

C/2024/3406

31.5.2024.

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 13. RUJNA 2018.

(C/2024/3406)

EUROPSKI PARLAMENT

ZASJEDANJE 2018. – 2019.

Dnevne sjednice od 10. do 13. rujna 2018.

STRASBOURG

Sadržaj	Stranica
1. Otvaranje sjednice	4
2. Odgovor EU-a na požare iz srpnja 2018. u Matiju u grčkoj regiji Atici (podneseni prijedlozi rezolucija): vidi zapisnik	4
3. Prijetnja rušenja Khan al-Ahmara i drugih beduinskih naselja (podneseni prijedlozi rezolucija): vidi zapisnik	4
4. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (rasprava)	4
5. Dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (rasprava)	14
6. Rasprave o kršenjima ljudskih prava, demokratskih načela i vladavine prava (rasprava)	25
6.1. Uganda, uhićenje oporbenih parlamentarnih zastupnika	25
6.2. Mjanmar, posebno slučaj novinara Wa Lonea i Kyawa Soe Ooa	31
6.3. Kambodža, posebno slučaj Kema Sokhe	36
7. Nastavak zasjedanja	41
8. Govor Zorana Zaeva, premijera bivše jugoslavenske republike Makedonije	41
9. Nastavak zasjedanja	45

Sadržaj	Stranica
10. Glasovanje	45
10.1. Uganda, uhićenje oporbenih parlamentarnih zastupnika (RC-B8-0364/2018, B8-0364/2018, B8-0365/2018, B8-0367/2018, B8-0368/2018, B8-0372/2018, B8-0378/2018) (glasovanje) ..	45
10.2. Mjanmar, posebno slučaj novinara Wa Lonea i Kyawa Soe Ooa (RC-B8-0371/2018, B8-0371/2018, B8-0374/2018, B8-0376/2018, B8-0379/2018, B8-0380/2018, B8-0381/2018, B8-0382/2018) (glasovanje)	45
10.3. Kambodža, posebno slučaj Kema Sokhe (RC-B8-0366/2018, B8-0366/2018, B8-0369/2018, B8-0370/2018, B8-0373/2018, B8-0375/2018, B8-0377/2018) (glasovanje)	45
10.4. Sporazum o suradnji između Eurojusta i Albanije (A8-0275/2018 - Laura Ferrara) (glasovanje) .	45
10.5. Zaštita pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka u institucijama, tijelima, uredima i agencijama Unije i slobodno kretanje takvih podataka (A8-0313/2017 - Cornelia Ernst) (glasovanje)	45
10.6. Jedinstveni digitalni pristupnik (A8-0054/2018 - Marlene Mizzi) (glasovanje)	45
10.7. Odluka o stupanju u međuinstitucijske pregovore: Popis trećih zemalja čiji državljani moraju imati vizu pri prelasku vanjskih granica i zemalja čiji su državljani izuzeti od tog zahtjeva (Kosovo*) (A8-0261/2016 - Tanja Fajon) (glasovanje)	46
10.8. Odgovor EU-a na požare iz srpnja 2018. u Matiju u grčkoj regiji Atici (RC-B8-0388/2018, B8-0388/2018, B8-0390/2018, B8-0391/2018, B8-0392/2018, B8-0393/2018, B8-0394/2018) (glasovanje)	46
10.9. Prijetnja rušenja Khan al-Ahmara i drugih beduinskih naselja (B8-0383/2018, RC-B8-0384/2018, B8-0384/2018, B8-0385/2018, B8-0386/2018, B8-0387/2018, B8-0389/2018) (glasovanje) ..	46
10.10. Europska strategija za plastiku u kružnom gospodarstvu (A8-0262/2018 - Mark Demesmaecker) (glasovanje)	46
10.11. Mogućnosti za poboljšanje povezanosti zakonodavstva o kemikalijama, proizvodima i otpadu (B8-0363/2018) (glasovanje)	46
10.12. Europski akcijski plan „Jedno zdravlje” za borbu protiv antimikrobne otpornosti (A8-0257/2018 - Karin Kadenbach) (glasovanje)	46
10.13. Europa u pokretu: program za budućnost mobilnosti u EU-u (A8-0241/2018 - István Ujhelyi) (glasovanje)	46
10.14. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (A8-0268/2018 - Pavel Poc) (glasovanje)	46
10.15. Dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (A8-0267/2018 - Olga Sehnalová) (glasovanje)	46
11. Obrazloženja glasovanja	46
11.1. Zaštita pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka u institucijama, tijelima, uredima i agencijama Unije i slobodno kretanje takvih podataka (A8-0313/2017 - Cornelia Ernst)	47
11.2. Jedinstveni digitalni pristupnik (A8-0054/2018 - Marlene Mizzi)	47
11.3. Europska strategija za plastiku u kružnom gospodarstvu (A8-0262/2018 - Mark Demesmaecker)	47
11.4. Europski akcijski plan „Jedno zdravlje” za borbu protiv antimikrobne otpornosti (A8-0257/2018 - Karin Kadenbach)	48

Sadržaj	Stranica
11.5. Europa u pokretu: program za budućnost mobilnosti u EU-u (A8-0241/2018 - István Ujhelyi) .	49
11.6. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (A8-0268/2018 - Pavel Poc)	49
11.7. Dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (A8-0267/2018 - Olga Sehnalová)	50
12. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik	50
13. Nastavak zasjedanja	50
14. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	51
15. Sastav odbora i izaslanstava: vidi zapisnik	51
16. Dulja zastupnička pitanja (rasprava)	51
17. Podnošenje dokumenata: vidjeti zapisnik	57
18. Odluke o određenim dokumentima: vidjeti zapisnik	57
19. Predstavke: vidjeti zapisnik	58
20. Prosljeđivanje tekstova usvojenih na dnevnoj sjednici: vidjeti zapisnik	58
21. Kalendar sljedećih dnevnih sjednica: vidi zapisnik	58
22. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice	58
23. Prekid zasjedanja	58

DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE OD 13. RUJNA 2018.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

1. Otvaranje sjednice

(Se abre la sesión a las 8.30 horas).

2. Odgovor EU-a na požare iz srpnja 2018. u Matiju u grčkoj regiji Atici (podneseni prijedlozi rezolucija): vidi zapisnik

3. Prijetnja rušenja Khan al-Ahmara i drugih beduinskih naselja (podneseni prijedlozi rezolucija): vidi zapisnik

4. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (rasprava)

El presidente. – El primer punto del orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Pavel Poc, en nombre de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria, sobre la aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n.º 1107/2009 relativo a los productos fitosanitarios (2017/2128(INI)) (A8-0268/2018).

Pavel Poc, zpravodaj. – Pane předsedající, máme na stole zprávu o implementaci nařízení o přípravcích na ochranu rostlin. Já bych rád poděkoval všem stínovým zpravodajům, Evropské komisi, a zejména výzkumné službě Evropského parlamentu. Byla to vynikající práce, na této věci jsme pracovali více než půl roku. Zvykli jsme si tvrdit, že evropský systém schvalování pesticidů je nejpřísnější na světě. Ano, to je pravda, systém ano. Ale když jsme poprvé přezkoumali jeho zavedení do praxe, zjišťujeme, že je bohužel tento systém znehodnocen nerespektováním, obcházením, zneužíváním, malou transparentností, a to jak na úrovni naší, na úrovni EU, tak na úrovni členských států. Nařízení týkající se pesticidů bohužel není plně implementováno a zásada předběžné opatrnosti je často ignorována, současný stav by mohl snadno znamenat ohrožení zdraví Evropanů i ohrožení druhové rozmanitosti, ekosystému nebo půdy.

Jenom pár skutečností, které nám tento výzkum ukázal. Na unijním trhu najdeme řadu přípravků, které nejsou více jak 15 let přehodnoceny. Evropská komise v tomto směru činí i docela podstatné kroky, věřím, že její práce bude úspěšná. Nouzová povolení, která mají být striktně využívána pouze v případech, kdy je ohrožená rostlinná produkce, jsou členskými státy pravidelně zneužívána k obcházení klasického autorizačního procesu s potenciálně dalekosáhlými zdravotními důsledky. Případ neonikotinoidů, které jsme kvůli zdraví včel na úrovni EU dočasně zakázali, a ten zákaz v mnoha státech vůbec nevešel v platnost, protože byly právě tímto způsobem povoleny, hovoří za všechny.

Na naší evropské úrovni je občas zneužívána tzv. *confirmatory procedure*, bohužel se nám dostávají na trh přípravky, u kterých není ukončen výzkum, u kterých nevíme přesně, jaké mají důsledky, nejsou dostatečná data. Mimo jiné díky tomu máme dnes na trhu mnoho herbicidů, jejichž účinnou složkou je stejná látka, jako byla v neblaze proslulém *Agent Orange*. U mnoha pesticidů neznáme dlouhodobé dopady na biologickou rozmanitost, naprosto nedostatečně vyhodnocujeme účinek na půdu, půdní makroorganismy i mikroorganismy. Neumíme se vypořádat s koktejlovým efektem, neumíme se vypořádat s dlouhodobým vystavením organismů těmto látkám a těmto důsledkům. I kdyby však všechno probíhalo dokonale, na konci toho procesu máme Stálý výbor pro rostliny, zvířata, potraviny a krmiva, který je více-

méně anonymní a nemusí se v zásadě řídit vůbec ničím ani vědou.

Tato zpráva je zprávou implementační, nic více, nic méně. Snažili jsme se držet se závěrů výzkumné studie, je mi trochu líto některých poněkud emociálních a bohužel nepravdivých pozměňovacích návrhů. Příkladem za všechny je pozměňovací návrh Evropské lidové strany, kterým bezelstně podpořila další pravicové frakce a který říká, že se počet pesticidů dostupných na evropském trhu snižuje. Není to pravda, Evropská komise v tomto směru dělá opravdu dobrou práci a podle veřejné databáze Evropské komise je dnes v Evropě dvakrát tolik přípravků povolených, než tomu bylo v roce 2009.

Tato zpráva je velmi dobře načasovaná, její závěry, výsledky výzkumu i návrhy si může osvojit zvláštní výbor PEST, který má navrhnout vylepšení našeho evropského autorizačního systému pesticidů. Její výsledky jsem použil také pro práci na návrhu nařízení o transparentnosti a udržitelnosti hodnocení rizik v potravinovém řetězci. Tento Parlament bohužel nemá samostatnou zákonodárnou iniciativu a doufám, že nám Evropská komise pomůže navrhnout nutné úpravy legislativy. Některé zjištěné nedostatky již návrhy Evropské komise napravují, na nápravu jiných si ještě počkáme. Tato zpráva ale v každém případě pomůže ve všech dalších plánovaných krocích při vylepšení této legislativy.

Peter Jahr, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Landwirtschaftsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, liebe anwesende Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Manchmal ist es wie beim Schreiben eines Aufsatzes: Das Thema ist so interessant, da gäbe es so viel zu sagen, und dann schreibt und schreibt man, und manchmal kann man das ursprüngliche Kernthema und die Kernproblematik gar nicht mehr erkennen.

Ich möchte noch mal an das eigentliche Thema erinnern. Das eigentliche Problem war: Wird das europäische Zulassungs- und Genehmigungsverfahren den selbstgerechten Zielen gerecht? Und da muss ich aus unserer Sicht sagen: dreimal Nein. Es sollte unbürokratischer werden: Ziel nicht erreicht. Es sollte eine europaweite zonale Zulassung etabliert werden: Ziel nicht erreicht. Und es sollte transparenter und preiswerter werden: auch da das Ziel nicht erreicht.

Hauptproblempunkt bleibt, dass wir zwar eine länderübergreifende zonale Zulassung haben, aber dass trotzdem die gegenseitige Anerkennung der Mitgliedstaaten ausbleibt. Das führt dann in der Praxis dazu, dass auf der einen Seite des Flusses in Österreich ein Mittel angewendet werden darf, und auf der anderen Seite des Flusses in Deutschland steht die nationale Genehmigung mit mehrjähriger Verzögerung noch aus. Hier gilt es auch, eine gewisse nationale Genehmigungsarroganz zu überwinden. Ich bitte einfach darum, dass wir in der Rage der Diskussion und der Problematik dieses Kernthema in der politischen Tagesdebatte nicht vergessen. Mit der Bitte verknüpfe ich auch das Dankeschön an unsere Berichterstatter und unsere Schattenberichterstatter, die teilweise den Bericht entschlackt haben.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am delighted to attend today's plenary session and to discuss the implementation of European Union legislation on plant protection products. Your own-initiative report will make a valuable contribution to our ongoing work on this important topic.

I want to start by stressing that we share common concerns and common goals: first of all, to protect citizens' and animal health; second, to safeguard the environment; and third, to maintain food safety. All three goals are common to all of us. We share these with Europeans, who are increasingly interested and engaged in how we produce food and want to ensure this is done in a sustainable way. This is very much the debate at the moment. In response, Europeans expect – and rightly so – policy-making to be more open, more inclusive and more transparent. We can only meet these expectations if we work together, learn together from recent challenges, and move forward together.

I also want to underline, with these expectations in mind, that the European Union has one of the strictest regulatory systems for pesticides in the world, as was just mentioned, but we see a lot of implementation difficulties. The system is based on science and requires a scientific evaluation of every active substance. The Commission has removed and will continue to remove active substances from the market if they are not safe. Let me stress that since the Plant Protection Products Regulation entered into force in 2011, 22 non-approval or non-renewal decisions have been taken, based on scientific evaluation. In fact, approval criteria are so strict that companies sometimes decide not to submit their substances for renewal because they do not expect them to pass this test. Substances expected to fall under the cut-off criteria see a particularly low rate of applications for renewal. This is a fact. The Commission does not hesitate, either, to restrict the use of certain substances – when justified – to protect non-target organisms like bees, as was just mentioned. The recent decision to ban outdoor use of three neonicotinoid substances is a good example.

This, I hope, demonstrates the Commission's commitment – and my personal commitment – but also some of the difficulties that the Commission faces. These decisions are often challenged and sometimes do not receive the support of a qualified majority of Member States. That is true. Before the summer, the Commission proposed a ban or restriction on the use of four substances. However, none of them received the necessary support from Member States.

I want to be clear that the legislation adopted by Parliament and the Council is very strict. At the same time, there is no such thing as a perfect system, so we should always look to refine it and incorporate lessons learned. I am pleased to read this own-initiative report and see it focuses on the same issues as the Commission's ongoing Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT) evaluation, which should be finalised in the first half of 2019. We are on the path to finishing our job.

Another important report will be the Special committee on the Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides (PEST Committee) report, which will be voted on in committee on 6 December and will also feed into the Commission's analysis as we move ahead. I am waiting for the PEST Committee report. I will actually be very eager to carefully collect and actually look at all contributions on the matter, including those from various stakeholders, academia and NGOs in the first place, and the report from the Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM). One point I need to be clear about, however, is that it is premature to envisage specific measures now. The evaluation needs to be finalised first before it can provide a solid evidence base for an appropriate course of action.

This is not the only area we are working on. Both the fitness check on the General Food Law and last year's European Citizens' Initiative on glyphosate called for greater transparency in EU risk assessment in the food chain and greater sustainability. I have proposed that the European Union General Food Law be revised with these goals in mind. They touch on several recommendations that you make in the implementation report. The proposal also aims to increase transparency and strengthen risk communication. This is correct. I am confident that it will result in significant benefits and improve citizens' trust and confidence. Trust in science is very important now.

There is no doubt that transparency is fundamental and I am very proud to have delivered on this. I was actually recently thanked and reminded of this on this occasion by a voice in this debate. A very active leader was Mr Burtscher-Schaden. He said this sentence to me: 'in March 2016, you stated that all studies should be disclosed because of an overriding public interest and two years after, in March 2018, you came with a strong legal proposal'. Thanks a lot. In other words, I promised and I delivered. Now it is up to all of us to move forward with our proposal.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) Committee has begun work on our proposal and the first draft report was published in July. I am pleased that the file is being handled quickly. I call on all of you to support this so that the legislative process can be finished within the current legislative term. From my point of view, it would help us to move in the right direction.

Beyond this, we are investing via research in a more sustainable future. To support the development of low-risk products of biological origin, the Commission has identified research areas under the Seventh Framework Programme and the Horizon 2020 programmes and has funded – or will fund – several projects on integrated pest management and biological control. No doubt this will take time. There is also the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive, which seeks to reduce the risk of pesticides to health and the environment. I know that Ms Jytte Guteland is also preparing a report in this respect and we will await its final conclusions.

Last year, a Commission report found wide variations between different national action plans linked to this Directive. This needs to change for all of us. Member States are currently reviewing these plans and must include clear, measurable goals and timetables. I call on you to lead focused debates on national action plans in your own individual Member States. This would be very helpful.

Thank you once again for your engagement and your report. I will follow your vote later today closely and I can assure you that your conclusions will be carefully considered in our REFIT evaluation. I look forward to continuing our joint work to improve transparency, trust and the overall sustainability of our food safety system.

Mairead McGuinness, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and to pick up on one of the points he made about sustainability and security for citizens, for the environment and for food safety. We are all concerned about those, Commissioner, so that's a point we took into account when we were looking at this legislation. We are also grateful to our own parliamentary research services for this rather large tome of a document, which is an impact assessment of legislation which is world class. I think we all agree with that: we have good legislation. What this report is about is making sure it's being implemented effectively.

Other colleagues have spoken about where the problems are in implementation, and they are at Member State level – a lack of coordination, perhaps a lack of trust – and they are things which can be rectified. I hope that the work of our rapporteur and colleagues in this Chamber will allow that to happen because it is really important.

I know that when this legislation was first being discussed there were a lot of concerns amongst farmers because they felt they would be left with no products to keep their plants healthy, to improve yields, or whatever. And I would point out that when we say we should ban this product or that product, without saying what the alternatives are and what the consequences are, it doesn't make us look good as legislators. So I would ask us to be very conscious of our language because – clearly, Commissioner, you are right – where a product has a problem it should not be used, but we also need to make sure that we have sufficient replacement products or systems so that farmers can manage their plant health, look after diseases and control weeds, in a way which is sustainable.

I am afraid that is where we have failed because we are not reassuring those who produce our food that we have them in mind when it comes to discussions and debates and legislation on plant protection products.

Karin Kadenbach, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, wertest Hohes Haus! Zuerst möchte ich mich bei unserem Kollegen Pavel Poc für seine hervorragende Arbeit bedanken, der man wirklich entnehmen kann, dass er ein Experte in diesem Bereich ist.

Die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die mich und meine Arbeit aus dem Gesundheits- wie auch aus dem Agrarausschuss kennen, wissen, dass es mir wichtig ist, dass sich die Bürgerinnen und Bürger bei der Zulassung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln auf die Einhaltung des gefahrenbasierten Ansatzes, so wie er diesem Gesetz zugrunde liegt, verlassen können. Zudem wurde dieser gefahrenbasierte Ansatz vor einiger Zeit um einen weiteren Grundsatz, das Vorsorgeprinzip, erweitert. Unter dem Aspekt, dass wir uns innerhalb der Union für eine nachhaltige Landwirtschaft aussprechen und diese entsprechend legislativ und finanziell unterstützen wollen, ist es mir wichtig, auch im Bereich der Zulassung und des Einsatzes von Pflanzenschutzmitteln die entsprechenden Rahmenbedingungen zu schaffen.

Wir rühmen uns, dass wir das beste und sicherste Zulassungsverfahren haben, was sich auch im Rahmen der Tätigkeit im Sonderausschuss für das Genehmigungsverfahren der EU für Pestizide immer wieder bestätigt und trotzdem massive Schwächen zeigt: So sind zum Beispiel die zahlreichen Ausnahmeregelungen, die nach Artikel 53 der gegenständigen Verordnung in den Mitgliedstaaten gewährt werden, äußerst besorgniserregend. Durch diese missbräuchliche Anwendung zum Inverkehrbringen eines Pflanzenschutzmittels, das nur in Notsituationen Anwendung finden sollte, werden auf unseren Märkten Mittel im Schnellverfahren zugelassen oder können bereits verbotene Mittel wieder zum Einsatz gebracht werden. Damit werden alle Grundsätze, die dem Schutz der Umwelt, der Gesundheit von Mensch und Tier dienen, einfach missachtet und das eigentliche Bewertungsverfahren umgangen.

Jan Huitema, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, wat we ook doen en welk landbouwmodel we ook gebruiken, het produceren van voedsel grijpt nu eenmaal in in de natuur. En het heeft een milieu-impact. Het is onze taak en de taak van de sector om die milieu-impact zo klein mogelijk te maken.

Daarom is een geïntegreerde gewasbeschermingsaanpak zo belangrijk. We moeten veel meer inzetten op voorkomen dat er een plaag uitbreekt dan genezen. Hoe doen we dat? Allereerst door veredeling, om gewassen te veredelen die beter bestand zijn tegen ziektes. Door ons meer te richten op bodemkwaliteit. Met ecologische innovaties, zoals het inzetten van insecten en micro-organismen, maar tegelijkertijd ook technologische innovaties, zoals precisielandbouw, maar dan als laatste redmiddel om ervoor te zorgen dat de oogst niet verloren gaat. Om voedselverspilling tegen te gaan, zijn chemische middelen soms nodig.

Wat belangrijk is om te beseffen is dat de toelatingsprocedure die we hier in Europa hebben voor de middelen de strengste ter wereld is. Waar ik naartoe wil is dat de zoektocht naar alternatieven, lagerisicomiddelen en biologische middelen sneller gaat, dat het toelatingssysteem daar gespecialiseerde mensen voor heeft en dat er meer mankracht en meer geld voor is om dit te gaan doen. Dát en dat bijvoorbeeld voor de kleine teelten, die nu nog niet zo'n laatste redmiddel hebben, ook bepaalde middelen beschikbaar komen.

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

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE), *blue-card question*. – I was pleased to hear the Commissioner say that this debate should be conducted in public and that all scientific studies should be made public. Today four Green MEPs are at the European Court of Justice arguing that the Monsanto studies on glyphosate should be in the public domain. I would like to ask Mr Huitema if he agrees with the Commissioner and with me that we should make our policy on the basis of public science and that secret science is not science.

Jan Huitema (ALDE), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Dank voor de vraag. Ik vind ook dat de wetenschap zoveel mogelijk leidend moet zijn en dat we daar zo transparant mogelijk over moeten zijn.

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich darf mich zunächst beim Berichterstatter für den Bericht bedanken. Das zeigt ja, dass das System erhebliche Mängel hat. Es ist nicht das Problem: zu viel Bürokratie oder zu teuer. Ganz im Gegenteil: Wir müssen das System besser machen und besser prüfen. Wir sehen doch, dass wir im Zulassungsverfahren erhebliche Mängel haben. Das Problem ist ganz klar eine mangelnde Transparenz. Und wir haben das Problem, dass Mitgliedstaaten nicht ordentlich umsetzen. Wie kann es denn sein, dass wir Neonikotinoide verbieten und andere Mitgliedstaaten aus Ausnahmegenehmigungen heraus dieses Mittel weiter zulassen? Das kann und darf nicht passieren.

Wir haben auch ein Problem bei der Bewertung von den Stoffen, was man ganz klar sagen muss, dass nämlich Umweltauswirkungen und Wirkungen auf Nutzinsekten in dem ganzen Verfahren überhaupt nicht genügend geprüft werden. Wir haben es ja bei Neonikotinoiden gesehen. Das Verfahren hat sich als falsch erwiesen, dass wir eigentlich 20 Jahre später merken, dass die Umweltauswirkungen von Neonikotinoiden erheblich größer sind als vorher gedacht.

Deshalb: Ja, wir sind uns einig. Wir müssen Alternativen zum Einsatz bringen. Aber da muss man auch Mittel darin investieren. Und wir müssen wirklich darauf achten, dass wir die Mittelanwendung von Chemie auf dem Acker senken. Das kann nicht so weitergehen.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, dit verslag gaat over gewasbeschermingsmiddelen. En dat is een hele gekke naam voor stoffen die niet zozeer bedoeld zijn om te beschermen, maar vooral om te doden.

De Commissie heeft de plicht om ervoor te zorgen dat alleen producten worden goedgekeurd die niet schadelijk zijn voor mensen, dieren of het milieu. De Europese Ombudsman concludeerde echter dat de Commissie veel te soepel is, waardoor veel stoffen ten onrechte op de markt blijven. Volgens voedselwaakhond Foodwatch houdt de Commissie honderden gifstoffen op de markt, al jarenlang, zonder dat er een wetenschappelijke beoordeling of evaluatie heeft plaatsgevonden. Hierdoor zijn zelfs een aantal stoffen nog op de markt die bewezen schadelijk zijn voor de gezondheid.

Landbouwgif met glyfosaat als symbool laat zien wat er mis is in Europa. Multinationals gaan boven milieu en geld, boven gezondheid. De speciale onderzoekscommissie naar de toelating van pesticiden zou een einde kunnen maken aan dit falende beleid. Helaas wordt er net als bij de Commissie ook in dit Parlement niet gewacht op de resultaten van dit onderzoek. Een gemiste kans. Net zoals de inhoud van dit verslag een gemiste kans is.

Het Parlement had de kans om achterdeurtjes te sluiten. Het Parlement had de kans om een oude gang van zaken te veranderen. Het had de kans om de vele gruwelijke dierproeven voor landbouwgif te stoppen. Maar het Parlement heeft die kansen laten liggen ten koste van dieren, mensen en het milieu. De toekomst van onze planeet staat op het spel. Ik vind het dan ook onbegrijpelijk dat het Parlement die kansen niet heeft aangegrepen.

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

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, si ce rapport est globalement pertinent, je m'étonne qu'il se félicite, je cite: «du fait que la Commission parvienne à la conclusion que l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) a fait preuve d'une grande transparence et a partagé des données dans les limites des règles de stricte confidentialité».

Je m'étonne également que le texte salue, je cite: «les efforts continus de l'EFSA pour améliorer son système afin de garantir son indépendance et la gestion des conflits d'intérêts potentiels».

En tant que coordinatrice pour mon groupe au sein de la commission spéciale PEST (Procédure d'autorisation des pesticides par l'Union) je n'ai pas le même ressenti vis-à-vis de l'EFSA, qui reste quand même au cœur de la controverse sur le glyphosate.

Si l'EFSA a copié-collé, dans ce rapport, une centaine de pages de l'industrie et si le Parlement a créé une commission spéciale sur la procédure d'autorisation des pesticides, gardons à l'esprit qu'il devait y avoir des raisons.

Joëlle Mélin, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, les différents scandales environnementaux et les hésitations et volte-face de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne les phytosanitaires et les phytopharmaceutiques comme le glyphosate montrent bien que les textes, fussent-ils européens, sont faits pour être contournés et sont donc inefficaces.

L'évaluation de la directive en cours montre à quel point le poids des lobbies joue contre les Européens et combien nos institutions sont faibles. Il est clair que toutes les études contradictoires écornent la crédibilité des organismes officiels et dans le même temps, les États membres sont freinés lorsqu'ils veulent appliquer le principe de précaution et de substitution. Il nous faut donc appliquer le plus tôt possible les principes d'indépendance et de transparence afin d'assurer notre sécurité sanitaire et notre sécurité alimentaire. Très sérieusement, la capacité de la Commission à améliorer la situation, non plus avec des mots et des incantations, mais avec des décisions fermes est aujourd'hui, elle aussi, écornée. Cette transparence et cette indépendance doivent s'imposer, elles aussi, à la Commission.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ce rapport sur la mise en œuvre du règlement sur les produits phytopharmaceutiques arrive à un moment où la question des pesticides est au cœur des débats en Europe. Les citoyens sont de plus en plus attentifs à ce qu'ils mettent dans leurs assiettes, à juste titre. D'ailleurs, une partie de la distribution européenne a emboîté le pas et a commencé à exclure certains produits phytosanitaires controversés de ses rayons.

En tant que parlementaires, notre rôle n'est pas de céder aux sirènes. Nous devons rester pragmatiques, vigilants et montrer une voie équilibrée. Il est de notre devoir de nous assurer que les procédures d'homologation des produits phytosanitaires sont claires et transparentes. Les citoyens ont le droit de savoir ce qu'ils mangent et ils doivent être rassurés sur les aliments qu'ils consomment. En ce sens, je souhaite soulever une aberration européenne: on ne peut importer des produits cultivés dans des pays tiers avec des substances qui, ici en Europe, sont interdites. Nous ne pouvons pas imposer à nos agriculteurs et aux consommateurs d'être les meilleurs élèves de la classe tout en important des produits qui ne respectent pas nos normes et nos standards. C'est le meilleur moyen de condamner notre agriculture.

Nous devons aller vers une agriculture plus respectueuse de l'environnement et plus rémunératrice pour les agriculteurs. C'est le sens du message que je porte dans ce Parlement sur la double performance environnementale et économique de l'agriculture européenne.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, «Nous voulons des coquelicots», voilà le mouvement qui a été lancé hier en France par des personnalités, des scientifiques, des artistes et des citoyens. Que veulent-ils? Ils réclament l'interdiction immédiate de tous les pesticides de synthèse. C'est un appel d'humains lancé à d'autres humains. Nous avons l'obligation d'avancer ensemble, et ce dans l'intérêt des 500 millions de citoyens européens, mais aussi et surtout – j'ai envie de dire – de nos agriculteurs, qui sont les premières victimes des pesticides, mais qui demandent les mêmes règles pour tous au sein du marché intérieur.

Nous devons agir en responsabilité, mais il y a urgence, et nous le savons. On ne peut pas faire comme s'il n'y avait pas de problème de fertilité, de puberté précoce, comme si 80 % des insectes ou 30 % de nos oiseaux n'avaient pas disparu et comme si les pollinisateurs n'étaient pas en danger de mort. La Commission européenne, Monsieur le Commissaire, doit appliquer, et nous le savons, le principe de précaution tel qu'il est prévu à l'article 191, paragraphe 2, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne. Aussi, j'espère que dans ses propositions futures, l'exécutif européen tiendra compte de nos recommandations formulées ici, mais aussi que notre commission d'enquête sur les pesticides, qui rendra ses travaux à la fin de cette année, en fera autant.

Je veux ici solennellement rendre un hommage particulier à mon collègue Pavel Poc pour cet excellent rapport qui est le fruit d'un véritable engagement de sa part sur ce sujet depuis maintenant plusieurs années.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Voorzitter, zoals steeds staat of valt een goede wetgeving met een goede uitvoering. Uit het verslag blijkt duidelijk dat een betere implementatie, een betere handhaving en monitoring van de bestaande wetgeving inzake gewasbeschermingsmiddelen nodig is. Ook om te vermijden, zoals al gezegd is, dat uitzonderingsmaatregelen als achterdeurtje worden gebruikt.

De N-VA-delegatie steunt dit verslag. We ijveren vooral voor een betere benutting van goede landbouwpraktijken, zoals de geïntegreerde plaagbestrijding. We onderschrijven zeker ook de vraag om de transparantie in de procedures te verhogen. Dat kan het vertrouwen alleen maar ten goede komen. Ook de oproep om in te zetten op onderzoek en innovatie, ook inzake biologische bestrijdingsmiddelen, kan op onze steun rekenen.

Tot slot wil ik benadrukken dat we voorstander zijn en blijven van een wetenschappelijk onderbouwd objectief en *evidence-based* beleid.

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, l'inquiétude des Européens ne cesse de s'amplifier au fil des crises, au fil des renoncements.

La saga glyphosate, on l'a dit, avec ce nouveau renouvellement de cinq ans, la crise des œufs contaminés au Fipronil – c'était l'été dernier – le feuilleton des néonicotinoïdes, insecticides tueurs d'abeilles qui a finalement abouti, lui, à l'interdiction, en mai dernier, de trois d'entre eux. Un constat s'impose: la législation relative aux pesticides n'est pas correctement appliquée par les États membres. Le recours abusif, notamment, aux autorisations d'urgence doit cesser.

En Belgique, c'est le recours à cette procédure, prévue à l'article 53, qui justifie qu'une substance aussi dangereuse pour les voies respiratoires que la chloropicrine soit encore utilisée sur les fraisiers en plein champ. Cela nous renvoie à l'application du principe de précaution qui, je le rappelle, est un principe d'action et non un encouragement à ne pas bouger, à ne rien faire.

Notre Parlement a un devoir impérieux en ce qui concerne les pesticides, comme pour d'autres produits. Il doit placer la santé des Européens au premier plan, comme le propose l'excellent rapport que je soutiens, bien évidemment, de notre collègue Pavel Poc.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, our natural world is facing Armageddon, with the loss of three quarters of insects and the collapse of ecosystems. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), at the current rate of soil loss, we have only 60 harvests left. The chemical dependency of our farming system is the root cause of this devastation. We need to change the way we farm, not only for nature's sake, but because we are destroying the very land we depend on for our survival.

The report we are debating highlights significant shortcomings in the approval process for pesticides and the control in their use across the EU. The Commission is handing out so-called 'emergency waivers' for farmers to use pesticides that we know are damaging to human health or the environment. There are also clear conflicts of interest here: with industry dictating much of the approval process, too much power is in the hands of agribusiness. Organic farmers everywhere are showing the way towards a truly sustainable farming system that provides a secure livelihood and a healthy future for all of us and for the ecosystem we depend on.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, intervengo, in primo luogo, condividendo le preoccupazioni espresse dalla mia collega di gruppo, l'on. Hazekamp, in merito all'andamento della commissione PEST, una commissione da cui avremmo voluto poter avere la possibilità di fornire degli elementi di assicurazione per la salute dei cittadini e in cui, invece, ci sembra che ancora una volta la politica non sia davvero al servizio della salute delle persone.

Io credo che oggi, con questa discussione, noi abbiamo il dovere di garantire tre cose: non solo l'armonizzazione, non solo la trasparenza, ma la certezza che il Parlamento europeo lavori antepoendo il principio di precauzione e la salute dei cittadini europei a qualsiasi altro tipo di interesse. Noi abbiamo il dovere di dimostrare questo, e credo che, diciamo, quest'Aula si assuma una responsabilità importante anche da questo punto di vista con questo voto.

Fatemi infine ricordare Fabian Tomasi, morto prematuramente a 53 anni per colpa del glifosato, fatemi rendere omaggio alla sua battaglia contro la Monsanto.

Anthea McIntyre (ECR). – Mr President, it is very important that we have a science-based, evidence-based approval process, and we do. This is a very rigorous process. Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is a very robust regulation and it's simply not true to say that the precautionary principle is clearly not being applied in the context of risk analysis regarding pesticides. No doubt, there are problems with the implementation in Member States, but the answer is not new regulation, it is actually the enforcement of the regulation we have. Too often in this place we decide we're going to create new regulation simply because we are not properly enforcing the regulation we have. That is very bad practice and we should stop. We need to enforce the regulation we have, and a part of that regulation is the possibility of emergency uses. We need the flexibility. We cannot have a one-size-fits-all answer for the whole of the EU. We have different conditions, we have climate changes coming along, so it is not national governments flouting the regulation; it is national governments responding to the specific needs of their farmers and their agriculture, and I support that.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Ich widerspreche Frau McIntyre hier. Wir haben unterschiedliche Wahrnehmungen. Im Pestizid-Ausschuss haben wir erkannt, dass die wissenschaftlichen Methoden, die die EFSA verwendet, teilweise 15 Jahre veraltet sind. Wir haben feststellen können, dass es faktisch keine Forschung gibt zur gemeinsamen Wirkung von Pestiziden. Wenn Sie einen konventionellen Apfel kaufen und essen oder ein Glas Wein trinken, haben Sie fünf bis zwanzig verschiedene Pestizide darin. Es gibt faktisch keine Forschung dazu. Es gibt neue toxikologische Methoden, die dringend in unsere Zulassungsverfahren eingeführt werden müssen.

Wir zerstören unsere Umwelt, wir zerstören unsere Landschaft, wir zerstören unsere Biodiversität mit dieser Form der Pestizidlandwirtschaft, wie wir sie heute hier vom Parlament aus fördern. Sogar die europäischen Jagdverbände unterstützen uns Grüne in unserem Kampf für eine Ökologisierung der Landwirtschaft, denn das sind auch die Leute, die draußen am Land sind und die sehen: Da gibt es keine Vögel mehr, da gibt es keine Insekten mehr, da gibt es keine Hasen mehr. Die sehen das, und sie sind mittlerweile auf unserer Seite.

Ich gebe Frau Delahaye absolut Recht: Es müssen für Produkte, die in die Europäische Union eingeführt werden, dieselben Standards gelten wie für uns Bäuerinnen und Bauern. Denn es ist nicht einzusehen, dass wir diesen Nachteil in der Konkurrenz haben. Wir brauchen eine neue Agrarpolitik, wir brauchen eine Ökologisierung der Agrarpolitik. Und ich rufe auch die Konservativen dazu auf, hier endlich zu erkennen, was das Gebot der Zeit ist.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, am ascultat cu atenție punctele de vedere și cred că toți avem un punct comun, și anume că vrem să avem o agricultură sănătoasă. Însă este nevoie de modificare și apreciez punctele de vedere ale raportorului.

Să ne gândim numai la sistemul unic de autorizare la nivelul Uniunii Europene cerut în acest raport. Este nevoie, domnule comisar, să avem un sistem unic și trebuie să și urmărim cum se implementează acest sistem unic de autorizare.

Apoi, recunoașterea reciprocă nu funcționează și eu cred că asta este datoria noastră: când nu funcționează ceva, să luăm măsuri.

Pe de altă parte, cercetarea trebuie să continue și s-a spus aici: atunci când agricultura nu are o anumită soluție, noi trebuie să o găsim și să o dăm, pentru că nu se poate ca agricultura să stea în loc. Avem o politică agricolă comună și suntem în competiție, până la urmă, cu alte piețe. Eu nu aș vrea să importăm din țări terțe și să omorăm agricultura din Uniunea Europeană însă, în același timp, trebuie să ne gândim la efectele dăunătoare, și aici trebuie să investim în cercetare.

Trebuie să lucrați, domnule comisar, împreună cu comisarul pentru agricultură și trebuie să vedem dacă am gândit bine investițiile în acest domeniu, pentru că, da, nu se poate să avem substanțe noi, nu se poate să avem o agricultură eficientă și competitivă în piața globală, dacă nu avem și un rezultat al cercetării adecvat.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, as we have the luxury of some time, I want to respond to a sense that I'm getting from this debate, and which a lot of us would feel, that organic agriculture is portrayed as the Holy Grail, and conventional agriculture as problematic. I perceive that as a problem in itself because I know that organic farmers need to use products on occasion – let's call them plant protection products – when there are difficulties. Equally, organic livestock farmers need to use animal health products when animals are sick. I think this division, this ideology, is unhelpful as we try to move towards sustainable agriculture, and I wish we would be less ideological in our discussions.

I want to support the point made by my colleague who talked about the importation of food into the European Union, where it may be produced using products which we are banning inside the European Union. Please, Commissioner, listen carefully to that point and do something about it.

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

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Präsident! Ja, Frau McGuinness, Sie haben völlig recht: Es gibt eine intelligente Form von Landwirtschaft und es gibt dumme Formen von Landwirtschaft. Es gibt eine Landwirtschaft, die sich an der Natur orientiert, und eine, die das nicht tut. Und ich sage keinesfalls, dass die gesamte konventionelle Landwirtschaft nicht intelligent ist und sich nicht an der Natur orientiert. Auch dort gibt es sehr gute Betriebe. Sie haben völlig Recht: Auch in der biologischen Landwirtschaft wird im Notfall ein Mittel eingesetzt, das minder giftig ist. Ich halte auch nichts davon, das hier auseinanderzuidividieren. Nur so zu tun, als ob in der konventionellen Landwirtschaft, vor allem in der agrarindustriellen konventionellen Landwirtschaft alles in Ordnung wäre – da kann ich einfach nicht mit.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE), blue-card answer. – I'm not sure what your question was. I have to say I disagree with your language. I think to use the words 'intelligent' versus 'stupid' in this debate is not helpful. Frankly, there are a lot of farmers who were up earlier than we were, trying to be intelligent farmers under very difficult circumstances. The point I make is that sometimes you need products. And please understand that conventional farmers do not want to use just any products, because they are costly, and we are working towards reducing the need to have these, but it is this ideological approach – that you cannot use any product – which will result in real problems in the food supply chain. I think we agree on most things, though perhaps not on the language.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for this fruitful debate. I listened very carefully to your proposals and suggestions, especially in relation to trade. When we are discussing our trade agreements with third countries, we are very much involved in debates about the use of pesticides which are banned in the EU. It is and will always be on our agenda.

Ms McGuinness rightly mentioned a less ideological approach in our debates. I was in Carcassonne a few weeks ago and had a meeting with organic farmers who were producing organic wine, and we have debates, which are not easy, about copper. Sometimes, too, I see how some are vocal about a ban on glyphosate, for example, knowing that a scientific assessment was done transparently. This is excluding the Monsanto Papers, which are always mentioned. It is not about the Monsanto Papers: it is about the possibility of really assessing the situation from an evidence-based point of view, from the precautionary principle, and about having arguments in our hands.

Look, ban glyphosate and copper, and what about organic farming? What can we do?

Ms McGuinness has very rightly raised questions. We need to understand the complexity of the issues and to see how we can achieve proper enforcement, implementation, control and integrated management. All this should, of course, be done in a proper manner.

About the use of derogations: yes, we sent letters to those Member States because we asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to assess once again all the issues related to the use of such derogations in the area of neonicotinoids. We assess the situation and then we inform governments once again, especially those who use them without evidence. We are doing our job. We are not scapegoating, which is always bad, bad, bad.

No! For me, as a medical doctor, there is no doubt that health is a priority, but if I am using medicines in animal health or plant health, or using medicines in treating people, I know what this means. We need to have a very balanced approach. I am, of course, ready to work together with you. We all share the same belief in achieving the goals regarding health, the environment and food safety. We need to work together to maintain and reinforce the European Union's very stringent regulatory system for pesticides. Enforcement and implementation are the key. I assure you that we are committed to working towards greater transparency, increased trust and more a sustainable system of food production.

Once again, thank you for your engagement and for your own-initiative report. We will be very sensitive to the report and we will see how it can be included in the whole picture, bearing in mind the possibility of having different assessments, and we will then propose to Parliament the further steps to be taken.

Pavel Poc, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank colleagues for a very important discussion. Apparently a majority of this House are aware that there are problems in the EU system for pesticide approval and the implementation of this system, either at EU or Member State level. I am grateful to the Commissioner for saying that this means something to the Commission. I look forward to the next time that we cooperate on this issue.

But there is one last thing that I would say to Ms McGuinness. I am sure that you adore science and you adore facts, so you simply cannot say that the number of available active substances is getting lower. I have a table of Commission statistics here. It says, very simply, that, in 2009, 224 active substances were approved, and in 2018, 490 active substances were approved at European level. So the number of available active substances on the European market is not going down. That is simply not true. I would like you to give us the possibility to vote in a split vote against this fake fact.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar hoy.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento interno)

Carolina Punset (ALDE), *por escrito*. – Desde la entrada en vigor de la Directiva relativa a los productos fitosanitarios de 2009, se han eliminado un gran número de sustancias peligrosas del mercado y se han autorizado otras con nuevos efectos, en principio menos perjudiciales para el ser humano pero que, en algún caso, han demostrado ser letales para las abejas y otros polinizadores, como los neonicotinoides, incomprensiblemente aún autorizados en cereales. Otras cuestiones que deberían abordarse en la nueva estrategia de biocidas, tal y como la propia Directiva determina, es la exclusión de las sustancias con capacidad de producir alteraciones endocrinas en personas y organismos no objetivo. Esta desidia en la aplicación de este criterio de exclusión, ha permitido la prórroga del uso de glifosato, cuyos efectos como regulador endocrino están demostrados por diferentes organizaciones, como lo está su efecto potencialmente cancerígeno. Además, debería desarrollarse con detalles el criterio de exclusión «tóxico para el medio ambiente» que, como se ha demostrado en el caso de los neonicotinoides, parece que no cuenta, ya que, aun siendo extremadamente perjudiciales para el medio ambiente, el uso de estas materias es legal. La Comisión debería establecer una definición clara de regulador endocrino y una descripción detallada de las toxicidades para el entorno de los fitosanitarios.

5. Dvojná kvalita proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (rasprava)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Olga Sehnalová, en nombre de la Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor, sobre la calidad dual de los productos en el mercado único (2018/2008(INI)) (A8-0267/2018).

Olga Sehnalová, zpravodajka. – Pane předsedající, vážené kolegyně a kolegové, od první interpelace mé a několika dalších kolegů, kterou jsme reagovali na první signály o dvojí kvalitě, uplynulo dlouhých sedm let. Sedm let od odpovědi Evropské komise, že v různých zemích existují různé chuťové a cenové preference, že přeci jsou ty potraviny nezávadné, tak o co jde. Kolegyně a kolegové, nejde o nic menšího, než o samotnou podstatu fungování vnitřního trhu. Už předchozí Parlament v roce 2013 vyzval Komisi, aby se tématu věnovala, vypracovala celoevropský průzkum a vyhodnotila účinnost stávající legislativy. Ale až po dalších pěti letech přesvědčování a dokazování, různých průzkumech je tu zpráva o dvojí kvalitě a jasná pozice Evropského parlamentu.

Chci poděkovat všem kolegyním a kolegům, kteří se během uplynulých let zasazovali o to, abychom toto vysoce politické a symbolické téma, které vypovídá o rovnosti, spravedlnosti a férovosti evropského vnitřního trhu, brali v Evropské unii vážně. Děkuji všem, kdo pomohli vysvětlovat zde, v Komisi i na Radě podstatu věci: totiž že opravdu není normální, aby výrobek, který vypadá pro spotřebitele na první pohled stejně, měl bez toho, aby o tom spotřebitel také na první pohled věděl, jiné složení. Že nejde o souboj mezi levandulí a fialkami, ale o menší obsah masa nebo jeho náhražky, horší kvalitu surovin, jejich různou jakost a poměr, více různých přídatných látek a podobně.

To, co chceme, je, aby spotřebitelé nebyli klamáni a měli právo na výrobky stejně kvalitní. Co divného je na požadavku: Značte stejně to, co je stejné, a jinak, co je jiné. Zkrátka a dobře: nedělat ze spotřebitelů, promiňte mi ten výraz, hlupáky. Osobní zkušenosti s dvojí kvalitou nejen potravin, ale i nepotravinářského zboží má totiž v našich zemích mnoho lidí. Že jde o chuťové preference? I u dětské výživy pro kojenče? Ale jděte. Ani přímá úměra cena versus kvalita zde zdaleka neplatí.

Jsem ráda, že se po loňském Junckerově projevu o stavu Unie rozhoupala i Evropská komise. Máme na stole výkladová doporučení, společnou metodiku testování, peníze na sbírání dalších důkazů. Plánuje se více testů v členských státech. Ale pozor. Už dnes máme k dispozici tvrdá data, výsledky testování v laboratořích renomovaných univerzit, jako např. v případě českého průzkumu, na kterém jsem se sama podílela. Je jisté dobré shromažďovat údaje na úrovni Unie. Ale to je po tolika letech frustrací spotřebitelů málo. Obzvláště, když se některé země, ve kterých byla dvojí kvalita odhalena, odmítají do celoevropského průzkumu zapojit.

Vážené kolegyně a kolegové, mnozí z vás mi jistě dají za pravdu, že úkolem politiků není předepisovat výrobcům, co a jak mají vyrábět. Cílem není unifikovat výrobky, vymýšlet jakousi jednotnou eurochuť. Preference spotřebitelů ale nesmí nadále sloužit jako záminka pro snižování kvality.

Většina spotřebitelů ani netuší, že výrobky stejné značky mohou být uzpůsobeny různým trhům. Pokud chce výrobce nabídnout zákazníkovi regionální úpravu, co mu brání, aby se k ní na obalu hrdě přihlásil? Chci přesné a na první pohled snadno srozumitelné informace o složení výrobku. To je základ. Členské státy také musí zavést nařízení o spolupráci národních dozorových orgánů pro ochranu spotřebitele. Musí sdílet údaje, poukazovat navzájem na nevyhovující výrobky i možné klamání spotřebitelů. Důležitá je také role spotřebitelských organizací. Jejich každodenní mravenčí práce při sledování trhu a vzdělávání spotřebitelů si moc vážím. Nemůžeme ale od nich ale čekat zázraky.

To, co je nejdůležitější z mého pohledu: chybí právní úprava na úrovni EU. Předpis, který jasně a bez možnosti odlišných výkladů stanoví, co je dvojí kvalita. Že prodávat na vnitřním trhu výrobky, které spotřebitel může snadno vnímat jako identické se záměrně jiným složením, je klamání spotřebitele.

Předpis, který zároveň přinese právní jistotu dozorovým orgánům, které se nebudou bát nákladných právních bitev s nadnárodními společnostmi. Ne proto, aby váš oblíbený nápoj chutnal všude stejně, ale aby nad sebou nepoctivci cítili reálnou možnost trestu, pokud nebudou jednat férově.

Vážené kolegyně a kolegové, věřím v poctivost většiny výrobců. Přesto, tam, kde chybí, jsou tady zákonodárci, aby se svých občanů, ať žijí v kterémkoliv koutě Evropy, zastali. Dnešním hlasováním máme šanci ukázat, že stojíme na straně férové Evropské unie, kde nejsou výrobky ani občané druhé kategorie.

Biljana Borzan, *izvjestiteljica za mišljenje Odbora ENVI*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, istraživanja su pokazala da se naizgled isti proizvodi niže kvalitete često plasiraju u državama istočne Europske unije. Radi se o različitim proizvodima, od deterdženata do dječje hrane koja često zna biti i manje kvalitetna i manje zdrava.

Kada sam se prije pet godina počela baviti ovim problemom, moram priznati da mi se činilo malo vjerojatnim da ćemo danas na stolu imati ovako ambiciozno izvješće.

Izvješće su potvrdila tri odbora i ono poziva na promjenu Direktive o nepoštenoj poslovnoj praksi. Također poziva na osnivanje europskog tijela koje bi u okviru postojeće agencije reguliralo tržište.

Ovaj problem građani velikog dijela Europske unije smatraju jako emotivnim. Mi se osjećamo kao građani drugoga reda. Danas je vrijeme da pokažemo da ovaj Parlament predstavlja sve građane, da nema istoka i zapada i da smo svi jedna Unija. Nismo svi isti, ali smo ravnopravni.

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, of course all European consumers, irrespective of where they live, should have equal access to the same high-quality products. That is basic. This is one of the basic principles of the European Single Market. Over the past 12 months, the Commission has made decisive progress in addressing the issue of dual quality. We have worked with the Member State authorities and have provided concrete guidance on the relevant legislation, as well as co-funding for tests and enforcement capacities.

The Commission's Joint Research Centre, in close cooperation with all the stakeholders concerned, has developed a harmonised testing methodology, which is now being implemented in an EU-wide testing campaign. The majority of the Member States beyond those that have initiated and carried out tests at national level have agreed to participate in this exercise, which will provide us for the first time with authoritative and comparable evidence regarding the scope and dimension of the problem.

The Commission is confident that the initial results, which will be obtained by the end of the year, will help us to define our methodology and to determine what is a significant difference noticeable to consumers when they are faced with products marketed as identical. This comprehensive action would not have been possible without the leadership that Parliament has shown, and I therefore wish to thank all of you, and in particular the rapporteur, for the excellent work that has been done and for your support.

You are aware that the Commission has proposed to amend the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive in the broader context of our new deal for consumers. Allow me to thank the European Parliament and the rapporteur, in particular, for swift action on that proposal. Making consumers believe that products which are sold under the same brand, and with the same or very similar packaging, are the same across several Member States, when in fact this is not the case, is an illegal business practice.

Let me assure you that the Commission remains fully committed to countering unfair commercial practices relating to the issues of dual quality of products. Our legislative package on the new deal for consumers can be a decisive step in the right direction. I therefore call on everyone in this room to support the adoption of this ambitious and important package before the elections.

Момчил Неков, *докладчик по становището на комисијата по земеделие и развитие на селските райони*. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми Олга и Биљана, г-н Комисар, няма да има „Европа на две скорости“, когато няма „двоен стандарт срещу различните европейски граждани“.

Проведените анализи в редица страни, сред които и моята – България, показаха, че въпреки многогодишните усилия и апели, порочната практика „еднакъв продукт и опаковка, но различно съдържание и пропорции“ продължава. Приветствам усилията на комисар Йоурова за изменение на Директива 29 от 2005 г., но силно вярвам, че амбицията на предложението трябва да бъде по-голяма, защото милиони европейци очакват повече. Това ще стане чрез изричното включване на забраната на т.нар. „двоен стандарт“ в приложение 1 към директивата.

„Местните предпочитания“ е аргумент, с който бизнесът се опита да отговори на притесненията на гражданите. Моля Ви, това просто не е разумно. Как може на тримесечни бебета да се определят местни предпочитания и защо продуктите от един клас, пригоден уж към местните вкусове, имат значителни разлики в съдържанието и пропорциите си?

Крайно време е „продуктовата дискриминация“ спрямо милиони европейци от Централна и Източна Европа да спре. Крайно време е Съюзът да постави всички европейци под общ знаменател.

Ivan Štefanec, za skupinu PPE. – Správu o dvojakej kvalite výrobkov považujem za veľmi dôležitú pre všetkých občanov. Je založená na prirodzenom princípe, že na našom spoločnom trhu musia platiť rovnaké pravidlá pre všetkých. Musí to platiť pre výrobcov, obchodníkov a, samozrejme, aj pre spotrebiteľov.

Pri každom opatrení musíme mať na pamäti predovšetkým záujem ľudí a ochranu spotrebiteľa. Ľudia sa nemôžu cítiť ako občania druhej či tretej kategórie podľa toho, čo si kúpia pri tovare pod vybratou značkou. Som si istý, že aj značka tovaru má byť garanciou kvality a každému serióznemu výrobcovi či predajcovi na tejto kvalite aj musí záležať.

Dnešnú správu ale prerokovávame preto, že existovali a existujú prípady, keď to tak nie je. A nie je ich málo. Som preto rád, že na pôde Európskeho parlamentu táto správa vznikla a že má podporu aj v Európskej komisii. Riešenie vidím spolu s ďalšími kolegami predovšetkým v jednotnej metodológii, v posudzovaní dvojakej kvality výrobkov ako nekalej obchodnej praktiky a v posilnení postavenia spotrebiteľských organizácií.

Ani pri riešení tejto témy nepotrebujeme nové inštitúcie, ale lepšie využívanie existujúcich inštitúcií. Nepotrebujeme nové regulácie, ale intenzívnejšiu spoluprácu európskych a národných predstaviteľov a nepotrebujeme populizmus, ale najmä jasné dodržiavanie pravidiel.

Dôležitý je aj príslušný rozpočet na testovanie podozrivých výrobkov a lepšiu informovanosť pre rozlíšenie čestných od podvodníkov. Nemôžeme hádzať do jedného vreca všetkých a je dôležité aj posudzovanie každého konkrétneho prípadu. Ak niekto koná ale nečestne, musíme to vedieť v celej únii.

Verím, že predložená správa je dobrým krokom na ceste k odstráneniu dvojakej kvality výrobkov na našom spoločnom trhu, a preto si vás dovoľujem požiadať o podporu v takej podobe, v akej sme ju schválili vo Výbore pre vnútorný trh a ochranu spotrebiteľa.

(Rečník súhlasil/rečníčka súhlasila s tým, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty (článok 162 ods. 8 rokovacieho poriadku).)

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), blue-card question. – Dear friend, Mr Štefanec, I am addressing you as a close friend. Why do you think all these lower-quality products were found only in central and eastern Europe? Do you not think that central and eastern European citizens should have the same rights as the citizens of other countries in the European Union?

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Áno, väčšina prípadov sa objavuje v strednej a východnej Európe, ale nie je celkom pravda, že všetky prípady sú len v strednej a východnej Európe. Takéto prípady sa objavujú aj medzi staršími členskými krajinami Únie. Preto je práve dôležité riešiť tieto prípady a je dôležité, aby sme naozaj mali rovnaké pravidlá, aby sme dodržali rovnakú kvalitu a rovnaké zloženie výrobkov pod rovnakou kvalitou. Ja som si istý, že to je aj v záujme všetkých čestných výrobcov-obchodníkov. Vždy musíme chrániť spotrebiteľa a spotrebiteľ musí dostať informáciu, podľa ktorej si musí slobodne vyberať.

Nicola Danti, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, un anno fa in quest'Aula il presidente Juncker diceva che nel mercato unico non ci devono essere cittadini di serie A e di serie B.

Il richiamo era a quei consumatori che ogni giorno acquistano prodotti che vengono commercializzati con lo stesso nome e la stessa confezione, ma che hanno differenti livelli di qualità, gusto e ingredienti a seconda dei paesi. Una pratica ingannevole, sempre più frequente, che riguarda non soltanto i prodotti alimentari, ma anche altri beni di largo consumo.

In un anno abbiamo percorso molta strada. Le modifiche legislative apportate dalla Commissione nel pacchetto consumatori e la risoluzione oggi al voto riconoscono l'importanza di affrontare questo fenomeno alla stregua di una pratica commerciale sleale.

Non vogliamo certamente imporre un prodotto unico o identico in tutta Europa, bensì garantire che siano evitati comportamenti scorretti e che i consumatori siano adeguatamente informati.

Jana Žitňanská, za skupinu ECR. – V prvom rade by som sa chcela poďakovať pani poslankyni Sehnalovej, a to nielen za vynikajúcu správu, ale najmä za tie roky trpezlivej práce, bez ktorej by sme tu dnes o dvojakej kvalite potravín v Európe vôbec nehovorili.

Hoci sa týmto problémom postupne začala zaoberať aj Európska komisia, faktom zostáva, že kontrolné orgány jednotlivých štátov doteraz nevedia, čo je už považované za dvojakú kvalitu, ako majú pri posudzovaní výrobkov postupovať a ako majú zistené rozdiely riešiť.

Na európskej úrovni totiž neexistujú žiadne právne predpisy týkajúce sa dvojakej kvality a usmernenia a iné dokumenty Európskej komisie nie sú jasné a často sa v záveroch rozchádzajú. Európska komisia taktiež síce hovorí, že dvojitá kvalita neohrozuje zdravie občanov, avšak je potvrdené, že jednotlivé zložky vo výrobkoch na trhoch strednej, východnej či južnej Európy často obsahujú menej zdravé alternatívy, viac cukru, tuku alebo soli.

Úplne preto súhlasím s názorom pani spravodajkyne, že dvojaká kvalita a jej posudzovanie by sa malo konečne jasne vymedziť a spotrebiteľia by mali vedieť, čo kupujú, a tiež, aby prestali mať pocit, že pre tzv. nové členské štáty záruka kvality niektorých značiek potravín a kozmetiky neplatí.

Dita Charanzová, za skupinu ALDE. – Pane predsedajúcí, vážený pane komisaři, dvojí kvalita výrobků je velice důležité téma pro naše občany. Je ale i důležitým tématem z hlediska toho, jak nám funguje vnitřní trh. Není přece možné, aby na vnitřním trhu EU existovali spotřebitelé druhé kategorie. Spotřebitelé, kterým jsou určeny méně kvalitní výrobky. Všichni spotřebitelé bez rozdílu přece očekávají, že pod stejnou obchodní značkou či obalem nakoupí v Unii identické zboží. A jsou tedy právem překvapeni, když zjistí, že tomu tak není.

Potřebujeme společnou a rozhodnou akci na evropské úrovni, a proto jsem ráda, že Evropská komise již představila legislativní návrh. Ruku v ruce s tím bychom měli již dnes ale využít možností stávajících předpisů a vytvořit tlak na výrobce a obchodníky, ale i na dohledové orgány. Těm je nutné zajistit vhodné podmínky pro jejich činnost a výrazně zintenzivnit vzájemnou přeshraniční spolupráci. Za podstatné také považuji posílení role spotřebitelských organizací. Ty mohou lidem pomoci ve chvíli, kdy mají o kvalitě daného zboží pochyby. Klíčové pro mě je ale konat. Čas běží, firmy by měly prokázat dobrou vůli a začít přijímat konkrétní kroky. O tomto tématu dlouho hovoříme a já jenom doufám, že už přejdeme od slov k činům.

Igor Šoltes, v imenu skupine Verts/ALE. – Hvala za besedo, lep pozdrav poročevalkam za odlično opravljeno delo.

Predsednik Komisije, gospod Juncker, je včeraj dejal, da ne sme biti razlik med severom in jugom, vzhodom in zahodom. Pa je temu res tako?

Tudi na področju hrane temu ni tako, ker so praksa in izsledki pokazali, da imamo hrano dvojne kakovosti, da so izdelki v enaki embalaži z različno vsebino in to nedvoumno so nedovoljene trgovinske prakse, ki jih je treba ustrezno sankcionirati.

Potrebujemo ustrezen nadzor nad delovanjem tržišča, da se ne zgodi ta tako imenovana nedovoljena praksa, ki vzpostavlja državljane drugega reda, ki na nek način postavlja tudi, če se grobo izrazim, prehranski apartheid.

Mislim, da temu kot Parlament in Komisija moramo narediti konec, in iz trte so izviti izgovori proizvajalcev, da se prilagajajo lokalnim preferencam, ker kdo lahko trdi, da nekateri so pripravljeni oziroma da si zaslužijo slabšo hrano, slabše kvalitete, da pa to ni ustrezno seveda označeno.

Zato potrebujemo ostre in natančne ukrepe.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, je evidentní, že dvojí kvalita potravin trápí zejména spotřebitele v nových členských státech EU. Je prokazatelné, že na trhu dostanete výrobky se stejnou značkou a stejným obalem, jako se prodávají např. v Německu, ale jejich kvalita, složení a použitá receptura je naprosto odlišná. Spotřebitel je tedy v podstatě podváděn. Vymlouvat se na to, že čeští spotřebitelé mají jiné chutě nebo cenové preference než ti němečtí, mi připadá naprosto směšné. A nemluvíme tady jenom o potravinách. Bohužel totéž platí i pro čisticí nebo hygienické prostředky.

Vítám proto, že díky úporné snaze neúnavné kolegyně Sehnalové se s tímto problémem snad konečně začne něco dělat. Na dvojí kvalitu výrobků, pokud vím, upozorňuje od roku 2011. Vítám v tomto směru i legislativní iniciativu Komise, která snad konečně pochopila, že nám nejde o výmluvu, ale o problém skutečný. Je jistě správné revidovat směrnici o nekalých praktikách, nicméně jsem proto, aby diskriminační praktiky vůči spotřebitelům byly vloženy jako další položka na tzv. *black list* zakázaných praktik. Podepsal jsem v tomto duchu i pozměňovací návrh kolegyně Sehnalové a apeluji na všechny kolegy, kteří chtějí pro spotřebitele v EU něco udělat, aby tento návrh podpořili. Pevně doufám, že sliby nezůstanou jenom na papíře, nechceme přece mít v Evropě dvojí kvalitu spotřebitelů.

Marco Zullo, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono numerose le ricerche che hanno evidenziato che nel mercato unico dell'Unione europea esistono prodotti alimentari e non della stessa marca, che a prima vista sembrano uguali, se guardiamo la confezione e la pubblicità, ma che invece possono essere di qualità diversa a seconda del paese in cui li comperiamo.

Allora può essere che i prodotti possano variare a seconda delle esigenze e dei gusti dei consumatori locali, ma pretendiamo che se i prodotti sono diversi allora devono essere diverse anche le etichette e le confezioni, perché il consumatore non deve essere ingannato, ma informato con precisione e trasparenza di questa diversità.

Allora questo percorso di trasparenza, come ha detto il Commissario, può essere aiutato, per esempio sostenendo le associazioni di consumatori nelle attività di test comparativi, rafforzando il ruolo del Centro comune di ricerca della Commissione, che può essere in supporto alle autorità nazionali che si occupano di sicurezza del mercato, e aggiungendo queste pratiche alla direttiva relativa alle pratiche commerciali sleali. Queste sono azioni che possono rendere il mercato unico più trasparente e vicino al consumatore.

Mylène Troszczyński, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, les études invoquées pour expliquer les différences de qualité des produits au sein du marché intérieur sont insuffisantes pour justifier l'adoption de ce texte. Il faut se montrer plus prudent dans les conclusions, car l'adaptation des produits au marché respecte des mécanismes qui échappent naturellement aux législateurs.

J'entends bien la volonté clairement exprimée ici de vouloir à nouveau uniformiser et centraliser les procédures de contrôle au niveau de la Commission. Mais l'échelon de contrôle proposé paraît disproportionné. L'échelon local semble bien mieux adapté dans ce cas de figure. Les particularités locales ou nationales doivent être prises en compte, que ce soit dans le mécanisme de formation des prix, celui des normes ou des standards de production à respecter, comme les exigences des consommateurs, que ce soit en fonction de leur niveau de vie ou même des goûts de la population locale.

Il serait de bon ton de mettre un coup d'arrêt à cette centralisation excessive au sein de l'Union européenne, de ne pas infantiliser les consommateurs et de respecter la liberté des producteurs.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodniczący! Bardzo chciałbym poprzeć to sprawozdanie. Nieczęsto mi się to tu zdarza, wymaga to natomiast wiele samozaparcia. To sprawozdanie powinno składać się z jednego zdania: „mając na uwadze stosowanie mylących praktyk znakowania na rynku europejskim produktów o różnej jakości za pomocą identycznych lub łudząco podobnych etykiet, wzywa się państwa członkowskie do przyjęcia uregulowań zapobiegających temu zjawisku”. Koniec! Pani Sehnalová, na litość boską, 45 ustępów w kółko o tym samym! Czytanie tego jest bardziej szkodliwe niż te wszystkie dodatki do żywności, o których Pani tu pisze. Nie da się przez to przebrnąć: w kółko, rozwlekle powtarzane jest to samo. Co my tu w ogóle mamy? Jakieś forum wysokiego szczebla do spraw poprawy funkcjonowania łańcucha dostaw żywności. Matko Boska! To brzmi jak nazwy komunistycznych instytucji, które pamiętam z dzieciństwa. Nie można w taki sposób pisać prawa, gdyż jest to legislacyjne gadulstwo. Prawo powinno być krótkie, jednoznaczne i łatwe do przeczytania dla wszystkich. Z tego względu postaram się poprzeć to sprawozdanie i naprawdę z zadowoleniem odnotowuję, że nie ma w nim nic o kobietach. Jest to bardzo dobry prognostyk.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst mal gilt mein Dank der Berichterstatlerin Frau Sehnalová und unserem Schattenberichterstatler Ivan Štefanec, denn ich glaube, dass, wenn die Abstimmung morgen in die richtige Richtung geht und wir es schaffen zu vermeiden, dass wir zweierlei Qualitätsstufen automatisch in Artikel 6 der Richtlinie über unlautere Geschäftspraktiken aufnehmen, dass wir dann für den Binnenmarkt etwas Wichtiges erreicht haben.

Für uns als EVP-Fraktion ist klar, und der Kollege Štefanec hat ja direkt darauf hingewiesen: Natürlich haben alle Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher in Europa – egal, woher sie kommen – die gleichen Rechte. Und daran müssen sich auch alle Unternehmen in diesem Binnenmarkt messen lassen. Das hat die Kommission in ihrem Vorschlag ja auch zu Recht angedeutet. Deswegen herzlichen Dank, Herr Kommissar.

Allerdings haben nicht alle Menschen in Europa den gleichen Geschmack. Dieser Herausforderung müssen sich die Unternehmen stellen, und dieser Herausforderung muss sich auch der europäische Gesetzgeber stellen. Deswegen ist es richtig, dass wir Transparenz schaffen. Aber deswegen wird es weiterhin Produkte geben, in denen in Portugal ein anderer Fisch drin ist als in Polen. Und obwohl klar beide Länder mit P angefangen, haben die Menschen möglicherweise andere Vorstellungen davon, wie ein Fischstäbchen zu schmecken hat. Und deswegen gibt es vielleicht dann am Ende auch unterschiedliche Geschmacksmuster, die getroffen werden müssten. Deswegen ist Transparenz wichtig, dass die Beteiligten wissen, was darin ist. Und deswegen hoffe ich, dass wir den Bericht am Ende so abschließen können, wie er im Ausschuss auch verabschiedet wurde. Ich hoffe, dass die Kolleginnen und Kollegen dem am Ende auch zustimmen können.

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

Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Andreas, ja wiem, że w Europie mamy różne gusty i różne przyzwyczajenia. Chciałabym jednak, żebyś uściślił, czy zgadzasz się z tym, że jeżeli zawartość dwóch puszek z rybami czy dwóch pudełek proszku do prania jest różna, to opakowanie nie może być myląco podobne? Na opakowaniu nie można tylko *petitem* wyjaśnić, co znajduje się w środku. Opakowanie musi być inne. Chciałabym, żebyśmy to bardzo wyraźnie zaznaczyli.

Andreas Schwab (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Vielen Dank für diese Möglichkeit, ein weiteres Beispiel herauszugreifen. Ich habe lange gebraucht, um zu verstehen, dass Waschmittel einer bestimmten Marke in Deutschland und Frankreich auf völlig unterschiedlichen Rezepturen beruhen, weil in Frankreich traditionell Ammoniak als Chemikalie der Sauberkeit in den Nasen der Menschen eine Rolle spielt und in Deutschland eben Chlor. Wir haben aber hier im Grenzgebiet zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich nie die Diskussion darüber angefangen, ob die Franzosen mit Ammoniak besser bedient sind oder die Deutschen mit Chlor.

Ich gebe aber zu, dass in der Situation, in der wir in Osteuropa und in ganz Europa momentan sind, derartige Geschmacksunterschiede natürlich eine politische Relevanz haben, und deswegen bin ich sehr wohl bereit zu sagen – das habe ich ja auch deutlich gemacht –, dass Transparenz wichtig ist. Ich würde aber nicht so weit gehen, dass deswegen die binnenmarktrelevanten Punkte, die für die Hersteller natürlich wichtig sind, um langfristig ein Produkt in ganz Europa vertreiben zu können, deswegen komplett verboten werden sollten. Wenn es gelingt, die Geschmacksmuster in den Räumlichkeiten von Bädern und WCs zu vereinheitlichen und Ammoniak und Chlor irgendwie zusammengebracht werden können, dann hätte ich damit kein Problem. Und ich würde es ungern sehen, wenn wir das den Herstellern per se verbieten, weil am Ende natürlich für die Produktion dieser Chemikalien Kosten entstehen und der Binnenmarkt seine Wirkung nur voll entfalten kann, wenn sie wirklich die günstigsten Produktionsvarianten wählen können.

El presidente. – Se dirigían dos tarjetas azules también al señor Schwab. Ocurre, sin embargo, que los debates que todavía quedan pendientes han de finalizar a las 11.45 horas. De esta forma, si concediéramos ahora tarjetas azules, una vez que además ya aceptó una —había dos más propuestas—, el debate no terminaría jamás, razón por la cual lamento enormemente decirles que de momento no habrá más tarjetas azules, en este caso para el señor Schwab, porque acaba de aceptar una y ha respondido sobre la misma.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, il n'y a pas quatre Europe. Une que l'on voudrait au nord, une que l'on voudrait au sud, une que l'on voudrait à l'ouest et une que l'on voudrait à l'est. Il y a une Europe, un seul marché intérieur et les mêmes règles doivent s'appliquer pour tous. Il n'y pas d'Européens de deuxième ou de première zone: nous sommes tous des Européens et nous avons droit à la même protection, surtout lorsqu'il s'agit de denrées alimentaires, et donc de santé humaine. La santé d'un Européen ne vaut pas moins à l'est qu'à l'ouest, au nord ou au sud.

L'existence de disparités entre les produits commercialisés et distribués sur le marché unique, sous le même nom de marque et avec un même emballage est inacceptable. Face à ce scandale, les autorités nationales des 28 et la Commission européenne doivent impérativement se coordonner pour une meilleure coopération transfrontalière et un partage des données plus efficace sur ces produits. Il est fondamental de lutter contre le double niveau de qualité au sein de l'espace européen. Je vous demande, Monsieur le Commissaire, de mesurer le degré de gravité – et je sais que vous le mesurez – du problème en complétant votre communication d'avril dernier et de publier des résultats au plus tard à la fin de cette année.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, скандалният факт, че едни и същи търговски марки се продават с различно съдържание в различните части на Европа, много ясно показва отношението на предприемачите от част от западните държави.

Да продаваш една марка с различно качество означава, че ти смяташ, че хората в различните части на Европа заслужават да консумират различни неща на еднаква цена. И ако при газирани напитки или някакви подобни неща може да има избор дали да си ги купиш или не, когато говорим за различно качество на детските храни, тук нещата вече стават гротескни. Ясно показват незабравен колониален манталитет. Ясно показват разделението на Европейския съюз на ядро и на периферия и убеждението, че в периферията могат да се консумират храни и напитки с различно съдържание, които съвсем очевидно ги правят по-нискокачествени.

И оправданието, че не са вредни, тук не работи. Не става дума дали са вредни или не. Става дума за това, че някои смята, че хората в Източна и Централна Европа заслужават да консумират по-некачествени стоки. На това лицемерие трябва да се сложи край!

Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE). – Г-н Председател, общият европейски пазар намалява пречките пред търговците и улеснява печалбата. Той носи ползи за потребителите, но не и когато се злоупотребява с него. След като са налице двойни стандарти при храните и други стоки, то той има нужда от подобрение. Как? Чрез усъвършенстване на нормативната база, стриктното ѝ прилагане, повече контрол и по-високи санкции, насочени срещу нелоялните търговски практики.

Въпросът за храната и здравето на европейските граждани не търпи компромиси. Като потребител и гражданин на страна, засегната от двойния стандарт, настоявам да се гарантира, че всички европейски потребители се ползват в пълна степен от своите права съгласно законодателството на Съюза.

Ключова дума при преодоляване на проблемите е „отговорност“. Отговорност от всички и от всеки по веригата – Европейска комисия, правителства, надзорни органи, производители, търговци и потребители.

Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE). – Gerb. Pirmininke, iš tikrųjų mano tautiečiams Lietuvoje svarbu žinoti, kad mes esame lygiaverčiai, o ne žemesnės klasės europiečiai, kuriems galima brukti prastesnės kokybės produktus. Buvau šešėlinis šio klausimo pranešėjas Žemės ūkio ir kaimo plėtros komitete, įdėjau daug pastangų, kad būtų parengti kokybiški pasiūlymai, kad būtų pažaboti šie gamintojų ir prekybininkų pagudravimai. Tie gudravimai kartais prilygsta paprasčiausiam apgaudinėjimui, kurio pasekmės – prastesnė žmonių sveikata, blogesnė savijauta, nuvilti lūkesčiai. Mums reikia aiškiai nustatytą bendrą europinių taisyklių, kad pasiektume tvarų ir negrižtamą sprendimą, o mūsų piliečiai nebūtų laikomi antrarūšiais.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Niedawno na rynki w Europie, w tym na rynek polski, weszły nowe, bardzo popularne amerykańskie chipsy. Niestety w Polsce skład nowo wprowadzonego produktu był inny niż ten w zachodniej części Unii, gdzie nie zawierał oleju palmowego ani glutamianu sodu jak u nas. Jednak dzięki masowemu sprzeciwowi konsumentów producent zapowiedział zmianę składu. Presja ma oczywiście sens.

Cieszę się, że reakcja konsumentów wpłynęła na politykę producenta, ale to nasze prawo powinno zapewniać obywatelom odpowiednią ochronę przed nieuczciwymi praktykami i powinno wszystkich obywateli Unii Europejskiej chronić w ten sam sposób. Jest to częścią naszej odpowiedzialności.

Dalej będę zabiegała o to, żeby takie samo opakowanie oznaczało taką samą jakość i zawartość produktu w całej Europie. Dziś oczekujemy kolejnych zdecydowanych działań ze strony Komisji Europejskiej, a w projekcie pilotażowym, który przygotowałam, zapisaliśmy, że Parlament Europejski będzie brał udział w pracach nad położeniem kresu tym nieuczciwym praktykom. Zapewniam, Panie Komisarzy, jesteśmy na to gotowi.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Jeg har ikke så lang tid, så lad mig være meget direkte. Det er fuldstændigt uacceptabelt på EU's indre marked, at vores forbrugere bliver behandlet forskelligt, afhængig af om man kommer fra Vesteuropa eller Østeuropa. Nu har vi sikret, at virksomhederne har et indre marked, hvor de kan afsætte deres varer over det hele. Og alligevel er der virksomheder, der vælger at behandle forbrugerne vidt forskelligt. Det samme produkt på ydersiden, men vidt forskellige kvaliteter på indersiden. Det skal vi ikke finde os i! Jeg synes, vi skal forbyde denne urimelige handelspraksis i EU. Vi har ikke andenrangsforbrugere i Europa. Tag dog og sælg nogle ordentlige produkter til vores forbrugere overalt i Europa! Jeg håber virkelig, at vi får sendt et tydeligt signal i dag fra Europa-Parlamentet, og jeg håber virkelig, at vi kan stå sammen her i Europa-Parlamentet om at forbyde denne helt uacceptable, urimelige handelspraksis. Forbrugerne i Europa skal være de samme, de skal behandles ligeværdigt og ikke på to forskellige niveauer.

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātie kolēģi! Jau pirms četriem gadiem, uzsākot šo periodu, mēs ļoti aktīvi ar kolēģiem no Horvātijas, Polijas, Slovākijas, Čehijas uzsākām darbu pie diskriminācijas novēršanas produktu kvalitātē, kādu mēs vērojam, un mani Latvijas pilsoņi par to sūdzējās, starp Austrumeiropu un Rietumeiropu.

Mēs izmantojam visus iespējamus līdzekļus, lai pārliecinātu mūsu Rietumu kolēģus, ka tā ir problēma. Un jāsaprot, ka tikai pērn, kad šo problēmu bija sadzirdējusi arī Komisija un Juncker savā runā, šis darbs tiešām ieguva paātrinājumu.

Īpaši paātrinājumu tas ieguva tad, kad mēs Budžeta komitejā panācām līdzekļus projektam, lai pētītu metodoloģiju, kā salīdzināt produktus. Arī šogad esam iesnieguši priekšlikumu, lai pētījumi notiktu arī attiecībā uz nepārtikas produktiem.

Ir pilnīgi skaidrs, ka diskriminācija ir jāizbeidz. Ir pilnīgi skaidrs, ka marķējumam identiskiem produktiem ir jābūt identiskam, un, ja produktu kvalitāte atšķiras, ir jābūt citam marķējumam. Skaidrs, ka šīs atšķirības, kas pastāv, ļoti lielā mērā ir noteiktas ar to, ka lielās kompānijas uz Austrumeiropas un Viduseiropas patērētāju muļķošanas rēķina iegūst lielāku peļņu.

Es ļoti ceru, ka Komisija nopietni apsvērs mūsu priekšlikumus. Es esmu pārliecināta, ka ir vajadzīgi gan tomēr labojumi likumdošanā – Eiropas likumdošanā, gan arī uzraudzības iestādēs, jo citādi atsevišķās iestādēs diez vai tiks ar šo problēmu galā.

Tātad, Komisija, turpinām strādāt!

Ева Майдел (PPE). – Г-н Председател, вчера Жан-Клод Юнкер отново спомена, че Европа трябва да бъде голяма на големите теми и малка по малките въпроси. Ние, като част от нашите общества, обаче знаем, че има теми, които само изглеждат малки, но всъщност оставят големи впечатления в нашите съграждани.

Голямата политика понякога е голяма само по коридорите на нашите институции. Една такава малка, но всъщност много голяма тема са двойните стандарти на продуктите в Европа. Една напитка, козметика или шоколад, продадени с цена и опаковка на позната марка, но с лошо качество, не подронва доверието в самата марка, колкото в европейската способност да се осигури равно третиране за нашите граждани в целия Съюз.

Точно затова ние трябва да се погрижим да има общи правила за качеството на стоките за всички европейци. Ние в ЕНП настояваме да имаме и обща методология за тестване на храните, разработена от Общия център за изследване на Европейската комисия в цяла Европа.

Не трябва да забравяме, че второто качество стоки не създава второ качество европейци, а само второ качество Европа.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, nu o singură dată lăcomia a dus la obținerea de profituri prin înșelarea consumatorilor. Am văzut acest lucru în sectorul financiar și vedem acum aceeași poveste în comerțul cu branduri globale, în special în țările din Est. Unele companii transnaționale au găsit un teren fertil în aceste țări din Est, unde, zeci de ani, consumatorii nu au avut niciun drept să protesteze cu privire la calitatea produselor.

Asemenea practici trebuie interzise, deoarece cetățenii europeni din țările din Est trebuie să aibă aceleași drepturi ca ceilalți cetățeni din restul Uniunii Europene.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Norbert Erdős (PPE). – Köszönöm szépen a szót, Elnök úr! Tisztelt képviselőtársaim! Tisztelt Biztos úr! Az Európai Unió nem engedheti meg, hogy bárki ugyanazon a márkanév alatt rosszabb minőségű terméket kapjon, mint egy másik tagállamban vásárló polgártárs! A mostani jelentéssel végre egy világos politikai és jogi iránymutatás meghozatalára kerül sor a kettős termékminőség elleni harcban. Kifejezetten örülök, hogy javaslatom, mint például az F-szám vagy a Bizottság Élelmiszerbiztonsági Központi Laboratóriumán belül egy új uniós megfigyelő és ellenőrző egység kialakítása, vagy például másik javaslatom, a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatokról szóló irányelv módosítása, vagy például harmadikként ugyanazon márkán belül eltérő minőségű termékek árusításának tiltása bekerültek az állásfoglalásba. Sehnalová jelentéstevőnek, Nekov véleményadó úrnak, valamint a többiek munkáját nagyon szépen köszönöm! Kiváló jelentés született. Köszönöm, hogy meghallgattak!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, vreau să adaug la ceea ce s-a spus aici – cu care sunt de acord, mai puțin cu ceea ce spunea domnul Schwab – că, anul trecut, grupul nostru, un grup de colegi din Cehia, Croația, România și Italia, am organizat o conferință – și vreau să trag un semnal de alarmă.

Companiile mari care au fost prezente la această dezbatere vizavi de produsele duale au ridicat câteva argumente absolut aiuritoare. Au ridicat problema gustului – așa cum am auzit și aici, că fiecare țară are alt gust – și au ridicat problema puterii de cumpărare.

Stimați colegi, eu vin din zona producătorilor. Dacă vrei un gust specific într-o anumită țară, îi pui un ambalaj specific și o etichetă specifică. Dacă îți cont de puterea de cumpărare, aduci în țara aceea un produs de calitate întâi, cu un ambalaj specific, și alt produs de calitate a doua, cu alt ambalaj specific.

Aici este vorba de înșelăciune și nu numai de faptul că avem cetățeni de mâna a doua sau mâna întâi. E o înșelăciune, e o concurență neloială și, domnule comisar, trebuie să aveți grijă că aceste mari companii nu au de gând să renunțe, chiar dacă noi aici adoptăm un regulament.

Vreau să fie votat amendamentul pe care raportoarea l-a înaintat și l-au semnat peste 70 de colegi, pentru că avem nevoie de protecția consumatorilor, avem nevoie de tratament egal, avem nevoie de a îndepărta această înșelăciune și banii necuveniți pentru marile companii.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα προϊόντα δύο ποιότητων στην ενιαία αγορά πραγματικά είναι μια γάγγραινα διότι υπάρχει μια διακριτική μεταχείριση εις βάρος των καταναλωτών, κυρίως στην Ανατολική Ευρώπη, και αυτό πρέπει να σταματήσει. Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε λίγη ώρα ο πρωθυπουργός των Σκοπίων, Zoran Zaev, θα μιλήσει στην Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Πρόκειται για μια φέεστα προκειμένου να στηριχθεί η κατάρπυση συμφωνία των Πρεσπών που υπέγραψε ο Zaev με την κυβέρνηση Τσίπρα-Καμμένου. Καταγγέλλω την παρουσία του Zaev στην Ευρωβουλή. Δεν πρόκειται με την παρουσία μου να νομιμοποιήσω τις σπονδές στον Zaev και στην κατάρπυση συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Όχι στην καπηλεία του ονόματος της Μακεδονίας μας και της Ιστορίας μας! Η Μακεδονία είναι μία και ελληνική! Αποχωρώ σε ένδειξη διαμαρτυρίας.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια για την έκθεση που μας παρουσίασε αλλά κυρίως για την πολυετή αφοσίωσή της στην ανάδειξη και προσπάθεια επιλύσεως ενός σοβαρού θέματος το οποίο έχει πολλές διαστάσεις και επηρεάζει σημαντικά τη ζωή των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Θεωρώ ανεπίτρεπτο να παραπλανούν τους καταναλωτές οι κατασκευαστές, οι παρασκευαστές αλλά και οι εταιρείες με το να παρουσιάζουν προϊόντα διπλής ποιότητας χωρίς να τους δίνουν τη δυνατότητα να διακρίνουν τη σύνθεση και τα χαρακτηριστικά τους. Για να αποφύγει το ενδεχόμενο να πέσει θύμα παραπληροφόρησης, κάθε Ευρωπαίος πολίτης έχει το δικαίωμα να μπορεί να διακρίνει τη σύνθεση, την ποιότητα και τα χαρακτηριστικά ενός προϊόντος, ειδικά όταν είναι τρόφιμο, είτε το αγοράσει στην πατρίδα του, είτε σε κάποια άλλη χώρα την οποία επισκέπτεται. Για να συμβεί αυτό, θα πρέπει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να εφαρμόσει αυστηρά την υφισταμένη νομοθεσία, να προστατεύσει τους πολίτες της και αν χρειαστεί να αναθεωρήσει αυτή τη νομοθεσία.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, to, že stejný obal má obsahovat stejný výrobek stejné kvality, tomu všichni rozumíme a je překvapivé, že trvalo tolik let přesvědčit také Komisi k tomu, aby pomohla toto pravidlo, tuto spravedlnost prosadit. Jsem ráda, že právě na půdě Evropského parlamentu vznikla řada iniciativ a Komise vyslechla volání po jasnějších pravidlech.

Jsmě hrdá, že v tomto procesu sehrála důležitou roli Česká republika. A chci poděkovat kolegyni Olze Sehnalové, která se tomuto tématu skutečně velmi systematicky věnuje řadu let. Bylo to také Ministerstvo zemědělství ČR, které prosadilo toto řešení na úrovni Rady ministrů. Metodika, kterou připravila Evropská komise, může pomoci členským státům posoudit, zda výrobek porušuje pravidla, a první výsledky bychom měli znát co nejdříve. Samozřejmě očekávám pozitivní výsledek také při řešení směrnice, kterou budeme projednávat. Děkuji ještě jednou kolegům za tuto zprávu.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Domnule președinte, vreau să vă spun că este absolut inacceptabil să avem produse de calitate mai slabă, mai proaste în Europa Centrală și de Est – pentru că aici este problema. – și nu mă refer numai la asemenea produse, cum au fost, de exemplu, acelea pentru bebeluși, pentru nou-născuți, care este o problemă extrem de gravă și ar trebui analizată și de alte foruri ale Uniunii Europene.

Mă refer – și s-a menționat aici – și la produse bancare, care sunt mult mai proaste și în dezinteresul clienților în Europa Centrală și de Est, la produse de asigurări, care sunt diferite în Europa occidentală și în Europa Centrală și de Est.

În același timp, vreau să vă spun că există un sentiment crescut de discriminare, pe care îl simt cetățenii în Europa Centrală și de Est, și mă refer aici la acest lucru pentru că îl avem printre noi pe Înalțul Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politică de securitate, doamna Mogherini. Este o situație gravă, pentru că cetățenii din Europa Centrală și de Est se simt discriminați, iar acest lucru trebuie să înceteze.

Este cazul României și al Bulgariei cu spațiul Schengen, unde suntem ținuți în loc de 12 ani, fără să fim primiți în acest spațiu comun, deși îndeplinim toate condițiile. Este o situație inacceptabilă, care trebuie să înceteze cât mai curând.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, slušajući jutros jezike koji dominiraju u ovoj vijećnici, evidentno je da veliki problem pritišće narode srednje i istočne Europe. Dakle, problem je jasan, diskriminacija je tu sigurno.

Mogu reći da smo gospođa Šojdrova i ja prije dvije godine organizirale jednu izložbu ovdje u Europskom parlamentu na kojoj smo prezentirali proizvode iz Hrvatske, Njemačke i Češke. Razlika ne samo što je bila u okusu, razlika je bila i u sastavu proizvoda. Konkretno, krumpir koji je osnovni sastojak čipsa nije postojao u čipsu koji se prodavao na hrvatskom tržištu. Iz toga vam je sve jasno.

Znači, evidentno je da dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda utječe na zdravlje i nitko ne može reći da neko dijete, beba od tri mjeseca, može imati ukus ovaj ili onaj. Dakle, ne radi se o nikakvim lokalnim i regionalnim ukusima ili okusima, radi se o tome da želimo jednakost i dosta je bilo govora o tome da želimo Europu, istok i zapad jednak, ali to su samo bile riječi. Znači, dosta je riječi, želimo prijeći na djela i molimo Komisiju da konačno ovo zakonodavstvo promijeni.

Mihai Țurcanu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, domnule comisar, calitatea dublă a existat, există și va exista dacă noi astăzi, în plenul Parlamentului, nu dăm un vot masiv cu plus. Și spun acest lucru pentru că sunt raportor în acest raport și am avut întâlniri cu cei implicați și nu putem accepta explicații de genul „producătorii se bazează pe percepția gustativă a consumatorilor” sau „ajustează rețetele cu ingrediente mai ieftine, doar pentru a se alinia la puterea de cumpărare a anumitor cetățeni”.

Domnule comisar, ne-a fost frică să vă trimitem - „frică”, colegii nu au vrut să trimitem – amendamente foarte concrete, dar vă cer, aveți această posibilitate, să înființați sau să dați atribuții unei direcții, unui serviciu de-al dumneavoastră, care să auditeze pe fluxul de producție aceste fabrici care sunt suspicinate de dublu standard. Numai așa putem să tragem semnale puternice și să avem o acțiune coerentă pentru a stopa acest fenomen atât de jignitor pentru toți consumatorii Europei.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Pravičnost, enakost, to sta osnovni vrednoti, na katere stavi Evropska unija. In če kje morajo te vrednote obveljati, morajo obveljati ravno pri hrani, pri našem najboljčutljivejšem artiklu, se pravi pri živilskih proizvodih in pa pri osnovni hrani.

Mi smo poklicani, da opozorimo na to, kar se dogaja, da ni pravično, da ni fer, da je kaznivo pravzaprav, da lahko z zavajajočimi etiketami ali pa vsebinami, kot je palmovo olje, zasipujemo vzhodnoevropske trge, srednjeevropske trge, na Zahodu se pa temu izognemo.

Zato je prav, da je bilo sprejeto to poročilo, da bo sprejeto. Iskrene čestitke vsem, poročevalki in pa vsem poročevalcem v senci za dobro poročilo.

Skupaj pa nam je naloženo sedaj, da na osnovi zaključnega dela Komisije, pa tudi nas, in pa pritiskov s strani potrošnikov naredimo red na tem trgu, ki je najbolj občutljiv.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their remarks and for their unanimous support. I can see that all Members, irrespective of their political group, are ready to support this report. I can only express the Commission's sincere desire to work with all of you to find a solution that will address the concerns of those among us who have been calling for more action on this issue, while at the same time making sure this does not create any distortions in our Member States and our single market.

I believe that we all wish for fairness and equality on the European single market. I hope that together we will achieve these goals as soon as possible: let us, as soon as possible, adopt the report and adopt our proposals and fair trade practices, and see how we can really enforce our instruments for defending consumer rights.

Olga Sehnalová, zpravodajka. – Pane předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, kolegyně a kolegové, dovolu mi srdečně vám poděkovat za dnešní debatu a za všechna slova podpory. Dovolte mi, abych využila téhle své poslední minuty, abych poděkovala kolegům, stínovým zpravodajům ve výboru IMCO a také zpravodajům stanovisek ve výborech ENVI a AGRI, Biljaně Borzanové a Momchilu Nekovovi. Jsem také ráda, že to byli sociální demokraté ve výboru IMCO, kteří iniciovali vznik této zprávy. A věřím, že naše dnešní hlasování potvrdí připravenost našeho Parlamentu vedle řady konkrétních doporučení, která v té zprávě jsou, také pozměnit již zmiňovanou směrnici o nekalých obchodních praktikách. Jedná se o důležité gesto směrem k občanům, že vedle přiznání problému tady existuje taky skutečná ochota ho řešit.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar hoy.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento interno)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Dvejetainis kokybės klausimas Europos Parlamento pradėjo atidžiai domėtis dar 2011 m., kai Slovakijos Respublikos vartotojų asociacijos atliktas tyrimas parodė, kad šešių firminių maisto produktų sudėtis ir kainos septyniose ES šalyse labai skiriasi. Imdamasi tolesnių su šiuo tyrimu susijusių veiksmy, pranešėja pirmiausia kreipėsi į Komisiją su klausimu, ar Komisijos nuomone, ši dvejetainis kokybė yra problema, susijusi su bendrosios rinkos veikimu ir vartotojų apsauga. Pritariu Parlamento pozicijai, kad vienodos galimybės naudotis aukštos kokybės prekėmis nediskriminacine tvarka bendrojoje rinkoje turėtų būti reali visų Europos piliečių teisė. Jei taip nėra, gali būti padaryta didelė žala esminiam bendrosios rinkos veikimui ir vartotojų pasitikėjimui bendrąja rinka. Be to, vartotojai turėtų būti aiškiai ir skaidriai informuojami, kad produktas, kurį jie išsigijo arba apie kurį jie žino kitoje valstybėje narėje, yra

skirtingas siekiant išvengti vartotojo suklaidinimo ir jo klaidingo bendro požiūrio į įsigyjamą produktą. Taip pat svarbu didinti vartotojų informuotumą apie produktus, jų savybes ir sudėtį. Būtina pažymėti, kad prekyba tikslingai skirtingos sudėties produktais skirtingose ES dalyse, kuriuos vartotojas gali lengvai palaikyti identiškais, yra nesąžininga praktika, ir todėl neturėtų būti priimtina. Todėl Parlamento pranešėja šiuo klausimu mano, kad nesąžiningos komercinės veiklos direktyvos I priedo papildymas kita klaidinančios komercinės praktikos kategorija yra veiksmingiausias būdas spręsti visus su akivaizdžia dvejoja kokybe susijusius klausimus Europos Sąjungoje.

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – Mikor pár éve megjelentek az első hírek az élelmiszerek kettős minőségével kapcsolatban, azaz hogy a kelet-európai piacon silányabb minőségű termékeket kínálnak a fogyasztóknak, mint a nyugat-európai polgárokknak, az EU illetékesei és a vezető élelmiszergyártók, csak legyintettek egyet, sőt tréfát csináltak belőle. Ma, köszönve a jelentéstevő asszonynak, kezünkben tarthatjuk a jelentést, amely megállapítja, hogy az élelmiszergyártók azonos vagy a fogyasztók számára megkülönböztethetetlen csomagolásban eltérő összetevőkből, eltérő minőségű vagy tömegű termékeket hoznak forgalomba az Unió egységes piacán. A márkanév, a csomagolás kialakítása, a hirdetésekben mutatott kép első pillantásra ugyanaz, mégis a recept, az összetevők vagy azok aránya eltérő. Nem más ez, mint a fogyasztók szándékos megtévesztése a nagyobb haszon reményében. Sajnos ez általában a kelet-európai fogyasztók kárára történik. A gyártók sok esetben a különböző helyi ízlésekkel magyarázták a termékösszetevők eltérését. Viszont a kutatások kimutatták, hogy nem csak az élelmiszerek, de más fogyasztói cikkek, mint például a mosó- és tisztítószeresek minősége is silányabb. Az már nehezen magyarázható meg, hogy a kelet-európaiak miért szeretnék a rosszabb minőségű mosószereseket?! Az óráállítással kapcsolatban láthattuk, hogy a Bizottság nagyon gyorsan tud lépni, ha akar. Itt egy újabb, égető téma, amely már több éve megoldásra vár! Várjuk a Bizottság jogalkotási lépéseit!

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Wyrażam satysfakcję z faktu, że problem tzw. podwójnej jakości produktów został dostrzeżony przez najważniejsze instytucje UE. Dziękuję Pani Posel Sprawozdawczyni za inicjatywę w postaci tego sprawozdania. Biorąc pod uwagę fakt, że brak jeszcze konkretnej propozycji legislacyjnej w tym zakresie, nasz głos jest szczególnie ważny. Uważam, że problem powinien zostać dokładnie wyjaśniony i to nie tylko w odniesieniu do żywności, ale również artykułów gospodarstwa domowego oraz środków czystości.

Tłumaczenia producentów, jakoby zmiany w składzie ich produktów w poszczególnych państwach wynikały tylko z ich „troski o różniące się lokalne gusta i smaki”, są naiwne i nieprzekonujące. Producenci nie prezentują, w jaki sposób zbadali rzekome preferencje smakowe Czechów, Słowaków, Chorwatów czy Polaków; nie wykazali, według jakich danych jedna grupa konsumentcka oczekuje mniejszej zawartości ryby w paluszkach rybnych, a większej oleju palmowego w maśle. Cieszy nas chęć opracowania odpowiednich metodologii postępowań przed organami konsumenckimi w poszczególnych państwach, aby zastosować narzędzia, które są do wykorzystania na szczeblu lokalnym. W kolejnym stadium istotne jest również zaakcentowanie roli KE – jej rola musi jednak zostać odpowiednio wyważona.

Podsumowując: popieram tekst sprawozdania, ponieważ w obecnej formie proponuje ono odpowiedni nacisk na producentów, ale bez zbyt daleko idących projektów harmonizujących legislację w tym zakresie na szczeblu unijnym.

6. Rasprave o kršenjima ljudskih prava, demokratskih načela i vladavine prava (rasprava)

6.1. Uganda, uhićenje oporbenih parlamentarnih zastupnika

El presidente. – El siguiente punto del orden del día es el debate sobre seis propuestas de Resolución relativas a Uganda, detención de diputados de la oposición (2018/2840(RSP)).

Charles Tannock, author. – Mr President, it's unclear exactly what happened on 13 August this year in a northwest province of Uganda during political campaigning for a by-election. President Museveni's vehicle was indeed attacked but lethal force was used against protesters. Opposition politicians such as Robert Kyagulanyi were detained and allegedly even tortured. But this lack of clarity over the facts does not mask the definite increase in concern expressed over increased repression of the political opposition in Uganda.

The deterioration of the fundamental freedoms of expression, assembly and association in Uganda is indeed worrying, as are President Museveni's efforts now to entrench his power by changing the law to allow a president to hold office over the age of 75. Over the next three years before the elections in 2021, the international community must watch closely and call on the Museveni Government to investigate all human rights abuses, to uphold the rule of law and freedom of speech, and to fight hard to prevent election fraud and corruption.

Maria Heubuch, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident! Wollen wir wirklich Partner für Kriminalität werden? Denn genau das werden wir, wenn wir hier schweigen. Wenn Abgeordnete, wenn Journalisten hinter Gitter kommen, Schläge und Folter in der Haft, also Menschenrechtsverletzungen, an der Tagesordnung sind, dann können wir Grünen das nicht akzeptieren. Das muss gestoppt werden!

Wir Grünen stehen an der Seite von Bobi Wine. Bobi Wine ist nicht nur ein Oppositionsführer, er ist eine Gallionsfigur für junge Menschen, er lehrt sie Frieden und Demokratie, er wirbt für Menschenrechte, und seine Stimme darf nicht verstummen.

Wir fordern die Freilassung der Gefangenen. Wir fordern eine Untersuchung der Vorfälle und Strafverfahren gegen die Täter, auch gegen die Polizei. Wir müssen in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit mit Uganda die eigene Menschenrechtskommission des Landes so unterstützen, dass sie kein zahnlöser Tiger bleibt. Wir haben die Möglichkeiten, hier Druck auszuüben, und wir müssen hier Druck ausüben.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge, *autora*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se da una parte l'Uganda si sta mostrando al mondo come paese accogliente nei confronti dei rifugiati, in quanto ad oggi ne ospita 1,4 milioni, dall'altra non possiamo chiudere gli occhi davanti a vicende che minano la libertà e i diritti umani e civili.

Sicuramente la legge che rimuove il limite di età massimo a 75 anni per le elezioni presidenziali ora sta muovendo diversi gruppi a manifestare contro il Presidente Museveni, in carica del 1986 e candidabile ancora una volta nel 2021 nonostante la sua età.

Le elezioni municipali ad Arua hanno portato a nuovi dissidi nel paese e a violenze che si sono propagate in tutta l'Uganda. Polizia ed esercito ugandese sono stati al centro degli scontri durante manifestazioni e dibattiti politici. L'arresto di membri del Parlamento appartenenti all'opposizione, come nel caso di Bobi Wine, e un elevato tasso di morti e feriti, non possono essere trascurati.

Ancora una volta ci impegniamo a sottolineare che la libertà di espressione e i diritti fondamentali non possono essere messi a tacere con la violenza. Tutto il mio augurio di buona guarigione a Bobi Wine.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey, *autora*. – Señor presidente, el 13 de agosto de este año la policía y el ejército ugandeses arrestaron y golpearon a cuatro miembros de la oposición del Parlamento, al menos a dos periodistas y a otras veintinueve personas antes de las elecciones locales. Los políticos de la oposición y el abogado de los acusados han dicho que los detenidos fueron torturados durante su arresto. Estos hechos subrayan, de nuevo, las violaciones a la libertad de asociación, reunión y expresión especialmente graves en Uganda. Sin embargo, el presidente Museveni, en el poder desde el año 86 y acusado de fraude electoral, continúa con un importante apoyo occidental.

Antes le apoyábamos por el rol que jugaba en la lucha contra el terrorismo yihadista y ahora le apoyamos sobre todo por su apoyo en la consecución de nuestros objetivos de política migratoria. O, dicho de otro modo: Uganda nos hace el trabajo sucio, sirviendo de tapón para los migrantes de Somalia y Congo que quieren buscar una vida mejor huyendo de la miseria y de la guerra; por eso es nuestro socio.

Basta ya de incoherencia. La Unión Europea tiene que condenar el régimen autoritario ugandés y ponerse del lado, de una vez, de los derechos humanos y de las libertades fundamentales.

Joachim Zeller, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident! Uganda ist für die Stabilität in Zentral- und Ostafrika ein wichtiges Land. Uganda ist an friedensschaffenden Maßnahmen in Konfliktregionen beteiligt. Uganda hat viele Flüchtlinge aus dem Südsudan und der DR Kongo aufgenommen, es ist für die EU ein wichtiger Partner.

Umso mehr macht uns die politische Situation im Lande besorgt. Seit 1986 herrscht Präsidenten Museveni mit harter Hand. Erst im Frühjahr hat er die Verfassung ändern lassen, um ohne Altersbeschränkung weiter im Amt bleiben zu können, auch nach den nächsten Wahlen. Aber die Unzufriedenheit, insbesondere der jungen Bevölkerung – drei Viertel aller Einwohner in Uganda sind unter dreißig Jahren – wächst. Und mit dem Eintritt des populären Künstlers Bobi Wine in die Politik auf der Seite der Opposition gibt es einen ernsthaften Gegenspieler zu Museveni. Bei Nachwahlen in einigen Wahlkreisen konnten Oppositionskandidaten diese bereits gewinnen.

Wie nervös das Museveni-Regime im Vorfeld der Wahlen in zwei Jahren ist, zeigte es bei den Ereignissen im August, wo nach einer Wahlkampfveranstaltung der Fahrer von Bobi Wine erschossen, Bobi Wine selbst wegen Landesverrats inhaftiert und mehrere seiner Parteigänger und Journalisten ins Gefängnis geworfen wurden. Die Vorgänge vom August müssen aufgeklärt werden. Eine demokratische Entwicklung sollte von uns nachdrücklich unterstützt werden.

Marietje Schaake, *author*. – Mr President, the arrests of Ugandan opposition politicians, as well as serious human rights violations such as extra-judicial killings and the excessive use of force, were reason for the UN High Commissioner to call for an independent investigation and to ask for the perpetrators to be brought to justice – and this House today echoes that call. We also urge respect for the independence of parliamentarians: that is vital for the future of Uganda, as is respect for freedom of expression and for the role of independent media.

All our EU programmes are conditional upon respect for human rights and I think we should not hesitate to use that leverage, including in respect of Uganda, in order to stand for our principles and to stand with the people in Uganda – who are worried, as is the Human Rights Commission there.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi tout d'abord saluer la présence de la Haute représentante dans notre débat. J'ajouterai que l'initiative de notre discussion sur l'Ouganda vient de notre groupe politique, parce que nous avons estimé qu'en tant que parlementaires, nous ne pouvons pas rester indifférents quand des élus sont arrêtés dans des conditions aussi troublantes.

La liberté d'exercer librement son mandat et l'indépendance du parlement sont des éléments essentiels dans une société démocratique. Malheureusement, ce n'est pas ce qui se passe en Ouganda, où les représentants de l'opposition ont été soumis à des intimidations. L'arrestation de Bobi Wine et des trois autres parlementaires en est l'illustration la plus récente. Il faut – je le crois – condamner, dans les termes les plus fermes, ces gestes et insister pour que les accusations fabriquées contre eux soient abandonnées.

Grâce à notre coopération au développement avec l'Ouganda, je crois que nous disposons d'un moyen de pression efficace pour essayer d'améliorer la situation des droits humains.

Brando Benifei, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Presidente Museveni ha da molti anni perpetrato azioni di repressione nei confronti dell'opposizione. Miei coetanei e amici, attivisti politici, dei giovani democratici ugandesi – penso alla deputata Brenda Nabukenya, a Sam Muyizzi, a tanti altri attivisti – sono stati detenuti e torturati in questi anni.

Oggi con la scioccante vicenda di Bobi Wine, la detenzione sistematica di giornalisti e l'uccisione di Yasin Kawuma, vediamo un ulteriore peggioramento, un ulteriore degrado dello Stato democratico e di diritto.

Io credo sia necessario agire oggi. Noi abbiamo programmi europei, penso più specificamente anche alla cooperazione allo sviluppo legata all'assistenza di bilancio, che devono essere condizionati davvero al rispetto dei diritti umani. Non possiamo accettare che l'Europa si faccia complice, in maniera indiretta, di abusi crescenti nei confronti della popolazione e nei confronti del mondo democratico ugandese.

Ignazio Corrao, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i diritti alla manifestazione e alla libera associazione sono prerogative universali che poggiano alla base di tutte le democrazie.

In Uganda sembrano non essere dello stesso avviso, soprattutto quando si assiste a una protesta che sfocia in sparatorie, pestaggi, omicidi, torture e all'arresto di sei parlamentari e di altre trenta persone. Il bilancio di tale protesta ricorda più uno scenario di guerra che quello di una democrazia, in un paese dove repressione e arresti di politici e oppositori non sono l'eccezione ma la regola.

Colleghi, il problema sta alla radice: ci troviamo di fronte a un Presidente e a un governo che violano le prerogative del Parlamento e la sua indipendenza, e questo va molto al di là di violazioni dei diritti umani e civili, questo rappresenta il tramonto dello Stato di diritto.

La rimozione delle leggi ugandesi che violano i diritti alla libertà di espressione e di associazione, come la legge sulla diffamazione criminale, è il primo passo che l'Uganda deve intraprendere. Esorto pertanto questo Parlamento a sfruttare l'influenza politica fornita dai programmi di aiuto allo sviluppo, in particolare i programmi di sostegno al bilancio, per rafforzare la difesa e la promozione dei diritti umani e civili in Uganda.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Jacques Colombier, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, la procédure de jugement, dans le cadre de tribunaux militaires, de plusieurs opposants ougandais, pose une question essentielle relative à l'état de droit. Il serait, à notre sens, plus acceptable que si ceux-ci avaient commis une infraction, ils soient déférés devant une juridiction civile. De même, des parlementaires de l'opposition ont été, pendant la campagne électorale, arrêtés et même, dit-on, torturés.

Ces actes scandaleux sont inacceptables. Mais le Parlement européen est-il vraiment en mesure, en ce moment, de donner des leçons d'état de droit, quand la Hongrie, dont le peuple souverain a arraché sa liberté par des sacrifices immenses au totalitarisme communiste, a été victime, cette semaine, ici même dans nos murs, d'un véritable attentat contre sa souveraineté? Quand la Pologne est montrée du doigt par les dirigeants bruxellois, qui ne tirent leur légitimité de nulle part, si ce n'est de cénacles proches de Soros et consorts? Quand les peuples autrichien, italien, tchèque, slovaque sont mis en accusation alors qu'ils viennent très nettement de désigner leurs dirigeants de la façon la plus démocratique qui soit? Alors, parlons certes de l'Ouganda, mais commençons par respecter la seule démocratie qui vaille, celle fondée sur le suffrage des peuples dans les pays européens et le respect de leur souveraineté.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážená paní vysoká představitelko, vlády mnoha zemí uplatňují vůči představitelům opozice postupy, které porušují základní lidská práva. Mezi tyto země patří i Uganda. Jde bohužel o již takřka standardní sadu kroků, kdy jsou představitelé opozice zastrašováni vraždami svých spolupracovníků. Falešně obviňování, např. z držení zbraní, jsou nezákonně drženi ve vazbě a ve vazbě mučeni a následně např. obviněni z vlastizrady pro pouhou kritiku představitelů vlády. Zástupci tisku jsou po skončení shromáždění zavíráni do vězení. Po skončení shromáždění, kterého se zúčastnili jako zástupci tisku. Proto musíme také do Ugandy důrazně vzkázat, že porušování základních lidských práv nebudeme tolerovat. Pokud se přístup ugandské vlády nezmění, musí EU poskytovat pouze adresnou pomoc těm, kdo v Ugandě bojují za dodržování lidských práv a vlády práva.

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, na sequência dos resultados das eleições municipais em Arua, vários opositores foram detidos e torturados, entre eles o popular músico e agora eleito deputado Bobi Wine, conhecido como o presidente do Ghetto. Esta vaga de detenções originou protestos por todo o país, que foram violentamente reprimidos por agentes de segurança, cuja brutal atuação permanece impune e que urge investigar.

Hoje, uma vez mais, debatemos a situação das liberdades fundamentais no Uganda, cujo regime persiste em permitir atrocidades contra o seu povo, designadamente o assassinio de crianças em nome de rituais e a perseguição a deficientes e homossexuais.

Senhora Mogherini, a União Europeia deve condenar de forma clara a intensificação da repressão no Uganda e exigir a libertação imediata de todos os opositores presos e, aproveitando a sua qualidade de dadora dos programas de ajuda ao desenvolvimento, incrementar a pressão sobre o regime do Presidente Yoweri Museveni para que honre os seus compromissos no âmbito do direito internacional no que respeita à liberdade de expressão, associação e reunião e respeite os princípios do primado do direito, da democracia e do respeito pelos direitos humanos.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Mogherini, ayer el presidente Juncker subrayó en el debate sobre el Estado de la Unión la importancia de África como prioridad de la política exterior europea. La compartimos. Pero no a costa de degradar nuestro compromiso con el Estado de Derecho y con la calidad democrática.

Uganda ha sido apreciada por la Unión Europea por su cooperación en materia migratoria, pero no puede ser a costa de mirar para otro lado cuando la deriva autoritaria ha llevado a reformar la Constitución y las leyes para permitir la reelección indefinida de Museveni —que lleva la friolera de treinta y dos años en el poder, compitiendo con Paul Biya en Camerún y con Teodoro Obiang en Guinea—, y no desde luego, de mirar para otro lado, cuando se detiene a diputados de la oposición, además de a periodistas y a activistas críticos con el autoritarismo creciente en Uganda, entre ellos Bobi Wine, un músico que además es diputado y que fue torturado y detenido después de ser liberado, cuando intentaba trasladarse a Estados Unidos para atender las dolencias renales consecuencia de sus torturas.

La Unión Europea tiene la obligación de lanzar un mensaje claro, en particular en un país que todavía criminaliza la orientación sexual, Uganda.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, aontaím le mo chomhghleacaithe Preda, Zeller agus Svoboda maidir leis an tuarascáil seo. Ní féidir linn cur suas le cad atá ag tarlú in Uganda. Níl aon saoirse ann. Tá deachtóir ann. Tá sé ann le blianta fada. Ní theastaíonn uaidh go mbeadh aon lucht freasúra ann. Má théann siad ina choinne, cuirtear i bpríosún iad agus an rud céanna leis an bpreas agus na meáin. Agus dá bhrí sin, mar a dúirt mo chara Svoboda, caithfidimid féachaint ar an gcabhair a thugaimid dóibh. In a lán tíortha, táimid ag tabhairt airgid ar chúiseanna maithe, ach níl sé á úsáid mar ba chóir é a úsáid. Dá bhrí sin, tá sé an-tábhachtach go bhféachaimis air sin agus b'fhéidir go dtarraingeomís siar beagáinín ón gcabhair a thugaimid dóibh go dtí go dtugann siad isteach rúin agus moltaí níos fearr.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, I share the opinion that it is vital for Ugandan democracy to ensure the independence of the country's Parliament as an institution and the independence of its members in pursuing their role as elected representatives. Moreover, I support the call to launch a prompt, independent, impartial and effective investigation into the killing of Mr Yasiin Kawuma and into reports of deaths and of the excessive use of force during protests.

The authorities should guarantee, protect and promote fundamental rights, including the civil and political rights of Uganda's citizens, such as freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

I would also like to take the opportunity, in this Chamber, to praise you, High Representative, for your hard work and your smart work aimed at enhancing the influence of the European Union and making it more visible in international affairs.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, let me start with something that doesn't relate directly to the issue that we are discussing today: we meet every month to discuss human rights violations and take action. I think that it is important for me to say a few words on the system that we have built together to assess human rights violations and ensure accountability, and bring perpetrators to justice. Today the existence of the International Criminal Court is being questioned. And I think it important to say formally and clearly in this Chamber that it is not being questioned by the European Union and that we will continue to strongly and fully support the ICC and its work.

I know that this is the strong position of this Parliament, and of all our Member States. We remember very well when, 20 years ago in Rome, the Statute of the ICC was finally ratified. We remember very well that, after Rwanda and the war in the Balkans, the world needed real change and we all know that the International Criminal Court has brought that change. It has strengthened universal justice beyond power politics and beyond geopolitical interests. It has made it clear that justice is not an enemy of reconciliation, but, on the contrary, the basis for reconciliation, for it is when the victims feel powerless, when crimes are met with impunity, that reconciliation is much harder to achieve. Accountability is essential to build the foundations for peace. So the court may not be perfect, but the best way forward for us is not to dismantle our global institutions. The way forward for us is to make them stronger and to build a strong, more effective multilateral system. That is why, once again – I want to say so very clearly and very strongly in this room – that is why the European Union will continue to be a strong supporter of the ICC, and I am counting on your support in the work that lies ahead of us.

Coming to the issue that we are discussing in this item of the agenda, on 13 August, as most of you have mentioned, at least 35 people were arrested in the Arua District in the north-west of Uganda immediately before a local by-election. Among the people arrested were four Members of Parliament belonging to the opposition, and in the following days various Ugandan sources reported that security forces had inflicted brutal treatment on the detainees, including the Members of Parliament. The European Union delegation and Member States' ambassadors on the ground followed the situation extremely closely and issued a joint statement on 17 August, calling upon all forces in Uganda to respect the rule of law and individual rights. We got the authorisation from the military authorities. Our delegation and European ambassadors were able to visit two of the Members of Parliament, Bobi Wine in the military barracks where he was being detained and Francis Zaake in the hospital where he was undergoing treatment. Both of them had several wounds and needed extensive medical treatment. They were eventually authorised to leave the country at the beginning of September. However, they are still facing treason charges. An investigation into the alleged abuses has been launched by the police. The Speaker of Parliament decided to set up another committee to deal with this issue. Finally, a report is also expected from the Ugandan Human Rights Commission. We will wait for the conclusions of these investigations, but let me state very clearly once again that security forces have a duty to respect everyone's freedom to peacefully demonstrate in support of their opinions. The allegations of torture are serious. If they are confirmed, perpetrators must be prosecuted and victims must obtain redress. Uganda has, unfortunately, a long history of violence and conflict, and we know very well that its people deserve some peace and the right to peacefully express their opinion. We've made this position very clear to the Ugandan Government and we will continue to engage with it so that responsibilities can be established and perpetrators are brought to justice.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się po zakończeniu debat.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE), na piśmie. – Prawa człowieka, których źródłem jest niezbywalna i niepodważalna godność człowieka, powinny być gwarantowane i przestrzegane przez każde państwo. Dlatego sprawa niezależnego członka Parlamentu w Ugandzie Roberta Kyagulanyi Ssentamu, znanego również jako Bobi Wine, jest niepokojącym przejawem łamania podstawowych praw człowieka, szczególnie tych określanych jako absolutne, których nie można ograniczyć w żadnym przypadku. Władze każdego państwa powinny być gwarantem przestrzegania praw i wolności, nie tylko wypełniając postanowienia konwencji międzynarodowych, ale również zapewniając ochronę praw człowieka. Co więcej, na władzach państwowych ciąży moralny obowiązek respektowania godności ludzkiej oraz ochrona jednostki przed nadużyciem władzy. Władze Ugandy, jak każde inne państwo na świecie, powinny respektować prawa człowieka oraz je chronić. Należy uwolnić wszystkich więźniów politycznych oraz zaprzestać praktyk eliminowania z życia publicznego przedstawicieli opozycji i ich sympatyków oraz zaprzestać wykorzystywania sił zbrojnych Ugandy w zwalczaniu lokalnych opozycjonistów.

6.2. Mjanmar, posebno slučaj novinara Wa Lonea i Kyawa Soe Ooa

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie Mjanmy/Birmy, w szczególności w sprawie dziennikarzy Wa Lone i Kyaw Soe Oo (2018/2841(RSP)).

Barbara Lochbihler, Verfasserin. – Herr Präsident! Die burmesischen Journalisten Wa Lone und Kyaw Soe Oo haben es gewagt, in ihrem Land zur Ermordung von zehn Rohingya im Dorf Inn Din zu recherchieren. Diese Verbrechen fanden statt im Zuge der Militäroffensive, bei der Hunderttausende Rohingya ermordet oder vertrieben wurden. Sie wurden verurteilt, weil Militär und Regierung alles daran setzten, die grausamen Verbrechen an den Rohingya undokumentiert und ungesühnt zu lassen. Wir fordern ihre Freilassung sofort und ohne Bedingungen.

Die UN-Untersuchungskommission dokumentiert eindrucksvoll, dass das myanmarische Militär für Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit und Kriegsverbrechen in seinem Land und gegen die Rohingya möglicherweise auch für Völkermord verantwortlich ist. Sie nannten explizit den Militärführer Min Aung Hlaing und fünf weitere Offiziere. Wenn nächste Woche im UN-Menschenrechtsrat über den Bericht beraten wird, muss die EU deutlich und unmissverständlich die Strafverfolgung der verantwortlichen Militärs durch den Internationalen Strafgerichtshof oder einen Ad-hoc-Gerichtshof fordern und gegebenenfalls auch ihre eigenen gezielten Sanktionen anpassen.

Sajjad Karim, author. – Mr President, for some time now my delegation has been very hesitant to call for the trade relationship we have with Myanmar to be reviewed. But today, following this latest development, we find ourselves in a situation where we can no longer simply say that Myanmar is a country that deserves the trade access we provide to it. There needs to be a fundamental review of that relationship.

Furthermore, the United Nations today has provided us with a report which is very clear in its findings. As part of the international community and as a set of institutions, Europe must ensure that it provides its support to the international community. So, at United Nations level, we must do the right thing and ensure that the voices we have at the table there are not allowing Myanmar to go unchecked. Our voices must be the loudest at that table.

(Applause)

Soraya Post, author. – Mr President, we will not and cannot allow ourselves to stand by while crimes against humanity and genocide have been happening in Myanmar. The Rohingya people are victims of ethnic cleansing. They are being punished, killed, raped and displaced from their homes. They are suffering and dying in refugee camps like Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh.

Journalists have been persecuted simply for reporting on the atrocities committed against Rohingya people. The Myanmar military and the Government led by Aung San Suu Kyi have to be held accountable. We call for justice for the Rohingya people and for all those who stand up for their rights and investigate and report on these crimes against humanity. We demand the immediate release of the two Reuter journalists. There are reasons for us to consider whether we should continue to give economic support to the Myanmar regime.

Ignazio Corrao, author. – Mr President, the decision to jail Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, two Reuter reporters, while they were investigating the massacre of Rohingya is unacceptable. The military regime wanted to send a severe warning to whoever dares to look into military abuses: a real example of censorship through fear for anyone who fights to uncover uncomfortable truths and expose wrongdoing by those in power, and whoever tries to report inconvenient truths.

Investigative journalism is the link between the truth and us, and that is precisely why it is vital for democracy. That is why we will always stand up and fight for freedom of thought for journalists, activists and lawyers who express critical views.

We must adopt targeted individual sanctions against the leaders of the military regime so long as Myanmar legislation is not aligned with basic international human rights law and standards. We urge the Myanmar authorities to free the two journalists immediately and to repeal the Official Secrets Act and all the other laws that allow the authorities to arrest or harass whoever fights to inform people about the atrocities they are perpetrating.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señor presidente, aquí estamos otra vez hablando una vez más de la vulneración de los derechos humanos en Myanmar. Hay que recordar que el 23 de agosto fue el aniversario del inicio del genocidio de los rohinyás. Una ocasión para recordar nuestro fracaso a la hora de hacer rendir cuentas a los responsables.

Para recordar, también, que la expulsión continúa y responde también, sobre todo, a grandes negocios de los que nadie habla. En las tierras expoliadas se construyen bases militares y se está permitiendo la entrada masiva de capital transnacional promoviendo el extractivismo, la agroindustria y el acaparamiento de tierras que están detrás de la expulsión de los rohinyás.

Si tras un genocidio, hasta ahora confirmado incluso por Naciones Unidas, la cláusula de derechos humanos incluida en nuestros acuerdos comerciales no se aplica ¿cuándo será el momento entonces de aplicarla? ¿Cuando no tengamos intereses económicos? Si no tomamos medidas contundentes para asegurar el fin de la violencia, el acceso a la justicia y las medidas de no repetición, seremos cómplices indirectos de estos crímenes.

Seán Kelly, *Údar*. – A Uachtaráin, a Choimisinéir Mogherini, fáiltím roimh an tuarascáil seo agus go háirithe aontaím leis, gur cheart an bheirt iriseoirí Wa Lone agus Kyaw Soe Oo a ligean saor.

Ní dhearna siad aon rud mídhleathach; ní dhearna siad ach scríobh faoi chuireanna uafásacha i gcoinne cearta daonna a rinne fórsaí míleata Mhaenmar. Ní féidir cur suas leis seo. Agus dar le tuarascáil idirnáisiúnta, tá rudaí imithe ar gcúl go mór i Maenmar maidir le saoirse agus go háirithe maidir le muintir Róihinse.

Ceaptar gur cuireadh ar a laghad 10 000 díobh chun báis. Tá 700 000 duine tar éis an tír a fhágáil agus leathmhíle díobh siúd ina leanaí. Dá bhrí sin, caithfidh rud éigin a dhéanamh agus caithfidh féachaint go háirithe ar an ngaol trádála atá againn leo – go háirithe an gaol trádála “Gach Ní Seachas Airm” – go dtí ar a laghad go gcuireann siad ar ceal an dlí uafásach sin, an tAcht um Rúin Oifigiúla.

Urmas Paet, *author*. – Mr President, the conviction of the two journalists reporting human rights violations by the Myanmar forces is a clear example of the undermining of press freedom. The journalists must be freed at once.

As regards the Rohingyas, the situation has not improved. The UN fact-finding mission recently concluded that the Myanmar authorities had committed the most serious human rights violations and the gravest crimes under international law, including genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. The EU and the international community must spare no effort to make the Myanmar authorities stop these atrocities and to ensure that those responsible will be brought to justice. The EU must therefore use all the tools it has, including a review of the trade preferences that Myanmar benefits from under the ‘Everything But Arms’ scheme.

The EU needs to take the lead in the UN Security Council on referring the situation to the International Criminal Court, and the UN Security Council must impose a global, comprehensive arms embargo on Myanmar, as well as adopting targeted individual sanctions against those responsible for these heinous crimes.

Neena Gill, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, High Representative, other Members have already outlined the case of Myanmar journalists Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, who were sentenced to seven years’ imprisonment on 3 September for investigating and reporting on human rights violations in Rakhine State. Wa Lone had been writing in-depth stories on sensitive subjects including land grabs by the powerful military and the murder of prominent politician Ko Ni. It’s appalling that he’s not even able to see his new-born daughter. Kyaw Soe Oo worked on an investigative story about Myanmar’s plan to harvest the crops of Rohingya farmers who fled to Bangladesh. He also reported how some Buddhists were enforcing local-level segregation in central Rakhine. And it was only because of these brave journalists that the world got to know about the severe injustices and violations of human rights.

Collecting information, High Representative, is not a crime, therefore I am deeply disappointed by Aung San Suu Kyi, who has defended the court’s decision to jail Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo.

With this resolution, Parliament is not just urging the authorities in Myanmar to release immediately and unconditionally the two journalists, but also urging the High Representative and the Commission to ensure that wherever we have harassment of journalists we take action in terms of our trade agreements, and that we take action in this case. I think it's important that in Myanmar we actually have a review of the archaic laws that facilitate these attacks. I hope, High Representative, that you will join us in this call: we do need to act now.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, de débat en débat, nous avons l'impression que la situation au Myanmar ne cesse de se dégrader. Désormais, ce sont les journalistes qui sont persécutés, condamnés, emprisonnés au motif qu'ils rapportent ce qui s'y passe, témoignent de la cruauté sans fin du pouvoir birman et continuent à témoigner du nettoyage ethnique des Rohingyas qui est, selon l'ONU, un génocide.

C'est pourquoi nous exigeons, encore une fois, des sanctions et la mise en place urgente d'une enquête internationale. Nous appelons aussi le Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU à faire traduire les responsables devant la justice internationale.

Il n'y aurait rien de pire que de s'habituer à l'horreur. Et j'ai peur, parfois, que nos yeux finissent par s'habituer aux horreurs commises en Birmanie depuis trop d'années déjà.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, one year on the Myanmar Government has failed to take any credible steps to investigate the crimes against Rohingya and hold those with blood on their hands to account. Instead they are focused on targeting two brave journalists who dare to expose the military's atrocities. I welcome the ICC ruling that it has jurisdiction over Myanmar's deportation of the Rohingya population to Bangladesh. It is a crucial step towards ending impunity. However Myanmar's military leaders have been accused of acting with genocidal intent. Therefore a referral to the ICC for the full scope of human rights violations is Rohingya's main hope for justice. The international community may take responsibility, must take responsibility, and I ask you, Madam High Representative, to take the lead. Failing to do so sends the signal that Myanmar can continue to commit these atrocities against the Rohingya and other ethnic minorities in northern Myanmar. The longer we wait, the more time Myanmar officials have to destroy evidence in Rakhine State. We must take a united stand now.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Mogherini, vorrei condividere con lei oggi questo pensiero, perché il caso dei due giornalisti a me sembra un ulteriore elemento di prova che il processo di transizione democratica fatica a farsi largo in quel paese, e forse dovrebbe imporre a tutti noi la necessità di rivedere l'approccio nelle nostre politiche.

La scorsa settimana l'Alto commissario delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti umani, Michelle Bachelet, nel corso di un discorso tenuto a Ginevra, ha definito sconvolgenti i risultati della missione di inchiesta internazionale. E del resto anche lo scorso febbraio ho fatto parte della delegazione del Parlamento europeo che si è recata in Myanmar, ed è triste constatare che a distanza di mesi quasi nulla è cambiato.

Ora, è del tutto evidente che l'Unione europea non può stare a guardare. Non chiediamo solo la liberazione dei due giornalisti, ma anche che si utilizzino tutti gli strumenti a nostra disposizione per tentare di cambiare il corso delle cose in quel paese.

Goffredo Maria Bettini (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Mogherini, io ho avuto l'onore di partecipare alla missione degli osservatori del Parlamento europeo durante le ultime elezioni in Myanmar. Fummo colpiti dalla partecipazione popolare, dall'organizzazione, soprattutto delle donne, in occasione di quella festa della democrazia e di quell'inizio della transizione alla libertà dopo la vittoria della leader San Suu Kyi.

Sapevamo che la Costituzione sarebbe rimasta arretrata, il peso delle forze armate importante e vincolante. E sapevamo anche di forme di buddismo estremista, violento e xenofobo, e che già allora non venne frenato dalla leader vittoriosa.

Ma quello che è successo in seguito in Birmania al popolo Rohingya va oltre ogni previsione più pessimistica: uno sterminio etnico, un genocidio, un susseguirsi di violenze ampiamente documentato. Giornalisti indipendenti arrestati, gli assassini impuniti, media fomentatori dell'odio. Noi dobbiamo dire basta. Ha ragione l'on. Panzeri a dire che questo basta non sono solo provvedimenti specifici, ma che occorre cambiare una linea generale.

La Birmania è in bilico: se non si muove, tornerà a essere un esempio di vergogna agli occhi di tutti i democratici del mondo.

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, os jornalistas da Reuters Wa Lone e Kyaw Soe Oo, que investigavam o assassinato de dez homens e crianças muçulmanos rohingyas descobertos numa vala comum na aldeia de Inn Din no Estado de Rakhine foram presos em dezembro do ano passado e agora condenados a sete anos de prisão, acusados de terem violado a arcaica lei de segredos oficiais do Myanmar.

Caros colegas, o único delito destes dois corajosos jornalistas – nomeados na categoria de jornalistas internacionais do ano pela *One World Media* - foi fazer o seu trabalho, investigar as atrocidades cometidas após a ofensiva do exército birmanês em Inn Din, em agosto de 2017, que originou a fuga de 700 mil pessoas para o Bangladesh, e denunciar os crimes de guerra cometidos em nome de uma inaceitável limpeza ética.

Senhora Alta Representante, quero felicitá-la pelo seu difícil trabalho em relação a seguramente uma das suas maiores dores de cabeça que é precisamente o dossiê sobre o Myanmar, mas a verdade é que, de forma constante neste Parlamento, apresentamos resoluções sobre este país. Cumpre-nos agora a nós, representantes do povo europeu, dizer que estamos do lado de quem defende uma imprensa livre e independente e os que condenam a manipulação da justiça, os crimes contra a humanidade e a impunidade de quem os pratica.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, I strongly support the calls upon the Government of Myanmar and the security forces to put an end immediately to the ongoing violations against the Rohingya people and other ethnic minorities in northern Myanmar and to ensure that security and the rule of law prevail. The international community must adopt a united and strong stand on this situation. The European Union and the Member States have to take the lead in the UN General Assembly and the upcoming 39th session of the United Nations Human Rights Council and step up their efforts towards the establishment of an international mechanism to back investigations into alleged atrocity crimes and to seek justice by prosecuting those responsible for atrocity crimes. Finally, as is emphasised in this resolution, thousands of Rohingya people, many of whom are children, are internally displaced and in urgent need of humanitarian assistance and protection. Against this background it is paramount to continue to call for immediate and unhindered access throughout the country for the delivery of humanitarian aid.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, a few days ago a Myanmar court sentenced two Reuters journalists to seven years in prison. At the time of their arrest they were working on an investigation into the killing of ten Rohingya men in a village in Rakhine State. We have been following this case very closely from the beginning, almost one year ago. Following their arrest on 18 December last year we requested their immediate release. Our delegation to Myanmar has observed all relevant court hearings, and, together with Member States, we continuously raise the issue with the Myanmar Government.

When the court decided to press charges against the two journalists last year on 7 July we again reacted publicly. Many observers saw this trial as a test of media freedom, democracy and the rule of law. It is pretty clear that the test was failed, and we made this clear in our statements released right after the sentence, which will also intimidate other journalists, who could fear undue arrest or prosecution for doing their job.

Throughout the years, we've always accompanied Myanmar on its path towards democracy and I still have hope that Myanmar can go back to that path and become an inclusive and free country for all its citizens.

So we ask once again that the prison sentences be reviewed and that the two journalists be released immediately and unconditionally.

The report that they were working on, published almost a year ago, shed light on what was happening in Rakhine State. It contains the same kind of stories, exactly the same kind of stories, that I heard myself from Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. Those stories have also led to the preliminary report from the United Nations fact-finding mission.

The UN report confirms the need for pressure and engagement to make the situation change as soon as possible, and this is exactly what we've been doing so far as the European Union. As you know, we were one of the strongest voices calling for a fact-finding mission in 2017 and we are now sponsoring a resolution at the ongoing session of the Human Rights Council to support the recommendations and conclusions of the fact-finding mission. So, for those of you who asked us to do that, we are currently doing it.

The resolution will aim in particular to establish an international accountability mechanism. I discussed the issue with all my interlocutors at the ASEAN regional forum last month in Singapore, in particular with Bangladesh and also with China and Indonesia. We will also discuss the situation when we meet at the upcoming Asia-Europe meeting that we will host next month in Brussels, and of course I will use the UN General Assembly Ministerial Week 10 days from now to discuss how to improve the situation with all the relevant interlocutors, not only in the region, but also in the UN system.

There are some urgent measures to be taken. First and foremost guaranteeing full and immediate humanitarian access inside Rakhine State. We are already among the largest humanitarian donors for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh, but it is vital that aid reaches those in need inside Myanmar.

To address these kinds of issues, as well as to improve the overall human rights situation and address the lack of accountability for those who have committed crimes, we are putting pressure on relevant individuals and institutions in Myanmar. We have put in place restrictive measures against seven senior army and police officers associated with serious human rights violations in Rakhine State. In light of the UN report we are considering strengthening these restrictive measures.

We've also made it clear to the Myanmar authorities that our trade preferences with Myanmar are linked to clear conditions on human rights and democracy and that to preserve our current trade arrangements we need to see decisive action to improve the situation.

Finally, we're working closely with the civilian Government of Myanmar to address the root causes of conflict in accordance with the Annan report. The people of Myanmar have asked to turn the page, to go towards a democratic system and country, and they deserve better than this. They deserve a country where journalists are free to do their job and keep the state institutions accountable for their actions and they deserve a country where all citizens, all of them, have the same rights, whatever their faith or the background.

So we will continue to put pressure and to engage so that the country can advance again on its path towards democracy. Thank you very much, and especially I would like to thank all of you who are engaging strongly and closely with the country: parliamentary diplomacy – as always, but especially in this case – is key.

(Applause)

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się po zakończeniu debat.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Monica Macovei (ECR), *în scris*. – Peste 650 000 de musulmani Rohingya au plecat din statul Rakhine, aflat în Myanmar, din cauza intervenției militare împotriva acestei etnii. Mii de case au fost arse, iar organizațiile internaționale fac eforturi să facă față acestei crize umanitare fără precedent. Asistăm la una dintre cele mai criminale campanii din istoria recentă a omenirii îndreptate împotriva reprezentanților unei minorități.

Pentru toată această situație dezastruoasă, guvernul din Myanmar blamează Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA). Dar, potrivit presei din regiune, Rohingya care fug în țările vecine spun că în spatele acestor atacuri criminale se află, de fapt, armata Myanmarului care a primit ordin să îi forțeze să fugă din țară. Doamna Aung San Suu Kyi, laureată a Premiului Saharov, dar și a premiului Nobel pentru pace, este actualmente prim consilier de stat în Myanmar. Ca membru al guvernului deținător al acestor distincții, are obligația să își convingă guvernul să ia urgent măsuri pentru apărarea acestei minorități persecutate de multă vreme.

Modul în care majoritatea budistă îi tratează pe cei circa 1,1 milioane de Rohingya este inacceptabil. Solicit forțelor militare și de securitate din Myanmar să înceteze imediat uciderea și hărțuirea poporului Rohingya și să acorde acces imediat organizațiilor de ajutor umanitar.

6.3. Kambodža, posebno slučaj Kema Sokhe

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie Kambodży, w szczególności sprawy Kema Sokhy (2018/2842(RSP)).

Mark Demesmaeker, *Auteur*. – Voorzitter, sta me toch eerst even toe om de Cambodjaanse delegatie met oppositieleader Sam Rainsy te verwelkomen, die vanaf de tribune dit debat volgt. Van harte welkom, vrienden!

Als je het karakter van een mens wilt leren kennen, moet je hem macht geven. Dat wist lang geleden Abraham Lincoln al. We hebben de Cambodjaanse premier Hun Sen leren kennen. De langst regerende premier van deze aardbol is zo machtsbelust dat hij alle middelen gebruikt om nog eens tien jaar aan te blijven. Daarvoor schuift hij al wie in de weg staat meedogenloos opzij, zoals Kem Sokha, gewezen leider van de grootste oppositiepartij, CNRP, onder druk ontbonden in de aanloop naar de verkiezingen. Autocraten dulden geen tegenspraak. De democratie is doodgeknepen. De regering Hun Sen mist elke legitimiteit en alle internationale kritiek daarop heeft nog altijd niets uitgehaald.

Een Vlaams spreekwoord zegt: Wie niet horen wil, moet voelen. Het is tijd dat dit regime voelt dat het menens is. Hoog tijd dus voor sancties, visumsancties, handelssancties. Ik zie geen enkele reden om daarmee nog langer te wachten.

Barbara Lochbihler, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident! Danke an Sie, Frau Mogherini für Ihr Statement, das generell sehr unterstützend war für den internationalen Strafgerichtshof.

Zu Kambodscha: Die Wahlen in Kambodscha waren weder frei noch fair und haben im Ergebnis das Land zu einem autokratischen Einparteiensstaat gemacht. Der Preis dafür war hoch: Die größte Oppositionspartei im Land wurde praktisch ausgeschaltet, unabhängige Journalisten und Menschenrechtsverteidiger eingeschüchtert und eingesperrt. Wir fordern, dass die Regierung die Anklage gegen Oppositionsführer Kem Sokha und andere Oppositionspolitiker umgehend fallen lässt, die Auflösung der CNRP rückgängig macht und den Dialog mit der Opposition sucht.

Wir fordern ebenso von der Regierung, mit der Verfolgung und Gängelung der Menschenrechtsaktivisten und Organisationen aufzuhören. Zudem ist es geboten, die Vereinbarung mit dem Büro des Hohen Kommissars für Menschenrechte zu verlängern, die im Dezember ausläuft.

Es gibt zahllose ungelöste Landkonflikte in Kambodscha, und es ist zu begrüßen, dass die Regierung einigen Familien mittlerweile für verlorenes Land Entschädigung gegeben hat. Diese Entschädigungen finden aber nicht systematisch statt, und nach wie vor ist Straflosigkeit für Enteignung weit verbreitet. Insbesondere sollte die EU darauf drängen, die Vorgaben von 2015, insbesondere die Zucker-Lizenzen, zu überprüfen, die im Zusammenhang sind mit Landrechtskonflikten.

Josef Weidenholzer, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident! Kambodschas jüngste Geschichte ist geprägt von unglaublichen Verbrechen. Die Roten Khmer haben Millionen Menschen ermordet, und die Schatten dieser Vergangenheit sind noch allgegenwärtig. Lange Zeit hatte es den Anschein, dass das Land zu einer demokratischen Normalität zurückkehren könnte. Bedingt durch eine rasante wirtschaftliche Entwicklung begannen immer mehr Menschen, sich politisch zu engagieren, und diese Veränderungen haben das Regime von Hun Sen verunsichert. In den letzten Jahren wurde immer rigorosere gegen NGOs und oppositionelle Politiker vorgegangen. Sie wurden unter fadenscheinigen Vorwürfen verhaftet und mussten ins Exil gehen. Ich bin sehr froh, dass heute einige von ihnen unserer Debatte folgen können.

Es war richtig, dass sich die EU nicht zur Legitimierung der gefälschten Wahlen missbrauchen ließ und eine Teilnahme an der Wahlbeobachtung verweigerte. Das war ein glasklares Zeichen. Europa muss jetzt zusätzliche Aktivitäten setzen – kompromisslos, rasch und mit Fristsetzungen. Im wirtschaftlichen Bereich gibt es da viele Möglichkeiten, wie in unser Entschließung aufgezeigt wird. Das sind wir den Menschen in diesem geplagten Land schuldig.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *auteur*. – Monsieur le Président, les élections législatives de juillet dernier ont, comme nous le craignons, vu le parti majoritaire remporter l'ensemble des sièges. C'est dire l'état de la régression des libertés dans ce pays, sa transformation de fait en un système de parti unique, la suppression de la liberté de la presse, l'emprisonnement des opposants politiques et la dissolution du principal parti d'opposition.

La libération de Kem Sokha, emprisonné depuis un an, est donc une bonne nouvelle, même si sa libération reste très conditionnelle, que sa liberté demeure très limitée et que le nombre de ceux qui sont toujours en prison, subissant des restrictions de liberté et des intimidations, est toujours aussi important.

Je voudrais cependant insister sur la situation des syndicalistes et de ceux qui luttent contre l'accaparement des terres, qui dépasse toutes les limites dans ce pays, au bénéfice principalement de l'industrie sucrière, y compris européenne.

Des milliers de personnes sont ruinées et / ou déplacées pour le plus grand profit des dirigeants du pays. Nous ne devons pas nous taire là-dessus non plus. Les droits de l'homme sont indivisibles et je voudrais, Madame la Haute représentante, avoir votre point de vue sur ce point précis.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *Autor*. – Pane předsedající, jsem rád, že se nám podařilo vyjednat velmi dobrý kompromis. Nicméně podobnou rezoluci už jsme přijali v září 2017, v prosinci 2017 a jaké jsou výsledky? Nula. Vážení kolegové, situace v Kambodži se vůbec nezměnila. Naopak, ta krize, která tam v současné době je, se ještě více eskaluje. Jsem rád, že jsme konečně přistoupili k daleko restriktivnějšímu a silnějšímu textu. Vyzýváme Komisi, aby vyvodila důsledky z toho, co se v současné době v Kambodži děje, aby vytvořila seznam zodpovědných osob, na které budou uvaleny sankce v podobě zákazů udělení víz do EU, a dala tak jasný signál členským státům, aby s tou situací začaly něco dělat. Je neakceptovatelné, abychom opravdu přijímali jednu deklaraci za druhou a situace se stávala horší a horší, proto je nutné, abychom spolupracovali – všechny složky EU – Komise, vysoká představitelka pro zahraniční politiku a bezpečnost – a donutili vládu Kambodže ke spolupráci. Evropská unie musí využít všechny své nástroje, aby pomohla situaci v Kambodži v současné době řešit.

Petras Auštrevičius, *author*. – Mr President, Madam High Representative, first of all I want to welcome Sam Rainsy and his delegation into this hall and I appreciate their uncompromising fight for the democratic future of Cambodia. Those people really deserve all kinds of support, from us and from the free world in general.

Despite the recent releases of a few political prisoners, including Kem Sokha, the situation in Cambodia is deteriorating further. Elections in July were nothing but a farce. All the seats went to the ruling party. What do they say about this? They appreciate it, they like it, they call it 'elections'. There cannot be another scenario from our side: we must firmly demand that the Cambodian Government give back the voice and the rights of its people. We must put an end to impunity. To achieve this, the European Union has to finally move from statements to actions. Cambodia cannot benefit any longer from GSP Plus trade preferences. Those responsible, Mr President, must be identified and punished by banning them from travelling to Europe and by freezing their assets.

Csaba Sógor, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, although the 23-year-long rule of the Cambodian People's Party (CPP) has led to significant economic development in Cambodia, recent trends in the country's political development are extremely worrying.

The entrenchment of the CPP's political dominance over the past few years has led to serious concerns for democracy. The last elections are very instructive in this regard, being widely considered by foreign observers as an undemocratic charade. And there are plenty of other concerns, too: the arrest and detention of Kem Sokha is just the latest in a series of crackdowns on political and other human rights.

If the country's government does not step back from dismantling democratic rights the EU would be well advised to launch an investigation under the mechanisms provided for in the framework of the Everything But Arms agreement and to consider reviewing the trade preferences Cambodia enjoys.

Julie Ward, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I was very happy to hear about the release of Kem Sokha. For us to know that a political prisoner is out of arbitrary detention is always a relief. Although this development is positive, the situation in Cambodia is still extremely serious, given the gross disregard of its international human rights obligations and the serious attacks on democracy, namely the complete silencing of political opposition along with the broader climate of shrinking space for civil society.

I'm particularly worried by the situation of human rights defenders, especially in light of the charges against five members of the Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association. As Europeans, we must always be aware of the violations conducted by our own companies in Cambodia. Attacks against indigenous peoples, including land-grabbing, affect many communities.

It's our responsibility to develop a trade policy that prevents corporations from harming these less developed countries and fragile states. Following the EU's decision to suspend direct budget support to Cambodia, I wish to remind this House, and the EU in general, of the importance of dialogue and people-to-people contact in these contexts.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I welcome this new strong resolution against Prime Minister Hun Sen and his government's repeated actions and violations of basic democratic principles. I want to welcome Sam Rainsy, a friend and a great leader, who does not give up in his struggle for more justice and democracy for the Cambodian people. The elections last July in Cambodia were a farce, the party of Hun Sen, in power for 33 years now, obtained 100% of all contested seats in the national assembly and the senate. The opposition was banned and declared illegal. The government of Hun Sen is illegitimate and I would like the EU and Ms Mogherini to recognise and acknowledge this fact.

The EU gives a lot of money to Cambodia and we cannot continue doing business as usual. Cambodia benefits from the most favourable regime available under the US Generalized System of Preferences. Under Article 19 of this regulation, in case of serious human rights and labour rights violations the EU should suspend the preferential tariffs temporarily. If the EU wants to save its credibility we cannot do business as usual. I call on the Commission to publish immediately the conclusions of the last EU fact-finding missions and I invite the Commission to report these conclusions as soon as possible to Parliament.

Angelo Ciocca, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, circa quaranta giorni fa sono stato appunto in Cambogia e ho documentato e denunciato l'assenza totale dei diritti umani in quel paese. E l'Europa che oggi piange, che cerca di riflettere sui problemi cambogiani, nella realtà è stata complice ed è complice di questa situazione.

Allora, se l'Europa vuole realmente guardare alla Cambogia e alle tematiche e alle problematiche dell'assenza di diritti umani nel Sud est asiatico, deve chiudere quegli accordi, ad esempio l'accordo EBA, che dopo diciotto anni non ha portato nessuna opportunità ai popoli cambogiani, ma ha addirittura danneggiato pesantemente il paese Italia e la nostra agricoltura. Va chiuso quell'accordo, vanno chiuse e fermate le invasioni di prodotto per evitare lo sfruttamento in Cambogia, per evitare di uccidere l'economia e l'occupazione del riso italiano e per evitare di avvelenare anche le nostre tavole.

Questo è un dato che ci deve far riflettere: la speranza di vita in Cambogia è di 64 anni. Noi non dobbiamo importare questa disperazione in Europa, non dobbiamo importare questa problematica in Italia, ma dobbiamo affrontarla semmai in Cambogia.

Signor Presidente, concludo con un appello velocissimo: mi rivolgo a coloro che oggi stanno mancando proprio di diritti umanitari nello sfrattare un uomo di 90 anni che si chiama nonno Mariano nel nostro paese Italia.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ostatnie wydarzenia w Kambodży, a przede wszystkim wybory, w których partia rządząca otrzymała sto procent głosów, czy rozwiązanie partii opozycyjnej jasno wskazują na bardzo smutną prawdę: Kambodży nie możemy postrzegać w kategoriach państwa demokratycznego. W tym kontekście uważam, że nie wystarczą już wezwania rządu kambodżańskiego do przestrzegania demokracji i poszanowania zasad państwa prawa. Aby ochronić naród kambodżański przed rządami autorytarnymi i łamaniem praw człowieka, musimy sięgnąć po bardziej zdecydowane środki. Dlatego w pełni popieram decyzję o wstrzymaniu pomocy Unii Europejskiej na wsparcie wyborów. Dodatkowo uważam, że należy rozważyć cofnięcie preferencji handlowych dla Kambodży, jak również wprowadzić ograniczenia wizowe dla osób odpowiedzialnych za łamanie praw człowieka w tym kraju.

Javier Nart (ALDE). – Señor presidente, estamos condenando unas elecciones fraudulentas y estamos condenando violaciones de derechos humanos. En Camboya el presidente Hun Sen, un antiguo comandante jemer rojo, genocida, y el presidente del Partido Popular de Camboya. ¿Dónde se incardina el Partido Popular de Camboya? ¡Ah, caramba! Se incardina en la Internacional Demócrata de Centro. ¿Y quién está en la Internacional Demócrata de Centro? El Partido Popular Europeo.

Así que comencemos por casa. Por coherencia, por decencia, por ética y por estética, lo primero que debería hacer el Partido Popular Europeo es pedir la expulsión de ese indecente partido con ese indecente presidente que es Hun Sen. Y algo que también nos corresponde a nosotros: no se trata de suspender la ayuda económica a las elecciones fraudulentas, que ya es suficiente, para decir que son inaceptables. Lo que hay que hacer es suspender toda ayuda a Camboya que no pase por las organizaciones internacionales creíbles. Lo demás es pura música, pura fanfarria.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, lo scorso 10 settembre è stato liberato su cauzione Kem Sokha, leader dell'opposizione cambogiana, arrestato con l'accusa di tradimento nonostante godesse dell'immunità parlamentare, e detenuto senza processo in maniera arbitraria per più di un anno. Come lui, tanti altri oppositori politici, attivisti e giornalisti sono finiti nel mirino di Hun Sen, il Primo ministro sempre più determinato a prolungare i suoi 33 anni al potere.

In un clima solo apparentemente democratico, il regime cleptocratico di Hun Sen ha censurato la rete e imbavagliato la stampa, assestando un duro colpo all'ultima parvenza di democraticità con la farsa delle ultime elezioni.

Quello che noi dobbiamo fare, cari colleghi, è sospendere immediatamente ogni forma di aiuto che non sia garantita dalle organizzazioni internazionali, e prendere finalmente la decisione di avere un atteggiamento consoni nei confronti di questi regimi che ancora oggi intrattengono con noi rapporti commerciali, anche a tassi vantaggiosi, senza lasciare che le egoistiche ambizioni di un uomo rovinino il sogno e il bisogno di democrazia dei cittadini cambogiani che ancora escono e sanano le ferite del terribile periodo dei Khmer rossi.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, obrigado pelas palavras simpáticas que nos dirigiu há pouco. Depois de, no ano passado, o Supremo Tribunal cambojano ter extinto o CNRP, o partido opositor que nas eleições de 2013 obteve 44 % dos votos, de ter detido o seu presidente e interditado a atividade política a mais de uma centena dos seus membros, as eleições de 2018 para o Senado e para o Parlamento não foram mais do que uma farsa para permitir que o partido do Primeiro-Ministro Hun Sen, no poder desde 1985, conquistasse todos os lugares destes dois órgãos de soberania e se perpetuasse no poder.

Senhora Alta Representante, tenho quase sempre elogiado o seu trabalho mas preciso, no caso do Camboja, dizer-lhe que a União Europeia, o segundo parceiro comercial do Camboja, foi lenta a reagir ao colapso do pluralismo e da democracia naquele país e, por isso, não pode agora deixar de aplicar sanções individuais aos responsáveis por esta deriva autoritária e continuar a manter acordos preferenciais de comércio desenvolvidos no esquema de «tudo menos armas» com um regime que viola as suas obrigações internacionais em matéria de direitos civis, políticos e laborais dos seus cidadãos, incluindo a Convenção contra a tortura.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Mr President, for over three decades Cambodia has been ruled by an authoritarian leader, Hun Sen. Prime Minister Hun Sen and his party use violence, politically motivated prosecutions and widespread corruption to intimidate and suppress any kind of political opposition. Fear of losing the national elections in July 2018 prompted a major crackdown. The primary opposition, the Cambodia National Rescue Party, has been dissolved by the courts, with a leader, Sam Rainsy, forced into exile and another, Kem Sokha, jailed. The government restricts independent media and civil society groups through forced closures, threats, intimidation and arbitrary detention. I call on the Cambodian authorities to put end to all forms of harassment, abuse and politically motivated criminal charges against members of the political opposition, human rights defenders, trade unions, labour rights advocates and other civil society activists, and journalists of course. We need to use our diplomatic tools to protect the fundamental rights of Cambodian people to elect and to be elected, to guarantee pluralism and democratic principles.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la velocità del crollo verticale della democrazia e dei diritti fondamentali in Cambogia è veramente sorprendente. In un solo anno, infatti, l'unico vero partito di opposizione, il *Cambodia National Rescue Party*, è stato sciolto e il suo leader Kem Sokha è stato incarcerato con false accuse.

Cosa ci ricorda lo scivolamento verso un partito unico, il culto della personalità del leader, la repressione e l'ossessione verso qualsiasi tipo di opposizione? A me ricorda Pol Pot e la terribile dittatura dei *Khmer Rouge*, durante la quale ogni singola norma aveva l'obiettivo di distruggere, torturare ed estirpare chiunque venisse anche solo sospettato di non essere allineato al regime.

Vogliamo ricordare che il Primo ministro Hun Sen e due alti ufficiali sono ex membri dei *Khmer Rouge*? Quanta differenza troviamo oggi tra il *Cambodian People's Party* e il *Communist Party of Kampuchea* di Pol Pot? La caccia al dissidente è rimasta praticamente la stessa. La memoria storica è importante affinché la storia non si ripeta, e la Cambogia oggi rischia proprio questo.

Invito pertanto la Commissione a sospendere con la Cambogia il programma di accesso preferenziale al nostro mercato unico e renderlo condizionale al rispetto dei diritti umani e civili.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, last year saw significant steps backwards for Cambodia's fragile democracy. One-party rule, authoritarian tendencies that have gained more ground in the country, and the space for political opposition and civil society has not so much shrunk as simply closed.

At the general election in July following the enforced dissolution of the main opposition party, the ruling party won all seats in the National Assembly. The election took place in a highly restrictive environment and it was clearly not representative of the democratic will of the Cambodian citizens.

Last February, at the European Union Foreign Affairs Council, we stressed that the Cambodian electoral process could not be considered legitimate after the arbitrary exclusion of the main opposition party, and so we suspended the European Union financial assistance to the Cambodian National Election Committee and we declined to observe the July elections.

Over the last year the legal system has increasingly been used by the authorities in the country to suppress critical voices, not only from the opposition but also from civil society and the media, and at the Foreign Affairs Council in February, we stated that we may consider specific targeted measures if the situation had not improved. So, the situation has not improved and we are now considering the possibility of further measures that, as you know, would require the Council to take a unanimous decision.

We also recall that the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including labour rights, is essential for maintaining EU trade preferences. For this reason we sent already in July a fact-finding mission to Cambodia to evaluate the situation on the ground, and the decisions on any further steps will be based on the information gathered during this mission.

The European Union has been working with and for the people of Cambodia since the end of the war. At first we helped rebuild the country. We helped clear it of landmines and restart fundamental economic activities. Today we support job-creation and vocational training and we would like this partnership to continue, in order to continue to benefit the people of Cambodia. But it is clear that the Cambodian Government must reverse the current trend, otherwise this would not be possible.

The recent release on bail of opposition leader Kem Sokha is a positive first step, even though he was released under very restrictive conditions. We now expect the dropping of all charges and the removal of all restrictions placed upon him and we invite the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition to start a dialogue on the way forward.

We urge the Cambodian authorities to drop all remaining politically motivated charges against activists and lift the ban on the political activity of 118 senior opposition members. Local councillors from the opposition who were elected in June last year should be reinstated. We also call on the Cambodian Government to guarantee the safe return of all exiled opposition politicians, civil society activists and human rights defenders who have fled the country to avoid arrest.

The laws and regulations that have been used to restrict opposition and civil society must be reviewed and amended.

At the 1991 Paris Peace Accords the Cambodian Government agreed to a legally binding obligation to maintain a pluralistic and democratic system, so we now expect the Cambodian authorities to restore free political debate and competition, and to respect the space for a free and independent civil society.

If we continue to see this negative trend without any changes, as I said, we are ready in the Council to take appropriate measures.

(Applause)

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się po zakończeniu debat.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono o godz. 11.39 w oczekiwaniu na wystąpienie premiera Zorana Zaeva)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

7. Nastavak zasjedanja

(La seduta è ripresa alle 11.49)

8. Govor Zorana Zaeva, premijera bivše jugoslavenske republike Makedonije

Presidente. – Salutiamo il Primo ministro dell'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia Zoran Zaev. Il Primo ministro si esprimerà di fronte al Parlamento europeo alla vigilia di un importante referendum che si svolgerà nel suo paese. Sulla questione del nome da dare allo Stato sono in corso trattative e si è giunti a un accordo con il governo greco, ma anche sull'integrazione verso l'Europa e sull'integrazione nel sistema della NATO.

Il Primo ministro è venuto di fronte al Parlamento europeo a illustrarci qual è la situazione nel suo paese. Per noi, come sapete, la stabilità dei Balcani è fondamentale e il dialogo interreligioso nei Balcani è fondamentale. Quindi lui sa bene che il suo paese può contare sul sostegno dell'Unione europea, ma credo che per tutti quanti noi sia interessante ascoltare qual è la situazione in questo importante Stato dei Balcani e capire qual è il futuro dell'intera regione attraverso le sue parole.

Zoran Zaev, Prime Minister of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. – *(The following is a transcription of the interpretation of the original speech from Macedonian into English.)* Mr President, I feel honoured and more than happy to have received your invitation and I want to express my gratitude for your warm welcome.

For our Macedonian people, this is a historic moment. This is the first time that a Prime Minister of our country has addressed the European Parliament in their own language, but yet I have the feeling that I am at home. I feel so good. It is so natural to be here in the home that we belong to, in the home of our European family, to feel invited and to feel welcome.

As you surely know, the people in our country are facing yet another historic crossroads. In the lead-up to this new historic challenge, we have received in recent weeks a great deal of encouragement from you. Many Members of the European Parliament, leaders of the Council and the Commission visited our country to demonstrate their support for the referendum on 30 September when the Macedonian people will decide on the agreement with Greece signed in Prespa. Citizens know what decision they need to make. This is not an easy decision. We will be a 'Republic of North Macedonia', but with recognition for the Macedonian people and the Macedonian language. We all know what benefits derive from this decision and we know that this is the best opportunity our country has been given thus far. We know that it is a once in a lifetime opportunity and we will not miss that opportunity. We will seize it because this is our ticket for entering the European Union and NATO.

Only a few days ago we celebrated our Independence Day. On 8 September 1991, the vast majority of our citizens voted in favour of a free, independent and sovereign state. This impressive result was based on a wide consensus. People placed the fate of their country before everything. They rose above their political differences. This consensus involved all ethnic and social groups that dreamed of a better life in an independent country.

I was 17 years old at that historic time in 1991. I was yet another of the many young people living and dreaming of life in a free society: dreaming of their future in an open society, aiming for progress. We didn't want to stay any longer in the remnants of the former Yugoslavia that was turning into a regime. We did not want to be isolated from the rest of the world. We wanted to create a democratic country of opportunities, a union of prosperity where the rule of law guarantees justice and where we would be full of hope. We deeply believed in the opportunity we had. We believed in the end of political repression and an end to poverty. We believed in a better life in an independent republic. We were certain that the next generation would have more than we had ever dreamed of. We dreamed of being part of the European family.

We belong here geographically, historically and culturally, and we share European values. We see our future as part of the European Union. The perspective for EU membership is a mobilising factor bringing together all the stakeholders in society to work for the successful implementation of the reforms and to deal with challenges on that path.

Our people have worked very hard to accomplish their dreams and to reach their goals. Yes, we have made progress but this is not enough: 27 years later some of our dreams have still not become reality, and I am not satisfied because I know that we can do better. We are struggling with internal political conflicts. We are fighting not to be isolated from the rest of the world, and we did have conflicts with our neighbours. As a small country and a young democracy, we are still facing great challenges, but we have never lost our vision and we have never stopped fighting for a better future. We will certainly not stop now. We believe that we are in our rightful place and we strongly believe in a better future. We believe in our future as a respected member of the international community and this proud European family. Joining this family will bring greater stability for all of us and greater prosperity on the home front.

As Prime Minister, I assure you that we are doing everything possible to reach the standards of the European Union. We know the recommendations. They are our priorities: independent and democratic institutions, the rule of law, the fight against corruption, a professional, service-oriented public administration. We know there is a long road ahead of us. However, your warm welcome and your encouragement strongly motivate us and give us the strength to continue implementing our reform agenda.

The European idea is the guiding force and an inspiration in settling burning open issues in the region. The Republic of Macedonia is a case in point. Our strong faith in the European future was the key motive in reaching the historic agreements with Greece and with Bulgaria. We are proud of both agreements. I would like to thank my friends Boyko Borisov and Alexis Tsipras. We are a European success story, being an authentic model of a functional multi-ethnic democracy. We are a microcosm of Europe. We are living day by day the European motto, 'united in diversity' with all its advantages and challenges.

The political crisis we have overcome was, in fact, a fight for values, the kind of fight that can be seen in Europe, in the European and global setting: the fight for liberal values, the rule of law, human rights and freedoms, democratic governance, and an open economy as opposed to authoritarian nationalism. Our citizens have made their choice. They have committed themselves to European values and to a European Macedonia. We want to serve as an example and an inspiration for settling all bilateral issues in the Western Balkans and we strongly support finding sustainable solutions, founded on European values and international law, that will lastingly stabilise the region and will prepare the region for its integration into the European Union.

One of the most important issues that we needed to resolve was the name difference with Greece because this is a condition for starting negotiations for our accession to the EU and NATO. The strong motivation, and the model in the search for the solution of this difference with Greece, came precisely from the European Union, as the most successful peace project in the world: a model that has resolved great historical conflict situations, turning them into sustainable communities of friendship and trust. We share these European values. With the help of our European friends we have transformed our political misunderstanding with the Hellenic Republic within a community of good and friendly neighbours.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my friend Alexis Tsipras, knowing that it is not easy for him either. We had delicate, sensitive talks. This is what responsible leaders need to do. We both made concessions but we are getting so much more in the interests of our peoples and in the name of our future. We have put an end to a difference that was an obstacle for our country for a full 25 years. We have laid the foundations for new friendly relations and for a partnership that will enhance stability, security and the economy in our region.

We have reached an agreement about our respective, specific identity features once and for all and I believe we will make the right choice. I believe that we have a good respectful agreement that affirms our identity and guarantees our future – the future of both peoples and states.

The Prespa agreement is an excellent model for settling sensitive identity issues and it can be applied in other regions worldwide. The Prespa agreement is a compromise to shift from the status quo and move forward to the future. Now we have the opportunity to leave our past behind and take this step to the future. It is up to the citizens of our two countries to decide whether they will take this step across the threshold to the future. For Macedonia it is an opportunity that we have been awaiting for so long. In 1991, we voted for independence in a referendum and, again in a referendum, we need to take the next step, to create a realistic possibility of becoming the 30th member of NATO and closing, chapter by chapter, the process for our pending membership of the EU and of the European family.

The referendum on 30 September is much more than just a referendum on the Prespa agreement. This is a referendum for our future. This is a referendum on our second independence, a referendum of historic proportions, on a par with 1991. We know that our freedom and independence as a small country is only guaranteed as a member of the international community, as a member of the EU and NATO. This is not only for the Republic of Macedonia: all our neighbours will have a better future when we act as an alliance and a family. The integration of the Balkan countries in the EU will bring about even greater stability around Europe. There can be no strong Europe without a successful Balkans region, and the Balkans can be successful only when integrated into the EU.

This vision motivated us to take this historic step and encourage the process of reconciliation – building a community and an alliance in the region. The consolidation of the EU can – and should – take place along with the European consolidation of the Balkans. The benefits are multiple for the Union: strengthening stability in Europe; contributing to nurturing European values; more successfully handling security risks, migration and the fight against terrorism; preventing the influence of third parties; and enhancing the role of the EU on the international stage. Indeed, it was addressing security challenges and risks during the migration crisis that showed that we need to work together and that we can be trustworthy partners and allies. The European integration of the Balkans is a geostrategic investment in a stable, strong and united Europe based on common values and standards.

Membership of the EU will bring a lot of benefits and new opportunities for the people of the Republic of Macedonia. The EU and NATO will allow us to strengthen our economy. Even now we can see it: the economy is on an upward trend; growth rates rise by the month; foreign investments are a reality now, and we know that there is more to come.

The EU and NATO are a chance for a better living standard for the coming generations. Membership of the EU and NATO is a guarantee for our independence, freedom and democracy, better education, better health care, and better infrastructure. These are the chances that we are getting and this is the responsibility that we need to take. I know that it is up to us.

We also know what we can give back to our European family. We can give our loyalty, as we have already proved on many an occasion. We can give back true passion for the European idea. For us, Europe is much more than just a union, much more than just growth and economic security. For us, Europe means living in a modern, equal and open society with clear democratic standards, with the rule of law, solidarity, better courts and equal justice for all. We are a multi-ethnic country. We know and respect the benefits of community, we cherish the concept of a single society for all and we know that strength in society comes from unity. This is why we have a broad consensus in our country for entry into the EU and NATO. This consensus unites Macedonians, Albanians, Turks, the Roma, Serbs, Bosniaks the Vlachs, Egyptians, Bulgarians and everyone else living in Macedonia.

When it comes to the strategic interests of our country, I also wish us to be united, and to be united in politics as well. More than three-quarters of our population support membership of the EU and European values. Yes, our people want to be part of this family. They feel European and they belong to Europe. In 1991 I was 17 and this was everything I ever dreamed of: to be part of the European family and have a European future. The young in our country still dream about this today.

Twenty-seven years later, I am the Prime Minister and I am addressing the European Parliament on behalf of the citizens of my country in my own Macedonian mother tongue. It is now for us to decide on our future and we are grateful for this historic moment. We are proud that our beloved country finally has a chance to take membership of the EU and NATO full circle.

I can feel this right now. I can feel how close we are to accomplishing this dream for the European Macedonia. This is why I believe that the referendum will be a success and that our citizens will vote for Europe. The referendum on 30 September is our stake in and our contribution to a stronger Europe: to unity and greater stability in the region. We consider today's event and this invitation to address you, as support by the European Parliament for our European future and for taking the right path.

Thank you, President Tajani, and thank you dear Members of the European Parliament for the honour you have given us today.

(The House accorded the speaker a standing ovation)

President. – I think that the message from the European Parliament for your country is a good message today. Prime Minister, thank you for coming. You will have our support. Your country will have our support for the stability of the Western Balkans. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

(The sitting was suspended at 12.10 pending the vote)

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

9. Nastavak zasjedanja*(The sitting resumed at 12.14)***10. Glasovanje****President.** – The next item is the vote:*(For the results and other details of the vote: see Minutes)*

10.1. Uganda, uhićenje oporbenih parlamentarnih zastupnika (RC-B8-0364/2018, B8-0364/2018, B8-0365/2018, B8-0367/2018, B8-0368/2018, B8-0372/2018, B8-0378/2018) (glasovanje)

10.2. Mjanmar, posebno slučaj novinara Wa Lonea i Kyawa Soe Ooa (RC-B8-0371/2018, B8-0371/2018, B8-0374/2018, B8-0376/2018, B8-0379/2018, B8-0380/2018, B8-0381/2018, B8-0382/2018) (glasovanje)

— *Before the vote on the motion for a resolution:*

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Voordat we stemmen over de resolutie over Cambodja, wil ik er als mede-indiener even de aandacht op vestigen dat we op de publiekstribune een delegatie uit Cambodja hebben, met een groep monniken en ook oppositieleider Sam Rainsy. Ik wil hen van harte verwelkomen op de publiekstribune. Ze hebben onze debatten gevolgd.

10.3. Kambodža, posebno slučaj Kema Sokhe (RC-B8-0366/2018, B8-0366/2018, B8-0369/2018, B8-0370/2018, B8-0373/2018, B8-0375/2018, B8-0377/2018) (glasovanje)

10.4. Sporazum o suradnji između Eurojusta i Albanije (A8-0275/2018 - Laura Ferrara) (glasovanje)

10.5. Zaštita pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka u institucijama, tijelima, uređima i agencijama Unije i slobodno kretanje takvih podataka (A8-0313/2017 - Cornelia Ernst) (glasovanje)

10.6. Jedinstveni digitalni pristupnik (A8-0054/2018 - Marlene Mizzi) (glasovanje)

10.7. Odluka o stupanju u međuinstitucijske pregovore: Popis trećih zemalja čiji državljani moraju imati vizu pri prelasku vanjskih granica i zemalja čiji su državljani izuzeti od tog zahtjeva (Kosovo*) (A8-0261/2016 - Tanja Fajon) (glasovanje)

— *Before the vote:*

Tanja Fajon, rapporteur. – Madam President, today we simply vote on the mandate for trilogues for Kosovo visa liberalisation. This is not a final vote. However, the credibility of this House is very much at stake. Kosovo has fulfilled all the criteria for visa liberalisation, and now it is our job to deliver. We have done the same in all other cases, such as Moldova, Ukraine and Georgia, and I would ask you to vote in favour and to approve the mandate of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs. Kosovo's citizens deserve that.

10.8. Odgovor EU-a na požare iz srpnja 2018. u Matiju u grčkoj regiji Atici (RC-B8-0388/2018, B8-0388/2018, B8-0390/2018, B8-0391/2018, B8-0392/2018, B8-0393/2018, B8-0394/2018) (glasovanje)

10.9. Prijetnja rušenja Khan al-Ahmara i drugih beduinskih naselja (B8-0383/2018, RC-B8-0384/2018, B8-0384/2018, B8-0385/2018, B8-0386/2018, B8-0387/2018, B8-0389/2018) (glasovanje)

10.10. Europska strategija za plastiku u kružnom gospodarstvu (A8-0262/2018 - Mark Demesmaeker) (glasovanje)

10.11. Mogućnosti za poboljšanje povezanosti zakonodavstva o kemikalijama, proizvodima i otpadu (B8-0363/2018) (glasovanje)

10.12. Europski akcijski plan „Jedno zdravlje” za borbu protiv antimikrobne otpornosti (A8-0257/2018 - Karin Kadenbach) (glasovanje)

10.13. Europa u pokretu: program za budućnost mobilnosti u EU-u (A8-0241/2018 - István Ujhelyi) (glasovanje)

10.14. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (A8-0268/2018 - Pavel Poc) (glasovanje)

10.15. Dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (A8-0267/2018 - Olga Sehnalová) (glasovanje)

President. – That concludes the vote.

11. Obrazloženja glasovanja

11.1. Zaštita pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka u institucijama, tijelima, uređima i agencijama Unije i slobodno kretanje takvih podataka (A8-0313/2017 - Cornelia Ernst)

Oral explanations of vote

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, sorry for the delay. I am very glad to support this report with a view to better protecting our citizens' personal data, particularly in the context of data processing by the institutions. Having led negotiations on GDPR for the Industry, Research and Energy Committee (ITRE) on behalf of the PPE I am well aware of the need to ensure that citizens' data is protected and their rights respected.

During meetings with leading technology companies in Silicon Valley earlier this year, it was clear to me that regulation on data protection is increasingly significant to the lives of all citizens, and harmonisation of the regulation in EU institutions is essential. If we are to ensure an effective data protection framework that adequately supports and protects individuals, the rules of the institutions, bodies and agencies must be adapted accordingly. European citizens have a right to control their own private data, how it is collected, stored and used by others, and it is only right that data controllers exercise the utmost responsibility with individuals' information. This is vital and I welcome this important move today.

11.2. Jedinstveni digitalni pristupnik (A8-0054/2018 - Marlene Mizzi)

Oral explanations of vote

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, to all of those who believe that Brussels is just composed of grey bureaucrats imposing their decisions on the national governments, I would advise them to look at what we just voted.

For example, people who wanted to take advantage of the single market, those who want to work somewhere else in some other states, who may want to open business in some other state, they need that crucial information online. For example, how to register in a new city, how to calculate taxes, how to find where the closest garbage collector is, etc. 92% of the European population don't know that they can get that the information online and now, today, we've fixed that problem. We have just voted to establish a single digital gateway to ensure that citizens and businesses have easy online access to complete, accurate and up-to-date information. Thanks to this House, we have made the lives of European citizens much easier.

Lucy Anderson (S&D). – Madam President, well this new measure will establish an improved easy-to-use version of the Your Europe web portal. So I was very pleased to vote in favour today as the enhanced Your Europe portal will help citizens and organisations quickly find the information they need to carry out key activities across the EU, such as starting a business or obtaining proof of residence.

The Socialists and Democrats took the lead on Parliament's input and secured an excellent result, including better access for disabled users and more security and safety in relation to personal data. But it is very worrying that the UK Government has no idea, as in so many other areas, how to replicate such an effective tool for individuals and for businesses after Brexit.

11.3. Europska strategija za plastiku u kružnom gospodarstvu (A8-0262/2018 - Mark Demesmaeker)

Oral explanations of vote

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, tuto zprávu z vlastní iniciativy jsem podpořila. Považuji problém plastového odpadu za celosvětovou záležitost a EU je jeden z globálních aktérů a měli bychom tedy v boji za čisté životní prostředí jít příkladem. Studie o tom, kolik plastového odpadu se vyprodukuje v EU za rok, přinesla alarmující údaje. Postupně znečišťujeme naši planetu, což má i negativní dopad na zdraví lidí. Navíc plastovým odpadem zvyšujeme i hospodářské ztráty. Pokud současný stav odpovídá pouhým 30 % recyklovatelných plastů v EU, musíme se společně zasadit o zlepšení této situace. Kromě opatření na úrovni Komise a členských států považuji za důležité podněcovat občanskou debatu a vyzývat průmyslové podniky k realizaci opatření, která množství nerecyklovatelného plastového odpadu sníží.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, on tärkeää, että olemme tehneet suuria strategioita muovin vähentämiseksi ja luomme järjestelmiä sen kierrättämiseksi. On hyvä, että EU:ssa on myös toimittu nopeasti ja meillä on käytössä jo tai työn alla myös jo konkreettisia muovin käytön estämiseen tähtääviä direktiivejä.

Siitä lähtien kun valaat löydettiin vatsa täynnä muovia ja olemme tulleet tietoisiksi mikromuoveista ja niiden päätyemisestä kiertoon, meillä on ollut vahva kansan tuki toimia. Meidän täytyy pelastaa meriämme ja myös ekosysteemiämme, jossa mikromuovit esiintyvät valtavasti.

On paljon yhteisiä haasteita, jotka jakavat koko maapallon meriemme kautta, mutta myös alueellisia haasteita. Eräs niistä on esimerkiksi omassa maassani Itämeren rannalla Suomessa, jossa myös lumia kipataan meriin ja niiden mukana päätyy erilaisia muovituotteita myös meriin. Sen takia toivon myös alueellisia keinoja ja toimia, myös osana alueohjelmia, joista nyt MFF:n yhteydessä neuvottelemme.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałam za sprawozdaniem w sprawie europejskiej strategii na rzecz tworzyw sztucznych w gospodarce o obiegu zamkniętym i poparłabym każde działanie, jakie rzeczywiście ograniczałoby stosowanie plastików. Działanie takie powinno obejmować nie tylko pojemniki na żywność czy butelki, ale przede wszystkim mikrocząstki plastiku dodawane do kosmetyków, środków czyszczących, żywności a nawet leków.

Strategia wiąże się z wydatkami, jednak oszczędności dla konsumentów szacowane są na miliardy euro, nie licząc bezcennych skutków dla ochrony zdrowia. Równoległe ze strategią na rzecz tworzyw sztucznych w obiegu zamkniętym bardzo ważna jest eliminacja mikrocząstek plastiku. W przeciwnym razie może chodzić tylko o następny interes związany z wymuszaniem wprowadzenia np. automatów do recyklingu butelek. Prawie regułą już stały się nowe regulacje wprowadzane wskutek poprzednich – niszczących środowisko, powstałych czasem bez wyobraźni, nie wspominając o sumieniu – które spowodowały ogromne straty zdrowotne u ludzi i zwierząt.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem tuto zprávu podpořil, tato strategie pro plasty totiž navazuje na letos schválený odpadový balíček. Měla by sloužit k podnícení investic a nastavení nových udržitelných obchodních modelů ve výrobě plastů. Cílem také je, aby průmyslové podniky do roku 2030 používaly při výrobě výhradně plasty, které jsou opětovně použitelné nebo recyklovatelné. Jak uvádí zpráva, na území EU je v současné době recyklováno méně než 30 % plastového odpadu, což tedy způsobuje skutečně enormní zátěž životnímu prostředí. Do roku 2030 by podle dohodnutých pravidel mělo být recyklováno 55 % plastových obalů. Výzva, před kterou tedy stojíme, je skutečně zásadní. Musí se zapojit vlády, podniky, samozřejmě i občané a obce. Právě samosprávy se s plasty potýkají v první řadě a evropské fondy jim v tom musí vycházet vstříc. Evropa musí ale také investovat do výzkumu, technologií, jinak se cíle zásadní redukce odpadu podaří jen stěží naplnit.

11.4. Europski akcijski plan „Jedno zdravlje” za borbu protiv antimikrobne otpornosti (A8-0257/2018 - Karin Kadenbach)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałam za sprawozdaniem w sprawie europejskiego planu działania „Jedno zdrowie” na rzecz zwalczania oporności na środki przeciwdrobnoustrojowe. Odporność ta narasta, stwarzając ryzyko dla życia, szczególnie dla życia ludzi. Tylko w 2010 r. na całym świecie zużyto 63 000 ton antybiotyków do chowu krów, świń i kurczaków, co było dwukrotnie wyższe od liczby antybiotyków przepisywanych przez lekarzy do zwalczania infekcji u ludzi. Żałuję, że nie zostały przyjęte zgłaszane przeze mnie poprawki, w których zwracałam szczególną uwagę na przyczyny powstawania antybiotykooporności, zależne od współczesnych metod hodowli i upraw, które w największym stopniu są odpowiedzialne za aktualne zaburzenia i nieprawidłowości.

Zasada „Jedno zdrowie” powinna obowiązywać tym bardziej, że zdrowie ludzi i zwierząt, jak i środowisko są ze sobą powiązane i choroby wymagają zwalczania z wprowadzeniem działań, takich jak szybkie testy diagnostyczne, higiena, kontrola wypisywania antybiotyków (traktowanych także jako antybiotykowe czynniki wzrostu) czy nadużywania antybiotyków, zwłaszcza u zwierząt, oraz podawanie alternatywnych środków przeciwdrobnoustrojowych.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Ako lekárku ma veľmi teší prijatie tejto správy. Antimikrobiálna rezistencia sa označuje za hrozbu pre budúce generácie. Štatistiky hovoria, že v roku 2050 pri súčasnom trende si rezistencia na antibiotiká vyžiada viac obetí ako všetky onkologické ochorenia spolu. Preto vítam iniciatívu, s ktorou prišla Európska komisia. Je si však potrebné uvedomiť niekoľko skutočností. Do výskumu a vývoja nových antibiotík je potrebné investovať čas, energiu a hlavne veľké finančné prostriedky. Správne predpisovanie a presné užívanie antibiotík je *conditio sine qua non*. Používanie antibiotík nemôže nahrádzať dodržiavanie hygienických štandardov ani u človeka ani u zvierat. Nesmieme však prepadnúť panike, lebo nepodanie antibiotík v indikovaných prípadoch môže spôsobiť smrť ľudí, ktorým sa dalo pomôcť.

11.5. Europa u pokretu: program za budúcnost mobilnosti u EU-u (A8-0241/2018 - István Ujhelyi)

Oral explanations of vote

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report. Mobility has a major influence on how we live our lives today. It plays a vital role in the EU economy and society and it is imperative that we do everything in our power to improve it. The automotive industry accounts for almost 7% of the EU's GDP and employs 12.2 million people. It is estimated that passenger transport will grow by about 42% between 2010 and 2050 and that freight transport will grow by about 60% during the same period. Therefore Europe on the Move will aid this growth by making traffic safer, encouraging smart road charging, reducing CO₂ emissions, air pollution and congestion, fighting illicit employment and ensuring proper conditions and rest time for workers. The long-term benefits of these measures will extend far beyond the transport sector by promoting growth and job creation. So I welcome the report.

11.6. Provedba Uredbe o sredstvima za zaštitu bilja (A8-0268/2018 - Pavel Poc)

Oral explanations of vote

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, tuto zprávu z vlastní iniciativy jsem podpořila. Nedávný spor ohledně obnovení schválení glyfosátů poukázal na to, že důvěra v povolení přípravků na ochranu rostlin v EU byla vážně poškozena. Je tedy nutné posoudit, jak účinně a bezpečně probíhá povolovací režim pesticidů a herbicidů na úrovni Unie i členských států. Zejména pokud jde o povolování konkrétních přípravků na úrovni členských států, existují vážné pochybnosti o odůvodněnosti uplatňování velkého množství výjimek. Zpráva také správně apeluje na to, aby státy mezi sebou lépe sdílely data o přípravcích a zvýšily transparentnost procesu. V tomto ohledu nejsou některé cíle nařízení splněny. V sázce je samozřejmě hodně. Na jedné straně práce zemědělců, jejich výnosy a také zajištění potravin pro populaci. Na straně druhé je ochrana veřejného zdraví a naše opatření by měla být vyvážená.

Bolesław G. Piecha (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wstrzymałem się od głosu. Dlaczego? Zdaję sobie przecież sprawę, że słusznie w sprawozdaniu wezwano do wzmożonych kontroli i podkreślono potrzebę większej innowacyjności, jednak wiele zapisów dotyczy środków już istniejących albo wprowadzonych, czyli działa *ex post*. Mało jakby to sprawozdanie kieruje się w przyszłość.

W sprawozdaniu pojawiają się też liczne stwierdzenia, z którymi trudno mi się zgodzić, a mianowicie dotyczące przyspieszonej procedury zatwierdzania środków pochodzenia biologicznego. Co więcej, nie mogę się również zgodzić z niektórymi – nie do końca moim zdaniem słusznymi – tezami analizy Biura Analiz Parlamentu Europejskiego, które argumentuje, że odstępstwa i procedura dostarczania danych potwierdzających pozwoliła utrzymać na rynku produkty objęte ograniczeniami. A przecież w tych przypadkach obowiązujące przepisy w pełni uwzględniają dane ryzyko i nie ma potrzeby ich zmiany. Z tego powodu, wobec tych niespójności, wstrzymałem się od głosu.

11.7. Dvojna kvaliteta proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu (A8-0267/2018 - Olga Sehnalová)

Oral explanations of vote

Norbert Erdős (PPE). – Elnök asszony! Tisztelt képviselőtársaim! Nagy örömmel támogattam az egységes piacon belül forgalmazott termékek eltérő minőségéről szóló európai parlamenti állásfoglalás megszavazását, hiszen ebbe a javaslataim döntő része is belekerült. Egy indítványomat azonban nem támogatta az Európai Parlament, pedig valós kihívásra világít rá. Nemcsak az azonos márkájú, hanem a megtévesztően hasonló megjelenésű termékek is félrevezethetik a fogyasztókat, hiszen például a nagyon hasonló színeket, ábrákat és elnevezéseket látva, a vásárlók könnyen hihetik, hogy egy másik márká termékét veszik meg, pedig valójában nem. A jövőben ezért az azonos márkájú termékek mellett a megtévesztően hasonló megjelenésű termékek minőségét is rendszeresen össze kellene vetni. Köszönöm szépen, hogy meghallgattak.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, zpráva o dvojí kvalitě shrnuje všechny aktivity, které na úrovni EU byly dosud prováděny. Bylo jich hodně a bylo potřeba prokázat to, že skutečně zde existují potraviny a jiné produkty, které mají stejný obal, ale jinou kvalitu. Trvalo to dlouho, ale nakonec jsme velmi ráda, že i Komise uznala, že je třeba tuto situaci řešit. Hlasovala jsem tedy pro všechny pozměňovací návrhy. Domnívám se, že jejich cílem je skutečně využít všechny nástroje k tomu, aby byla prováděna systematická a efektivní kontrola kvality produktů, aby byla zajištěna spravedlnost pro všechny spotřebitele na jednotném trhu. Děkuji všem, kteří zprávu připravili.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Aj napriek tomu, že spotrebiteľia Európskej únie majú rovnaké práva, z analýz vyplýva, že niektorí producenti a výrobcovia predávajú výrobky rozdielnej kvality pod tou istou značkou a s klamlivo rovnakým vzhľadom.

Tento problém je rozšírený asi najviac v členských krajinách, ktoré pristúpili do Európskej únie po roku 2004. Ja osobne mám skúsenosti s rôznymi druhmi tovarov od potravín, kozmetiky, čistiacich prostriedkov, ktoré nakupujem vo Francúzsku, Nemecku či v Rakúsku a ktoré sa predávajú aj u nás na Slovensku pod rovnakou značkou. Že sú niektoré potravinové či iné tovary rozdielne pre dospelých by v niektorých prípadoch možno bolo aj tolerovateľné. Aleže sa množia prípady podstatných rozdielov pri detských potravinách a detských výrobkoch aj pre dojatá je absolútne nepripustné.

Preto vítam pilotný projekt Parlamentu na rok 2018, ktorý bude v rôznych výrobkoch vyhodnocovať rôzne aspekty dvojitej kvality. Pripájam sa k výzve, aby sa poslancom umožnilo väčšie zapojenie do dohľadu nad týmto projektom.

12. Izmjene danih glasova i namjere glasača: vidi zapisnik

(The sitting was suspended at 12.52)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

13. Nastavak zasjedanja

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

14. Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik

15. Sastav odbora i izaslanstava: vidi zapisnik

16. Dulja zastupnička pitanja (rasprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die große Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung mit Aussprache von Ivan Jakovčić an die Kommission: Europatag zum gesetzlichen Feiertag erklären, damit die Werte der EU gefördert werden (G-000006/2018 - B8-0038/2018).

Ivan Jakovčić, autor. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ova inicijativa je moja inicijativa ovdje u Europskom parlamentu i ja sam je zaista htio vidjeti kao točku dnevnog reda Europskog parlamenta, ali ona izvorno dolazi s Twittera s porukom jednog gospodina koji ima profil @NeoZG. Gospodin je rođen u Sarajevu, u jednoj multietničkoj sredini. Živi u Zagrebu. Osobno ga ne poznajem, ali sam se oduševio njegovom idejom kada je upravo 9. svibnja ove godine izašao s inicijativom na toj društvenoj mreži i rekao kako bi ustvari dan Europe trebao postati državni praznik u zemljama članicama, odnosno kako bi Europa trebala imati svoj državni praznik jer upravo temelji ujedinjene Europe nastaju nakon Drugog svjetskog rata i svega onog stradanja kojeg smo imali.

Mene je ta ideja jednostavno oduševila. Odgovorio sam mu da sam puno maštao o tome kako bi dan Europe postao praznik u svim zemljama članicama i kako bih zaista volio vidjeti da sve zemlje članice imaju veliki praznik na dan Europe, a ne samo da u Moskvi imamo defile i proslavu dana pobjede na jedan spektakularan način svaki put. Mislim da to trebamo imati i u ovom dijelu europskoga kontinenta, ne samo na krajnjem istoku i vjerujem da ova inicijativa može biti taj jedan mali mozaik u stvaranju želje da dan Europe, dan pobjede, postane državni praznik u svim zemljama članicama.

Ono što želim naglasiti je svakako potreba da se prisjetimo da je upravo 9. svibnja dan Europe u spomen na deklaraciju koju je toga dana 1950. predstavio Robert Schuman. Taj se datum tradicionalno smatra početkom izgradnje današnje Europske unije. S jedne strane taj dan služi kako bi se istaknulo da Europska unija počiva na načelima vladavine prava i demokracije te podsjetilo kako se životi ljudi zahvaljujući Europskoj uniji mijenjaju nabolje. S druge strane, dan Europe je prilika za međusobno približavanje građana različitih država, svladavanje sve većeg osjećaja udaljenosti između građana i europskih institucija pa čak i za suzbijanje negativnog raspoloženja protiv Europske unije koje postoji, moramo biti potpuno objektivni, u nekim dijelovima Europske unije.

Uzimajući to u obzir želim Komisiji postaviti sljedeća pitanja:

— Bi li Komisija potaknula države članice da dan Europe obilježavaju kao državni praznik? I ako da, na koji to način može učiniti?

— Drugo, može li Komisija navesti koje su mjere već donesene kako bi se zajedničke vrijednosti Europske unije dijelile između građana i europskih institucija te kako 9. svibnja ne bi samo bio proslava izjave kojom su postavljeni temelji europske integracije, nego i prilika za promišljanje o glavnim izazovima, primjerice danas u područjima migracija, sigurnosti i gospodarstva?

— I treće, poduzima li Komisija trenutačno bilo kakve mjere kako bi promicala dan Europe kao dan obilježavanja vrijednosti građana Europske unije?

Možda na neka pitanja mogu i ja sam odgovoriti, ali namjerno ih želim institucionalno postaviti jer znam da i u samom Europskom parlamentu dan Europe obilježavamo na način da su otvorena vrata Europskog parlamenta i ja svakoga 9. svibnja i sudjelujem u tome. Međutim, mislim da je to nedovoljno. Nedovoljno je zato što je to zatvaranje u našu instituciju, umjesto da s našom institucijom idemo među građane i da zaista u takvim trenucima i takvim momentima zajednički promoviramo europske vrijednosti jer uz sve mane koje ima Europska unija, nema alternativu. Jer mana ima, ima i pogrešaka, ima i krivih procjena i krivih odluka, ali alternative nema.

I zato sam uvjeren da kao što postoje državni praznici svih zemalja članica, koje s pravom slavimo u svakoj državi, obilježavamo samostalnost naših država, neovisnost naših država, ja mislim da je odličan trenutak da zajednički razmotrimo i odlučimo kako bismo uspostavili i dan Europe kao pravi praznik Europe, pravi praznik demokracije, slobode, ljudskosti i bliskosti među narodima i građanima Europske unije. Zato pozivam Komisiju da izađe s takvom inicijativom i pozivam zemlje članice također da prihvate takvu inicijativu.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me begin by thanking Mr Jakovčić for bringing this question forward. As stated in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union: ‘The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.’ These common values are the backdrop of our national democracies and a reflection of who we are.

There are worrying signs that the necessary knowledge of our common values and of the role of national and European democracy is not embedded enough. This risks leading to their erosion and it challenges the cohesion of our societies. Citizens need to be aware of their European Union citizenship rights in order fully to benefit from them. While some rights are well known to citizens, such as the right to free movement, gaps and misunderstandings remain. For example, awareness of the right to vote in European elections remains low.

The proportion of Europeans wanting to know more about their EU rights continues to increase – slowly, but it is increasing. The Commission will thus continue its efforts in this regard. Europe Day is a fantastic occasion to do exactly that. It is a landmark date in the calendar of the European Union when the Commission celebrates the European project and the common values it is founded on. Every year on 9 May the representations of the Commission organise a whole string of events in the Member States, often in cooperation with the European Parliament, national authorities and many other partners, NGOs and civil society. We open our doors to the public, encouraging visitors to experience how our everyday work allows European citizens to lead a better life.

The array of activities organised on 9 May is conducive to creating ever-stronger awareness of the European Union, its values and actions. By way of example, let me mention just some of the activities the Commission organises to celebrate European Day and share the Union’s common values. First, we promote citizens’ visits to projects financed by the EU, in the context of the ‘EU in my Region’ campaign, which is organised in cooperation with Member States.

Second, in 2018 more than 220 events have taken place focusing on awareness raising about European Union achievements, and reflecting on challenges for the European Union. This year, specific emphasis has been placed on European values, as well citizens’ rights, through the ‘EUandME campaign’. Furthermore, precisely on 9 May the Commission launched an online public consultation on the future of the EU. This ambitious debate runs in parallel with the ongoing Citizens’ Dialogues organised in the Member States, which have so far reached more than 320 238 citizens.

This is the context of the Council recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education and the European dimension of teaching. The Commission recommends that Member States promote an annual celebration – of course on a voluntary basis – of a Day of the European Union in schools. This recommended Day of the European Union in schools would not constitute a public holiday, but would be an occasion to stimulate reflection among young people on the European Union and its values.

Against this background, the Commission does not deem it necessary to have 9 May established as a Europe-wide public holiday. However, they would welcome any decision in this direction taken by individual Member States at national level.

Let me also say a few words about what we do to promote European values through our programmes and policies. Firstly, a specific part of the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme is devoted to promoting the rights deriving from Union citizenship. It aims to promote awareness of European citizenship rights, as well as to foster inclusion and democratic participation by mobile European Union citizens living in other EU Member States, and by under-represented groups, including women and young people. We intend to continue and further to develop these activities under a new Justice, Rights and Values Fund after 2020.

We intend to continue to promote measures in the field of education in order to share and promote EU values, especially among young people. In fact, high-quality, inclusive education and training is essential not only in terms of offering our citizens knowledge and skills to succeed in the labour market but also in promoting the competences of critical thinking and deeper understanding of our common values.

The Council Recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education and the European dimension of teaching, which was adopted on 22 May 2018, focuses on four objectives: first, promoting common values at all levels of education; second, fostering more inclusive education; third, encouraging a European dimension of teaching; and, fourth, supporting teachers and teaching.

In order to achieve the aims of the Council Recommendation, the Commission supports and works together with Member States. It is taking steps to enhance a sense of European identity among young people through initiatives such as: firstly, boosting school mobility under the Erasmus+ Programme; secondly, increasing virtual exchanges among schools, notably through the eTwinning network; thirdly, supporting teaching, learning, research and debates on European integration issues in all fields of education and training under the 'Jean Monnet' measures; fourthly, supporting numerous mutual learning initiatives between Member State authorities and stakeholders within the European Framework for cooperation in education and training; and, fifthly, the European Solidarity Corps and DiscoverEU.

Lastly, the European structural and investment funds can also be used to support teacher training or fund infrastructure to implement the recommendation.

I am now looking forward to our debate, and we will continue to reach out to the Member States through our communication efforts. I know that I can count on you in these joint efforts.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I'd like to compliment Mr Jakovčić on his initiative. I think it is well worth considering having a public holiday for Europe Day.

Europe Day was first introduced in 1985. The date commemorates the Schuman Declaration of May 1950, which proposed a pooling of the French and West German coal and steel industries, leading to the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1952. Following the foundation of the European Union in 1993, observance of Europe Day by national and regional authorities increased significantly. Germany, in particular, has gone beyond celebrating just the day, and since 1995 has extended the observance to an entire Europe Week. In Poland, the Schuman Foundation, a Polish organisation advocating European integration, established in 1991, first organised a 'Schuman parade' on Europe Day 1999, at the time advocating the accession of Poland to the EU. The European Parliament formally recognised Europe Day in October 2008.

The EU is one of the most successful political projects in human history. It brought an end to war in Europe, creating a dynamic for peace and cooperation. My country joined in 1973. We have benefitted hugely from the customs union, the single market, free trade and the common agricultural policy. All these things have been very positive for us. Also, EU membership led to the abolition of the marriage ban and to establishing the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Celebrating Europe Day to me makes a lot of sense. It will also counteract some of the negativity that we were talking about this week, with Prime Minister Orbán using anti-EU rhetoric in Hungary to win re-election. So I think we should look to formalise it.

The Commissioner mentioned schools, but if the schools were free on that day they could do all the celebrating that week, in line with Germany. And also, if we had a Europe Day, MEPs could be back in their constituencies to celebrate it, because we are not available when the celebrations go ahead here in Europe.

Andrejs Mamikins, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would say to the honourable Commissioner, my friend and real socialist Mr Andriukaitis, that Europe Day on 9 May is a big event for us. It has great salience for us here in the European Parliament and for all those who work in the European institutions. It is evident that we try to fill this day with the strongest meaning, but it is not the same for many ordinary European citizens to whom the European institutions still seem quite distant and irrelevant.

I am in favour of making Europe Day a public holiday in all the EU Member States, and I support my colleague, Ivan Jakovčić, in this claim. Holidays are traditionally connected to great family events or to the celebration of big historical dates. I think that Europe Day is both a historical date and a family holiday. This is something that makes people feel that their nation is part of a big family and it makes them turn back in time and imagine how this family started. This celebration certainly contributes to a positive vision of the EU, and to major awareness of what the EU actually is. But as information about the EU grows, do the expectations of the citizens of the EU grow? It is important that we make the citizens feel part of a secure, stable and prosperous Union, able to stand up for its interests in the international arena.

We don't want to see people feeling part of a Union with an opaque decision-making system, disengaged from minority issues and subject to the will of the other great powers. Europe Day is a way to approach the hearts of the people. I know this personally, because for several years I have been participating in activities in my country, Latvia, on 9 May. I know that people come to the celebration with the hope of a better Europe.

It is extremely important that we do not destroy these fragile feelings by adopting measures that go against the fundamental rights of people and their personal development. I am speaking in particular about the Copyright Directive on which a majority of MEPs voted in favour here in this Chamber. I consider it a failure of the democratic process and as subjugation to pressure by lobbyists. I really don't know how these MEPs will explain to their constituencies, to their voters, after the entry into force of the Directive, the reason why they voted for the computer filtering of social media, putting every piece they publish into a copyright panopticon.

In my opinion what we as MEPs cannot afford is to be deceptive with our voters – otherwise we just won't have the moral right to go to the Europe Day celebration and pretend to work for the sake of Europeans. The EU is a great power, or even better, it is a great power in the making. I think that we still need to show to our partners how strong we feel about our values and how essential it is to adopt a multilateral approach when adopting even the smallest agreement.

Europe Day is also a message to the international community. We are a union, and we celebrate it like any country celebrates its national day. We all know well that foreign countries will try to use any cohesion gap, any deficits, any weakness and incompleteness of the European Union to their benefit. There is no other way to dissuade our partners from an opportunistic approach than to show our unity at every occasion. That is why I think the celebration of Europe Day must be held in all corners of the world where there are EU representations, missions, offices, embassies and so on.

Another point I would like to raise is the legitimacy of the European Union. We have many symbols – an anthem, a flag, a motto and Europe Day, and then the euro as a single currency became our symbol. But we need to be cautious about what message we transmit with our symbols. We must ensure that when the EU flag is flown in other countries it is there to bring only our peace and democracy.

Urszula Krupa, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Dnia 9 maja Robert Schuman wygłosił deklarację uważaną za początek procesu integracji europejskiej, mówiąc, że Europa nie powstanie od razu ani w całości, lecz że będzie powstawać przez konkretne realizacje, tworząc najpierw rzeczywistą solidarność. Ustanowienie 9 maja Dniem Europy miałoby za cel poprawę integracji między obywatelami i instytucjami, z promowaniem wartości europejskich – co oczywiście jest bardzo ważne – i informacje te mogłyby być w dniu europejskim przekazywane.

Ale zanim zostanie ustanowione takie święto, należałoby przystąpić do faktycznego budowania solidarności europejskiej, z poszanowaniem suwerennych państw członkowskich. 9 maja w Polsce organizuje się różnorodne obchody z paradami Schumana, również w mass mediach poświęca się dużo czasu na podsumowanie członkostwa kraju w Unii. Jednak tego typu działania nie wyeliminują rosnącego poczucia dystansu między obywatelami a instytucjami europejskimi, dopóki sama Unia nie będzie przestrzegać przyjętych w traktatach wartości.

Art. 2 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej mówi, że opiera się ona, między innymi, na poszanowaniu wolności, równości i solidarności. I tylko w nawiązaniu do tych słów nasuwają się pytania o podwójne standardy panujące w strukturach Unii, które dotyczą na przykład nierespektowania wyników wolnych wyborów w niektórych krajach członkowskich, faworyzowania rolników „starej piętnastki” we wspólnej polityce rolnej w porównaniu z rolnikami z Europy Środkowej, nacisków w związku z przyjmowaniem uchodźców, a nawet gorszej jakości produktów wysyłanych do Europy Środkowej.

Obywatele państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej dostrzegają odchodzenie od wartości prezentowanych przez założycieli, a szczególnie nierespektowanie wartości chrześcijańskich. Wydaje się, że dopóki Unia nie powróci do wartości reprezentowanych przez przywódców założycieli „Europy Ojczyzn”, świętowanie 9 maja byłoby jedynie przypomnieniem i celebracją deklaracji założycielskiej dalekiej od idei przyswiewcającej założycielom.

André Elissen, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – We spreken vandaag over het uitroepen van 9 mei tot officiële feestdag ter promotie van de Europese Unie. Dit is een onderdeel van de Europese promotiemachine, een machine die op volle toeren draait. Een treffend voorbeeld van deze propaganda is het Jean Monet-programma. Ieder jaar worden er vele honderden miljoenen euro's uitgegeven aan onderwijs. Men zou verwachten dat dit onderwijs bestaat uit het zorgvuldig belichten van alle kanten van een verhaal. Maar nee hoor, alleen positieve verhalen over de zogenaamd fenomenale prestaties van de Unie komen in aanmerking voor financiering.

Kritische geluiden kunnen fluiten naar een bijdrage. Ik heb hierover vragen gesteld aan de Europese Commissie, want dit kan en mag niet waar zijn. En, zoals we deze week konden zien, worden democratisch gekozen leiders, zoals de minister-president van Hongarije, de heer Orbán, in dit parlement beledigd en bijna met pek en veren weggejaagd. Dit omdat hij opkomt voor zijn eigen land. Ook andere landen, zoals Polen, kunnen zich opmaken voor de morele superioriteit vanuit de Unie.

Zolang je precies doet wat de Europese elite vraagt, word je met open armen ontvangen. Maar iedereen die het waagt om kritiek te spuien, krijgt met de eurofielen te maken. Kritiek op grenzeloze migratie wordt direct afgestraft door de elite hier. Die denkt zelf te moeten bepalen wat goed is voor Hongarije en de Hongaren.

En dan te bedenken dat de gesprekken over de toetreding van Turkije nog altijd niet zijn stopgezet. Deze islamitische dictatuur wordt met fluwelen handschoenen aangepakt, terwijl een democratische minister-president uit een democratisch land wordt weggezet als een tiran. Het is hypocriet. Dat is meten met twee maten. Kortom, het is typisch de Unie!

Zijn dat dan de zogenaamd gemeenschappelijke waarden van de Europese Unie? Is dat wat ieder jaar gevierd moet worden? Het moge duidelijk zijn, wij zien niets in een officiële vrije dag ter promotie van de Europese Unie. Bovendien is het nogal cynisch dat uitgerekend parlementariërs pleiten voor een extra vrije dag. Als er één groep mensen al meer dan genoeg vrije dagen heeft, of beter gezegd vrije dagen neemt, zijn het wel de leden van het Europees Parlement! Kijkt u even om u heen in deze pijnlijk lege zaal. Van de 751 parlementariërs heeft hoogstens een handvol de moeite genomen om dit belangrijke debat bij te wonen.

Normale mensen staan in de file in de ochtend- en avondspits. De enige kans dat een parlementariër in de file belandt, is wanneer hij of zij een handtekening wil zetten om de dagvergoeding op te kunnen strijken, om vervolgens zo snel mogelijk het parlement te verlaten. Pleiten voor nog een extra vrije dag is een klap in het gezicht van alle hardwerkende burgers. Er valt wat ons betreft niets te vieren.

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

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *pitanje koje je postavio podizanjem plave kartice*. – Hvala, gospodine Elissen, što ste prihvatili moju plavu kartu. Meni nije žao što vi ne podržavate praznike jer mi je jasna vaša pozicija i nepoštivanje onoga što je vladavina prava u Europskoj uniji. Ali ovdje se radi o jednoj inicijativi jednog mladog čovjeka iz Sarajeva koji je predložio to i ja sam to doveo u Europski parlament i nije nikakva mašinerija Europske unije koja to želi nego obični građanin koji je došao s tom idejom.

Ali ja vas želim pitati nešto: zašto ste toliko licemjerni na kraju svog izlaganja i kažete da je ova hala prazna. Vi znate jako dobro koji je danas dan, znate jako dobro da je ova sala često prazna upravo zato što ljudi rade na odborima i rade druge zadatke i poslove.

A vi, za razliku od mene, koji sam često u ovoj sali, a ja vas jako, jako rijetko vidim, vi isto koristite ovu govornicu samo zato da biste blatili Europski parlament, a iz njega dobivate svoju plaću.

André Elissen (ENF), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Dank voor deze vraag. En ja, ook wij respecteren de rechtspraak. Sterker nog, wij respecteren de soevereiniteit van de rechtsstaten, zoals Polen en Hongarije, en dat doet dit Parlement niet door mijnheer Orbán zo te beledigen. Laat ik dat gezegd hebben.

Wat het feit betreft dat hier niemand aanwezig is, kan ik kort zijn. Bij u mag dat misschien anders zijn, maar wij in Nederland – en ik denk in meerdere Europese landen – hebben gewoon een vijfdaagse werkweek. Dus ook de donderdagmiddag en ook de vrijdag is voor ons een werkdag. U gaat me toch niet wijsmaken dat al die mensen die soms halverwege de stemmingen al weg zijn of over elkaar heen buitelen om naar buiten te kunnen om het vliegtuig, de trein of de auto te pakken om snel naar huis te gaan, allemaal aan het werken zijn? Kom nou niet met die flauwekul! Die hebben gewoon een extra vrije dag! En dat wéét u, alleen u kijkt weg en ik benoem het.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Elissen! Wenn ich mir ausnahmsweise mal die Freiheit nehmen darf, auch selber Stellung zu nehmen: Wir haben hier die Debatte über die sogenannte große Anfrage. Es steht einzelnen Abgeordneten frei, mit Unterstützung ihrer Fraktion solche großen Anfragen zu stellen. Es ist allgemein bekannt, dass diese Diskussion über die großen Anfragen immer am Ende der Plenarwoche stattfindet.

Heute Mittag zu den Abstimmungen waren 700 Abgeordnete da. Es kann keine Rede davon sein, dass die sich heute Morgen eingetragen haben und dann abgehauen seien. Abgeordnete pflegen gemeinhin am Freitag in ihren Wahlkreisen ihrer Arbeit nachzugehen. Ich zum Beispiel nicht, ich komme aus Stuttgart und habe einen ganz kurzen Weg. Ich habe morgen noch zwei Besuchergruppen.

Also den Eindruck zu erwecken, als ob alle Kollegen hier morgens unterschreiben und dann abhauen, das halte ich für grob fahrlässig und auch für extrem unkollegial.

Im Übrigen: Was den Eindruck einer Selbstbedienungsdemokratie, den Sie erweckt haben, anbelangt, darf ich Sie mal in aller Bescheidenheit darauf hinweisen, dass es Mitgliedsparteien Ihrer Fraktion waren, die nun zur Rückzahlung von unrechtmäßig und betrügerisch verwendeten Geldern verpflichtet worden sind. Das erlaube ich mir in aller Bescheidenheit hier mal zu vermerken, nur damit die Dinge nicht unwidersprochen bleiben.

Herr Elissen, Sie dürfen gerne darauf erwidern. Ich will meine Position hier nicht ausnützen.

André Elissen (ENF). – Ik moet zeggen, ik vind het wat brutaal eigenlijk. U noemt het bescheidenheid, maar dat is geen bescheidenheid. Dat laatste wat u zei, is gewoon brutaliteit. Los daarvan, u kunt nu wel doen alsof iedereen zo hard aan het werk is op al die dagen dat ze er niet zijn. Dat geldt zowel voor Straatsburg als voor Brussel. Dan zal ik u nog even een eindje op weg helpen. Waarom is het dan zo dat iedereen 's morgens bij het binnenkomen zijn dienstkaart voor die apparaatjes moet houden om te laten zien dat je er bent? En vervolgens bij het verlaten van het gebouw hoeft dat niet meer? Ze hebben het mij uitgelegd. Dat is timemanagement want dan kunnen we niet meer controleren of je inderdaad vier uur aanwezig bent geweest om recht te hebben op de dagvergoeding! En zo wordt de boel hier in de maling genomen!

U kunt allemaal wegstippen, maar dit is de werkelijkheid. Dit zal niet voor iedereen gelden, maar het geldt voor een hele grote groep. En als u meer bewijzen wilt, dan zou ik zeggen: komt u gewoon eens bij me langs. Dan kan ik u nog een heleboel andere zaken vertellen die hier niet deugen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I think it is incorrect to say that making Schuman Day a public holiday would actually add another free day for people to have a day off. There is nothing to stop countries getting rid of a public holiday they have already and replacing it with Schuman Day, 9 May.

Der Präsident. – Bevor ich jetzt dem Herrn Kommissar das Wort erteile, will ich noch darauf hinweisen, dass der Nachweis zur Anwesenheit hier nicht durch den Zutrittsausweis, den wir hier haben, geführt wird – der Herr Kollege Elissen geht jetzt im Übrigen –, sondern dass dieser lediglich der Sicherheit beim Zugang dient. Der Nachweis der Anwesenheit geschieht über andere Methoden. Das hat mit dem Zutrittsausweis nichts zu tun.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members very much for the very interesting debate. I would like to thank the European Parliament, and especially Ivan Jakovčić, for driving forward the dialogue both here and with European citizens. I also thank those visitors who are here and who are listening to our debates, promoting and sharing our common values, as well as fostering discussions on topical European policy issues that are indeed essential for European citizens to reflect on, and on the European project, and becoming aware of their European identity. Such discussions are particularly important in the run-up to the European elections next May, as democratic participation is key to the European project. I would like to send this message here to all of us.

The Commission will continue to use Europe Day as an occasion to inform European citizens about the EU in general, and our common values in particular. The Commission is truly committed to engaging in open dialogue with our citizens on societal issues, and we will use all our resources to do so. Today we have heard different opinions. I am proud that we have had a good opportunity to listen to each other and to hear various opinions. Of course, having a European Day would create such an opportunity on a much broader scale.

Some speakers mentioned ‘democratically elected people’, but sometimes democratically elected people do not act in line with democratic process, the rule of law or democratic values. What can we do when we see that democracy has vanished? That is a question for all of us. It will be very important to continue our debates and to send the message to our citizens that they need more citizens’ dialogue. It would be good to ask citizens to take initiatives, to use the EU Citizens Initiative, and to debate interests in a broader sense, asking Member State parliaments and governments too to express their opinion.

Personally, I very much like the idea of having such a day. However, as a Commission, we should respect all the complexities and ask the citizens – here in this room and everywhere. Let’s start our debates together and then, maybe at election campaign time, we can use the possibility really to move forward – once again opening doors for all views, whether from the National Front or any other quarter. We should raise those issues together – showing that democracy is only one way but that respect for democracy must be introduced.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

17. Podnošenje dokumenata: vidjeti zapisnik

18. Odluke o određenim dokumentima: vidjeti zapisnik

19. Predstavke: vidjeti zapisnik

20. Prosljeđivanje tekstova usvojenih na dnevnoj sjednici: vidjeti zapisnik

21. Kalendar sljedećih dnevnih sjednica: vidi zapisnik

22. Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.37 Uhr geschlossen.)

23. Prekid zasjedanja

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

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