Report was postponed because of the mid-term review of the Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy. To improve our report and its impact, we will deliver a streamlined and much shorter report next year. We will focus on thematic issues and use country-specific examples rather than going through each country one by one. Our next report will be tabled in the spring of 2018.

Today, we would like to focus on three issues in particular. The first is civil society and the role of human rights defenders. In your report, you highlighted that the space for civil society is shrinking in many parts of the world and you called for the EU to use all means to protect human rights defenders and NGOs. Even on the occasion of our forum with NGOs last week, there were friends and colleagues who were not allowed to travel and to join us in Brussels. What we keep hearing is that old narrative of a clash between interests and values, but whenever one person's rights are abused we are less safe and secure. Our society, when human rights are not guaranteed, is more fragile, less resilient and an easier target for radicalisation. Investing in human rights, in civil society and in open societies is the best possible investment for the security of our countries. It is what we call sustainable security, security with deep roots in societies and communities.

Looking at the mid-term review of the Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy, which was published in June 2017, it is evident that we have taken a number of measures to address this issue. All our European delegations today have at least one human rights defenders liaison officer. They have worked together to support human rights defenders who were put on trial. In many cases we have helped them leave a country when their life was at risk. The protection of human rights defenders in civil society is also frequently the topic of our human rights dialogue with third countries. We would like to thank, once again, our Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, who has helped us keep a constant focus on human rights issues all around the world.

The second issue is violence against women and girls. No continent is spared. Every culture, including our European culture, still harbours some forms of discrimination and violence. One in three women in Europe has experienced either physical, sexual, or emotional violence. The European Union is already, and by far, the first investor in gender equality and change around the world.

Let me just mention two recent initiatives. First, we are extremely proud of our decision to sign the Council of Europe's Istanbul Convention. Second, the Spotlight initiative launched by the European Union last September with the United Nations is a truly unprecedented action, for the size of our investment, which stands at half a billion euros, and for its innovative way of working. Spotlight will be run together by several European Union agencies and European Union services, and with our delegations around the world. We will engage beyond governments, with civil society organisations and local communities. This is not a traditional, top-down development assistance, because a change in attitudes cannot be imposed from above. It can only grow from the heart of each society and each community.

Our third point is about democracy support and election observation. We would like to thank all of you who have spent energy and time as heads or observers of our election observation missions. As rightly pointed out in your report, a special focus is now given to the follow-up of our missions' recommendations. These recommendations are now always raised in our political dialogues with partner countries. We are also working with local associations and institutions. Our engagement with local authorities goes well beyond the moment when ballots are counted. Too often, part of our societies feel that the 'system' is not working for them. Many people have the impression that they are not listened to and they are losing trust in their institutions. This feeling of exclusion is one of the great enemies of our democracies. If we want to save our democracies we must also improve our democracies. When we work for better institutions, or to open up the space for civil society or for free and independent media, we are also contributing to resilience and to sustainable security. This is the European way to security. It is about our values and it is about our interest. In these difficult times, we have become an even more indispensable partner for all those who believe in human rights and work for them. The Commission is sure that with your support we will continue to be the credible force for human rights that the world so urgently needs.

Jordi Solé, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality*. – Madam President, as rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM), I want to recall that more than 50% of the world's population is composed of women and that women's rights are basic human rights.

It is therefore essential that this dimension is well covered in this report. In particular, I am worried to see that sexual and reproductive health and rights were quite overlooked. It is unacceptable that women and girls' bodies remain an ideological battleground. The integrity of women and girls' bodies is an inalienable human right that should be protected. A few months ago, we witnessed how the Trump administration reinstated and expanded the global gag rule. This is a breach of human rights that will jeopardise efforts to fight diseases such as Aids, Zika or Malaria and to reduce high-risk births and child mortality. In that sense, it is fundamental that the EU and its Member States fill the financing gap left by the US in this field.

Andrzej Grzyb, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałbym podziękować autorce dzisiejszego sprawozdania na temat przestrzegania praw człowieka w roku 2016. Co prawda, jak powiedziała sprawozdawczyni, składanego późno, bo ponad rok od tych wydarzeń. Trudno o dobry dystans do tych wydarzeń. Chciałbym jednocześnie podziękować zarówno sprawozdawczyni, jak i kontrsprawozdawcom za to, że starali się znaleźć te zasadnicze punkty ważne w tym rocznym sprawozdaniu. W szczególności zauważam to potraktowanie priorytetowe wolności religii i wyznania oraz prześladowań na tym tle. Religia nie jest bezpośrednim powodem konfliktów, ale jest częstokroć używana jako narzędzie w konfliktach. Myślę, że temu musimy się sprzeciwić, a wolność wyznania to podstawowa wartość wolności, to prawo człowieka, które powinno być respektowane w całej rozciągłości.

Chcę też powiedzieć, że zawsze powinniśmy pamiętać, że w dalszym ciągu jest wykonywana kara śmierci, że również hańbiący jest handel ludźmi w skali świata, w szczególności to, co słyszeliśmy przy okazji sprawozdania dotyczącego sytuacji w Libii, w innych częściach świata. Sytuacja ludności na obszarach pokonfliktowych, jak Irak czy Syria, trudność adaptacji, powrotu do swojej ojczyzny. Ponadto sytuacja, która dotyczy mniejszości, tak jak na przykład też omawiana tutaj w tym Parlamencie sytuacja ludności mniejszości muzułmańskiej Rohingja w Mjanmie i zjawisko, które dotyczy relacji pomiędzy wielkim biznesem, przedsiębiorczością a ludźmi na określonych terenach. Zjawisko land grabbingu – mamy do czynienia z wstydliwą rzeczą, że oto ludność autochtoniczna jest pozbawiana prawa do ziemi. Myślę, że te zjawiska, które zostały tutaj zarysowane w sprawozdaniu, ale również te, o których my tutaj pamiętamy z debaty w tej izbie, powinny być dorocznie przypominane, tym bardziej że jutro mamy wręczyć nagrodę Sacharowa za wolność myśli, między innymi opozycji wenezuelskiej.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la relatrice per il lavoro svolto, e devo dire che c'è una contagiosa patologia che si sta diffondendo sempre più nel mondo, ed è quella del disprezzo verso i diritti umani. La verità è che il cinismo prodotto da un iperrealismo politico, economico e commerciale, cerca ormai di sovrastare e annientare il vento della solidarietà e dei diritti.

Io ritengo invece che di fronte ai grandi soggetti economici che sempre più governano il mondo, l'appello ai diritti individuali e collettivi sia la via da seguire per impedire che tutto sia assoggettato alla legge naturale del mercato. Abbiamo bisogno di accompagnare la rivoluzione dell'uguaglianza, la rivoluzione della dignità, che possa porre sempre di più al centro l'autodeterminazione della persona.

Le sfide che abbiamo dinanzi a noi sono molteplici. Dobbiamo sapere e vedere, e soprattutto affrontare. I difensori dei diritti umani subiscono discriminazioni e intimidazioni e vengono spesso uccisi. L'Unione europea deve mantenere una posizione univoca sui valori dei diritti umani, ma spesso si incontrano posizioni diverse. L'Europa può avere una voce credibile se il messaggio che invia non solo è unitariamente condiviso, ma anche se si è in grado di mostrare una forte coerenza nelle proprie politiche interne ed esterne.

La relazione annuale che voteremo è chiara su questo aspetto, e invita tutte le istituzioni dell'Unione europea e gli Stati membri a porre i diritti umani al centro delle relazioni dell'Unione europea con i paesi terzi, e dobbiamo farlo sempre e nei confronti di chiunque.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Z uznaniem wysłuchałem wystąpienia pana komisarza, który domagał się czy postulował bardziej oszczędne i zwięzłe sprawozdanie. W istocie – powinniśmy bronić tego, co fundamentalne. Europa powinna przychodzić zawsze z pomocą wtedy, kiedy dochodzi do niszczenia całych grup społecznych w wojnach religijnych i wojnach etnicznych, musi upominać się o wolność religijną, która jest łamana w wielu punktach świata. Główną ofiarą tych prześladowań padają chrześcijanie.

Musimy być wszędzie tam, gdzie w ramach wielkich procesów przemieszczeń ludzi związanych z uchodźstwem dochodzi do naruszania praw człowieka. Wreszcie powinniśmy przychodzić z pomocą wszystkim represjonowanym, więzionym za przekonania polityczne.

Jednocześnie powinniśmy unikać stronniczości, a w żadnym razie nie mogę zgodzić się z panem posłem Solé, który atakuje administrację Trumpa, promuje prawa reprodukcyjne, które w istocie stanowią naruszenie prawa osoby ludzkiej do życia. Walczmy o to, co fundamentalne, unikajmy tego, co stronnicze.

Renate Weber, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the report we are discussing today is a valuable paper as it tackles a wide range of horizontal topics of the utmost importance for the EU and its policy instrument for advancing human rights and democracy worldwide. I thank the rapporteur for her openness during the negotiations and I am happy to see that issues which were proposed by my group were extensively supported by the other groups and are now in the final report.

However, I consider that in general the reports we are adopting should go beyond theoretical statements. We should not censor ourselves when speaking about violations of human rights and democracy in the world without referring to particular cases, countries and regimes. We should not be shy in naming and shaming abusive state and non-state actors. Such an approach would give more value to our work and to the work of civil society, whose representatives expose themselves to danger and abuse, yet continue to act as watchdogs and brought these events to our attention.

The aim of the report is also to be a supportive instrument for the work of the European External Action Service, as well as to the EU delegations in the third countries. I believe that speaking openly and stating the facts about undemocratic regimes will strengthen the significance of our work and its impact on the design of EU external policies. I hope that in the future we will surpass this limitation and will address without restraint events that damage human rights and democracy in the world.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta. Como dice este informe, nos encontramos en un momento de retroceso de los derechos humanos en todo el mundo. Una especial mención creo que merece estas semanas justamente el pueblo hondureño, que ha sufrido más de doce asesinatos en las manifestaciones contra el fraude electoral.

El informe plantea ideas interesantes, pero el problema es que estas ideas no se corresponden con la práctica de la mayoría de los países miembros. Así, mientras se defiende el papel de la Unión Europea como promotor de los derechos humanos se olvida que en su seno también son violados, como ocurre en la frontera sur de Ceuta y Melilla o en los centros de internamiento de inmigrantes. En el territorio europeo se ha preparado, por ejemplo, la criminalización de la defensora de los derechos humanos, Helena Maleno.

La vulneración de los derechos humanos por parte de las multinacionales europeas, los acuerdos comerciales, la industria militar, el expolio de los recursos naturales y tantas otras prácticas nos hacen pensar que si esto continúa así los aspectos positivos de este informe en la práctica van a quedar en papel mojado.

Hay que rectificar.

Barbara Lochbihler, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, this is quite a comprehensive and good annual human rights report, and I thank the rapporteur for her work. This annual report includes strong language on the shrinking space for civil society, including the call for an EU monitoring mechanism for cases of violations of freedom of assembly and association.

Given that I have only one-and-a-half minutes of speaking time, I would like to focus on the situation of environmental rights defenders, which the annual report explicitly mentions. Their important work often goes against the interests of influential companies, and they face severe human relations by state actors as well. According to the NGO 'Global Witness', on average three environmental human rights defenders were murdered each week in 2015. In 2016, there were around four murders per week and this murderous trend went on this year. Almost 40% of the environmental human rights defenders killed are indigenous people.

We are glad that Lolita Chavez, a committed environmental and indigenous human rights defender from Guatemala, is one of the finalists for the Sakharov Prize this year. Environmental human rights defenders like her are under threat when they oppose the interests of corporations and governments. The sectors most affected are mining, extractive industries, agri-business, hydroelectric dams and water rights and logging. The EU and its Member States are clearly not doing enough to ensure corporate accountability and legal redress. It is time to hold accountable those European corporations who contribute to the excessive violence against those activists. I know that it is late, but still I have to say that I really regret that High Representative Mogherini is not here to contribute to this human rights debate.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter ma collègue, M^{me} Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, pour l'excellent rapport qu'elle a préparé et négocié sur l'état des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie dans le monde en 2016.

J'ai été très satisfait de constater que les amendements que j'ai proposés ont été pleinement intégrés dans le rapport. Il s'agissait, dans ces amendements, de l'importance de mettre au cœur de nos politiques d'élargissement et de voisinage le renforcement des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie.

J'ai également proposé l'élaboration des orientations pour le soutien de la démocratie, car c'est une illusion de penser que démocratie et droits de l'homme pourraient fonctionner l'un sans l'autre. Au contraire, il s'agit de deux faces d'une même pièce.

Or, de nos jours, dans plusieurs parties du monde, il y a encore des politiques qui cherchent à nous convaincre que le communisme et le populisme de gauche peuvent fonctionner au profit des citoyens. C'est faux!

En Chine, le destin de Liu Xiaobo, prix Nobel de la paix, est un cas typique de la répression brutale exercée par les autorités contre les dissidents. Toujours en Chine, Lee Ming-che, ardent défenseur des droits de l'homme, vient d'être condamné à cinq ans de prison. Au Venezuela, les cas d'Alfredo Acosta et de Leopoldo López, lauréat 2017 du prix Sakharov, témoignent de la faillite du système chaviste.

C'est pourquoi, en conformité avec l'engagement que nous avons pris dans nos traités, nous devons promouvoir les droits de l'homme et la démocratie sur la scène internationale.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, last year, I condemned the global clampdown on civil society and human rights defenders, but sadly the situation is only getting worse. In the Gulf, where many EU Member States – including the United Kingdom – have strategic and economic interests, the situation of human rights defenders remains catastrophic. In Bahrain, at least 169 peaceful critics have been targeted in the space of a year. Last week, Bahrain activist Nedal Al-Salman was banned from travelling to the EU NGO Forum on human rights, and as we speak, Nabeel Rajab is serving a two-year sentence solely for speaking to the media. He is facing 15 more years for tweets about the Saudi-led coalition air strikes in Yemen and the use of torture in Bahraini prisons. Nevertheless, neither the High Representative nor any EU Member States publicly condemned the confirmation of his sentence on 22 November. Nabeel Rajab is a prisoner of conscience; he deserves our full support and resolute action. In Turkey, the situation is truly appalling. The European Union's ambiguous relationship with Mr Erdogan is unacceptable, and our policy must change. Many human rights defenders, lawyers, academics, civil society representatives, trade unionist activists, judges, journalists, civil servants and artists face trumped-up charges of terrorism. I would especially like to highlight some cases that are close to my heart, for example Zehra Doğan and the Istanbul 10. The EU must uphold its human rights commitments in assisting civil society actors worldwide as stated in the EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy 2015-2019 and the EU global strategy. Ms Mogherini, I urge you to call for the immediate release of Mr Rajab in Bahrain and all jailed human rights defenders in Turkey, and to concretely engage with defenders well before they are put on trial.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Na wstępie także chciałbym pogratulować sprawozdawczyni tego bardzo dobrego sprawozdania. Jak już wspominała, rok 2016 był na pewno bez wątpienia trudny z perspektywy praw człowieka i demokracji, ale jak już poprzednia debata na temat sytuacji uchodźców w Libii pokazała, jest to system naczyń połączonych. Ja chciałbym się skupić właśnie na Afryce, ponieważ sądzę, że to, o czym pan komisarz powiedział, to widoczne kurczenie się przestrzeni dla społeczeństwa obywatelskiego czy organizacji społecznych, to jest konsekwencja tłumienia między innymi protestów pokojowych w takich krajach jak Kongo, Nigeria, Etiopia czy Sudan (to tylko przykłady), ale także prześladowania oczywiście dziennikarzy czy obrońców praw człowieka. Konflikty zbrojne na terenie Afryki to nie tylko ofiary cywilne, ale przede wszystkim także przypadki przemocy seksualnej wobec kobiet czy na przykład werbowania dzieci żołnierzy. Te i podobne przypadki i zjawiska oczywiście przyczyniają się do masowej emigracji zarówno w samej Afryce, jak i oczywiście do Europy, dlatego sądzę, że wspieranie praw człowieka na kontynencie afrykańskim jest jednym z głównych wyzwań także dla nas, w interesie europejskim.

Chciałbym podziękować sprawozdawczyni, że istotnie podkreśliła w sprawozdaniu fakt współpracy Unii Europejskiej z Afryką także na tym poziomie. Mimo że wiele organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i zajmujących się prawami człowieka na terenie kontynentu afrykańskiego to jeszcze młode organizacje, to sądzę, że wspieranie ich może naprawić dać szansę działania skutecznego i może rozwiązać, i pomóc rozwiązać problemy tym krajom afrykańskim zgodnie ze standardami międzynarodowymi, jednocześnie gwarantując poszanowanie, uwarunkowanie kulturowe i budowanie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, quero saudar a relatora pela qualidade do relatório. Infelizmente, de ano para ano e de relatório para relatório, constatamos que os direitos humanos, em lugar de avançarem, estão, nalguns casos, a sofrer graves retrocessos em diversas regiões do mundo.

Não seria justo ignorar que foram feitos alguns avanços e que muitos deles foram alcançados com o envolvimento direto ou indireto da União Europeia. Mas são ainda avanços tímidos e insuficientes. As guerras e o terrorismo, a situação dos migrantes e refugiados, o tráfico de seres humanos, a escravidão, a criminalização das liberdades fundamentais, a perseguição das minorias, a repressão exercida sobre os defensores dos direitos humanos, a criminalização do aborto, o desprezo pelos povos indígenas, o desrespeito pelos direitos das mulheres e das crianças, entre outros, configuram um cenário extremamente perigoso, desde logo porque são fenómenos que estão frequentemente interligados.

Este cenário exige, por isso, da União Europeia, que esteja à altura dos seus valores e das suas responsabilidades. A verdade é que por todo o mundo há milhões de pessoas cujos direitos humanos são alvos de violações sob diversos pontos de vista e que olham para a União Europeia como a última esperança de alcançarem alguma proteção, justiça e reparação. E a União Europeia, por razões históricas, filosóficas e culturais, tem de fazer tudo o que estiver ao seu alcance para não desamparar essas mesmas pessoas.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur for preparing a good, comprehensive report. 2016 was a dramatic year with many consequences for human rights. It is therefore of utmost importance that the EU stays focused on the good and effective use of our instruments and diligently puts human rights at the core of our relations with the third countries. This should be echoed by the EU institutions and Member States alike.

The report puts a lot of emphasis on democratisation and the essential role that the EU plays in this domain. With respect to enlargement and neighbourhood, these regions require that we focus our attention on the rule of law and fundamental freedoms. We must continue to engage with our partners in these countries and pay attention to their political developments. This comprises support to democratic institutions, enhancing parliamentary cooperation and empowering civil society.

I especially welcome the mentioning of the essential role the EU plays in election observations and electoral assistance. As election day is the culmination of the life of any democracy, the EU's support during the entire electoral cycle remains crucial in this respect. Following up on reports and recommendations has to be an integral part of our presence in third countries.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Én is gratulálni szeretnék először is az átfogó jelentéshez, melyben a szerző az Európai Unió nevében ismét kötelezettséget vállal az egyetemes emberi jogok, az alapvető szabadságok és értékek előmozdítása mellett. Az Uniónak képesnek kell lennie, hogy a határain túl a harmadik országokban is előmozdítsa az emberi jogok tiszteletét.

Az emberi jogok megsértésének sokféle esete jelenik meg a jelentésben. Úgy gondolom, egyetérthetünk abban, hogy az oktatáshoz és az anyanyelvhez való jog az alapvető jogok egyike. Így én arra szeretném felhívni a figyelmet, hogy sajnálatos módon Ukrajnában épp 2016-ban indult el az a folyamat, mely 2017 őszén az új ukrán oktatási törvény oktatási nyelvre vonatkozó cikkelye által csökkenteni szeretné a nemzeti kisebbségek anyanyelvhasználati jogát. Míg eddig a kisebbségek anyanyelvükön férhettek hozzá az oktatás minden szintjéhez, ez 2018 után csak az általános iskolára fog korlátozódni, azaz az új törvény már megszerzett jogokat vesz vissza.

Pedig a múlt pénteki EU–Ukrajna társulási tanács záródokumentumában is megfogalmazódik az EU hivatalos álláspontjaként, hogy a kisebbségek már meglévő jogai nem szűkíthetők. A Velencei Bizottság hétfőn közzétett jelentésében pedig kimondja, hogy a hetes cikk miatti kritikák jogosak, és annak módosítását javasolják. Elsősorban, mert az elfogadott szöveg jelentősen különbözik attól, amelyről a kisebbségekkel konzultáltak, egyeztettek. A törvény hetes cikke továbbá jelentős kétértelműségeket tartalmaz, pedig átfogó reformok esetén a nemzetközi és alkotmányos kötelezettségvállalásokat figyelembe kell venni, különösen a már meglévő kisebbségi jogok esetében.

Remélem, Ukrajna teljes mértékben végrehajtja a Velencei Bizottság ajánlásait, konzultál az érintett kisebbségekkel és szomszédaival, az oktatási reform végrehajtása során pedig beépíti a nemzetiségek igényeit és javaslatait.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! 36 lat temu, 13 grudnia 1981 roku, zabito w Polsce rodzącą się dopiero demokrację, wprowadzono stan wojenny. Minęły lata i w 1989 roku powróciliśmy na drogę budowania demokracji i państwa prawnego. Trwaliśmy na niej 25 lat. Także w tym okresie i inne państwa w Europie zaczęły budować demokrację, rozwijać społeczeństwo obywatelskie, szanować prawa człowieka.

Niestety, wydaje się, że znów w wielu miejscach na świecie mamy odwrót od tych wspaniałych idei. Rośnie liczba represyjnych rządów, represyjnego prawa, braku szacunku jednych dla innych, braku szacunku dla praw człowieka oraz społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

Niestety, ten proces dotyczy także niektórych państw członkowskich. Jeśli więc chcemy w przyszłości być ambasadorem demokracji i praw człowieka na całym świecie, musimy poradzić sobie z tymi problemami także i u siebie.

László Tókécs (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Ma délután a Mianmarban élő muszlim rohindszák védelmében emeltük fel a szavunkat. Más esetekben a világon leginkább üldözött keresztény közösségeket vesszük védelmünkbe. Az Európai Uniónak – etnikai és vallási különbségtétel nélkül – egységesen kell fellépnie az egyéni emberi és a kisebbségi kollektív jogok, illetve a lelkiismeret-, a szólás- és a vallásszabadság tiszteletben tartása érdekében.

Különösképpen fontos, hogy felvegyük a harcot a jogfosztó és tömeggyilkos vallási és politikai ideológiákkal, mint amilyenek az iszlám fundamentalizmus és az ateista kommunizmus. Az Európai Unió ennek az egyetemes jogvédő küzdelemnek a legfőbb letéteményese, amint ez a Parlament 2016. évi emberi jogi jelentéséből is kitűnik.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Pán komisár, budúci rok bude 70 rokov od prijatia Všeobecnej deklarácie ľudských práv, ktorú podpísali a ratifikovali takmer všetky krajiny sveta. V tomto Parlamente som už tretie volebné obdobie účasť na prerokovávaní hodnotiacich správ o ľudských právach a demokracii. Počas celého obdobia sú si tieto správy veľmi podobné. Je zarážajúce, že po sedemdesiatich rokoch je ešte toľko krajín, kde nie sú základné, univerzálne, neodňateľné a nenegociovateľné práva rešpektované. Nemožno sa čudovať. Veď aká je politika EÚ?

Dodržiavanie ľudských práv v tretích krajinách nie je vždy zásadnou podmienkou pri obchodných rokovaniach inštitúcií Európskej únie.

A po druhé: už takmer 10 rokov, rovnako ako v tejto správe, žiadame legalizovať potraty, ukončenie života nenarodených detí, napriek tomu, že podľa všetkých medzinárodných dokumentov je právo na život základným a prvoradým právom.

„Catch the eye” eljáráás

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Ανδριουκάιτις, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πραγματικά παρεμβαίνει σε διάφορα μέρη του κόσμου, ισχυριζόμενη ότι θέλει να προστατεύσει τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Δεν κοιτάζει όμως τι γίνεται εδώ, στη γειτονιά μας, τι γίνεται στην Αλβανία, πώς παραβιάζονται εκεί τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Εκεί όπου οι αλβανικές αρχές, στη Χειμάρα, γκρεμίζουν τα σπίτια των Ελλήνων. Εκεί όπου, ξανά στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, στο χωριό Δρυμάδες, οι αλβανικές αρχές γκρεμίζουν ελληνικές εκκλησίες, γκρεμίζουν την εκκλησία του Αγίου Αθανασίου. Δεν βλέπουμε αυτά τα θέματα;

Πώς θα παρέμβει εν προκειμένω η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για να συμμαζευτούν οι αλβανικές αρχές, να σεβαστούν τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου, τα περιουσιακά τους δικαιώματα, τα θρησκευτικά τους δικαιώματα; Χρειάζεται λοιπόν να μην κλείνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τα μάτια σ' αυτές τις παραβιάσεις των δικαιωμάτων της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, jsem ráda, že zpráva opakuje svou výzvu k vypracování společného postojů Evropské unie týkajícího se používání bezpilotních letounů vybavených zbraněmi. Činnost těchto tichých zabíjáků totiž porušuje mezinárodní humanitární právo. Stroj neví, co to je právní rámec, proporcionalita, odpovědnost, ochrana civilního obyvatelstva a transparentnost. Ale je naší povinností je v tomto duchu používat.

Jsem přesvědčena, že je třeba opět naléhat na celou Evropskou unii, ale především na Komisi, aby zakázala vývoj, výrobu a používání plně autonomních zbraní, které umožňují vést útoky bez zásahu lidí. Je naší povinností využívat nových armádních technologií tak, aby sice pomáhaly chránit životy vojáků, ale to nesmí být na úkor bezpečí nevinných civilistů. Všichni víme, že stroje mají svoje limity a nic jako stoprocentní účinnost neexistuje. A právě o to více se musíme zasadit o vytvoření silných mezinárodních pravidel, ale především musíme začít sami u sebe.

(A „catch the eye” eljáráás vége)

Vytienis Povilas Andriukaitis, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, on behalf of Vice-President Federica Mogherini, I would like to thank the rapporteur for her excellent work and the honourable Members for this very fruitful debate.

I could not agree more that maximising the efficiency of our tools in promoting and protecting human rights and democracy is of the utmost importance. To achieve our ambitious goals for improvements to democracy and human rights across the globe, we have to ensure a strategic and systematic approach. Furthermore, external coherence is key for the legitimacy of our external policies, and we count on Parliament's attentive eye and useful recommendations to ensure such consistency. We remain committed to the improvement of democratic governance at home and will continue supporting democratic transitions in our neighbourhood and beyond.

Finally, let me express deep appreciation for the very constructive and enhanced cooperation with this House. Coming back to the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration and the slogan of the celebration, 'Stand up for Human Rights', we certainly hope, and anticipate, that the European External Action Service, the Commission, the Member States and Parliament will stand together for human rights in the years to come.

Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, *Berichterstatterin*. – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank an alle Kollegen, die hier heute Abend gesprochen haben. Wir teilen alle die gleichen Ziele, auch wenn wir unterschiedliche Akzente setzen. Ich möchte mich auch bei der Kommission für die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken. Und bitte sagen Sie doch Frau Mogherini: Für uns alle ist es halb zwölf, nicht nur für sie. Danke schön.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom. A szavazásra holnap, 2017. december 13-án, 12.00-kor kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *napisan*. – Danas svjedočimo sve češćoj povredi ljudskih prava i temeljnih sloboda diljem svijeta koje često pogađa najranjivije skupine kao što su etničke, jezične i vjerske manjine, osobe s invaliditetom, pripadnici zajednice LGBTI, žene, djeca, tražitelji azila i migranti.

Europska se unija temelji na snažnom angažmanu u promicanju i zaštiti ljudskih prava, demokracije i vladavine prava diljem svijeta, a ovo je Izvješće vrijedan instrument kojim se pruža sveobuhvatan pregled prioriteta EU-a, napora i izazova u borbi protiv kršenja istih u trećim zemljama te pomaže pri utvrđivanju daljnjih učinkovitih načina za njihovo rješavanje.

Tijekom godina, Unija je usvojila više važnih dokumenata kroz koje promiče i štiti ljudska prava, te niz diplomatskih i kooperativni alata koji podupiru napredak ljudskih prava diljem svijeta. Lisabonski ugovor, uloga Vijeća i Visoke predstavnice Unije za vanjske poslove i sigurnosnu politiku, Strateški okvir za ljudska prava 2012. – 2021. i Smjernice za ljudska prava važni su instrumenti kojima Unija promiče i štiti ljudska prava i temeljne slobode.

EU treba i dalje aktivno podupirati demokratske institucije za ljudska prava i civilno društvo u njihovom promicanju demokracije te se i dalje treba aktivno boriti protiv svakog oblika kršenja ljudskih prava, demokracije i vladavine prava unutar i izvan svojih granica.

Ádám Kósa (PPE), *írásban*. – Gratulálok a jelentéstevőnek, hogy ebben az évben már nem volt szükség arra, hogy a fogyatékosággal élők érdekében módosítót nyújtsak be, mert a jelentés külön pontban méltatja az ENSZ CRPD-egyezmény ratifikálását és kimondja, hogy a fogyatékoság nem csökkenti az emberi méltóságot, így az államoknak kötelességük védelmet nyújtani számukra. Egyetértek azzal, hogy hitelesen be kell építeni az általános hozzáférhetőség elvét és a fogyatékosággal élők jogait az EU valamennyi szakpolitikájába, kiemelve e kérdés előíró és horizontális jellegét.

Támogatom, hogy az EU a fogyatékoság alapján történő hátrányos megkülönböztetés elleni küzdelmet építse be külső fellépésébe és fejlesztési támogatási politikáiba. Örülök, hogy a fogyatékosággal élők jogait a fejlesztési politikáról szóló új európai konszenzusba befoglalják.

Még mindig aktuális azonban – a tavalyi szövegbe indítványomra bekerült rendelkezés –, hogy alaposabban meg kell vizsgálni a fogyatékosággal élő személyekkel kapcsolatos projektek hatékonyságát és végrehajtásukba be kell vonni a fogyatékosággal élőket képviselő helyi civil szervezeteket is. A saját lakóhelyükön kell támogatni a fogyatékosággal élő társadalmi integrációját. Be kell vonni a helyi szervezeteket, mert ők tudják pontosan, mire van helyben szükség és abban is ők tudnak segíteni, hogy a támogatás valóban azokhoz az emberekhez jusson el, akiknek szánták. Nem beszélni kell, hanem cselekedni, nem demokráciaexportra van szükség, hanem a helyi közösségek erősítésére.

18. Hong Kong, 20 godina nakon primopredaje (rasprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont az Alyn Smith által a Külügyi Bizottság nevében készített jelentés a Hongkong 20 évvel az átadást követő helyzetéről szóló ajánlásáról (2017/22014(INI)) (A8-0382/2017).

Alyn Smith, rapporteur. – Madam President, I am very pleased to introduce this report –briefly, you'll be glad to hear at this time of night – to the House. I believe it is an example of the EU adding real value, and of the Parliament working well. The EU external competences are still new, and at best we can use the footprint and historical connections of our Member States to use that insight to inform a values-based foreign policy in the wider world. We can use that insight to inform ourselves, but not be a prisoner of the baggage of history. On that point, on a slightly personal note, it's a great tragedy for me, that as the EU begins to speak with one voice in the wider world, my own Member State, the United Kingdom, has decided to retreat into isolationism with Brexit, if not my country, Scotland. I assure you, there are plenty of constructive partners in Scotland, and we'll be in touch.

On this report, it is right that we take stock of the situation in Hong Kong. We are 20 years after the handover from the British to the Chinese, and 20 years into a 50-year commitment to a 'one country, two systems' approach. Hong Kong is the 14th biggest trading partner of the European Union, it is an important partner to us, an important part of the EU-China dialogue. And it's important to be frank: Hong Kong is a great place but all is not perfect. There remains a concern that the 'one country, two systems' is being undermined, and in paragraphs 1(b) and 1(l) we voice that concern – not criticism but concern. I believe we have struck a balance. Freedom of speech also must be defended, now and in the future, and in paragraph 1(p) I believe we have struck a balanced statement which takes due stock of where things are. In paragraph 1(t) we set out ways in which we could support and strengthen civil society within Hong Kong, a crucial set of groups that are doing increasingly difficult work; they look to us for support. I am very pleased that we have reached such a high degree of consensus across the house: only two amendments of substance from the GUE group in favour of greater partnership on tax work, tax avoidance, money laundering, and financial transparency.

For my part, I strongly support the amendments, I urge colleagues to support them, too. I think there is a key area where we could assist in the fight against organised crime and money laundering. And with that I would warmly thank the shadow rapporteurs, our most excellent secretariat, the Green/EFA Group staff, and I commend the text very warmly to the House.

Vytėnė Povilaitis, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, Hong Kong is the European Union's fourteenth largest trading partner in goods and the fourth largest in services. More than 2000 European companies are present in Hong Kong, and the European Union is Hong Kong's second largest trading partner in goods after mainland China.

Vice President Dombrovskis was in Hong Kong just ten days ago, and we have invited the Chief Executive, Carrie Lam, to visit us in Brussels as soon as possible. We care about Hong Kong, and we know that its autonomy has been the foundation of its success. The people of Hong Kong are now asking to resume electoral reform, and to have a genuine choice for the election of the Chief Executive and Legislative Council in accordance with the basic law. But, as your rapporteur rightly notes, the principle of 'one country, two systems' has come under increasing pressure. The rule of law and the independence of the judiciary in Hong Kong have been questioned. The implementation of the electoral reform has been postponed. On top of this, we cannot forget the case of five book publishers who went missing in 2015. To us, that is the most serious challenge to the basic law since 1997, and, unfortunately, it is not an isolated event.

In line with the report's recommendations, we intend to reinforce our bilateral dialogue with Hong Kong. Our latest European Union-Hong Kong structured dialogue took place less than a month ago. What we always stress in our dialogues is that the principle of 'one country, two systems' is essential for Hong Kong's prosperity, but it is also important for change; for its own growth and prosperity.

Our relations with China are becoming more and more intense, not only economically, but also on foreign policy and security issues. Our dialogue is very open, and our message to our Chinese friends is very clear: preserving 'one country, two systems' is in their best interests, and we are ready to work with them to make this happen.

Dubravka Šuica, u ime kluba PPE. – Gospodo predsjednice, želim se najprije zahvaliti gospodinu Alynu Smithu na zajedničkom radu i na međusobnom podupiranju. Kako je ovo naša preporuka Komisiji, Vijeću i Visokoj povjerenici, želim još jedanput naglasiti da smo istaknuli u našem izvješću Hong Kong kao velikog trgovinskog partnera Europske unije. Naravno, snažno podupiremo načelo jedne zemlje – dva sustava, i visoki stupanj autonomije koji Hong Kong ima u odnosu na Kinu, a što je proisteklo iz kinesko-britanske deklaracije prije dvadeset godina.

Isto tako, ističem da mi kao europske institucije trebamo pružiti podršku svim trgovinskim i političkim partnerima. Mi znamo da se Hong Kong razvio u društvu u kojem postoji vladavina prava, sloboda i visoki standardi sigurnosti, zdravlja i autonomije. Ovim izvješćem i ovom preporukom smo željeli pružiti potporu prosperitetu i pravima građana Hong Konga kako bi se omogućio model za demokratske i političke reforme u Kini, a s ciljem liberalizacije i kineskog društva. Poštovanje autonomije Hong Konga ključno je za njegov daljnji razvoj i dobre odnose s Kinom i u tom pogledu Europska unija treba pružiti podršku.

Još bih naglasila reformu univerzalnog biračkog prava kako bi budući izbori bili u potpunosti demokratski, pravedni, transparentni, ali da se nastavi bilateralni dijalog s Europskom unijom u različitim područjima politike, što smo velikom većinom glasova na vanjsko-političkom odboru potvrdili, a nadam se da ćemo i sutra na glasovanju u Parlamentu.

Tonino Picula, u ime kluba S&D. – Gospodo predsjednice, zahvaljujem izjavitelju na zaista dobroj suradnji. Ovo izvješće je važan korak u našoj daljnjoj suradnji s Hong Kongom. Pristup jedne države dva sustava, temelj je naših odnosa. Dvadeset godina je prošlo, trideset godina je pred nama. Europska unija ima blizak odnos s Hong Kongom kao važnim trgovinskim partnerom, ali naš odnos treba nadograđivati, npr. boljom suradnjom u obrazovnim i istraživačkim programima.

Što se tiče stanja u Hong Kongu primjetne su intervencije Pekinga u njegovo uređenje. Prava novinara da slobodno pišu pokušava se ograničiti. Svjedočili smo i prosvjednim pokretima u Hong Kongu. Neki traže neovisnost, međutim, službena politika Europske unije je politika jedne Kine i dva sustava, što određuje našu suradnju. Ističem i problem utaje poreza i poreznih prijevара.

Podržavam apel vladi Hong Konga da poduzme učinkovitije mjere protiv poduzeća koja preko svojih podružnica u gradu olakšavaju utaju poreza i porezne prijevare. Nadam se da će većina kolega podržati ovaj apel na sutrašnjem glasovanju.

Bas Belder, namens de ECR-Fractie. – In de aanloop naar dit debat las ik in de New York Review of Books, editie 21 december 2017, een boeiend essay van de in Hongkong gestationeerde journalist Gavin Jacobson onder de titel "Hongkong protests". Aan de hand van gesprekken met een keur aan verdedigers van democratische kernwaarden schetst en analyseert Jacobson de uitholling van China's belofte van twee systemen, dat wil zeggen de gestage ondermijning van maatschappelijk en politiek pluralisme in Hongkong. Dat is exact waar het uitstekende en waardevolle rapport van collega Smith terecht de vinger op legt.

Ik wens dat dit debat en dit verslag een steun in de rug mogen betekenen voor de voorvechters van democratie en fundamentele mensenrechten in Hongkong.

Martin Schirdewan (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin der Ansicht, dass wir uns der komplexen und widersprüchlichen Situation in Hongkong nur offen und mit Offenheit nähern können. Diese Offenheit basiert meiner Ansicht nach einerseits auf der Anerkennung des Prinzips „One country, two systems“, andererseits aber auch auf der notwendigen Kritik an der Politik regionaler und internationaler Eliten, die Hongkong zu einer höchst ungleichen Gesellschaft gemacht haben, die einerseits von extremer Armut und andererseits von extremem Reichtum geprägt ist. Die *Hong Kong people* leiden unter einer unglaublichen Krise auf dem Wohnungsmarkt: Menschen leben wortwörtlich in Käfigen; deutsche Medien haben in den letzten Wochen ausführlich und intensiv darüber berichtet. Diese Krise wird maßgeblich befeuert mit Geldern aus Steuerstümpfen, die bewusst nicht auf der schwarzen Liste der EU betreffend Steueroasen auftauchen.

Legen wir diese Sümpfe trocken! Helfen wir den Menschen in Hongkong! Dann kann der Berichterstatter als glaubwürdiger Makler in Sachen Menschenrechte auftreten. In seiner jetzigen Form jedenfalls werden wir dem Bericht und seinen Empfehlungen nicht zustimmen können.

Vytėnas Povilas Andriukaitis, *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, on behalf of Vice-President Mogherini, thank the rapporteur for his excellent work and the honourable Members for their interventions. From this debate, we conclude that we all share a strong commitment to Hong Kong's autonomy in the context of the 'one country, two systems principle'.

Relations between the EU and Hong Kong keep on growing. Now they cover not only trade and economics, but also customs cooperation, innovation and technology, competition, food safety, the environment and education. European Union companies play a key role in sectors like financial services, retail and distribution, transport and logistics, which are all vital for Hong Kong. They rely on Hong Kong's efficient business environment. To that end, we hope that in Hong Kong the high standards of the rule of law, transparency, non-discrimination and economic freedom will be maintained in the future.

May I close by signalling once again the Commission's appreciation of Parliament's role in keeping this important issue on the international agenda.

Alyn Smith, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I really can be very brief, we have such a consensus on this report, the work has been done on it before we got to plenary, so I look forward to a solid majority tomorrow. I echo the points about the lack of progress on electoral reform, but we do cover that in point 1(h). I think we have struck a balanced text across the House. I would thank colleagues for the very good work and look forward to tomorrow's vote.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom. A szavazásra holnap, 2013. december 13-án 12.00-kor kerül sor.

19. Uporaba fosforne kiseline – fosfata – di-, tri- i polifosfata (E 338-452) u zamrznutim mesnim ražnjićima za okomito pečenje (rasprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont vita a Christel Schaldemose és Bart Staes által az ENVI bizottság nevében készített A foszforsav – foszfátok – di-, tri- és polifoszfátok (E 338-452) függőleges nyáron sütendő fagyasztott húskokban való felhasználása című jelentésről (2017/2920(RPS)) (B8-0666/2017).

Christel Schaldemose, *stiller*. – Fru formand! Kære kolleger! Den sag, vi nu skal debattere, har fået en helt absurd behandling i mange medier i EU. Så lad mig starte med at slå det fast med syvtommersøm: Vi kommer ikke til at forbyde kebabben i EU. I Miljøudvalget har vi derimod gjort indsigelse mod Kommissionens forslag om at tillade, at der tilsættes phosphater i frossent kød på spyd, altså bl.a. kebab. Vi ønsker således at bevare det, vi har i dag, status quo. Hvis Kommissionen skal have opdateret EU's liste over tilladte fødevarertilægsstoffer, skal der være tre kriterier, der er opfyldt: 1. Tilsætningsstoffet skal ikke være sundhedsskadeligt for mennesker; 2. Der skal være en teknologisk nødvendighed; og 3. Det må ikke vildlede forbrugerne. Ingen af de dele opfylder Kommissionens forslag, desværre!

Men kernen i vores indsigelse handler dog først og fremmest om sundhed. Der er fra videnskabelig side rejst tvivl om de sundhedsmæssige aspekter af phosphater i kød. Der er bekymring om, hvorvidt phosphaterne øger risikoen for bl.a. forekomst af hjertekarsygdomme. Det er også det, der har ført til, at EFSA har besluttet sig for at højprioritere en revurdering af phosphaterne og deres sundhedseffekter, når de puttes i mad. Den revurdering kommer i løbet af 2018. Vi mener derfor i Miljøudvalget, at der ikke er nogen grund til at åbne op for at tilføje phosphater i kød, før vi kender den vurdering fra EFSA. Så når vi siger nej til at tillade phosphater i frossent kød, er det altså primært af sundhedsmæssige årsager, og fordi vi gerne vil vente et års tid, imens EFSA arbejder.

Men når det er sagt, så er der heller ikke nogen teknologisk nødvendighed til stede, for der findes faktisk masser af god kebab på det europæiske marked i dag, som er helt fri for phosphater. Og vil man gerne og absolut have et bindemiddel i sin kebab, så findes der både E-nummerfrie og kemikaliefrie bindemidler på markedet. Så det er altså muligt at agere uden phosphater.

Og så vil jeg gerne tage fat i nogle af de ting, der har været rejst i medierne. Særligt i Tyskland har der været stor bekymring oven på vores afstemning i Miljøudvalget, og der har været historier om tab af arbejdspladser og alverdens ting og sager. Jeg vil gerne slå fast, at EU's gældende regler også gælder i Tyskland, så det er altså heller ikke Tyskland i dag tilladt i henhold til EU at tilsætte phosphater i frosne spyd med kød. Hvis det finder sted i Tyskland i dag, så er det, fordi reglerne ikke bliver overholdt.

Andre har også fremhævet, at der er nogen former for kød, det er tilladt at have phosphater i. Det er korrekt! Der findes f.eks. nogle traditionelle pølser, hvor det er tilladt. Men vi mener ikke, der er nogen grund til at give tilladelse til en hel masse nye områder, før vi er sikre på, at der ikke er et sundhedsmæssigt problem.

Det var iøvrigt også en sag, vi i Miljøudvalget rejste over for EU-Kommissionen tilbage i 2014 med vores daværende formand for Miljøudvalget, Matthias Groote. Vi rejste bekymringen, og vi deler stadig den bekymring.

Så i stedet for at råbe op om, at EU vil forbyde kebabben, hvilket ikke er rigtigt, så burde medier og virksomheder og borgere i stedet for spørge Kommissionen om, hvorfor Kommissionen vil gøre vores mad dårligere og mere usund, for det er det, denne historie handler om!

Vi tager i Miljøudvalget vores opgave med at beskytte de europæiske borgere alvorligt, og derfor så appellerer vi til forsigtighedsprincippet. Vi afventer EFSA's vurdering af phosphaterne i 2018, inden vi synes, at der skal ske nogen ændringer. Det er derfor, at vi ønsker status quo, det er derfor, vi kommer med denne indsigelse.

Bart Staes, Auteur. – Ik sluit me volledig aan bij wat Christel Schaldemose heeft gezegd. Dit debat gaat niet over het verbieden van kebab. Dit debat gaat erover dat de huidige wetgeving, die duidelijk verbiedt dat fosfaten worden toegevoegd aan vleesbereidingen, gehandhaafd moet blijven. Daarom verzetten wij ons tegen het voorstel van de Commissie om dit alsnog toe te laten. Ja, er zijn problemen in de lidstaten. Ja, er zijn discussies in sommige lidstaten of kebab nu een vleesbereiding is dan wel een vleesproduct. Maar dan is het aan de Commissie om de lidstaten te helpen, om de controles op te voeren, om ze daar te begeleiden. Ik heb daarover nog een amendement ingediend dat de toestand verduidelijkt.

Mevrouw Sommer, u hebt het verzet geleid in Duitsland en ik neem u dat zeer kwalijk omdat u dat op een populistische, oneerlijke manier hebt gedaan. Dit hoort niet. Het toevoegen van fosfaten in kebab is niet toegelaten. Dat zegt de regelgeving.

Er zijn maar drie redenen waarom de Commissie daarvan kan afwijken en die fosfaten alsnog kan opnemen in een positieve lijst. Mevrouw Schaldemose heeft ze opgesomd. Het moet duidelijk zijn of ze al dan niet schadelijk zijn voor de volksgezondheid. Er zijn voldoende studies die daar twijfel over uiten. Zelfs EFSA heeft tot op heden geen conclusief antwoord gegeven en EFSA heeft besloten een overzichtsstudie te maken, een overzichtsstudie die pas eind december 2018 wordt afgesloten. Het voorzorgsbeginsel zegt dan dat we eventjes moeten wachten totdat er duidelijkheid is.

Ten tweede moet er zekerheid zijn dat er een alternatief is. Uit het debat dat de jongste dagen en weken gevoerd is in de pers blijkt dat er alternatieven zijn, alternatieven waarbij er geen E-nummers worden toegevoegd aan kebabbereidingen, die veilig zijn, die gezond zijn. Als dat kan – en daarover heb ik ook een amendement ingediend – dan wordt het duidelijk dat het verzet van mevrouw Schaldemose en van mijzelf effectief geen verzet is tegen de kebabindustrie of tegen de werknemers in de Duitse vleesindustrie.

Ten slotte is het inderdaad zo dat er ook fosfaten worden toegevoegd aan andere producten zoals hamburgers, zoals worsten, zelfs aan frisdranken. Als de studie van EFSA straks zegt dat die schadelijk zijn voor de volksgezondheid, dan moet u die producten maar schrappen van de positieve lijst.

Vytėnė Povilė Andriukaitė, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the application concerning the use of phosphates in frozen vertical meat spits received in 2015 has been discussed in detail several times by the Working Party of Governmental Experts on Additives as regards the fulfilment of the conditions for inclusion in the Union list and the use of food additives. These conditions are defined in the Regulation on Food Additives. They provide that a food additive may be included in the Union list only if: firstly, it does not pose safety concerns; secondly, there is a reasonable technological need; thirdly, the issue does not mislead consumers; and, fourthly, its use has advantages and benefits for the consumer.

Let me briefly set out the evidence that all these conditions are fulfilled for this application. Regarding safety, the safety of phosphates was evaluated by the Scientific Committee for Food before 1991, and the maximum tolerable daily intake of 70 milligrams per kilogram of body weight expressed as phosphorous was established. Current authorisations are based on this evaluation. Phosphates are authorised for use in a wide variety – I would like to draw your attention to this – of foods, including meat products and certain meat preparations. The extension of their use to frozen vertical meat spits does have a significant impact on overall exposure to phosphates. I would like to draw your attention to this because it is very important.

Following a request from the Commission, in 2013 the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) assessed a published review on health risks associated with phosphate additives. In the light of this assessment, EFSA did not question the conclusions of opinion of the Scientific Committee for Food. The Commission regulation setting up a programme for the re-evaluation of approved food additives requires EFSA to re-evaluate the safety of all food additives approved before 20 January 2009. The end of 2018 was set as a deadline for the re-evaluation of phosphates. All the relevant and most up-to-date scientific evidence will no doubt be collected and evaluated.

The Commission closely follows the re-evaluation programme and considers appropriate risk management measures, when needed, on the basis of published opinions. Pending the publication of the new EFSA opinion on phosphates, the health-based guidance value established in the opinion of the Scientific Committee for Food remains valid.

Regarding technological needs, the technological need was recognised for certain meat spits, as specified in the draft regulation. Phosphates are needed, in particular, for the stabilisation of meat spits and for bonding meat pieces together to ensure homogenous freezing and to prevent the risk of unbalanced heat treatment or of raw or burnt spots. This is very important from a health point of view. Economically and technologically practical alternatives were not identified.

As regards not misleading the consumer, if added water makes up more than five percent of the weight of the finished product, according to the applicable European Union legislation, it has to be explicitly mentioned in business-to-business trade. As regards water in roasted meat spits, as consumed, the data provided by the applicant demonstrated that the use of phosphates does not lead to any additional water content. As a result of the heat treatment, additional water is not retained despite the addition of phosphates.

Finally, let me address the advantages and benefits for the consumer. Phosphates ensure homogenous freezing and prevent the risk of unbalanced heat treatment or of raw or burned spots. The avoidance of raw parts or burned spots results in a better quality and tastier product for the consumer.

For the reasons I have set out, the Commission is of the opinion that the draft regulation fulfils all the relevant requirements of the Regulation on Food Additives.

Renate Sommer, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Einspruch der Sozialdemokraten und der Grünen ist reine Panikmache, er ist ignorant und er ist verantwortungslos. Warum? Phosphate sind bei vielen Lebensmitteln zugelassen, aber sie sind auch in vielen Lebensmitteln natürlich enthalten. Würde das wirklich so stark die Gesundheit gefährden, wären wir alle längst todkrank. Und warum, liebe Sozialdemokraten, hatten Sie eigentlich 2014 mit Phosphat im Kassler überhaupt kein Problem? Was haben Sie gegen Döner Kebab? Ein Döner enthält gerade mal 134 Milligramm Phosphate. Das ist ein Bruchteil der 4 200 Milligramm Phosphat pro Tag, die die EFSA für unbedenklich erklärt. Außerdem sind Phosphate im gegrillten Döner ja längst erlaubt. Und übrigens: Die EFSA – der Kommissar sagte es – prüft alle Lebensmittelzusatzstoffe, nicht nur Phosphat, weil es unter Umständen so gefährlich sein kann; das stimmt ja nicht.

Ignorant ist die Behauptung, Döner brauche kein Phosphat. Im Gegenteil: Ohne Phosphat kein Döner, sondern ein zusammengesackter Fleischhaufen, außen verbrannt, innen noch roh, ein Hygienierisiko. Der technische Bedarf existiert also, und einen Ersatzstoff gibt es eben nicht, auch Tapiokamehl ist für Döner Kebab nicht brauchbar, und das enthält übrigens auch noch Phosphat.

Es gibt auch keine Irreführung des Verbrauchers wegen des Wasserzusatzes. Der Kommissar hat es gerade erklärt. Das zugesetzte Wasser verdampft hauptsächlich, wenn das Fleisch gar gegrillt wird.

Sämtliche Argumente des Entschließungsantrags sind also falsch, und trotzdem halten Sie daran fest? Ohne Grund gefährden Sie zigtausend Arbeitsplätze; das ist verantwortungslos. Es geht hier doch wirklich nur um eine technische Klarstellung, dass Phosphat im rohen Dönerspieß genauso erlaubt ist wie im fertig gegrillten. Ohne diese Klarstellung wird Phosphat im Döner verboten. Und genau das planen ja dann auch einige Mitgliedstaaten für diesen Fall. Sie werden kein Auge mehr zudrücken. Aber genau das fordert ja auch Ihr Entschließungsantrag: Sie wollen das Ende des Döner Kebabs in der EU. Wir wollen das nicht zulassen, das dürfen wir unseren Bürgern und Bürgerinnen nicht antun. Wir wollen den Döner retten.

Susanne Melior, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrter Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Frau Sommer, was Sie hier machen, ist Panikmache auf hohem Niveau. Sie sagen: Es gibt keinen Döner mehr, wenn wir morgen bei der Abstimmung diesem Einwand zustimmen. Ich will versuchen, darauf ganz sachlich zu reagieren und dieser Panikmache hier nicht weiter Vorschub zu leisten.

Unser Einwand richtet sich gegen eine Entscheidung der Kommission zur Ausnahmegenehmigung für den Zusatz von phosphathaltigen Zusatzstoffen in tiefgefrorenen Fleischspießen für Döner und Gyros. Der Zusatz von Phosphaten ist für Fleischzubereitungen nicht zugelassen, außer für genau definierte Ausnahmen. Zu diesen Ausnahmen gehören – das haben Sie richtig gesagt – Kassler oder auch Fleischbrät, das in Würsten verwendet wird. Streng genommen dürften seit Inkrafttreten der Lebensmittelzusatzverordnung im Jahr 2008 keine Phosphate für die Produktion von tiefgekühlten Fleischspießen verwendet werden. Wenn hier Lobbyismus erforderlich gewesen wäre, dann an dieser Stelle. Da haben Sie ja ausnahmsweise Recht. Hier gibt es eine Rechtslücke. Dazu gibt es aber gerade in Deutschland auch sehr verschiedene Auslegungen von Gerichten, etwa in einem Urteil aus München und in einem aus Augsburg – beide sind nicht identisch.

Die S&D-Fraktion ist nicht generell dagegen, dass auch für die tiefgefrorenen Fleischspieße diese Ausnahme gewährt werden sollte. Allein der Zeitpunkt ist für uns überhaupt nicht nachvollziehbar. Die Europäische Lebensmittelbehörde – und das hat der Kommissar auch nochmals bestätigt – überprüft gerade die Wirksamkeit von phosphathaltigen Zusatzstoffen. Die Ergebnisse werden bis Ende 2018 vorliegen. Dann haben wir also eine Neubewertung. Verehrter Kommissar, wenn die Bewertung aus dem Jahr 1991 stammt, ist sie schon sehr lange her, und da haben wir vielleicht inzwischen dazugelernt. Also sollten wir diese Bewertung abwarten und dann entscheiden, welche Lebensmittelprodukte auf der Ausnahmeliste verbleiben und welche entfernt werden sollten.

Also diese Panikmache, es würde keinen Döner mehr geben, ist völlig daneben. Döner lässt sich auch ohne phosphathaltige Zusatzstoffe produzieren. Das haben Sie eben falsch gesagt, Frau Sommer, und das ist in den Medien auch mehrfach anders beschrieben worden, insbesondere vom größten Hersteller in Deutschland.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, to, jak se dnes dělá kebab ve stáncích na ulici, nemá pranic společného s tím, jak se má doopravdy dělat. Prodejci kebabu si za pár peněz nechávají vozit z Německa zmražené hroudy masa, které jsou napíchané fosfátem, aby ušetřili, neboť maso tak nevysychá na grilu a prodávají ho se sníženými náklady za pár eur spotřebitelům. Současný postup nemá nic společného ani s vařením, tradičně se totiž tato pochutina dělá prokládáním různých druhů masa, různě tučných, a ne z látky nevábného tvaru i zápachu.

Jenom aby som si uviedomili, o čem tady mluvíme, kolegyně z S&D již zde vysvětlila, jak nesmyslná je argumentace skupiny PPE. Jestliže paní kolegyně říká, že chceme zachránit kebab, já bych si moc přála, aby primárně bylo i zájmem skupiny PPE chránit evropské občany. To je pro mě totiž daleko důležitější. A pokud existuje sebemenší podezření, tak se musím chovat dle principu předběžné opatrnosti, to znamená chovat se tak, abych občany riziku nevystavovala.

A tak, jak již zde bylo několikrát řečeno, vkládáte nám do úst něco, co prostě není pravda. My pouze chceme jediné, aby Komise zbytečně nespěchala, počkala si na to, jak evropská agentura celou tuto záležitost za rok posoudí a s těmi výsledky, jak se seznámíme, tak podle nich a podle toho, jak ty výsledky dopadnou, abychom se zachovali. Nevím, kam spěcháte vy, ale my nespěcháme nikam, kde bychom mohli ublížit evropským občanům.

Angelo Ciocca, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo oltre la mezzanotte, mezzanotte e due minuti, e siamo qui a parlare di un tema estremamente importante, che è la salute dei cittadini.

Siamo qui a dire stop a quei regolamenti europei che avvelenano ogni giorno i nostri cittadini. No a quei regolamenti che sono contro il buonsenso e contro la salute dei cittadini. Vogliamo un'Europa che lavori per salvaguardare l'alimentazione dei nostri cittadini, per salvaguardare la salute dei nostri cittadini. Non un'Europa che ogni giorno non perde occasione per fare regolamenti per avvelenare le tavole dei nostri cittadini e le bocche dei nostri cittadini.

Stasera addirittura si parla per salvare i kebab, ma prima di salvare i kebab, pensiamo di salvare, appunto, i cittadini europei. Siamo stufo! Il Natale 2017, che è alle porte, vede come regalo di questa Europa quello che ho in questo piatto. In questo piatto abbiamo insetti: questo è il regalo dell'Unione europea per i cittadini europei nel 2017, insetti per le tavole del 2018, da gennaio 2018. Qualcuno adesso per il Natale 2018 vuole regalare invece carne con fosfati. Ecco, noi vorremmo regalare salute, tranquillità nell'alimentazione ai nostri cittadini.

Io suggerisco che siano i Commissari a dare il buon esempio: iniziate voi a mangiare insetti arrostiti e a mangiare carne con fosfati, in modo tale che il popolo europeo potrà vedere gli effetti collaterali e tranquillizzarsi, se sono giusti o sbagliati quei regolamenti che ogni anno proponete al popolo europeo.

Esther Herranz García (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, en este caso, como en tantos otros, lo importante es dejar trabajar a la EFSA con total autonomía. Tenemos una excelente autoridad científica que es la encargada de emitir los dictámenes sobre los que basar nuestras decisiones políticas. La EFSA debe llevar a cabo una nueva evaluación como establece el Reglamento (UE) n.º 257/2010. Hasta entonces, a mi parecer, es obvio destacar que no procede hacer ningún tipo de juicio de valor y más aún cuando la información publicada por parte de esta Autoridad hasta este momento indica que no hay ningún indicio claro de riesgo para la salud, que es lo más importante: la salud de nuestros ciudadanos.

Por tanto, debemos rechazar esta objeción que pondría en riesgo la labor de muchas personas de manera directa o indirecta y esperar a su dictamen que, como el propio texto de la objeción indica, debe ser presentado en el plazo de un año. Si queda acreditado por la EFSA en el futuro que existe algún tipo de riesgo para la salud humana, seré la primera en apoyar esa reevaluación de esta sustancia. Hasta entonces, solo queda confiar en la labor científica de la Autoridad Europea, que es la que de verdad se preocupa por la salud de todos nuestros ciudadanos.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Evropska komisija je že pred leti priznala, da nekatere države članice kršijo evropsko zakonodajo, ki razen za posamične primere ne dovoljuje uporabe fosfatov v mesnih pripravkih. Danes je uporaba fosfatov pri pripravi kebabov in girosov torej prepovedana in želim, da tako tudi ostane. Navsezadnje je kebab večino svoje dobe preživel brez fosfatov.

Stroka nas opozarja, da obstajajo znaki povezav med dodatki fosfatov k hrani in povečanimi tveganji za srčno-žilna obolenja, da dodatki fosfatov poslabšujejo zdravje kosti in ledvic ter celo povečujejo smrtnost. Ne hitimo s širjenem nabora izjem, dokler EFSA ne objavi končnega poročila o vplivu fosfatov na hrano. Ne hitimo, ko gre za zdravje ljudi.

Ravnajmo raje modro in pri zdravju še poudarimo pomen preventive. Pravijo, da bi jutrišnje sprejetje ugovora imelo negativne posledice za posel. Jaz pa menim, da je preventiva veliko cenejša od kasnejšega zdravljenja.

Spoštovani, nihče od nas, ki podpiramo ugovor proti predlogu Komisije, ne želi prepovedati kebaba. Vsi, ki imamo otroke, dobro vemo, kako priljubljen je med mladostniki. Edino, kar zares želimo, je, da bi mladi in odrasli lahko kebab in druge podobne mesne pripravke uživali zdravo, brez nepotrebnih dodatkov fosfatov. Tudi tu je potrebno, torej utreti pot zdravim alternativam.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se domnívám, že tato půlnoční debata je možná více škodlivá zdraví než 100 mg fosfátu, který jsem dnes v uzenině zkonzumovala. V každém případě nyní jednáme o fosfátu v mraženém mase, protože část poslanců je chce prostě zakázat. Námitka proti opatření Komise je podle mě neopodstatněná. Domnívám se, že Komise správně reaguje na současnou praxi a nařízením zajišťuje větší transparentnost a jistotu spotřebitelům i výrobcům. Fosfáty jsou již dnes výslovně připuštěny v čerstvém mase a je zcela konzistentní, aby tomu tak bylo i v mase mraženém. Pokud by se prokázala závadnost v budoucnu, je možné samozřejmě s tímto limitem dále pracovat.

Jak víme, tak fosfáty se používají jednak k výraznější chuti a vůni masa. Používání fosfátu není jistě ideální, mělo by docházet k jeho snižování, což se také děje, a to pod tlakem regulace anebo také za účelem kvality. Výrobci se snaží zlepšit tuto kvalitu a sami dobrovolně snižují obsah těchto látek. Naše role je zajistit především zdravotní nezávadnost. Samozřejmě tedy souhlasím s tím, abychom byli velmi obezřetní, a proto také Komise povoluje pouze minimální množství fosfátu. Naše role je v tomto tedy jasná a opatření Komise jde tímto směrem, proto její návrh regulace podporuji. Úplný zákaz považuji za čistě populistické gesto, se kterým nesouhlasím.

Ivo Belet (PPE). – Ik ben hier net in de buurt van het Parlement nog een heerlijke kebab gaan kopen. Ik zal hem nu niet opeten, Commissaris, anders moet ik met volle mond spreken tegen u en tegen mijn collega's. Dus ik ga hem straks opeten, met heel veel goesting.

Ik denk toch niet dat het de bedoeling is dat we die kebab nu ineens gaan verbieden omdat sommigen hier in Huis een ideologische en een of andere betuttelende kruistocht zijn begonnen. Wij zijn ook begaan met de volksgezondheid. Volksgezondheid is een van onze prioriteiten, zeker voor dit Europees Parlement en voor de Europese Commissie. Maar laten we alsjeblieft ophouden met paniekzaaielij. Daar is helemaal geen reden toe.

Als je te veel van die kebabs eet, als je er twee of drie per dag eet, ja, uiteraard is dat te veel en dan kan dat je gezondheid aantasten, maar dat geldt ook voor frieten, dat geldt ook voor frisdranken, noem maar op.

Dus laat het Europees Voedselagentschap, zoals meneer Peterle het terecht opmerkte, zijn werk doen. Als het onderzoek naar de toegevoegde bestanddelen zoals fosfaat in onze voeding is afgerond, dan kunnen wij een oordeel vellen. Maar laten we alstublieft intussen toch niet deze kebab verbieden. Want als we logisch zijn met onszelf dan moeten we vandaag ook een verbod instellen op allerlei soorten kazen en op frisdranken en op allerlei andere vleeswaren. Dat zou toch te gek zijn.

Dus smakelijk en een goeie avond.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als neues Mitglied des Hauses ist das mein erster voller Plenartag.

Eigentlich freue ich mich, dass ich gleich dem Grundsatz von Montesquieu entsprechend handeln kann, der gesagt hat: „Wenn es nicht nötig ist, ein Gesetz zu machen, dann ist es nötig, kein Gesetz zu machen“. In diesem Fall, Kebab betreffend, müsste man sagen: Wenn es nicht nötig ist, ein Verbot zu machen, dann ist es nötig, kein Verbot zu machen.

Es scheint mir hier nach Studium der Unterlagen und nach den Beratungen klar zu sein, dass es hier nötig ist, kein Verbot zu machen, weil der Phosphatgehalt im Kebab viel, viel geringer ist als in vielen Speisen und übrigens auch Getränken, die wir ständig zu uns nehmen.

Wenn Frau Kollegin Sommer, die dankenswerterweise dieses Thema aufgegriffen hat, um nicht zur Überregulierung auf europäischer Ebene beizutragen, Populismus vorgeworfen wird, wie das gerade gemacht wurde, dann richtet sich das deshalb selbst, weil ja die Angstmache, die dahinter steckt, wenn versucht wird, zentralistisch von unserer Seite hier einzugreifen in etwas, was den Alltag der Bürgerinnen und Bürger betrifft, der eigentliche Populismus ist.

Deshalb freue ich mich, in der kommenden Abstimmung gegen den Einwand gegen den Kommissionsvorschlag stimmen zu dürfen und klar zu machen: Die Europäische Union kümmert sich um wichtige Themen, wie in der nächtlichen Debatte heute schon geschehen – Israel, Menschenrechte, Libyen, Hongkong –, und sie betreibt keine Überregulierung, indem beispielsweise der Kebab verboten wird.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I have listened very carefully to the comments made and the views expressed. Let me assure the honourable Members that all the concerns have been considered by the Commission services and discussed with Member State experts on food additives. We had very thorough debates.

Of course, health is the main concern of the Commission, and personally I am very concerned about people's health. The draft regulation received the strong support of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed on 25 September 2017, and not one Member State questioned the safety of the proposed use.

Some colleagues made some emotional expressions, and I would like to draw attention to a comment by Angelo Ciocca, in which he proposed that I taste insects. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that, in the New Testament, Saint John the Baptist ate grasshoppers with wild honey. It is an old story, and it was tasty and healthy. At this very important time, do not disseminate messages which are not reality.

I would like to repeat that the Commission is firmly of the view that the draft regulation fulfils all the relevant legislative requirements. Thank you very much indeed, and I wish you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom. A szavazásra holnap, 2013. december 13-án, 12.00-kor kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Statystyki wskazują, że codziennie obywatele krajów UE spożywają kilkaset ton mięsa w kebabach. Musimy pamiętać, że rynek produkcji mięsa na kebab to m.in. firmy działające na tym rynku, a za każdą firmą stoją liczne miejsca pracy w gastronomii, o czym musimy pamiętać, rozpatrując ekonomiczne aspekty tego zagadnienia. Wyniki przeprowadzonych badań nie pozwalają jednak jednoznacznie stwierdzić, czy istnieje związek przyczynowo-skutkowy między ryzykiem zachorowań a spożywaniem fosforanów. Uważam, że decyzje konsumenckie powinny być oparte na wiarygodnej informacji na temat produktów oferowanych do sprzedaży i których spożywanie zaważyć może na naszym zdrowiu. Dlatego też musimy być ostrożni w podejmowaniu ostatecznych decyzji dotyczących zakazu bądź jego braku w przypadku fosforanów i zamiast dokonywać tego wyboru już dziś, pozwólmy, aby EFSA dokonała ponownej oceny bezpieczeństwa fosforanowych dodatków do żywności, która ma być dokonana do 31 grudnia 2018 r. Pamiętajmy, że jedna porcja kebabu to ok. 134 mg fosforanów, więc jedząc go regularnie przez rok, spożylibyśmy ich taką ilość, jaka znajduje się w 1,5 l butelce coca-coli. Każdego dnia przecież spotykamy się z substancjami, które spożywane w nadmiarze szkodzą, lecz ich odpowiedzialna konsumpcja oraz realizowane np. kampanie informacyjne pozwalają na podjęcie świadomych decyzji konsumenckich i jednocześnie pozwalają zadbać o zdrowie mieszkańców UE.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *písemně*. – Námitka týkající se používání fosforečnanů ve zmrazených masných homolích pro vertikální grilování reaguje na návrh Komise, jehož cílem je aktualizace jedné z příloh stávajícího nařízení o potravinářských přídatných látkách. Návrh má v praxi legalizovat používání fosforečnanů (a několika dalších tzv. éček) u uvedeného typu mas. Schvalování používání aditiv v potravinách je legislativně postaveno na splnění tří předpokladů: aditiva musí být bezpečná, jejich použití technologicky opodstatněné a nesmí uvádět spotřebitele v omyl. V případě používání fosforečnanů však panují obavy, že není splněno žádné z výše uvedených kritérií, a zejména zdravotní aspekt je nutně důkladně zvážit před tím, než by obecný zákaz používání přídatných látek z fosforečnanů v masných polotovarech měl být jakkoliv revidován.

20. Dnevni red sljedeće dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik

21. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice

(Az ülést 00.13-kor rekesztik be.)

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 predstavke
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