



C/2024/3001

2.5.2024

RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI TAL-5 TA' LULJU 2017

(C/2024/3001)

IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW

SESSJONI 2017-2018

Dati tas-seduti: 3-6 ta' Lulju 2017

STRASBURGU

Werrej	Paġna
1. Ftuħ tas-seduta	4
2. Dibattiti dwar każijiet ta' vjolazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, tad-demokrazija u l-istat tad-dritt (thabbir ta' mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjonijiet imressqa): ara l-minuti	4
3. Il-bini ta' strateġija industrijali ambizzjuża tal-UE bħala prijetà strateġika għat-tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjoni mressqa): ara l-Minuti	4
4. Negożjati qabel l-ewwel qari tal-Parlament (approvazzjoni) ((Artikolu 69c tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti	4
5. Thejġija għas-Summit tal-G20 tas-7 u t-8 ta' Lulju 2017 (dibattitu)	4
6. Preżentazzjoni tal-prijoritajiet tal-Presidenza Estonjana tal-Kunsill (dibattitu)	22
7. Merħba	41
8. Hin tal-votazzjonijiet	41
8.1. Ftehim biex jiġi emendat il-Protokoll ta' Montreal dwar sustanzi li jnaqqsu s-saff tal-ożonu, adottat f'Kigali (A8-0237/2017 - Kateřina Konečná) (votazzjoni)	41
8.2. It-Tniġġis Transkonfini tal-Arja Fuq Distanza Twila sabiex jitnaqqsu l-aċidifikazzjoni, l-ewtrofikazzjoni u l-ożonu troposferiku (A8-0241/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (votazzjoni)	41
8.3. Il-konklużjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Approvazzjoni) (A8-0232/2017 - Elena Valenciano) (votazzjoni)	41
8.4. Il-konklużjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Riżoluzzjoni) (A8-0233/2017 - Elena Valenciano) (votazzjoni)	42

Werrej	Paġna
8.5. Memorandum ta' Qbil bejn l-Aġenzija Ewropea għat-tmexxija operattiva tas-sistemi tal-IT fuq skala kbira fl-isparju ta' libertà, sigurtà u ġustizzja u l-Eurojust (A8-0215/2017 - Claude Moraes) (votazzjoni)	42
8.6. Ġlieda kontra l-frodi li jaffettwaw l-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni permezz tal-liġi kriminali (A8-0230/2017 - Ingeborg Gräßle, Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (votazzjoni)	42
8.7. Il-qafas ġuridiku tal-Unjoni għal ksur doganali u sanzjonijiet (A8-0239/2016 - Kaja Kallas) (votazzjoni)	42
8.8. HIV/AIDs, Tuberkużi u Epatite C (B8-0436/2017) (votazzjoni)	42
8.9. Thejġija tal-Programm ta' Hidma tal-Kummissjoni għall-2018 (RC-B8-0434/2017, B8-0434/2017, B8-0435/2017, B8-0450/2017, B8-0451/2017, B8-0454/2017, B8-0455/2017, B8-0456/2017) (votazzjoni)	42
8.10. Baġit 2018 — Mandat għat-Trilogu (A8-0249/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan) (votazzjoni)	43
8.11. Lejn strateġija tal-UE għar-relazzjonijiet kulturali internazzjonali (A8-0220/2017 - Elmar Brok, Silvia Costa) (votazzjoni)	43
8.12. Rakkomandazzjoni lill-Kunsill dwar it-72 Sessjoni tal-Assemblea Ġenerali tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti (A8-0216/2017 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votazzjoni)	43
8.13. Il-bini ta' strateġija industrijali ambizzjuża tal-UE bħala prijorità strateġika għat-tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (B8-0439/2017, B8-0440/2017, B8-0440/2017, B8-0445/2017, B8-0446/2017, B8-0447/2017, B8-0448/2017, B8-0449/2017) (votazzjoni)	43
9. Spjegazzjonijiet tal-vot	43
9.1. Il-konkluzjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Approvazzjoni) (A8-0232/2017 - Elena Valenciano)	43
9.2. Il-konkluzjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Riżoluzzjoni) (A8-0233/2017 - Elena Valenciano)	44
9.3. Ġlieda kontra l-frodi li jaffettwaw l-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni permezz tal-liġi kriminali (A8-0230/2017 - Ingeborg Gräßle, Juan Fernando López Aguilar)	45
9.4. Il-qafas ġuridiku tal-Unjoni għal ksur doganali u sanzjonijiet (A8-0239/2016 - Kaja Kallas)	46
9.5. HIV/AIDs, Tuberkużi u Epatite C (B8-0436/2017)	46
9.6. Thejġija tal-Programm ta' Hidma tal-Kummissjoni għall-2018 (RC-B8-0434/2017, B8-0434/2017, B8-0435/2017, B8-0450/2017, B8-0451/2017, B8-0454/2017, B8-0455/2017, B8-0456/2017)	48
9.7. Baġit 2018 — Mandat għat-Trilogu (A8-0249/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan)	49
9.8. Lejn strateġija tal-UE għar-relazzjonijiet kulturali internazzjonali (A8-0220/2017 - Elmar Brok, Silvia Costa)	50
9.9. Rakkomandazzjoni lill-Kunsill dwar it-72 Sessjoni tal-Assemblea Ġenerali tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti (A8-0216/2017 - Andrey Kovatchev)	50
9.10. Il-bini ta' strateġija industrijali ambizzjuża tal-UE bħala prijorità strateġika għat-tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (RC-B8-0440/2017, B8-0439/2017, B8-0440/2017, B8-0445/2017, B8-0446/2017, B8-0447/2017, B8-0448/2017, B8-0449/2017)	51
10. Korrezzjonijiet u intenzjonijiet għall-vot: ara l-Minuti	52

Werrej	Paġna
11. Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel: ara l-Minuti	52
12. Rapport tal-2016 dwar it-Turkija (dibattitu)	52
13. Il-Fond Ewropew għall-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli (EFSD) u t-twaqqif tal-Garanzija tal-EFSD u tal-Fond ta' Garanzija tal-EFSD (dibattitu)	74
14. Azzjoni tal-UE għas-sostenibbiltà – Forum Politiku ta' Livell Għoli dwar l-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli (dibattitu) . .	86
15. Sede Unika tal-Parlament Ewropew (dibattitu)	101
16. Il-promozzjoni tal-koeżjoni u l-iżvilupp fir-Reġjuni Ultraperiferiċi tal-UE (dibattitu)	117
17. Kompożizzjoni tal-kumitati: ara l-Minuti	127
18. In-nirien fil-foresti riċenti fil-Portugall u fi Spanja: L-istrumenti ta' rispons tal-UE u l-proċeduri dwar il-prevenzjoni u l-protezzjoni ċivili (dibattitu)	127
19. Mekkanizmi għas-Soluzzjoni tat-Tilwim dwar it-Tassazzjoni Doppja fl-Unjoni Ewropea (dibattitu)	137
20. Deċiżjoni tal-Qorti tal-Ġustizzja tas-16 ta' Mejju 2017 dwar l-FTA bejn l-UE u Singapore (dibattitu)	142
21. Atti delegati (Artikolu 105(6) tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti	147
22. Trasferiment ta' approprjazzjonijiet: ara l-Minuti	147
23. Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti	147
24. L-aġenda tas-seduta li jmiss: ara l-Minuti	147
25. Gheluq tas-seduta	147

RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI TAL-5 TA' LULJU 2017

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

Vizepräsident

1. Ftuh tas-seduta

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Dibattiti dwar każijiet ta' vjolazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, tad-demokrazija u l-istat tad-dritt (thabbir ta' mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjonijiet imressqa): ara l-minuti

3. Il-bini ta' strateġija industrijali ambizzjuża tal-UE bħala prijorità strateġika għat- tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjoni mressqa): ara l-Minuti

4. Negożjati qabel l-ewwel qari tal-Parlament (approvazzjoni) ((Artikolu 69c tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura)): ara l-Minuti

5. Thejjija għas-Summit tal-G20 tas-7 u t-8 ta' Lulju 2017 (dibattitu)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Vorbereitung des G20-Gipfels am 7. und 8. Juli 2017 (2017/2762(RSP)).

Matti Maasikas, nōukogu eesistuja. – Suur aitäh, härä juhataja. Kõigepealt lubage mul öelda, kui uhke tunne mul on täna siin Euroopa Parlamendis esindada Euroopa Liidu Nōukogu ja Eesti eesistujat. Ma loodan väga heale koostōōle Euroopa Parlamendiga ja tänan teid selle eest, kuidas Eesti eesistumist ja mind on siin majas juba vastu vōetud.

Mr President, I am grateful for your invitation to discuss the G20 summit, which Germany will host from Friday in Hamburg. At the summit, G20 leaders, including Presidents Tusk and Juncker, will be faced with intense discussions on various topics of global importance.

The international political environment is currently particularly charged and global cooperation can no longer be taken for granted. In this context, the mission of European leaders is clear. The G20 is central to this effort since it is – as G20 leaders stated in Pittsburgh in 2009 – the premier forum for international economic cooperation. It is also essential to give a clear signal that securing balanced and inclusive growth remains a top priority. Even if the global economy is showing positive momentum, political uncertainty surrounding the outlook is still high.

Allow me to expand on a selection of issues which I think will take centre stage in Hamburg. I will refer to trade, climate, migration, digitalisation and countering terrorism.

It should be the EU's priority to send a strong signal to the G20 of our commitment to open trade and multilateralism. As recalled by the June European Council, the EU will pursue a robust trade policy, upholding an open and rule-based multilateral trading system with a central role for the WTO.

The EU will also keep markets open and fight protectionism, firm in the belief that trade contributes to creating wealth and jobs. The EU will therefore actively promote an ambitious free-trade agenda on the global stage. In this respect, reaching a political agreement on the EU-Japan trade deal ahead of the G20 meeting would send a strong signal against protectionism.

We need to improve the daily lives of citizens by ensuring that the benefits of globalisation are more widely shared. As was stressed by the June European Council, we need to foster a truly level playing field, while remaining vigilant concerning the respect and promotion of key standards, including social, environmental, health and consumer standards, which are central to the European way of life. Beyond that, we must also be able to better communicate the actual benefits of trade to the wider public.

On climate change, we are all aware that the global community needs to act urgently and move forward with the implementation of the Paris Agreement. The unilateral decision by the United States administration to withdraw from the Paris Agreement is therefore a highly regrettable step. We already discussed this issue here in Parliament during the June session.

As you are aware, the EU's commitment to fully implementing the Paris Agreement was strongly reaffirmed by the June European Council. The agreement remains a cornerstone of global efforts to effectively tackle climate change, and it cannot be renegotiated.

I can only further confirm that the Council under the Estonian Presidency will continue in its commitment to ambitious global action against climate change and support the global ownership of the Paris Agreement. The EU and its Member States are playing their full part in implementing the Agreement, both through the development of our domestic policies and in keeping with our commitment to global solidarity.

We will have to minimise the effects of the US decision on the effectiveness and credibility of the climate framework. The Presidency believes that we should continue our dialogue and engagement with the US.

At the same time, we can also be encouraged by strong statements of commitment, as well as pledges by local governments, businesses, cities, communities and other non-state actors in America. These developments underscore the importance of the action agenda as a platform to connect the different non-state actors. Its importance is expected to grow in the coming years, boosting the political profile and momentum for climate action.

My third point is on migration. Dealing with the migration crisis has been at the core of the political debate in the EU, including here in the Parliament, and it is all the more pertinent today in the light of the news from the central Mediterranean and Italy.

We naturally tend to focus on the migration crisis in our part of the world, but migration is not a European phenomenon. Nor is managing it solely a European responsibility. It is rather a global responsibility, requiring collective solutions in full respect for our obligations under international law.

In this regard, the G20 is launching the G20 Africa partnership, which should foster sustainable and inclusive economic growth and development. It will contribute to creating decent employment, particularly for women and young people, thus addressing poverty and the root causes of migration. This also ties in closely with the ongoing legislative work in the EU on the external investment plan, including the European fund for sustainable development and the European Investment Bank's external lending mandate.

We are also committed to taking an active part in the follow-up to the UN summit on addressing large movements of refugees and migration, held in September last year. The EU intends to play a prominent role in the process leading to the establishment in 2018 of UN global compacts on migration and refugees. We would ask all G20 members to engage as well.

Digitalisation is a key priority for the Estonian Presidency and, therefore, we welcome the inclusion of this topic at the G20 summit. Information and communications technology is no longer a specific sector. It is the backbone of all modern innovative economic systems.

Therefore, we need to breach digital gaps based on, inter alia, age, geography, gender and income. However, technological progress also involves challenges to our security and democracy, which we expect to be reflected by the G20. These challenges highlight the need to strengthen consumer protection, transparency and security in the use of information and communication technology.

Last but not least, the EU has been at the global forefront of the fight against terrorism financing. Recently an agreement on the revision of the Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Agreement was reached. Countering terrorism requires holistic action, including improved cooperation and preventing violent extremism conducive to terrorism.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. –Mr President, in the coming days, the G20 leaders will meet in Hamburg. It will be an important moment: there will be many new faces around the table, and there are many challenges to address.

The agenda is more far-reaching than for previous meetings, showing that this format has the potential to look far beyond its initial economic focus. Economy and trade will certainly feature large, but also the fight against terrorism, as well sustainable development, climate change and energy, migration, Africa, health, digitalisation, employment and women's empowerment.

For the EU, the G20 summit is an opportunity to highlight the positive contribution we are currently making to global growth, our vision for fair globalisation, set out in the Reflection Paper on Harnessing Globalisation, and our consistent leadership across multiple areas of the global agenda. Examples include our commitment to the Paris Agreement, progress on our progressive, values-based trade agenda, and our engagement with developing countries through the European Fund for Sustainable Development on which the House will vote this week.

In these times of turmoil, it is also the moment to show our unwavering commitment to global multilateral governance and responsible international political dialogue, aimed at delivering in the interest of people all over the world. Against a background of rising ultra-nationalist politics, posing a risk to global economic growth and the rules-based global order, the G20 Hamburg summit has the motto 'Shaping an interconnected world', to underline the necessity of multilateral cooperation for prosperity, security and freedom. Let me briefly run you through the main messages that we as the EU want to give.

On the economy, we will highlight the positive contribution the EU is making to the global economy. The EU is growing at nearly 2% this year and next year. The European investment plan is well on track, having led to more than EUR 200 billion in additional and sustainable investments. We are getting our mojo back!

On climate and energy, we will reaffirm our strong commitment to the Paris Agreement, clean energy transition and support for the poor and vulnerable in the fight against climate change, and we will maintain cohesion within the G19 despite the US decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. We would, of course, welcome it if the US would reconsider its decision, but let me be very clear: the deal cannot be renegotiated.

On trade, we will present our vision for harnessing globalisation instead of turning inward and resorting to protectionism, because we all agree that there is no 'protect' in protectionism, but there is isolation in isolationism. We will demonstrate that the EU will stand up for free and fair trade and for the multilateral trading system as a whole, and we will showcase the progress we are making on our progressive trade agenda, with the EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement and now the EU-Japan trade deal. And, because trade should be fair, we are looking for a strong signal from China as to its full cooperation within the Global Forum on Steel Access Capacity.

On taxation, we will maintain momentum for the fight against tax evasion and avoidance. Next steps will include defensive measures against non-cooperative tax jurisdictions and increased efforts to promote the availability, and international exchange, of information on beneficial ownership of legal persons and legal arrangements.

On migration: this is a challenge that is going to be with us for quite some time to come – for decades. We must preserve a commitment to a comprehensive global response to tackling irregular migration and forced displacement, including support for the UN Global Compact on refugees and on regular, safe, orderly migration, and we must build support for a strengthened approach to break the business model of migrant smuggling.

This is what we must do on the global stage but let me add one thing: it would already make a world of difference in Europe if every single Member State would live up to its commitments to show solidarity with those of our Member States most affected by this challenge. We cannot leave Italy alone with this. Everybody should play their part.

(Applause)

We have shown in the past that if we stick together and find solutions that everybody shares we can reach results. Certainly the situation in Greece is not yet where we want it to be. There is still a lot to do, but if you look back at 2015 and then look at the situation now, you will see that much has also improved. There is an incredible level of solidarity with refugees and migrants in Greece and in Italy. But the rest of Europe cannot simply count on the solidarity of the people in Greece and Italy, because the people there also have their limits, and we need to show that the rest of Europe understands this and is playing its part in helping to resolve this crisis.

(Applause)

On terrorism, we need agreement on an action plan to advance the fight against terrorism. We will not win the battle against terrorist financing and the spread of radicalisation online if we do not work with our international partners on this.

On Africa: we will support close partnership with Africa to foster sustainable growth and job creation. Just imagine if we do not do this: our refugee problem in the future will then be so much worse than it already is today. The only sustainable solution is growth and more optimism in Africa, so that people understand it is in their interest to stay in Africa and to develop their own countries, instead of going to Europe.

Lastly, I welcome the fact that the German G20 Presidency has put strong emphasis on stakeholder involvement. All the groups concerned –business, labour, civil science, the think tanks, women and youth – have been active and have put forward recommendations. We are in a post-paternalistic society and we can no longer prescribe, from politics or governance, what should be done: we need to include global brain power to make sure that we find the right solutions. That is how globalisation will be shaped in the interest of humanity as a whole, because, at the end of the day, everything we do here in the European Parliament and in the Commission is at the service of citizens, their freedoms and their ability to pursue their hopes and dreams.

(Applause)

Angelika Niebler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Vertreter der Ratspräsidentschaft, verehrter Herr Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die letzten Wochen waren von traurigen Nachrichten überschattet. Ich denke an den Tod unseres Altbundeskanzlers Helmut Kohl, ich denke an die erste Präsidentin des Europäischen Parlamentes, Simone Veil, der wir ja auch gestern gedacht haben, ich denke an ein Busunglück, das wir bei uns in meiner Heimatregion in Bayern am Montag mit achtzehn Toten und vielen Verletzten hatten usw.

Wenn ich mir auch im Vorfeld ansehe, was sich gerade in Hamburg ereignet, meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen: Demonstrationen, Ausschreitungen, also alles negative Schlagzeilen, die auch den Gipfel, der jetzt am Wochenende stattfindet, dominieren. Wirft man dann noch einen Blick auf die Tagesordnung für das G20-Treffen und blickt auf die Themenauswahl, so scheint mir auch in dem Bereich Dissens vorprogrammiert zu sein, allen voran im Bereich der Klimapolitik.

Ich habe aber doch zwei Botschaften: Zum einen glaube ich, dass es wichtig ist, dass die Industrie- und Schwellenländer zusammenkommen und diskutieren. Das ist die Lehre, die ich aus dem bewegenden Trauerakt, der letzten Samstag hier bei uns im Hause stattgefunden hat, auch nochmals ziehen möchte. Es war für mich wirklich einmalig, noch mal an die Botschaft von Helmut Kohl erinnert zu werden: Im Gespräch bleiben, versuchen, gemeinsam Lösungen zu entwickeln. Deshalb finde ich es gut, dass der G20-Gipfel stattfindet. Und zum zweiten denke ich mir, wenn nur ein wenig, ein paar positive Botschaften herauskommen, wenn man nur im Bereich der Handelspolitik und im Bereich der Unterstützung für Afrika weiterkommt, dann ist es schon ein großer Fortschritt.

Jeppe Kofod, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to pay tribute to the Commission and Vice-President Timmermans on the issue of harnessing globalisation and the very important reflection paper that the Commission produced this year. How do we ensure fair globalisation? Globalisation brings a lot of benefits to us but also a lot of challenges to our societies, and the G20 summit in Hamburg is an opportunity for the EU to lead on how to create fairer globalisation in which everyone benefits.

Many important topics have been mentioned already by the speakers here on climate change, on sustainable development goals, on the migration crisis and so on, and it is important that we in the European Union take the lead on all these issues.

I also want to say that globalisation issues have troubled a lot of countries and citizens alike. Let me be clear and honest: when it comes to globalisation, the free and unregulated market has, to some extent, failed us. It has worked extremely well for multinational corporations and already-wealthy individuals, but for far too many ordinary workers – like the steel workers in France and the UK or the slaughterhouse workers in Denmark and Germany, to take examples – globalisation has also brought unfair competition, negative wage pressure, job insecurity and, in many cases, unemployment.

So at the same time as enormous wealth has been created, it has not yet been fairly shared: that is clear. Why are the world's eight richest people now wealthier? They are now wealthier than half of the world's population. Real wages for middle-income families have stagnated in many societies, including in various parts of Europe, and in many EU countries real wages have actually shrunk.

This is an outrage and we need to do something about it. This is a result of market liberalism run amok, and we need to change course. Showing European leadership on harnessing globalisation means ensuring that European values, principles and standards shape globalisation, and not vice-versa.

For the Socialist and Democrats, a key principle is global tax justice. It was also mentioned by the Commission and I was glad to hear that. We are calling for global tax justice to be a top priority at the G20 summit too. We want the EU to take the lead on concrete new initiatives: we need a global asset register so that taxable assets can be traced and recovered; we need a global register of beneficial ownership so that tax fraud can be revealed; we also need to coordinate efforts to stop, punish and prevent tax havens – and this too was mentioned by the Commission. I think it is important we take the lead in that fight. We also need to ensure that corporate income tax is fair.

This is an opportunity for the EU. Let us take the lead on all of these issues! We look forward to the G20 Summit. And thank you, Mr Timmermans, for the great speech.

Helga Stevens, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Commissioners, colleagues. These are turbulent times. We face challenges which spread far beyond the borders of the European Union. We face global challenges which connect us all and require a global response. We face a humanitarian crisis, conflict at our doorstep and a barely recovering economy. This is why we need the Summit to be fruitful.

Talk is cheap, and our electorate wants to see results. Unfortunately, leader summits have become better known for updating the family photo than for plotting a strategic course for the next twelve months. Leaders need to start looking at what they can realistically achieve at a global level in the next few months, and whilst the EU is willing to take on more and more responsibility on the world stage, the EU cannot start believing that it can solve every crisis by itself. We do not need an EU which thinks that just one policy can solve the migration crisis, but an EU which works with the UN, NATO, and the G20 to end the funding of terrorism and to punish the barbaric practice of human trafficking.

The EU needs to sit at the table and commit to making the EU as global-facing and pro-free trade as possible. The EU needs to champion less regulation and lower taxes, not more red tape and bureaucracy. We need an EU which lives up to its obligations to protect the environment without stifling business, because it is jobs and growth which draw people out of poverty and prevent unsustainable economic migration. It is jobs and growth which bring countries closer together and gives people more self-confidence and respect. That is what we need to better connect us as nations and to help us move forward with confidence, unity and renewed vigour in the coming months.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Estonian Presidency: you are very welcome in this House. Thank you, Mr Timmermans, for your speech, and I was very glad to hear you used the word 'challenge', and not 'crisis', when you were speaking of migration because we talk a lot about 'the migration crisis', whereas what is really going on here is that there is a political and a moral crisis.

The Estonian Presidency is absolutely right in saying that migration management is a global responsibility, and therefore it is to be welcomed that the German Presidency wants to put this firmly on the agenda of the G20, making it a global issue. At the same time, it is also a European responsibility and, as the Commissioner set out very clearly, Member States are not living up to their responsibility. They are abandoning Italy and they are abandoning Greece.

I am reminded of a statement made by the Dutch Prime Minister at the time of a previous mass influx of migrants into Italy, when a journalist asked the Prime Minister 'Isn't it sad for Italy that, because of its geographical location, it has to take in all the refugees?', and the Prime Minister said 'Well, tough luck for Italy.' That has been the attitude of Europe, and it is a shame. We are the most prosperous continent in the world. If we cannot manage this migration influx, then who can? We have to start assuming our responsibility.

I am glad to see that the Commission has taken action: it has put forward a kind of action plan for Italy. But, first of all, the focus is now very much on what NGOs are doing, and I think we should stop the blame game. You can never blame NGOs for saving people's lives.

(Applause)

Secondly, I wonder why we are not using the legal instruments at our disposal, such as the Temporary Protection Mechanism. We have it: why is it not being used? It can be adopted in the Council by a qualified majority vote.

Thirdly, when will we stop using European money to fund dictators and failed regimes? How much more money are we going to send to Libya to let people die in miserable circumstances, not only in the Mediterranean, but also in ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Fabio De Masi, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! „Die G20 sind eine Veranstaltung ohne Legitimation. Legitimation besitzt nur die UNO.“ Dieses Zitat stammt nicht von mir, sondern vom großen französischen Diplomaten, Widerstandskämpfer und Autor der UN-Menschenrechtserklärung, Stéphane Hessel. Daher wird sich Hamburg empören. Der G20 Gipfel wird in meiner Heimatstadt, der schönsten Stadt Deutschlands, tagen. Trotzdem werden viele die Stadt verlassen, wenn die feinen Herren Trump oder Erdoğan uns besuchen. Hamburg, das Tor zur Welt –, wird einem Sperrbezirk gleichen, damit Demonstranten die Staatenlenker nicht belästigen. Sperrstunde mögen wir nicht in Hamburg, wie die weltbekannte Reeperbahn jede Nacht beweist.

Natürlich sollen Staatschefs miteinander reden, gerade in Zeiten weltweiter Krisen. Sie müssen das auch nicht in den Rocky Mountains tun. Aber die G20 verhandeln über das Schicksal der Welt. Diese Debatten gehören daher vor die Vereinten Nationen in New York. Dann hätte es Herr Trump auch vom Golfplatz nicht so weit.

Die G20, die 80 Prozent des weltweiten Sozialprodukts ausmachen, kommen zusammen, um über wichtige Themen zu sprechen: Handel, Migration, Steuerdumping, Klimawandel, Sicherheit und Terrorismus. Steuerflüchtlinge sind die wahren teuren Flüchtlinge. Bis zu 30 Billionen Dollar werden in Steueroasen gebunkert. Etwa acht Personen besitzen laut Oxfam mittlerweile so viel wie die Hälfte der Weltbevölkerung. Dies ist mit Verlaub eine kranke Entwicklung.

Dabei bräuchten wir nicht erst seit der Flüchtlingskrise öffentliche Investitionen in Wohnraum, Schulen, Universitäten oder Krankenhäuser. Aber die Verhandlung – auch hier in der EU – über eine schwarze Liste der Steueroasen gerät zum diplomatischen Kuhhandel. Wir brauchen endlich Quellen und Strafsteuern auf Finanzflüsse in Steueroasen, in und außerhalb der EU.

Die Kriege im Nahen Osten – von Afghanistan über Irak, Libyen oder Syrien – haben Chaos, Staatenzerfall, Terror und Flucht geschaffen. Nicht nur Bomben, auch Freihandelsabkommen – wie sie die EU nach TTIP und CETA nun auch mit Japan anstrebt – haben in Afrika große ökonomische Verwerfungen geschaffen. Die Waffenexporte und die Kumpanei mit Terrorpaten wie Saudi-Arabien oder dem neuen Türsteher der EU – Erdoğan – haben den Islamischen Staat erst groß gemacht. Aber die G20 diskutieren nun über militärische Flüchtlingsabwehr und weitere faule Deals wie mit der Türkei, etwa in Libyen oder Ägypten.

Der saudische König wollte seine Kamele nach Hamburg mitbringen – das kann er machen, wir haben Schafe und Fische. Der Hamburger Hafen schickt hingegen Waffen an die Golf-Diktatoren. Und die EU will mit der Verteidigungsunion weiter aufrüsten. Bis zu zwei Prozent des Sozialprodukts strebt die NATO an. Dies ist das Geld, das wir im Kampf gegen Armut und Klimawandel benötigen. Gegen diese Politik wird daher eine große Mehrheit der Hamburgerinnen und Hamburger friedlich auf die Straße gehen – und das ist auch gut so.

Yannick Jadot, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, en ces jours d'hommage à Simone Veil, quelles leçons tirer de son parcours et de son expérience pour le débat que nous tenons aujourd'hui?

Simone Veil était une combattante de l'Europe, parce qu'elle avait survécu à ce que l'Europe pouvait produire de pire, mais elle n'a jamais réduit l'Europe à une commémoration. Elle a toujours considéré que l'Europe était un projet de civilisation pour chaque femme, pour chaque homme, pour nous, Européens, et pour le reste du monde.

Simone Veil, aujourd'hui, serait-elle satisfaite d'un projet européen qui serait un projet de circulation sans entrave des biens, des services et des investissements, qui mettrait nos législations, nos réglementations environnementales et sociales et notre souveraineté démocratique à portée de canon des firmes multinationales du vieux monde, du pétrole, du nucléaire et des perturbateurs endocriniens? Que dirait Simone Veil en voyant les murs, les barbelés et les camps qui enferment des personnes qui aussi sont des personnes qui survivent?

Aujourd'hui, l'Europe est seule face à Trump, Poutine, Erdoğan et Xi Jinping, mais elle seule peut porter un projet de coopération à l'échelle internationale, un projet de solidarité et un projet de protection des biens communs. Pour cela, il faut qu'elle change de pied et qu'au G20, elle ne soit pas là pour promouvoir des accords de libre-échange qui produisent tous les chaos du monde et qui alimentent un modèle de développement deux fois plus gros que la planète, deux fois plus gros en prédation et deux fois plus gros en pollution.

S'il y a un élément que doit porter l'Europe au G20, notamment, c'est cette question du climat et, pour porter cette question, il ne suffit pas de dire que l'on va respecter l'accord de Paris: l'Europe n'est pas sur la trajectoire de l'accord de Paris en matière de réduction de ses émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

Alors, allons-y avec une ambition beaucoup plus forte. Allons-y pour dire que la promesse du G20 concernant la fin des subventions publiques aux énergies fossiles doit être mise en œuvre immédiatement. Voilà votre responsabilité, voilà notre responsabilité, y compris si nous voulons être sincères et fidèles à l'hommage rendu à Simone Veil.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the G20 meeting gives the EU an opportunity to speak to the major economies of the world and to find out what their perception of the post-Brexit landscape will be.

I strongly suspect that the EU – and particularly the host nation Germany – is in for an unpleasant surprise. The non-EU countries will be eyeing up how to grab a bigger slice of the lucrative market of exports to the UK from you if the EU pursues its active economic self-harm by trying to exclude the UK from fair access to the single market.

The European Union's decision in declaring a post-Brexit economic war on the UK won't act as a deterrent to other would-be leavers. Your huge trade surplus with the UK will crumble and other non-EU G20 nations will be licking their lips at the prospect of trading with, and exporting to, the UK.

The revitalised, liberalised United Kingdom will be seen as a key trading partner by these nations, and we will see cars made in Detroit, rather than Stuttgart, on British roads. For your own economic wellbeing, I urge the EU negotiators to look into the hungry eyes of your fellow G20 nations and reflect upon the damage your present course will have on your precious project. Thank you.

Marcel de Graaff, namens de ENF-Fractie. – Wat doet de EU op de G-20? De Raad en de Commissie zijn incompetent. Ze zijn niet eens in staat de grote problemen in de Europese Unie aan te pakken en op te lossen. Nog steeds is de werkloosheid dramatisch, nog steeds staan banken op omvallen. Nog steeds is de schuldenberg groter dan ooit, nog steeds stromen migranten met duizenden per dag de EU binnen en nog steeds vinden vrijwel elke week aanslagen plaats.

De oplossingen voor deze tijd komen van de patriotten. Deze Commissie moet een voorbeeld nemen aan de Visegrad-landen in plaats van ze te veroordelen. De heer Juncker moet een voorbeeld nemen aan zijn partijgenoot de heer Orban en de grenzen sluiten. Leg de boten van criminele ngo's aan de ketting, zet de bemanning achter slot en grendel en confisqueer de tegoeden van deze ngo's.

Juncker moet Frontex opdracht geven het Australische model toe te passen. Boten moeten worden teruggesleept naar Libië. Migrantenvrijden zijn inmiddels veiliger in Libië dan Engelsen in Engeland, Fransen in Frankrijk of Duitsers in Duitsland. U bent een volledig incompetent en onverantwoordelijk bestuurder en ik zeg tegen Juncker en zijn hulpje, de heer Timmermans: stap op! Laat de patriotten het overnemen. Wij nemen wél verantwoordelijkheid. Wij hebben de oplossingen en wij nemen wél effectieve maatregelen.

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

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE), “blauwe kaart”-vraag. – Mijnheer De Graaff, het is niet de eerste keer dat ik u hierover hoor tussenkomen in de plenaire, waarbij u beschuldigingen uit aan het adres van mensen die keihard werken. Ik vind dat uw uitlating dat er criminele ngo's zijn, omdat ze mensen op zee redden die anders zouden verdrinken, uit het verslag geschrapt moet worden. Er zijn inderdaad mensensmokkelaars, mensenhandelaars, die we moeten bestraffen, maar we moeten ngo's die zeer goed werk doen op het terrein, hier niet beschimpen als zouden het criminelen zijn.

Mijnheer de voorzitter, ik vraag met aandrang dat deze gratuite beschuldigingen van mijnheer De Graaff uit het verslag geschrapt worden. Laten we als Europa een echt Europees asiel- en migratiebeleid voeren, zodat we niet moeten rekenen op ngo's, maar dat we hen dankbaar zijn voor hun werk.

President. – I am very sorry but with all the understanding one may have for your point, the blue card is there to ask a question of the speaker. You did not ask a question of the speaker. Please use the procedures that are foreseen if you want to ask for something to be deleted from the Minutes. You may do so in a personal remark at the end of the debate.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Mr President, here we are again. I have a question for you, First Vice-President Timmermans. It is a very specific question, and I would like you to give me – as well as Hungarians and a number of other people who are interested – a very specific answer. Suppose we were to follow your order and receive migrants and refugees in my country, Hungary. You, as well as every single person in this room, know perfectly well that those people would not want to stay in Hungary because they want a better life. They would like to move on to richer countries like Germany, Austria, Sweden, and so on. Mr Timmermans, how can we hold them back? What is the order, so to say, in this respect? We all know very well that we cannot put these people into a closed institution; they have the right to freedom of movement. I know we should integrate them. This will probably be the answer, but this is the wrong answer, Mr Timmermans and dear colleagues, because they would not like to be integrated in Hungary, they would like to move on the next day to richer countries.

So you must have a strategy on that, because your whole strategy about the treatment of the migrant crisis is based on the idea of solidarity among Member States and forcing all Member States, including my country Hungary, to receive migrants. So how would you solve this problem? I look forward to your answer, Mr Timmermans.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dzisiaj w drodze na G-20 prezydent Stanów Zjednoczonych ląduje w Polsce, oczekując obiecanego, ciepłego przyjęcia, nieco sztucznie zorganizowanego. Jeśli jednak potwierdzi dzisiaj gwarancje z art. 5 NATO, to będzie to niezwykle istotna wartość dla wszystkich krajów, które sąsiadują z Rosją Putina i zaznały w przeszłości „bratniej” pomocy ze strony Armii Czerwonej. Żaden z tych krajów nie powinien jednak uczestniczyć w osłabianiu Unii Europejskiej. Każdy z tych krajów w imię własnego bezpieczeństwa na wszelki wypadek powinien tworzyć elementy europejskiej obronności. Z wielu przyczyn szczyt G-20 jest trudnym zadaniem dla gospodarzy, nie tylko z uwagi na demonstracje, które rzeczywiście tworzą nagłówki gazet i mediów. Dzisiaj trudno odnaleźć coś, co nazywamy euroatlantycką wspólnotą wartości, która stanowiła fundament powojennego ładu pokojowego i świata wolnego człowieka. Stąd, jak sądzę, bardzo szeroka agenda tego spotkania, ale nieco zaniżone oczekiwania, co do efektów G-20 w Hamburgu. Trzeba zatem umieć potwierdzić minimum, które łączy, a co łączy to rzeczywiście wspólna walka z terroryzmem, ze źródłami terroryzmu, zahamowanie fali migracyjnej, bo tu się rozstrzyga zachwiane poczucie bezpieczeństwa w Europie i nie tylko w Europie. Ale jest coraz więcej świadectw tego, że sobie z tym poradzimy.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Herr Kommissar Timmermans, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, global gibt es viele schlechte Nachrichten – Angelika Niebler hat einige genannt –, und deswegen ist es doch umso wichtiger, dass wir alle Möglichkeiten nutzen, *Global Governance* wieder zu etablieren. Gerade angesichts des Verhaltens von einigen Ländern, die da sagen „*my country first*“ oder „*my America first*“, müssen wir als Europäer dagegen setzen: „*people first*“. Das muss die Devise für *Global Governance* sein – im Interesse der Menschen globale Strukturen einzurichten.

Und ich glaube in der Tat, dass die EU da einige Schwerpunkte setzen muss. Wir haben gehört: Afrika muss ein Schwerpunkt sein. Keine Frage, wir müssen eine nachhaltige Entwicklungsstrategie für Afrika entwickeln, damit Menschen zu Hause eine Perspektive haben und ihre Lebenschancen dort Wirklichkeit werden lassen können. Investitionen und verantwortungsvolle Staatsführung für Afrika sind – meiner Ansicht nach – eine Priorität für die EU.

Dann geht es natürlich auch um das *empowering* für Frauen. Wenn die IAO von der vergessenen Milliarde, der dritten Milliarde von vergessenen Menschen, spricht, dann meint sie Frauen, die nicht in der Lage sind, ihre Fähigkeiten zu entwickeln – also *empowering* von Frauen, die zweite Priorität.

Die dritte Priorität: natürlich fairer Handel und nicht nur freier, weg vom Protektionismus. Wenn die IAO sagt, dass 780 - Millionen Menschen, die in globalen Wertschöpfungsketten auch Produkte für uns produzieren, nicht genug Einkommen haben, um ihr eigenes Leben zu finanzieren – dann stimmt da etwas nicht! Wir müssen faire Bedingungen für globale Wertschöpfungsketten haben, wir müssen die Arbeitnehmerrechte stärken. Erst dann ist Handel nicht nur frei, sondern auch fair, und das muss die dritte Priorität sein.

Hamburg ist in der Tat eine wunderschöne Stadt, Hamburg repräsentiert aber auch den freien und fairen Geist von Menschen, und deswegen sollte Hamburg hierfür auch ein Symbol sein.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, in times of challenge, security should define the credibility of partners, including trade partners. I therefore welcome the agreement with Japan. The dreams before G20 were already overshadowed by an exclusive deal between Russia and China, as well as rather unfriendly military exercises on the Baltic Sea. Our response to this – the Western response to this – should be a closer transatlantic alliance, with both the US and Canada.

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Zunächst möchte ich deutlich sagen: Ich finde gut, dass dieser G20-Gipfel stattfindet. Die G20-Gipfel sind einer der wenigen Orte, wo zur Zeit der Globalisierung und der Krise des Multilateralismus verschiedene Akteure miteinander sprechen. Diese Chance muss man nutzen. Darüber hinaus muss man allerdings auch klar sagen, dass die Debatte vor dem G20 von falschen Alternativen bestimmt ist.

Es gibt nämlich auch noch etwas zwischen der globalen Handelsordnung und Finanzmarktordnung, wie wir sie heute haben, und dem Trump'schen Protektionismus. Der Weg dazwischen ist die Globalisierung sozialer und ökologischer Regeln, die mit der Öffnung der Märkte einhergehen muss, und deshalb kann man auch der EU nur sagen: Die Zeit ist jetzt gekommen, mit der Freihandelsagenda, mit den bilateralen Verträgen, wie sie bisher entworfen worden sind, so wie Sie sie mit Japan jetzt wieder entworfen haben, nicht einfach so weiterzumachen, sondern wir brauchen Verträge, die die Chance der Stunde nutzen, um soziale und ökologische Regeln durchsetzbar als Teil dieser Standards zu verankern. Es darf dort kein Weiter so geben, sondern wir brauchen eine Verstärkung der internationalen Zusammenarbeit, aber das in einer Form, dass soziale und ökologische Regeln gestärkt werden.

Was in Hamburg bei diesem G20-Gipfel derzeit allerdings passiert, ist auch in anderer Hinsicht traurig, denn Hamburg ist in der Tat eine liberale Stadt, und zu diesem liberalen Geist gehört, dass man nicht nur die Staatschefs willkommen heißt, sondern auch die Demonstrantinnen und Demonstranten, die friedlich demonstrieren. Auch für sie muss eine offene Stadt Geltung haben.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Ekonomikos augimas, prekyba, mokesčiai, kaip taisyklė, yra kartinės tokių susitikimų temos. Tačiau nesuprantu vieno: kaip čia taip yra, kad ekonomikai kasmet vis labiau augant, vis labiau plečiantis neva geriems susitarimams dėl prekybos, globalizmą pateikiant kaip privalumą, pasaulio visuomenė vis labiau skursta, o maistas brangsta. Gal to priežastis – neteisingai skirstomos pajamos, globalių kompanijų ir bankų susitarimai, kapitalo be socialinės atsakomybės auginimas? Gal ir ekonomika auginama anaipol ne visuomenės gerovei? Pajamų nelygybė, skurdo rizika, nuolatinis milijonų žmonių nedarbas šiandien yra svarbiausios problemos. Gerokai svarbiau yra ir tai, kad ekonomikos augimu būtų tinkamai pasinaudota kuriant bendrąjį gėrį, racionaliai investuojant uždirbamas lėšas ir perskirtomas pajamas visuomenės turėjimui, o ne atskirų korporacijų pelno gausinimui.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Ik maak van dit geopolitieke forum, de voorbereiding van de G-20, gebruik om een pleidooi te houden voor de herziening van de Conventie van Genève. Begonnen als een concept met nobele en hoogstaande doelstellingen is dat inmiddels totaal onaangepast geworden en werd het achterhaald door de feiten. De zorg voor vluchtelingen, voornamelijk uit het toen communistische Oost-Europa, is inmiddels geworden tot een ordinaire industriële massa-invasie met culturele ontworteling, verkrachtingen en een eindeloze werkloosheid tot gevolg, een duister verband tussen een *dirty business*, tussen ngo's, mensenhandelaars en dat alles onder auspiciën van de Europese instellingen.

Stop die Conventie van Genève, vervang ze door een echt vluchtelingenstatuut met een opvang in eigen regio, en, zoals we nu zien in Syrië, na afloop van het conflict een terugkeer naar de landen van oorsprong.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, my thanks to Mr Timmermans. As we approach the G20 Summit, we do so with our world facing huge challenges that threaten the common values and ideals that we share. In the United Kingdom, in London, in Manchester, in cities across Europe, Brussels, Paris and Berlin, terrorist attacks have brought death and destruction. The events in the Korean peninsula are a stark and vivid reminder of darker days we thought were in the past. The migration crisis continues. In the past ten days alone, an estimated 10 000 migrants have arrived in Italy from Libya, and yet we continue with the same bit-part solution that we have always had.

On all of these issues, a coordinated approach is required right across the G20 to bring about meaningful and lasting results – strong and united leadership based upon shared ideas of freedom, democracy and tolerance.

Françoise Grossetête (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, Monsieur le vice-président de la Commission, le monde vit sur un volcan qui peut à tout moment se réveiller.

L'éruption peut être due à la guerre en Syrie, à l'affrontement auquel se livrent les chiïtes et les sunnites dans le Golfe, notamment au Yémen, ou encore à l'agressivité de la Corée du Nord, qui sont les symptômes d'un monde profondément instable.

L'éruption peut être aussi économique et sociale, si nous ne prenons pas garde à nous renforcer face à la mondialisation, notamment en poursuivant la régulation financière, en luttant contre le dumping ou en œuvrant pour une fiscalité plus juste.

Terrorisme, défi migratoire, défi climatique, défi démocratique, défi économique... Il est grand temps que l'Union européenne porte enfin un autre regard sur le continent africain et l'aide à se développer et à se pacifier.

Il nous revient d'occuper la position de chef de file que l'Amérique a abandonnée, car Donald Trump fait de la figuration, mais ses gesticulations ne trompent personne. Les dirigeants du G20 savent qu'au jeu des chaises musicales, c'est le plus rapide qui l'emporte. Si ce n'est pas l'Europe, ce sera la Chine ou la Russie qui gagneront, et nous resterons là les bras ballants.

L'Union européenne a toujours eu pour vocation de partager et de diffuser ses valeurs et ses idéaux. En ce jour de commémoration, à Paris, en l'honneur de Simone Veil, première Présidente de ce Parlement, inspirons-nous de son exemple exceptionnel de vie.

Le G20 doit être l'occasion pour les dirigeants européens de montrer qu'ils ont une vision, non seulement pour notre continent, mais aussi pour le reste du monde.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le vice-président, Monsieur le responsable du Conseil, le multilatéralisme, c'est dans l'ADN de l'Union européenne. Le G20 se tiendra au centre de l'Europe à un moment où, à la fois, le Brexit et le gouvernement Trump nient la valeur du multilatéralisme.

Au fond, pour vous, Monsieur le vice-président, pour l'Union européenne et pour chacun des chefs d'État ou de gouvernement qui participera à ce G20, il y a une double tâche. Dans le G20 lui-même, il faut faire en sorte que ce que dit le bras gauche cesse d'être ignoré par le bras droit. On ne peut pas avoir joué ce rôle exemplaire dans la conclusion de l'accord de Paris lors de la COP 21 et laisser une finance qui, dans les enceintes de Bâle, fait fi des objectifs du financement de la transition écologique.

Pour cela, les travaux qui ont été menés par le groupe de réflexion intitulé «Task force on climate related financial disclosure» (TCFD) doivent être soutenus, alors que le gouvernement Trump veut ignorer toutes les conclusions auxquelles il est parvenu sous l'égide de M. Bloomberg. Vous devez, au nom de la Commission, dire aux États membres combien ce groupe de réflexion doit être soutenu et à quel point il est important que ses conclusions deviennent la feuille de route du G20.

Pour l'Union européenne, cela signifie que, dans chacune des instances, d'abord à Bâle, mais aussi au sein du Conseil des normes comptables internationales (IASB), vous devez défendre, et concrétiser sous forme d'une régulation des marchés, ces exigences d'un changement du climat d'investissement en faveur d'une transition vers le financement des investissements à long terme, des énergies renouvelables au détriment des économies fossiles, qui continuent à irriguer trop de critères d'excellence de l'économie européenne.

Sans oublier ce rendez-vous sur la lutte contre les paradis fiscaux: la proposition de l'OCDE, d'une liste qui ne contiendrait plus que Trinité-et-Tobago, ne peut pas être la feuille de route de l'Union européenne. Nous comptons sur chacun des acteurs européens dans ce G20 pour porter une voix forte. Que la lutte contre les paradis fiscaux reste une priorité!

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Die Europäische Union ist einer der drei großen Player unter den G20, und deshalb setzt sich die Europäische Union große Ziele: Afrika soll zu Wachstum und zu Arbeitsplätzen geführt werden – ganz Afrika –, und das sei dann die Lösung für die Migrationskrise. Meine Damen und Herren, können wir bitte auf dem Teppich bleiben! Die Europäische Union hat es ja noch nicht einmal geschafft, Griechenland zu Wachstum und Arbeitsplätzen zurückzuführen, das kleine Griechenland, das im Vergleich zu afrikanischen Staaten ein wirklich wohlorganisierter, wohlentwickelter Staat mit einer starken Regierung ist. Dieses kleine Land haben wir nicht zu Wachstum und Arbeitsplätzen führen können. Und deshalb ist es unrealistisch, nun über ganz Afrika zu reden und ganz Afrika stabilisieren und auf einen Wachstumspfad führen zu wollen.

Wir müssen uns konzentrieren, wir müssen realistische Ziele formulieren. Diese realistischen Ziele im Zuge der Immigrationskrise können nur lauten, dass wir uns auf den Norden Afrikas, auf die Mittelmeerränder in Afrika konzentrieren, auf die arabischen Staaten, da, wo Wachstum und Arbeitsplätze ebenfalls erforderlich sind und wo der islamische Terrorismus seine Brutstätte findet. Das ist die Priorität, und darauf sollten wir uns konzentrieren!

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Mr President, the G20 will actually revolve around Presidents Trump and Putin, not you. These two men working together can defeat ISIS. These two men understand the threat of migration and culture, jobs and identity. And migrants – no, no, no! What don't you understand? We have got to secure our borders. Our cultures and identities are under threat and you are incapable of dealing with it. Presidents Trump and Putin actually get this. They understand the nation state and putting up walls and barriers.

We need to arrest and deport the migrants and tow them back to Libya. The Paris climate change agreement is a bad business deal, and Trump gets that because he is a businessman and he is right. And you are obsessed with the gender agenda. Please, we women do not need special treatment. I am not special needs, I take it most of you are not special needs. Stop singling us out. And get real to the threats we face: it is migrants, ISIS and security. You do not have the solutions. The nation state is the way forward, as we are showing in Brexit and the Visegrad countries. Your speeches this morning have confirmed that the death knell of the EU is ringing, so get used to it and go back to your nation states.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, good morning everyone in the Chamber and thank you, Mr Timmermans, for the lack of tantrums that we saw yesterday from Mr Juncker, entertaining as it was.

I have two observations to make, and they are serious ones. We have heard this morning the usual calls for open markets, improved trade agreements and religiously enshrining and making sure delivery of consumer protectionism and such. But just remember please, everyone attending the G20, that when we talk about the impact in terms of job losses, falling wages and decreasing lifestyles and living standards, that's what voters measure G20 meetings by, and we need to be a little bit more flexible in terms of that approach and the timing to achieve the objectives. But the other clear message for me that I would love the G20 to address is the existing European Union monetary policy, which clearly favours one major Member State and penalises so many others. We have young people out there who want jobs – want to work – and they have to leave their countries because of the EU monetary policy. So please can we send some very clear messages and change tack.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señor presidente, Consejo, Comisión, conviene recordar que en la historia de la humanidad no ha habido un solo período en el que se haya avanzado, en el que se haya progresado mediante el aislamiento y mediante el proteccionismo. Eso no hay que olvidarlo nunca.

Pero hoy más que nunca, en una sociedad globalizada, solo mediante una economía abierta y una sociedad abierta podremos seguir avanzando. Por eso la Unión Europea tiene que mantener en el G20 una posición de liderazgo constante frente a las veleidades aislacionistas que están mostrando ahora algunos países. Esto es esencial.

Pero la apertura y el no aislacionismo empiezan por la propia casa. Y, en ese sentido, hace falta que el mercado único digital sea una realidad plena, porque es el factor determinante de la competitividad global de nuestra economía. Por eso hay que dar la bienvenida a que la Presidencia estonia haya hecho bandera de los asuntos digitales en este período. Y, en ese sentido, tengo que decir que confío en que podamos alcanzar un acuerdo sobre el Código Europeo de las Comunicaciones Electrónicas y así contribuir a que la conectividad que necesitan nuestras empresas y nuestra sociedad sea plena.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, como relator deste Parlamento Europeu para o acordo comercial entre a União Europeia e o Japão, quero sublinhar a enorme importância estratégica que tem o acordo político que as duas partes deverão anunciar amanhã numa cimeira bilateral à margem da reunião do G20. Este acordo entre duas das maiores potências económicas mundiais é uma grande oportunidade para a economia europeia e é uma mensagem forte contra o protecionismo e a favor não apenas de um comércio aberto, mas de um comércio global mais justo e mais regulado.

Sejamos claros, porém. Este não é o fim do caminho. Há questões importantes ainda em aberto e o Parlamento permanecerá vigilante até ao fim das negociações, exigindo mais transparência, a começar pela divulgação de um mandato negocial e a plena salvaguarda dos nossos valores e padrões ambientais, sociais e laborais, no quadro de um capítulo forte sobre desenvolvimento sustentável. É esse acordo justo e ambicioso que queremos entre a União Europeia e o Japão.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente Timmermans, abbiamo letto ieri un'agenzia dove Lei dice che, non avendo l'Austria notificato i controlli alla frontiera del Brennero, la Commissione non può dare la sua reazione. Purtroppo oggi in Italia le prime pagine dei giornali sono piene proprio di questa notizia, e Lei può immaginare che invece i cittadini reagiscono, eccome.

Purtroppo il velo dell'ipocrisia è caduto, lo possiamo dire chiaramente, perché i paesi europei a parole sembrano diversi, nei fatti invece sono tutti uguali, si dimostrano veramente tutti uguali. A Berlino, qualcuno si era illuso di aver portato a casa qualche risultato; a parte la retorica, abbiamo portato a casa un risultato ben magro, il codice per le ONG, mentre i porti degli altri paesi europei rimangono tutti sigillati.

Per questo riponiamo le nostre speranze nel G20. Avete detto anche qui che è il foro internazionale più importante, dove si condivide la collaborazione. Ebbene, speriamo che questo foro si faccia carico della migrazione nel Mediterraneo, un fenomeno di proporzioni tali che deve essere gestito dalla comunità internazionale tutta. E porto un messaggio al Presidente Juncker: che non si accontenti di soluzioni ridicole, per favore, e porti a casa qualcosa di concreto.

Abbiamo ricordato sabato, in quest'Aula, Helmut Kohl. È stato ricordato come uomo del futuro, perché scelse il percorso giusto e la Storia lo seguì. Ecco, vede, o l'Europa riprende questa capacità, sarà in grado di riprendere questa capacità, o non sarà. In quel caso, non la rimpiangeremo molto.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Bouwen aan een verbindende wereld klinkt een heel klein beetje cynisch als je ziet wat er opnieuw in Italië aan de hand is. U heeft zelf gezegd, vicevoorzitter Timmermans, dat als alle lidstaten al zouden doen wat we hadden afgesproken om de crisis aan te pakken, dan zouden we vandaag niet in de penarie zitten. Het is echt schandalig dat we daar weer zijn. Ik zeg dit omdat velen daarop tussenkomen. Ik wil dat zeker ook ondersteunen. Maar ik zeg het ook omdat we ondertussen weten dat we de migratiecrisis niet gaan oplossen door kortetermijnmaatregelen te nemen, maar effectief door een verbindende wereld te creëren.

Een van de eerste en belangrijkste dingen die we in de G-20 moeten doen is ervoor zorgen dat er een soort van *united* positie kan zijn, zou moeten zijn, over het toepassen van het klimaatakkoord van Parijs. Want als we het klimaat niet aanpakken, dan zijn dit de voorafjes, dan zijn de problemen rond migratie vandaag de voorafjes van morgen en worden die problemen alsnog groter.

Ik heb gisteren bij het werkprogramma van de Commissie heel erg benadrukt dat het eerste wat we moeten doen, is zelf het goede voorbeeld geven en ik kijk ook naar mijn collega's in het halfroond. We zijn volop bezig met een aantal dossiers zoals het pakket schone energie. Laten we dat zo ambitieus mogelijk stellen, dat is onze eerste verantwoordelijkheid.

Ten tweede, de Verenigde Staten. We weten het allemaal, ik ben helemaal niet positief over wat president Trump kan en zal doen, maar laten we vooral onze rug niet naar de Verenigde Staten keren. Laten we de hand uitreiken naar die staten in de Verenigde Staten die wél vooruitgang willen boeken, die helemaal niet gediend zijn van het beleid van Trump. Ik denk dat daar ook binnen de G-20 in bilaterale contacten het nodige werk moet worden verricht.

Een derde punt: we hebben vandaag verhandelbare emissierechten. Laten we daar niet alleen stevig aan vasthouden, maar laten we het als een connectie gebruiken om in de rest van de wereld ook heel goeie beprijzingsmechanisme rond CO₂ te installeren.

Veel succes, zou ik zeggen. Ik denk dat dat meer dan ooit nodig is om op wereldniveau deze acties te ondernemen.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Presidência do Conselho, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, queria deixar três notas: a primeira não vai diretamente para a agenda do G20, mas para a conjuntura internacional em que se passa esta reunião.

Aquilo que, neste momento, está a ocorrer com a Coreia do Norte e o que está a ocorrer na península arábica com o Qatar e um conjunto de Estados árabes, designadamente a Arábia Saudita e o Egito, exige uma intervenção a nível global. Por muitas políticas de longo prazo que nós estejamos a acordar no G20, se houver a precipitação de uma crise grave, seja na península da Coreia seja na península arábica, todos esses reforços serão imediatamente postos em causa e aqui a Europa tem condições de fazer pontes entre os Estados Unidos, a China e a Rússia, entre os Estados Unidos, o Irão e a Arábia Saudita, e nós não devemos renunciar a esse papel.

Duas palavras depois para a agenda mais própria do G20. A primeira para dizer que a União Europeia – e aqui não precisamos do G20 – não pode deixar a Itália, a Grécia, incluindo a Espanha, sozinhas nesta questão dos refugiados. É uma responsabilidade de todos: do norte, do leste, do sul e do oeste da Europa. E, em segundo lugar, queria dizer – com a grande experiência que os portugueses têm em África – que, se nós não apostarmos a sério, e isto já pode ser uma responsabilidade do G20, no desenvolvimento de África, acabaremos todos por continuar a aumentar esta tragédia que está a ocorrer no Mediterrâneo.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Am kommenden Wochenende geht es – wie so oft – um die Frage: Wie gehen wir mit den Herausforderungen der Globalisierung und ihren Fehlentwicklungen um? Wir sind uns wohl alle bewusst, dass wir die Globalisierung formen müssen, damit die Globalisierung nicht uns formt. Dazu muss Europa seine Kräfte bündeln. Die Probleme innerhalb Europas beginnen nicht erst oder enden nicht erst an der Außengrenze der Europäischen Union. Ich erwarte mir daher von den G20 ein klares Bekenntnis gegen Protektionismus, für den Multilateralismus, für einen fairen internationalen Handel und für die Einhaltung internationaler Abkommen, internationalen Rechts und internationaler Werte.

Ja, wir brauchen eine *Global Governance*. Ja, wir müssen die Zukunft unserer gemeinsamen Welt zur gemeinsamen Verantwortung machen. Flüchtlingsströme und Migrationsströme sind eine globale Herausforderung, Afrika ist eine globale Herausforderung. Kämpfen wir endlich für mehr Fairness, Gerechtigkeit, Verantwortung und Zusammenarbeit! Wer sich abschottet ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, 20 država, 20 različitih političkih sustava, 20 različitih razina razvoja, 4/5 svjetskog bruto društvenog proizvoda, 3/4 globalne svjetske trgovine, 2/3 svjetskog stanovništva. Tko bolje od ovih G20 može riješiti probleme s kojima se suočavamo?

Uvijek smo se dosada bavili financijskim i gospodarskim krizama i tim pitanjima, ali ovaj put je naslov: „Oblikovanje povezanog svijeta“. Kako svijet povezati, kako iskoristiti globalizaciju na najbolji mogući način, kako globalizaciju pozitivno iskoristiti? Protiv protekcionizma, protiv izolacije, protiv uskogrudnih nacionalnih politika, a za povezivanje svijeta i za pozitivno iskorištavanje globalizacije.

Neću zaboraviti ni pitanje žena i jednakost žena koje je jedna od tema na G20. Drago mi je da ste to stavili na dnevni red, ali sam sigurna da će se otvoriti mnoge druge teme koje se ovih dana otvaraju u svijetu, poput Sjeverne Koreje. Nadam se da će G20 odgovoriti na ova pitanja i da će se konačno Putin i Trump susresti i približiti.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, for the last twenty years globalisation has defeated poverty in region after region. There is more to do, but it is a process that is thanks to globalisation, and it has created bigger markets for European companies than we have ever seen: crucial for the recovery we are just seeing in the European economy. We need to defend the stability of this world order that has provided for this. We need to see Russia as the threat it is, with the disinformation, cyber war and the warfare we see, for example, in Ukraine. We need to see that the US is not the credible partner we are used to seeing. When the US gets smaller, we need to get taller, reaching out for free trade and supporting with the national governance. That is the most important aim: that we can take leadership in this global development.

Christofer Fjellner (PPE). – Herr talman! Det sköljer en våg av protektionism över världen, och Trump och brexit kanske är två av de tydligaste exemplen på det.

G20-mötet i Hamburg är det viktigaste tillfället vi har just nu att ta strid mot den här protektionismen och isolationismen. För den här protektionismen har vi inte råd med. I vår del av världen kostar den pengar och jobb, men i fattiga delar av världen kostar den faktiskt liv. Sen 2008 har tre gånger så många allvarliga åtgärder som är protektionistiska införts än de som varit handelslättnader, totalt 3800 världen över.

Förr gjorde G20 i alla fall ett uttalande till stöd för den fria handeln, men vid senaste mötet satte Trump stopp för det. När USA sviker då måste EU ta ledartröjan. Därför är frihandelsavtalet med Japan fantastiska nyheter, men det räcker inte. Vi måste gå vidare och klara ett frihandelsavtal med Mexiko, Sydamerika, Australien och Nya Zeeland, för det hänger på Europa, nu när USA sviker.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Ana Gomes (S&D). – O G20 podia fazer a diferença contra a desigualdade, por justiça global nos impostos, pela destruição dos paraísos fiscais, mas do G20 não espero nada, nem sequer tem existência formal.

Mas da presidência estónia espero, e peço, uma ação decisiva em dois domínios absolutamente determinantes para salvar ou afundar a União Europeia. Primeiro, uma gestão inteligente, com visão estratégica e respeito pelos direitos humanos e o direito internacional, do fenómeno imparável, do desafio imparável que temos nas migrações, que não podemos continuar a gerir como se fosse uma ameaça e não uma oportunidade para a Europa em declínio demográfico. Gerir migrações implica combater as causas do terrorismo. A União Europeia precisa de abrir canais legais seguros controlados para refugiados imigrantes e não continuar a alimentar o negócio das redes de traficantes.

Não há União Europeia se deixarmos a Itália e a Grécia sozinhas a afrontar este problema, como foi dito, e não podemos pensar em externalizar as nossas responsabilidades pagando campos de detenção na Líbia. A segunda prioridade é obviamente a justiça fiscal e está ligada com esta porque senão o fenómeno das migrações não vai parar.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun Yhdysvallat käpertyy entistä enemmän itseensä, se tarkoittaa sitä, että Euroopalla on mahdollisuus ja tärkeä rooli ottaa enemmän tilaa ja johtajuutta kansainvälisillä areenoilla. Silloin kun Euroopan unioni on yhtenäinen, olemme vahvoja. Siitä hyvä esimerkki on Pariisin ilmastositopimus, joka ei olisi syntynyt ilman Euroopan unionin sitkeää työtä kansainvälisillä foorumeilla.

G20-kokouksen erityisen tärkeitä teemoja ovat nyt juuri kauppapolitiikka ja kehityspolitiikka, jotka ovat asialistalla. Olen hyvin iloinen siitä, että komissio on ottanut todella aktiivisen roolin kauppapolitiikan osalta. Tiedämme, että eurooppalaisella kaupalla on nyt kysyntää maailmanlaajuisesti, ja ne säännöt ja sopimukset, joita teemme kansainvälisten kumppaneiden kanssa, ohjaavat koko maailmankauppaa. Globalisaation hallinnassa on tärkeää se, että olemme aktiivisia kansainvälisesti. Pyrimme lisäämään näin yrittäjyyttä ja työtä Euroopassa kansainvälisen kaupan näkökulmasta. Tässä japani-neuvottelut ovat nyt hyvässä mallissa.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Διάσκεψη Κορυφής των G20 στις 7 και 8 Ιουλίου πραγματοποιείται σε μια χρονική στιγμή όπου η πλήρης απελευθέρωση του εμπορίου και η παγκοσμιοποίηση έχουν διαλύσει τις ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες και έχουν δημιουργήσει στρατιές φτωχών και ανέργων. Αυτό συμβαίνει διότι το παγκόσμιο εμπόριο επιβραβεύει τις χώρες στις οποίες ακολουθούνται αθέμιτες πρακτικές. Έτσι, αμερικανικές και ευρωπαϊκές πολυεθνικές έχουν εγκαταστήσει, με την τακτική του outsourcing, τη βιομηχανική τους παραγωγή στις χώρες της Ασίας, εκεί όπου ανθεί η παιδική εργασία, η κινεζοποίηση των μισθών, η διάλυση των εργασιακών σχέσεων και η παραβίαση των όρων υγιεινής και ασφάλειας, και όλα αυτά γίνονται με στόχο τα υπερκέρδη.

Ήρθε η στιγμή να απαιτήσουμε να μπει φραγμός στις αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές και να εφαρμόσουμε πολιτικές οι οποίες θα προστατεύουν τους πολίτες της Ένωσης που χάνουν τις δουλειές τους. Ήρθε η στιγμή να μπει φραγμός στη CETA, την TTIP και τις διάφορες άλλες πολυμερείς εμπορικές συμφωνίες, και αυτό μπορεί να γίνει μόνο με την εφαρμογή της αρχής της κοινοτικής προτίμησης. Ταυτόχρονα απαιτούνται μέτρα για τον περιορισμό των μεταναστευτικών ροών που πλήττουν την Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario Timmermans, el G20 no es una estructura formalizada ni actúa con personalidad jurídica única en la comunidad internacional; la Unión Europea, sí, y está representada en el G20 no solo por la Comisión, sino por hasta cinco Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Y sería muy bueno que no hubiese ninguna cacofonía, sino unidad de posición para plantar cara al populista en jefe, que retira a los Estados Unidos del pacto contra el cambio climático; y para exigir una lucha sin cuartel contra la elusión, la evasión y, por supuesto, los paraísos fiscales, que combata la globalización de la desigualdad exasperante; pero, sobre todo, para exigir una respuesta global al desafío de las migraciones.

Y, para eso, sería muy bueno que la Unión Europea honrase el Tratado de Lisboa y el compromiso y mandato de la solidaridad entre los Estados miembros; que no dejase sola a Italia y abandonada a su suerte; y que estableciese, de una vez, vías legales y visados humanitarios para que los desesperados de la Tierra tuviesen una oportunidad de intentar alcanzar Europa sin abandonarse a las mafias ni perder la vida en el intento.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατά την προσεχή Σύνοδο Κορυφής των G20, θα συζητηθούν όπως γίνεται πάντα όλα τα σοβαρά θέματα τα οποία απασχολούν όχι μόνο τα κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά και όλη την ανθρωπότητα. Τα προβλήματα όμως τα οποία προκύπτουν από αυτά τα σοβαρά θέματα, όπως είναι η οικονομία, το εμπόριο, η δίκαιη φορολόγηση, η ανάπτυξη, η αντιμετώπιση της τρομοκρατίας και της μετανάστευσης, δεν μπορούν να επιλυθούν από την παγκόσμια διακυβέρνηση που επιδιώκουν να επιβάλουν οι G20 και την οποία εισηγούνται πολλοί από εσάς.

Παγκοσμιοποίηση και παγκόσμια διακυβέρνηση σημαίνουν ισοπέδωση, η οποία δεν επιλύει προβλήματα, αλλά επιβάλλει τις απόψεις των διεθνών επικυρίαρχων. Τα διεθνή προβλήματα θα επιλυθούν με μια ειλικρινή και σοβαρή συνεργασία κυρίαρχων και ανεξαρτήτων κρατών ή ένωσης τέτοιων κρατών που γνωρίζουν τις ιδιαιτερότητές τους και με βάση αυτές τις ιδιαιτερότητες προσπαθούν να βρουν την πλέον εφικτή και πλέον πραγματιστική λύση.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I will try and react to some of the comments that were made and questions that were put to the Commission. First, on the refugee crisis and our cooperation with the Italian authorities on a code of conduct.

There is no one at the Commission who accuses NGOs of anything. I have stated very clearly yesterday in the press conference that the intentions of the NGOs are noble and good. What they are trying to do is save people from drowning in the Mediterranean. Nobody contests that. The only thing I have said very clearly yesterday is that a code of conduct could be helpful to avoid accidents at sea, to avoid misunderstandings, to make sure that the Libyan coast guard, once it is at the level needed, can do its job in Libyan territorial waters. That is the intention of our cooperation with the Italian authorities. I want to be crystal clear about that.

To the honourable Member, Ms Gardini, I would say this: I understand your criticism of the Commission and of what we are doing, but I think we are in this fight together. We are doing our best to encourage Member States to do what they have promised and to join with extra efforts to make this situation in Italy more bearable on all of us. But I would also ask her and other colleagues here in Parliament: could they please help us in talking to the prime ministers who are part of your political families, and tell them also they should take the responsibility? I understand – Ms in 't Veld said very clearly – she criticised the prime minister from her political family. Great. But talk to the prime ministers in your political family and convince them to do what needs to be done, and then we can all do the same job together instead of criticising each other. We are on the same line, the Commission and the European Parliament. Let's join efforts and convince the leaders of our nations, who are all part of one of mainly three political families in this House, to make sure that they do their bit. I believe if we do that together, we will get results fairly quickly.

Now, just a remark about Brexit. I know that Mr Finch operates under the Farage doctrine here in the European Parliament, which is to make outrageous statements and then run away before anybody can react. But still, I want to use the opportunity to react. I think we are all under an economic, political and above all moral obligation to do the least harm possible in this Brexit process. I think nobody disputes that position and attitude of the Commission, of the Member States and, I would argue also, of Her Majesty's government in London. But to go from there and to say that the whole of the European Union is going to suffer terribly in the G20 because of Brexit is a bit rich, frankly. And Mr Finch, just so you know, I am a great admirer of British culture and I love the UK deeply, whether they are in the EU or not, but Mr Finch really reminds me of a character created by John Cleese in Monty Python's *The Holy Grail*. It is the Black Knight, who, after being defeated terribly and all his limbs cut off, says to his opponent: 'Let's call it a draw'.

What I would like to say to Ms Morvai, who has developed a new practice of asking questions to me every time I am here – and credit to her, she waits to hear the answer – I wanted to say this. She asked me precisely the question about refugees. But let me turn this around one moment. What would have happened if, in 1956 the Swedish Prime Minister, the Danish Prime Minister, the German Chancellor, the Dutch Prime Minister, the Belgian Prime Minister, the Luxembourgish Prime Minister, had said: 'These Hungarians, these people culturally don't belong here. These people will change our culture in a way that we cannot accept.' What would have happened in 1956 if that had been done? I am proud of the European legacy where, when people are persecuted by an inhuman Communist regime such as the regime at the time in Hungary, they find safe refuge in other European countries – and the Hungarian communities across Europe have made an incredible contribution to our societies and have reached the highest level of all these societies in the first, second and third generation. That would be my answer to you, Ms Morvai.

And to Ms Atkinson, I really would like to say: how can you develop this profound admiration for President Putin on the basis of national sovereignty? Who in Europe has had more disregard of national sovereignty than President Putin, who occupies part of another sovereign nation? Who has had less disregard for this? How can you admire a man and his politics based on your analysis of national sovereignty? It is completely beyond me.

Finally, if you will allow me, I will answer Mr de Graaff in the same language that he and I share.

Mijnheer De Graaff heeft het over de patriottische lente die door zijn politieke leider in Nederland voortdurend werd verkondigd. Mijnheer De Graaff vertegenwoordigt een politieke beweging die in het land dat ik het beste ken, succes heeft geboekt bij een deel van het electoraat dat zich in de steek gelaten voelt door de traditionele partijen, zoals ook mijn eigen partij.

Als mensen naar je partij toe komen, geeft je dat ook een grote verantwoordelijkheid om iets te doen aan de zorgen die ertoe leiden dat mensen denken dat je een oplossing hebt. Maar de beweging van de heer De Graaff laat mensen alleen maar in de steek, door alleen maar woede te voeden, door alleen maar boosheid op tafel te leggen, door nooit eens een keer met een constructieve oplossing te komen, door nooit te proberen onderdeel van de oplossing te zijn, alleen maar proberen het probleem op te kloppen en groter te maken en ik zeg tegen de heer De Graaff – en hiermee wil ik eindigen – ik zie inderdaad een patriottische lente in Europa.

Het is een Europese patriottische lente die in Bratislava werd getoond door de Europese leiders toen ze samen een toekomst uitstippelden die we samen gaan vormgeven; die in Rome werd getoond door de Europese leiders toen ze aangaven samen de toekomst te willen aangeven; die op de G-20-top zal worden getoond door Europese leiders als ze aangeven dat de toekomst van de wereld, het welzijn van de Europeanen, alleen maar op duurzame manier kan worden gerealiseerd als Europeanen dat sámen doen, niet op basis van een vals idee van nationale soevereiniteit tegen mekaar, niet door neer te kijken op andere Europeanen of minderheden in de eigen samenleving, maar door iedereen de kracht te geven om samen een betere wereld te vormen.

President. – Thank you, First Vice-President, and thank you also for reminding us of John Cleese and his contributions to our common European culture. Please do inform us when you charge a Commissioner with a department for silly walks!

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all Member for their comments, which remind us once again that we are facing challenging times on several fronts, especially with the geopolitical and political uncertainties which are still very high. I therefore look forward to a strong message of confidence from G20 leaders. We need to preserve the spirit of cooperation in the G20 and to continue providing multilateral answers to the challenges that we are facing. This also means maintaining and building on their achievements of the past and not giving in to protectionism and isolationism.

President. – That concludes the item.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

Written statements (Rule 162)

Pál Csáky (PPE), írásban. – Timmermans úrnak az '56-os forradalommal és az azt követő, közép-európai, magyar emberek Nyugat-Európába menekülésével kapcsolatban tett megállapításait helyesbíteném. A II. világháborúig Európa bár sokszínű, de egységes kontinensnek számított, amelynek kultúrája keresztény-zsidó alapokra épült. Ezt az egységet bontotta meg a kommunista rezsim, fizikai és lelki pusztítást végezve. Sajnos, a négy évtizedes szakadás okozta károkat egyelőre nem sikerült teljesen felszámolni. Ezért is szerencsétlen a hasonlat, miszerint a pár ezer '56-os magyar menekült ugyanaz, mint az EU-ba ma az afrikai és ázsiai kontinensekről érkező tömeges menekültáradat. Az '56-os eseményeket követően a továbbra is a szabadságban és demokráciában hívók egy része elhagyta Magyarországot a jobb, és a korábban hazájukban is érvényes értékrend szerinti élet irányába. Az '56-osok tudták miért és hova igyekeznek, ez a jelenlegi esetben nem egyértelmű. Nem fair az EU keleti és nyugati felét az ilyen jellegű, nem igazságon alapuló kijelentésekkel egymástól eltávolítani. Nem az egységet szolgálja, sőt megoldásra sem vezet. Amellett, hogy a kívülről érkező problémákat meg kell oldanunk, ha jobb Európát akarunk, ugyanolyan odafigyeléssel kell lennünk az európaiak iránt, legyenek azok hollandok, franciák vagy magyarok, illetve akár kisebbségi létben élők. Az őshonos kisebbségekre gondolok, akiknek jogai érdekében az EU máig nem tett határozott lépéseket.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), por escrito. – El G20 no es una estructura formalizada ni actúa con personalidad jurídica única en la comunidad internacional; la Unión Europea, sí, y está representada en el G20 no solo por la Comisión, sino por hasta cinco Estados miembros de la Unión Europea. Resulta imprescindible que no haya ninguna cacofonía, sino unidad de posición para hablar con una sola voz frente a Donald Trump y su deseo de retirar a los Estados Unidos del pacto contra el cambio climático; y para exigir una lucha sin cuartel contra la elusión, la evasión y, por supuesto, los paraísos fiscales, que combata la globalización de la desigualdad exasperante; pero, sobre todo, para exigir una respuesta global al desafío de las migraciones. Y, para eso, sería muy bueno que la Unión Europea honrase el Tratado de Lisboa y el compromiso y mandato de la solidaridad entre los Estados miembros; que no dejase sola a Italia y abandonada a su suerte; y que estableciese, de una vez, vías legales y visados humanitarios para que los desesperados de la Tierra tuviesen una oportunidad de intentar alcanzar Europa sin abandonarse a las mafias ni perder la vida en el intento.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Skupina G20, ktorá tvorí až 4/5 svetového hrubého domáceho produktu a 2/3 svetovej populácie sa tento mesiac stretne, aby prerokovala dôležité otázky obchodu, daňového dumpingu, klimatických zmien, migrácie, bezpečnosti, terorizmu a iné dôležité témy všeobecného záujmu. Som rád, že sa tento summit koná. V čase globalizácie, ktorá nám prináša veľa výhod, ale i veľa výziev, je to príležitosť, keď môžeme viesť dialóg pre spravodlivejšiu globalizáciu a sústrediť sa na vytváranie a realizáciu realistických cieľov.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), írásban. – Reményem szerint az EU vezetői a G20-csúcstalálkozóra a korábbiaknál jobban felvértezve érkezhetnek, mert az utóbbi két év meddő vitái után az Európai Tanács júniusi ülése végre a menekültválságon túllépve kellő súllyal tudott foglalkozni és határozni a világ és az európai polgárok jövőjét meghatározó olyan közös kihívásokról, mint a globális gazdasági növekedés, a Párizsi Egyezmény végrehajtásának fontossága, valamint a közös biztonság. Afrika és a fenntartható fejlesztési célok jelentőségét nem lebecsülve, az európai érdekek, a migrációs mozgások jövője szempontjából szerintem a találkozó kulcskérdése a nemzetközi béke és biztonság szavatolása, elsősorban a szíriai és iraki szintéren. Kevésbé tartom megnyugtatónak az EU pozícióit a globális partnerekkel szemben a migrációs kérdéskörben. A határőrzéssel, a menekültek elosztásával, a migráció humánus megközelítésével kapcsolatban tett fontos elvi állásfoglalások ugyanis mindaddig nem tekinthetők a közös uniós cselekvést meghatározó döntésnek, amíg az EiT nem képes véget vetni saját egyes tagjai Európa- és idegenellenes aknamunkájának, mint amilyen például az Orbán-kormányé. Ezzel együtt az EU-nak továbbra is a Trump-adminisztráció politikáját kritikus fényben feltüntető, iránymutató és példaadó szerepben kell fellépnie a G20-on és az egész nemzetközi szintéren a migráció kezelésében az emberi jogok érvényesülését, a menekültekkel való emberséges bánásmódot illetően.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A propósito de um Pilar Social destinado a branquear as políticas neoliberais da UE são feitas 20 propostas concretas que se afiguram como um autêntico manual de exploração e nivelamento por baixo dos direitos laborais e sociais. Promovem o aprofundamento da exploração e da precariedade por via da «flexibilidade», atacam o direito à proteção social e segurança social pública e universal, alinham a «idade da reforma com a esperança de vida». Defendem a precariedade e a submissão dos direitos sociais e laborais aos desideratos dos patrões, do grande capital e dos interesses do diretório de potências da UE. Elimina-se qualquer referência a políticas públicas de serviços, como a educação ou a saúde. Assumem uma visão mercantilista dos direitos seja na proteção social, na saúde, na educação, na água, no saneamento, na energia, nos transportes, entre outros, quem os quiser que os pague! Um manual de exploração que urge rejeitar e com ele as políticas e constrangimentos da UE que promovem a pobreza, as desigualdades e a asfixia de povos e países soberanos.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

6. Prezentazzjoni tal-prijoritajiet tal-Presidenza Estonjana tal-Kunsill (dibattitu)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the presentation of the programme of activities of the Estonian Presidency (2017/2659(RSP)).

I give a very warm welcome to the Prime Minister of Estonia, Mr Ratas, who is now President-in-Office of the Council.

Jüri Ratas, nõukogu eesistuja. – Austatud istungi juhataja! Juulis 1979 pidas esimese kõne esimese otsevalitud Euroopa Parlamendi ees Louise Weiss, kelle järgi see maja on oma nime saanud. Oma kõnes viitas Weiss, tollal 89-aastane „Euroopa Vanaema”, Hermann Keyserlingi loomingule.

Keyserling oli Eestis sündinud filosoof, kes juba 20. sajandi alguses omas visiooni ühtsest Euroopast. Euroopast, kus riigid töötavad koos, aga säilitavad oma unikaalsuse. Euroopast, mis on tugev just oma mitmekesisuse tõttu. Samal istungil presidendina oma esimese kõne pidanud Simone Veil (keda just neil hetkil Pariisis viimasele teekonnale saadetakse) rõhutas, et ainult Euroopa dimensiooni kaudu on võimalik leida lahendus kolmele suurele väljakutsele: rahule, vabadusele ja heaolule. See on endiselt nii.

38 aastat hiljem on mul au seista siin, et esitleda Eesti Euroopa Liidu Nõukogu esimese eesistumise prioriteete. Keyserlingi ja Weissi ajaga võrreldes on palju muutunud, kuid idee Euroopa rahvaste liidust on püsima jäänud.

The European Union is not only an idea. For 500 million people in the EU, it is their daily reality. Europeans want and deserve a union that is strong and decisive and that delivers. To achieve that, we must ensure that every voice is heard and balance the different traditions, interests and opinions in Europe, fairly. This is why the overarching theme of our Presidency is *Unity through Balance*.

First, before I turn to our plans, I acknowledge that no Presidency can succeed, alone. We will work very closely with you, honourable Members of the European Parliament, to make sure that citizens are at the heart of everything we do. We need your wisdom and input on every topic on our agenda. We are very grateful to Malta for their excellent work paving the way for us and our trio partners – Bulgaria and Austria. In Bratislava, Malta and Rome, we had a frank and honest discussion about where we stand and what we need to do to weather the storms ahead and emerge stronger.

It is our shared agenda, with the honourable Parliament, to find concrete answers to our citizens' most pressing concerns – unemployment, security and immigration – and to bring Europe closer to our citizens. For the Estonian Council Presidency, our key aim is to move forward with the EU's positive agenda

The four priorities that we will focus on over the next six months reflect these discussions and are guided by the spirit of the Rome Declaration. They include an open and innovative European economy, an inclusive and sustainable Europe, a safe and secure Europe and, of course, a digital Europe with the free movement of data.

Our priority of an open and innovative European economy, a strong and competitive European economy, supports growth and employment. Of course, that will make our plans and vision in every other policy area possible. The Single Market is one of the greatest assets of the EU, and the free movement of goods, services, people and capital benefits us all. However, the Single Market is not complete. Some of its potential is still untapped.

Our Presidency is prioritising the creation of an innovative, European social market economy that is open to changes, opportunities, free and fair trade and original ideas. For companies to succeed, the business environment must be transparent, simple and free of red tape. We are focused on ensuring a stable banking sector and taking forward the Services Package, and we stand ready to reform EU company law.

Equally, a smarter, cleaner and more cost-effective energy system with an enhanced role for the consumer is an important part of a competitive European economy, and one that we will aim for.

Our next priority is an Inclusive and Sustainable Europe. Of course, a strong economy must be based on the core European values of inclusivity and sustainability. The EU is not just for the few, or for the here and now. We want to ensure that every European citizen can continue to enjoy a Europe that is beautiful, sustainable, free, prosperous and safe.

One of the biggest challenges for this generation of politicians is technological transformation. It is one that I am confident we can shape. Because of our changing society and the influence of technology, the very nature of work is changing. Remote working in a digital economy means an employer and an employee may never actually meet in person. Along with robotisation and artificial intelligence, it represents the „fourth industrial revolution“. In response, we need to adapt our social security systems and respond to changes in the economic environment. Skills must meet the needs of future jobs, whether it be building self-driving cars or designing virtual reality experiences.

During our Presidency, we will focus on ways in which the EU can offer equal opportunities and conditions for people, both in their own Member State and also when working and living in another.

Equally, we owe it to our future generations and we owe it to our planet to fulfil our commitment to the Paris Agreement and ensure that sustainability is a key feature of all European policies. Despite the United States withdrawing from the Agreement, we will not change our own commitment.

Our next priority is a safe and secure Europe. Born from the destruction of two bloody world wars, Europe came together, united. It is our utmost duty to keep Europe safe and secure. We cannot fail in that. Let me underline this to the House. In the 21st century, we must not accept aggression against a European country or the illegal annexation and occupation of part of its territory. Were it not for the 1983 European Parliament resolution on Soviet-occupied Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, perhaps I would not be standing in front of you today.

I remember what it means to live inside closed borders when the Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain, divided Europe. We were not allowed to visit foreign countries. Even Estonian islands were highly guarded border-zones that could be visited only with a special permit. I remember my parents watching Finnish television and listening to the Radio Free Europe – the only access to the free world.

I know what it means to wish for freedom and democracy. I believe that it is not impossible that one day in the future, a Ukrainian President may stand in front of this house in the same role as I am today.

It is clear that the European Union must assume greater responsibility for security in and around Europe. No single country is able to stand up to the threats we face, or solve these challenges, alone. The Global Strategy, the EU-NATO joint declaration and the debate on the future of defence rightly set out a high ambition. In order to keep those ambitious promises and deliver results, we need to spend more and we need to spend better on defence. That means joint development of the necessary capabilities.

At the same time, we need to make full use of the existing and new mechanisms, such as the Battlegroups, Permanent Structured Cooperation and the European Defence Fund. Practice makes perfect, so we must regularly carry out coordinated crisis-management exercises. The EU has a vast toolbox ranging from industry, to cyber defence, from strategic communication to Battlegroups.

The EU's external borders need better protection and tighter control over the movement of both irregular migrants and illicit goods. Law enforcement needs a targeted toolbox for cooperation and information sharing.

Sadly, many of the recent terror attacks have proven that often the threats to our safety are not caused by shortcomings on the ground, but by the lack of information sharing. Therefore, we must continue to create modern IT solutions for the rapid exchange of information. We must improve the interoperability of information systems and the quality of data exchange. There cannot be known „unknowns“, when peoples' lives are at stake.

The ongoing migration-crisis remains the most urgent challenge that we have seen for decades. It is our responsibility, not only as Europeans but as human beings, to assist those seeking refuge in Europe from the tragedy of the Syrian war. Once again, no one Member State can resolve the crisis on their own. We can only keep Europe safe if we act together, in the spirit of solidarity and responsibility.

The EU cannot only look inwards. We must look outwards, actively assisting countries in our neighborhood, both in the south as well as the east. We must reconfirm our political commitment to the Eastern Partnership in order to better respond to the ambitions of all the partners.

In addition to the Eastern Partnership Summit, we will also contribute to the preparations of the EU-Latin American and Caribbean States Summit and the EU-Africa Summit. In summary, our citizens expect safety and security, and we must deliver it together and without hesitation.

Next, our priority of creating a digital Europe and the free movement of data. In Estonia, we think of the free movement of data as the fifth freedom of the EU. Therefore, we will start a political debate in Europe on this essential freedom. The digital revolution is at the core of every challenge and opportunity that Europe faces today. Together with our Trio partners, Bulgaria and Austria, we are committed to delivering a Digital Single Market in 2018. But we must also look further afield, which is why we have a digital dimension to almost every aspect of our Presidency programme, from fisheries to space, and the use of data – the raw material of the digital society.

The development of cross-border services and e-commerce has tangible benefits for EU citizens. Buying goods or services online, watching your favourite domestic TV-show, or using e-prescriptions in another European country should be possible and easy. Concluding the current negotiations on geoblocking, audiovisual media services and taking forward the reform of copyright will help get us there.

A critical aspect of a functioning digital society is trust. Europe should be a safe place where rules respecting privacy, data protection and our digital identity are vital. As seen from the recent global cyber-attacks, we need to up our game to keep Europe safe.

To support this digital society, Europe requires fast, seamless, always-on and always-available connectivity. Europe needs to be among the pioneers in rolling out 5G and developing new connected products and services. Updating the telecommunications regulatory framework will contribute to these goals. A data driven economy and the fourth industrial revolution will also need a Digital Government.

Every person in Europe should be able to interact with the government with ease and without worry. During our Presidency, we will encourage the use of IT solutions in daily life, including our health, justice, and financial systems. Trust me on this point, once you have filled your tax declaration in just three minutes while sitting by the river on a nice Sunday, you will never want to go back to paperwork. In the Estonian Government, we save a stack of papers as high as the Eiffel Tower each month – that means twelve Eiffel Towers per year!

In September, I look forward to welcoming the Heads of States, governments and institutions to the Digital Summit in Tallinn to discuss these very issues and opportunities.

There is one more topic that I would like to address before I conclude – Brexit. We are sad to see the UK withdraw from the EU. It is a loss for our country, for the European Union and for the United Kingdom. I hope that the United Kingdom will remain a close friend. The negotiations need to be conducted in a constructive spirit, tackling first the citizens' rights, the financial settlement and the border in Ireland.

However, the Presidency's task is also to make sure that EU27 continues to work and continues to deliver for our future. We will not let Brexit negotiations dominate our work or prevent us from achieving results.

In Conclusion, Honourable Members of the Parliament, I hope that our Presidency will be remembered as one that allowed Europe to put the crises behind us and once again look optimistically towards our future. In the words of the great Irish poet Seamus Heaney, this could be a „once in a lifetime” moment when hope and history rhyme. My own country and people have been very lucky. Our hope and history have rhymed twice in less than a century so, in a way, it makes us experts on „seizing the day.” I am sure we are not alone in feeling that change is in the air.

Europe needs to be redefined for every generation, to adapt and to inspire. Helmut Kohl was one of the key architects of Europe. We sent him on his last journey from this very room only a few days ago. He said: „the visionaries of yesterday are the realists of today”.

I believe that things we never thought possible are happening, right before our eyes. So, there is no excuse for not acting, there is no excuse for thinking small. We will turn tomorrow's reality into the one we want. Today, it is up to us to begin creating that vision, creating that reality.

President. – President Ratas, thank you for a very comprehensive and ambitious programme that we in Parliament certainly look forward to working on with you, and if I may say, the fine choice of poet that you quoted. And I remember – if I may be indulged – he also said, ‘There is no such thing as innocent bystanding’, and perhaps we might remember that.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I am honoured to stand here today, on behalf of President Jean-Claude Juncker and the entire Commission, at the start of the first ever Estonian Presidency of the Council of the European Union. This moment comes after a long wait for a country that joined the European Union some 13 years ago, but good things come to those who wait, and Europe has many good things to look forward to over the course of the next six months.

Along with President Juncker and my fellow Commissioners, I was in Tallinn last week and saw first hand how well-prepared the Presidency team is. Knowing how the Estonian civil service works, I never doubted this for a moment. This is also reflected in the programme of the Estonian Presidency, which is fully in line with the joint declaration which the Presidents of the three institutions signed at the end of last year. Both go to the heart of the issues that matter the most for Europeans.

The timing of the Estonian Presidency could not be better. I say that because it comes at a time when we need to make progress on making the digital part of Europe's DNA. The next six months are crucial for making our economy digital. Since this Commission came into office, we have made some real progress towards completing the digital single market, having made 35 proposals since November 2014. Together with the upcoming Bulgarian and Austrian Presidencies, Estonia has set the goal of reaching agreement in all of them by the end of next year. That will be important if we are to benefit from the EUR 415 billion that completing the digital single market could unlock. I am delighted that the Presidency has highlighted 5G coverage as a priority area. We want 5G to be commercially available in at least one major city of each EU Member State by 2020, as it will be in Tallinn by next year. But in the long term, all urban areas, as well as major roads and railways across Europe, should have uninterrupted 5G coverage. Achieving that could bring EUR 146 billion worth of benefits a year and is likely to create 2.39 million jobs in the European Union. Jobs matter to Europeans, and these are the things that we must focus on.

That is why we are also making sure that we are investing in our digital future. There is no shortage of European innovators and entrepreneurs with new and fresh ideas to bring to a thriving digital market. But Europe cannot afford to lose these ideas to other parts of the world because of a lack of opportunities or financing. That is why we are focusing on investments, so start-ups and small businesses can access the financing that they need to scale up and bring their ideas to market. The capital markets union is already helping to make venture capital easier to access, and the Juncker Plan has now mobilised EUR 209 billion across Europe. One of your first achievements will be to secure an agreement on extending the fund so it can unlock at least EUR 0.5 trillion by 2020.

But the success of the digital single market will also depend on trust and security. That is why I hope we can learn from Estonia's experience on cybersecurity. The scale of the risks is significant. By 2020 there will be 50 billion connected devices. Just last year there were 4 000 ransomware attacks per day – a 300% increase compared to the year before. We saw the damage that the data ransomware attack caused to institutions in Europe and elsewhere just last week. That is a very stark reminder and a very clear warning that we cannot take our cybersecurity for granted. With that in mind, we will review the EU cybersecurity strategy with targeted initiatives by September.

I know we can rely on your support and expertise on this and on all other broader security issues which I know your Presidency has prioritised. Finding agreement on the European Travel Information and Authorisation System and the Entry-Exit System by the end of the year will be absolutely crucial to ensuring that. Equally, the reform of the Common European Asylum System has taken too long to come to fruition. I sincerely hope that the 'Unity in Balance' slogan of your Presidency can be applied here and across the board.

There is much work ahead of us over the next six months, and I am glad that the Estonian Presidency will be leading the way. I will not only wish them – or Jüri – good luck, but I also thank you in advance.

(Applause)

Tunne Kelam, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, there is an old saying that a person will be remembered for two things only – the problems he has solved, and the problems he has left. I think Estonia has a good chance of qualifying in the first category. As a small country that is not too much burdened by its national interests, Estonia can better play the role of an honest broker to bring the 27 Member State governments more closely together, because this is needed more than ever today.

I like the Estonian message, which could be called 'back to basics', that the fundamental freedoms need to be fully implemented. As you said, Prime Minister, the single market is not yet complete. I also like the focus on concrete results for EU citizens in terms of better provision for security, safety and quality of life. And similarly, for our neighbours, I am encouraged that Estonia sees the Eastern Partnership as a cross-cutting priority for our foreign and security policy. It should remain a special commitment to help neighbouring nations become part of the same area of rule of law and prosperity.

Yesterday evening, Commission Vice-President Timmermans said something which moved me. He said that if Poland and the Baltic States had not joined the European Union in 2004, they would have shared today the fate of Ukraine.

Let us now address together the fate of Ukraine and finally agree on a realistic common strategy to counter, without hesitation, Russia's aggressive policy. The ultimate goal of that policy is not Ukraine, but the weakening, confusing and compromising of the EU itself.

The same is true in relation to energy solidarity.

I trust Estonia will lend momentum to the completion of the digital single market, boost digital Europe and advance the free movement of data. And, to conclude, I look forward to an active and coordinated approach towards the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern crises, building an efficient border guard system and preparing for an active post-ISIS role in Iraq and Syria. I think Estonia has a chance to make Europe cosier and closer to our citizens, and greater for the outside world. Good luck Estonia! Good luck Europe!

Marju Lauristin, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, it is really a great day of joy for all Estonians, because all Estonia have been preparing ourselves to this first Presidency. I remember when we started this way to the European Union in 1997, we were poor but we were bold, and we were absolutely sure that the European Union is our destiny: it is our goal and we bring the best of us to that. The same year, we started also the programme 'Tiger Leap'. It was a programme of digitalisation. We brought computers in all the Estonian schools, and we were sure that digitalisation is our shortcut – shortcut to the future; shortcut to the future where we are now. Here our Prime Minister is standing – the youngest prime minister in Europe – and bringing here both programmes connected with digitalisation, digital revolution really in Europe. What I want to stress is that our experience is showing that digital revolution is total. It is not only market, it is not only technology. In the first place it is new relationships in the whole society: a new type of services, a new type of well-being, a new type of engagement and activity and participation of people, and for that, I suppose, it is very important also to build trust. And as a President said, I suppose that is the most difficult task, because we can tell whatever we like about our good experiences, about digital and so on, but you have to convince

the other 27 or 26 that it is that, and very often you will hear what we have heard here – ‘Oh, you are so small and bold, you can do that.’ But we are much bigger; we have bigger risks. We will wait.

But we know that Europe cannot wait. Europe cannot wait; Europe needs this; Europe needs to be the most competitive, biggest market in the world for most advanced technology, but also for most advanced society.

And I will also stress very much what already was said here. We are living not in a very happy moment for the world. We are looking what is going on around us. Yesterday we saw how Putin and the Chinese leader were embracing each other. We see what is happening in Turkey. We know that really Europe is one of the most important hopes for the world to preserve ideals of democracy, liberal democracy, human rights. These are values which cannot be left just to free flow. We have to protect them, fight for them, and as was said by the Prime Minister, Estonia is like also Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles: we know really the price of freedom. We know the price of the democracy, and for that I am sure that, under our Estonian Presidency, the European Union as a whole will be stronger also in this fight.

So I wish you good luck. I wish you strength and wisdom and trust.

(Applause)

Roberts Zīle, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I would first like to wish the Estonian Presidency every success. Going very quickly through the three priorities of your programme, I would like to start with an open and innovative European economy.

It is not an easy time for this task because we know there is a global shift in thinking about free trade and also, even on a single market issue, particularly in several service sectors, we see that it is not really a single market. I wish you a very strong position to succeed in this field and to go in a protectionist direction. In particular in Estonia you have had great experience, since Estonia regained independence, of creating a small, open economy with free trade and a very simple system of how to start doing business.

The second issue is security. With the EU having a border with an aggressive neighbour, I think you know very well why you have such priorities as increasing defence expenditure. You have always kept all your promises to NATO. I would point out that they are promises, not obligations.

Tunne Kelam spoke of supporting and strengthening relations such as with eastern partnership countries. This is also very important. On EU-NATO relations on the security issue, it may not be well known that Estonia is home to the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. Any EU Member State can get cybersecurity advice and excellence from this centre so it is not necessary to create some kind of European agency for this purpose.

Regarding digital matters, I think you will succeed in the next six months with the digital single market. I hope this will also be done with Commissioner Ansip who knows this issue very well. I would just like to add what has already been said about digital issues, namely that the e-residency programme in Estonia could also perhaps remove some obstacles which would be created if the outcome of the Brexit negotiations goes the wrong way.

Prime Minister, a final point, you are here today with your closest allies. There could be more of us – also on the Commission side – but it is not ridiculous.

Cecilia Wikström, *för ALDE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Till att börja med så vill jag naturligtvis önska det estniska ordförandeskapet allt gott.

Ni tar över i en tid som präglas både av populister som ifrågasätter allt det gemensamma men å andra sidan, och detta är positivt, en väldigt stor förväntan från Europas medborgare att hitta gemensamma lösningar för gemensamma gränsöverskridande problem.

Medborgarna säger i senaste Eurobarometern, mer än 70 procent säger, att när det rör terroristbekämpning, klimatförändringar och först men inte minst all politik som nu måste fokuseras på att bygga en asyl- och migrationspolitik där alla tar ett gemensamt ansvar. Det är väldigt viktigt för den här unionen och för vår framtid att vi faktiskt ska kunna skapa en politik som håller och där varje land har sin proportionella del utav det gemensamma ansvaret.

Som föredragande för Dublin-förordningen så hoppas jag givetvis att ni ska prioritera detta och verka för en gemensam och verkligen väl fungerande politik på det här området. Det är uppenbarligen så nu att den politik vi har inte håller och inte klarar den test som verkligheten har ställt oss inför.

Vi måste bevaka de yttre gränserna och alla människor som passerar måste registreras. Ett system där vi delar ansvar för dem som tvingas fly är ett europeiskt åtagande, och jag är rädd att väldigt mycket av vår framtid står på spel om vi inte lyckas leverera den här gången.

Medborgarna förväntar sig att det ska vara rättssäkert, att det ska ges skydd åt dem som behöver internationellt skydd, men att vi gemensamt också ska kunna återföra dem som inte uppfyller kriterierna, så att de inte bara finns här på ett irreguljärt sätt utan att de återförs till sina ursprungsländer på ett ordnat och värdigt sätt.

Jag tycker att det är viktigt att säga att efter mina möten nu med många från den estniska regeringen med premiärministern och de andra ministrarna, så kan vi ha mycket högt ställda förväntningar. Ni kommer att leverera med kvalitet och med en europeisk anda.

Låt oss finna lösningar för allas vårt gemensamma bästa. Jag hoppas att när ni nu tar över så kommer ni att kämpa för att vi ska hitta de här lösningarna, och när ni lämnar ordförandeskapet vidare så ska vi vara ännu mer en europeisk union än nu när ni tar över.

Lycka till!

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, Εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Ratas, καλωσορίζω την πρώτη εθνική προεδρία και θα ήθελα να σας συγχαρώ και για τα σημαντικά βήματα ψηφιοποίησης, τόσο της οικονομίας όσο και της δημόσιας διοίκησης σας. Θα ήθελα όμως να σταθώ σε όσα δεν μας είπατε στην αρχική σας ομιλία και να ζητήσω απαντήσεις στη δευτερολογία σας. Τι θα κάνετε για την προώθηση ενός ισχυρού κοινωνικού πυλώνα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εφόσον οι ανισότητες, κοινωνικές και περιφερειακές, αυξάνονται επικίνδυνα; Τι θα κάνετε για τη φορολογική εναρμόνιση, που είναι απαραίτητο εργαλείο για τον περιορισμό μιας κραυγαλέας φοροδιαφυγής, όπου οι πολυεθνικές πληρώνουν ελάχιστα, μέσω φορολογικών παραδείσων, και οι φορολογούμενοι πολίτες, μισθωτοί, συνταξιούχοι και μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις πληρώνουν το κόστος; Τι θα κάνετε για την ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη στο προσφυγικό, που είναι ελλιπής, καθώς κράτη μέλη αρνούνται να τιμήσουν τις δεσμεύσεις τους; Τι θα κάνετε για την ολοκλήρωση της τραπεζικής ενοποίησης με ένα πρόγραμμα εγγύησης των τραπεζικών καταθέσεων που έχει προτείνει η Επιτροπή, αλλά σκοντάφτει στις αντιδράσεις μέσα στο Συμβούλιο; Τι θα κάνετε για την ενίσχυση των πολιτικών συνοχής, καθώς οι ανισότητες μεγαλώνουν επικίνδυνα;

Περιμένω, στη δευτερολογία σας, συγκεκριμένες απαντήσεις και δεσμεύσεις και έργο σε αυτά τα θέματα όταν έρθετε να κάνετε τον απολογισμό σας, για να μην μείνουμε σε συμπαθείς γενικότητες.

Josep-Maria Terricabras, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, I am happy to intervene in this session on behalf of my Group.

Estonia has chosen four main objectives for the next six months. The logical order of these four objectives seems clear. The inclusive and sustainable Europe that Estonia wants to promote, as the fourth objective, will be closer if the first three objectives are achieved. They consist in the promotion of an open and innovative economy, and, as required by that, security in daily life as well as significant advances in the modern digital world and the exchange of information. These three goals may certainly facilitate a more inclusive and sustainable Europe.

The programme adds in its introduction that, in pursuing those objectives, Prime Minister, you will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. So far, so good. However, I would have liked to see an entire chapter in the programme devoted specifically to the defence of human rights, not just as a consequence to be drawn from other objectives but as a specific objective in itself. Estonia, which is a small country and is a friend of my country, Catalonia, must be guided not only by the logic of inclusion and sustainability but also by the explicit defence of human rights. Indeed, the human-rights deficit is not found only in third countries, which we constantly criticise: unfortunately it also occurs in many countries within the Union.

I am confident and convinced that, in the months to come, Estonia will go in the direction of denouncing any breach of fundamental rights in the European Union. Having said this, I must also say that my Group is pleased with the announcement of this project. We can only wish the best to Estonia and to Europe under this new Presidency.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Estonia è il paese dove ha preso avvio la rivoluzione del voto elettorale via Internet, ed è la prima volta che questa presiede il Consiglio.

L'Estonia indica quattro priorità, indubbiamente condivisibili: un'economia europea aperta e innovativa, un'Europa sicura, digitale, inclusiva e sostenibile. Ma in passato abbiamo visto belle promesse che nascondevano qualcosa di meno affascinante. E purtroppo, dietro il paravento estone, ritroviamo le priorità della Commissione, con il piede dell'acceleratore sull'Unione dei mercati dei capitali, sul FEIS, sull'Unione bancaria, ma anche sull'omnibus e sull'incremento della spesa militare che asseconda la dichiarazione congiunta con la NATO di un anno fa.

Nulla di nuovo sotto il sole, dunque. Mi piacerebbe invece che l'Estonia invertisse la rotta rispetto a una tradizione ormai consolidata, che vede gli Stati utilizzare questa opportunità per ottenere un maggiore lustro, con belle parole, ma purtroppo con politiche vuote. L'Estonia ha saputo rivoluzionare il proprio sistema elettorale? Bene, porti anche qui una ventata di cambiamento, perché i cittadini europei ne avrebbero realmente bisogno.

Matteo Salvini, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, buon lavoro. Al di là del voto elettronico, io penso che le emergenze in Europa siano due: lavoro e sicurezza, caro Presidente.

Tema disoccupazione: ci sono venti milioni di cittadini europei disoccupati, di cui quattro milioni di giovani. Quindi io prego la Commissione e la Presidenza di smetterla di fare regali alle multinazionali; di non sottoscrivere più accordi suicidi come quelli con il Canada del CETA, contro cui stanno manifestando in questo momento gli agricoltori italiani: 300 000 aziende agricole che producono grano a rischio; di smetterla di approvare direttive folli come quella sulle banche e come la direttiva Bolkestein; di smetterla di regalare a dazio zero lo sbarco di migliaia di tonnellate di olio tunisino, pomodori marocchini, riso cambogiano o thailandese sulle nostre tavole, con la salute dei nostri figli che ne paga le conseguenze; di rimuovere le sanzioni contro la Russia, che deve essere un partner commerciale e non un nemico, e che non si appresta a invadere niente e nessuno; e di difendere i confini.

Io capisco che l'Estonia non abbia questo gran problema perché ospita al massimo 150 immigrati. L'Italia sta diventando un enorme campo profughi. In questo palazzo, qualcuno disse: «Viva Macron, viva la Francia!», e adesso Macron chiude i porti alle navi straniere. Qualcuno disse: «Viva l'Austria che ha fermato i populist!», e l'Austria mette l'esercito e i blindati ai confini con l'Italia. La smettiamo di farci invadere? Cinquecento milioni di cittadini europei vi pagano per dare loro lavoro e sicurezza, non per fare regali agli scafisti e ai banchieri. Buon lavoro.

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr, Miniszterelnök Úr! Gratulálok Önnek az ambiciózus tervéhez, ahhoz a négy ponthoz, amit ismertetett. És gratulálok az észtek első elnökségének is, kívánom, hogy ez a program úgy, ahogyan tervezte, valósuljon meg. Bár említette, hogy nem szeretne kifejezetten a brexitre koncentrálni, azért nyilván Ön is elismeri, hogy a brexit megkerülhetetlen tényező lesz az Önök elnökségében. Sőt, azt mondom, hogy minekután a tárgyalások most kezdődnek meg, nagyon fontos, hogy milyen kiindulási pontokat fogunk meghatározni. Ön számára is, az Ön országa számára is, minden európai ország számára fontos, hogy a Nagy-Britanniában dolgozó európai uniós állampolgárok milyen helyzetben maradnak. Sőt, azt is mondhatom, hogy a nagy-britanniai állampolgárok milyen helyzetben maradnak az Európai Unióban. Egy közös, jó megállapodást kell hozni.

Említette a digitális gazdaságot, amit én nagyon fontos dolognak tartok, a belső piac kiteljesedésének egyik útjának tekintem. 430 milliárd euróról van szó, ha sikerül ezt a programot megvalósítani. Mégis szeretném felhívni az Ön figyelmét egy másik témára, amely szoros kapcsolatba van ezzel – ez a körforgásos gazdaság. Van egy jelentésem, ami egy kiváló jelentés a terméknövelő termékekről, aminek a trilógusa most fog megkezdődni. Ez hozzájárulhat ahhoz, hogy ez a körforgásos gazdaság kialakulhasson és kiteljesedhessen. Kívánok Önnek jó elnöklést ehhez!

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Madam President, it is a real pleasure to receive Prime Minister Ratas here among us, and we welcome the Estonian Presidency's commitment to an open and innovative Europe. This is a really big vision, and we would like to align that vision with European values too. That is why your contribution, Prime Minister, will be very important in making the best of the digital revolution, as we believe that many benefits can come from this, and I would say that, more than just a digital single market, we need a digital Union, making sure that everybody can benefit from the digital revolution when it comes to quality of public services, when it comes to full access for all citizens and when comes to the transformation of people's working conditions in the digital environment.

That is why the European social pillar, to be proclaimed during your presidency, should be geared to the future and should empower young people in Europe.

We also approve of your commitment to an open Europe, and indeed Europe is now negotiating very important trade agreements. We believe that, in negotiating these agreements, we should pay attention to the Union's commitment to the sustainable development goals. That is why the new instruments for defence are so important.

However, in a nutshell, all the best for your very promising presidency.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik heb recent een werkbezoek aan Estland gebracht en ik moet zeggen dat ik onder de indruk was van de voortrekkersrol die jullie spelen op het vlak van het digitale en dan heel specifiek op het vlak van e-government en administratieve vereenvoudiging. U gaf zelf het voorbeeld dat uw belastingen van overal ingediend kunnen worden.

Welnu, mijn verwachtingen van dit voorzitterschap zijn dan ook hoog, want een voorzitterschap dat zo gefocust is op dat digitale, zal ons ongetwijfeld kunnen helpen om de digitale interne markt, die zo belangrijk is voor Europa, versneld uit te bouwen of alleszins in een hogere versnelling te schakelen. Ik denk dat het trouwens ook niet alleen in het belang is van een goed werkende digitale interne markt, maar zeker ook van de Europese consument om de belangrijke lopende dossiers, zoals het dossier rond geoblocking, maar ook het dossier rond de typegoedkeuring van voertuigen, samen tot een goed einde te brengen. Veel succes alvast.

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Madam President, I will try to make all of my speech fit into 60 seconds.

According to the digital economy and society index for 2017, Estonia is number one in the EU in terms of supply and use of digital public services. The Estonian Government system is praised for its openness and trust. The Estonian Presidency will hopefully promote cross-border use of digital public services and Estonia will share its experience with other Member States.

Like other colleagues, I highly appreciate that the Estonian Presidency's priorities include the development of cross-border e-commerce in these services and modern electronic communications. Nevertheless, during dialogues, the Presidency will face challenges related to the review of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive. This piece of legislation is rather controversial and Estonia still has an opportunity to address such issues as the inappropriate extension of the scope of the directive to social media.

This is only one of several controversial files which will be on the table during the Estonian Presidency, but I strongly believe that sometimes small countries like Estonia are much better at searching and achieving compromises than big ones. And that is the reason I'm looking forward for a really fruitful and friendly Estonian Presidency.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, táim ag labhairt inniu ar son Martina Anderson, comhghleacaí nach féidir a bheith inár dteannta ar maidin.

Tá an Eastóin, cosúil le hÉirinn, tar éis fulaingt mar thoradh ar ghníomhaíochtaí a gcomharsan mór. Ní gá dúinn ach féachaint ar an stair maidir le hionsaí míleata agus slí bheatha ag ár gcomharsan féin. In Éirinn, táimid ag tabhairt aghaidh anois ar éiginnteacht de bharr ár gcomharsana móra atá tar éis vóta a chaitheamh ar an AE a fhágaint. Glacadh an vóta gan aon aird a thabhairt don phróiseas síochána in Éirinn nó gan aon aird ar an éiginnteacht shóisialta agus eacnamaíochta atá anois ag cnagadh ar dhóras mhuintir na hÉireann.

Tá athruithe móra le feiscint san Eoraip le linn ár saol, agus anois arís, tá athrú mór eile ag druidim inár dtreo. I 1991, bhí an AE ábalta tacú le tíortha beaga, cosúil le bhur gceann, a bhí ag fulaingt de bharr fadhbanna le bhur gcomharsana móra.

Ní mór don AE anois tacú le mo thír leis na deacrachtaí atá againn lenár gcomharsana móra. Ní mór don AE céim chun tosaigh a thógaint agus tacaíocht a thabhairt don chuid is mó de na daoine sa Tuaisceart atá ag iarraidh fanacht san Aontas Eorpach agus ní mór don AE tacú le stádas faoi leith d'Éirinn.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Norėčiau pasveikinti ir palinkėti sėkmės Baltijos sesei Estijai, kuri perima pirmininkavimą Europos Sąjungai ypatingai svarbiu laikotarpiu. Ji parengė rimtą ir ambicingą programą, bet, nežiūrint į tai, Estijai taip pat tenka sudėtinga užduotis vadovauti prasidedančiai diskusijai dėl bendros žemės ūkio politikos ateities. Europos Sąjunga turi užtikrinti sąžiningas konkurencijos sąlygas, todėl tas sritis, kurias ji remia, turi remti vienodai visose šalyse. Noriu tikėti, kad pavyks sėkmingai baigti ir „Omnibus“ reglamentą, kuris apimtų ir nuostatas dėl susietosios paramos lankstumo. Tikiu, kad Estijai pavyks deramai organizuoti ir kito esminio iššūkio sprendimą – *Nord Stream 2* statybas. Šis klausimas yra Europos Sąjungos solidarumo ir solidarumo su savo partnerėmis testas, esminis žingsnis malšinant dabartines Rusijos režimo ambicijas. Linkiu sėkmės pirmininkaujant.

President. – Mr Szanyi, I know you wish to ask a question but I am going to make a ruling that we will not have blue cards because of our time constraints, so thank you for your understanding.

Petr Mach (EFDD). – Paní předsedající, nevím, jestli jste si toho všichni všimli, ale Evropská unie je v procesu rozpadu. Velká Británie odchází, jednotlivé členské státy už neplní Vaše nařízení, ať se to týká Schengenu, ať se to týká pravidel rozpočtu a Řecka, Francie, anebo ať se to týká Vašeho nařízení o kvótách a postoje zemí střední Evropy.

Ale nebuďme z toho smutní. Evropská unie není Evropa. Evropa, ta se nerozpadá. Evropská unie to je byrokratický moloch, to je taková úřednická šed', to jsou paláce, za jejichž zdi jsou úředníci a politici často odtrženi od reality.

Naproti tomu Evropa, to je krásný kontinent, kde je více než padesát států, více než 700 milionů lidí zde žije, mluví desítkami jazyků, mají bezpočet zajímavých a krásných tradic. A toto nemizí. A když se rozpadne Evropská unie, tak v tom musíme vidět naději, naději, jakou získaly státy bývalého Sovětského svazu. Když se rozpadl Sovětský svaz, tak lidé získali znovu svobodu, státy získaly nezávislost.

A až se rozpadne Evropská unie, tak musíme věřit a snažit se o to, aby jednotlivé členské státy byly schopny spolu spolupracovat, ale na dobrovolné bázi, aby byly schopny spolu obchodovat, abychom mohli dál bezvízově cestovat, a proto Vás prosím při jednání s Velkou Británií, nepošlapejte tento princip, pokud ctíme princip volného obchodu jako princip, který je výhodný pro obě strany, tak mějme volný obchod s Velkou Británií, mějme volný obchod s dalšími. Těším se na Evropskou unii bez byrokracie, na svobodnou Evropu.

Nicolas Bay (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Premier ministre, si j'en crois l'entretien que vous avez récemment accordé à Benoît Vitkine, vous n'êtes pas aussi hostile à la Russie que ne le sont souvent les responsables politiques baltes.

Je comprends les inquiétudes de vos pays quant à la préservation de vos identités respectives, mais la nouvelle guerre froide dans laquelle nous entraîne l'Union européenne nuit gravement aux intérêts des nations européennes, y compris les vôtres.

Le 22 juin dernier, l'Union a prolongé une nouvelle fois ses sanctions contre la Russie. Prises au départ sous la pression des Américains, ces mesures ont enclenché une spirale de sanctions et de contre-sanctions, dont nos agriculteurs sont les premières victimes.

Après la réconciliation franco-allemande, notre continent a maintenant besoin d'une réconciliation polono-russe, par-delà les ressentiments légitimes hérités de la période communiste.

Oui, le moment est venu de nous concentrer sur les grands défis posés par la submersion migratoire et le terrorisme islamiste.

C'est dans cet esprit que nous voulons construire l'Europe de demain et c'est ce qui m'a conduit à prendre part à deux délégations de notre groupe. Il y a deux semaines, nous étions à Moscou et la semaine dernière, à Varsovie, pour le congrès Europe des Nations et des Libertés.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane premiére, děkuji za představení Vašich čtyř priorit předsednictví. Myslím, že jste zvolili velmi správně, ale těch úkolů je skutečně mnoho. Dovolte, abych se zaměřila na dva.

Již zde byla zmíněna směrnice o audiovizuálních službách. Považuji za velmi důležité, aby bylo dokončeno jednání, protože jde o návrh, který zde v Parlamentu byl přijat s velkou podporou ve výborech, a jedná se o zlepšení bezpečnosti internetu zejména ve vztahu k ochraně mladistvých.

Ta druhá priorita se týká vnitřního trhu. Vy jste sám zmínil, že chcete usnadnit pohyb služeb a poskytování služeb a podnikání napříč Evropskou unií. Budete tedy jistě vyjednávat o směrnici o vysílání pracovníků, která zde v Evropském parlamentu narazila na velkou a oprávněnou kritiku. Chci Vás tedy vyzvat, abyste se aktivně do jednání vložili, například slovenské předsednictví navrhlo tzv. duální systém, který ale nezískal širší podporu.

Stejně tak Vás čeká jednání o balíčku mobility, který zpřísňuje podmínky pro dopravce. Jde o příklad, kde opět hrozí rozdělení na nové členské státy a na staré členské státy a znovuvytvoření bariéry. Je na Vás pokusit se najít dobrý kompromis. A Vy jste pro to zvolili skvělé heslo. „Unity through Balance“, takže Vám přeji hodně sil a těším se na spolupráci.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to welcome the Estonian Presidency and I am convinced this presidency will be a very positive one. At a time of unprecedented challenges, we have only one possible way to succeed and to further enhance the European project. This is through unity and solidarity when discussing the future of the Union, and through more integration, in particular in key fields such as security and defence.

Any specific initiatives by Member States, while possible, must be transparent and open to all others with no shifting criteria or objectives. When it comes to internal and external security and stability, which are closely interlinked, I am confident the new presidency will bring fresh pragmatism and realism to the Eastern Partnership ahead of the November summit.

At a time of challenges, as I said before, during the Estonian Presidency it is fundamentally important to reassess the situation with regard to the 'frozen conflicts' and the way Russia is using it in order to destabilise the countries in question.

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Vážený pane předsedající, pane komisaři, pane premiére, za estonského předsednictví se bude projednávat kodex elektronických komunikací i nová struktura BERECu. Do budoucna tak pokládáme legislativní základy pro vysokokapacitní komunikační infrastrukturu, rozvoj digitálních systémů a digitálního trhu. Pokud se podaří nastavit parametry rozumně a bez přílišné byrokracie, můžeme velmi pomoci i evropskému digitálnímu byznysu. Digitalizace změní obrovské spektrum techniky a bude zasahovat do každého koutu našich životů – od počítačů po automobily.

Za dobu estonského předsednictví by měl Evropským parlamentem projít také celý zimní energetický balíček, který rovněž narýsuje pravidla na desítky let dopředu a bude mít do budoucna ohromný dopad do ekonomiky každého členského státu.

Proto přeji Vašemu předsednictví hodně úspěchů, nebude to jednoduché období. A to jsem zdůraznil jen dva technické a z mého pohledu důležité legislativní balíky a nezmiňl jsem jiné oblasti jako brexit či migrace.

Kaja Kallas (ALDE). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Ma tahtsin ka rääkida digitaalsetest arengutest, sest ilmselt kõik siin majas teavad, et Eesti on digiriik. Aga kuulates seda debatti ja kuulates neid häid sõnu, mida kolleegid Eesti kohta ütlevad, tahaksin jagada teiega hoopis teist emotsiooni.

Ma olen Eesti üle väga uhke. Ma olen uhke selle üle, et me ühe inim põlve jooksul oleme võidelnud välja oma vabaduse ja võrdse koha Euroopa riikide seas. Ma olen uhke ka selle üle, et on üks kindel valdkond, kus meie saame Euroopa Liidule olla suunanäitajaks ja eeskujuks. Ja näidata seda, et digitaalsest ühtsest turust on kogu Euroopal palju võita.

Ma usun, et me suudame selle Eesti eesistumisega tõestada, et Eesti on Euroopale sama oluline kui Euroopa on Eestile. Aitäh!

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, Estonia llega a la presidencia en un tiempo de grandes decisiones políticas. Sin duda, su principal reto diplomático es Siria, donde solo el diálogo con el actual gobierno y el respeto de la legalidad internacional pueden poner fin a la guerra.

Europa tiene un compromiso con la paz que está en grave riesgo, si se confirma la apuesta por el aventurerismo militar y el aumento de los presupuestos de defensa en detrimento de las políticas públicas. Sus prioridades están claras: banca, energía, digitalización, entorno empresarial y, sin embargo, ha obviado una parte fundamental en esta transformación tecnológica que sugiere. Y son los trabajadores y el necesario marco del diálogo social, para generar empleo de calidad, combatir la precariedad y terminar con la desregulación de las condiciones de trabajo y dejar de contribuir a generar una nueva fuente de desigualdad, como puede ser la brecha digital.

Usted nos plantea hoy continuismo, mantener los objetivos de política económica frente a los objetivos sociales y ambientales, y este no es el camino para los trabajadores europeos.

Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāj, cienījamie kolēģi! Eiropas Savienībā, iespējams, lielākais drošības drauds šobrīd ir terorisms. Jautājums: ko mēs kā likumdevēji varam darīt, lai apturētu terorismu? Nevar jau pieņemt likumu, ka terorisms ir pretlikumīgs — tas tāds jau ir! Bet mēs varam atņemt teroristiem iespēju viegli tikt pie finansējuma, apcirt viņu naudas avotu.

Šobrīd ir atvērts likums, kas ir trialoga procesā, kurā Parlaments ar Padomi cenšas nonākt pie gala lēmuma, — naudas atmazgāšanas apkarošanas direktīva. Līdz šim nav izdevies Parlamentam ar Padomi, tātad Maltas prezidentūru, vienoties. Mēs gribam nonākt pie skaidra patiesā labuma guvēju reģistra, kur atklāsim gan ofšoru, gan trasta īpašniekus, — tas ir svarīgs ierocis cīņā pret terorisma finansēšanu. Aicinu Igaunijas prezidentūru īpaši šim pievērst uzmanību un veicināt to, ka mēs pēc iespējas ātri varam nonākt pie gala risinājuma.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Mit Recht gibt es große Erwartungen an die neue Ratspräsidentschaft. Estland – obwohl ein kleines Land – hat Großartiges geleistet, und in vielerlei Hinsicht ist Estland ein Modell, nicht nur für die postsowjetischen Länder. In einer Zeit, in der das europäische Projekt beginnt, wieder Tritt zu fassen, ist das eine ganz wichtige Voraussetzung.

Zwei Erwartungen habe ich im Besonderen: einmal dass es die estnische Präsidentschaft mit kühlem Blick, ruhiger Hand und dem notwendigen Pragmatismus schafft, die Union in der Flüchtlingsfrage wieder handlungsfähig zu machen und dass die Digitalisierung Europas vorangebracht wird. Binnenmarkt, E-Governance, Cybersicherheit – mit Recht haben Sie das zu den Hauptschwerpunkten gemacht, und das wird sich auch auf die nächstfolgenden Präsidentschaften positiv auswirken. Wir erwarten uns von Ihnen da sehr viel.

Aber bei aller Euphorie, die wir mit Ihnen teilen, dürfen wir auch nicht vergessen, dass Ihr Handeln auch soziale Konsequenzen hat und dass es auch darum geht, dass wir alles daransetzen müssen, dass diese Entwicklungen auch dazu führen, dass alle davon profitieren.

Urmas Paet (ALDE). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Euroopa kaitsekoostöö on valdkond, mille arendamisel on Eestile kui Euroopa Liidu eesistujariigile kõrged ootused. Eestil on nüüd ainulaadne võimalus aidata suurendada Euroopa Liidu kaitsevõimet ja kaitsekoostööd. Eesti ei ole olnud ainult julgeoleku tarbija, vaid ka julgeolekusse panustaja. Nii on Eesti aastaid täitnud 2% kaitsekulutuste kriteeriumit, samuti on Eesti andnud olulise panuse rahvusvahelistes missioonides. Nii NATO kui ka Euroopa Liidu liikmena saab Eesti aidata kaasa kiirele Euroopa Liidu kaitsekoostöö arendamisele nii, et Euroopa Liit ja NATO täiendaksid teineteise võimekusi maksimaalselt.

Meenutan, et eelmise aasta novembris võttis Euroopa Parlament vastu raporti Euroopa kaitsealiidust ehk kaitsekoostööst. Selles on loetelu asjadest, mida Euroopa kaitsekoostöö arendamiseks teha tuleb. Kaitsefond ja juhtimiskeskus Brüsselis on loodud, kuid kakskümmend teemat vajavad veel otsuseid ja tegutsemist, et oleks võimalik rääkida tegelikult toimivast Euroopa Liidu kaitsekoostööst.

Järgmisel aastal tähistab Eesti oma 100. sünnipäeva ja ma usun, et saja aasta pärast saame me kõik koos turvalises Euroopas tähistada ka Eesti 200. sünnipäeva. Jõudu tööle!

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, tras pasar el *interpass* electoral europeo y haber dedicado los últimos meses a la reflexión, ha llegado el momento de la acción.

Es bien cierto que hemos ido concatenando, durante los últimos años, crisis tras crisis, algunas que no hemos acabado de resolver —desde los refugiados hasta la crisis económica—, pero la llegada de verdaderas amenazas internas y externas, existenciales para la Unión y para todo lo que representamos en el mundo, nos brinda la gran oportunidad de dar pasos hacia adelante en la integración, aprender de nuestros errores y responder a los malestares de los ciudadanos, dando pasos hacia delante, hacia una Europa más segura y más fuerte, más influyente fuera; una Europa más flexible y eficaz; y una Europa más sensible y justa, que sientan los ciudadanos que les protege.

Pero volver a legitimar el proyecto europeo solo vendrá de la mano de la dimensión social. Así que aprovechemos el *Social Summit* —la Cumbre Social— y pongamos en marcha el pilar europeo para los derechos sociales, porque nos va nuestra legitimidad en todo ello.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor primo ministro, tra sei mesi, quando faremo il bilancio di questa Presidenza, è facile prevedere che si parlerà degli ottimi risultati nel campo del digitale e dell'innovazione. Le chiediamo invece di stupirci, signor primo ministro, non sul digitale, ma sul tema dell'immigrazione e dei rifugiati.

Ci stupisca impegnando il Consiglio, a partire dal prossimo vertice di Tallinn, sul tema dell'accoglienza e della riallocazione dei rifugiati. Ci stupisca, da leader del paese del Nord capace di individuare soluzioni vere ad una crisi di cui si stanno facendo carico prevalentemente e soltanto i paesi del Sud. Cosa ce ne facciamo, signor primo ministro, di un'Europa che è digitale, se non è solidale? E a che serve un'Europa innovativa, se non conserviamo i valori che stanno alla base del nostro essere europei?

Signor Presidente, sia ambizioso: affronti i temi difficili dove molti altri hanno fallito, inchiodi i leader europei alle responsabilità della Storia. Questi sono i motivi per cui vorremmo ricordarci il semestre che oggi si apre. Buona fortuna.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Myślę, że to bardzo cenne słowa, które powiedział Tunne Kelam, mówiąc o prezydencji Estonii, że to powrót do źródeł. Chcielibyśmy w istocie, żeby tak było. Dziękuję za te słowa, a jednocześnie też za przekonanie, że prezydencja Estonii – o czym powiedział pan premier – to jest *carpe diem*, czyli chwytanie chwili, w której tu i teraz Wasz kraj przewodniczy.

Proponuję Państwo jako priorytet otwartą i innowacyjną gospodarkę, ale jednocześnie zrównoważoną, włączającą również nasze społeczeństwa, a także Europę przyszłości, która mówi o zadaniach cyfrowych, a w szczególności o zbudowaniu swobody przepływu danych. I to, co jest ważne dla wszystkich – aby Europa była bezpieczna, aby wszystkie nasze kraje były bezpieczne. To jest niezmiernie ważne. Chciałbym jednak zwrócić się do pana premiera, by kluczowe – niezależnie od priorytetów – było respektowanie traktatowych zasad pomocniczości i proporcjonalności, aby istniała pewność prawna i to, co na koniec chcę podkreślić, by realizowana była polityka wschodnia.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președinte, domnule prim-ministru, domnule comisar, vreau să spun, pe scurt, că mi-a plăcut ce ați prezentat ca program și proiect. Este clar: toată lumea trebuie să aibă cetățenii în inimă și în suflet. Vă felicit că sunteți cel mai tânăr președinte al Consiliului! Dar vreau să vă întreb: vă propuneți totuși să nu mai avem garduri virtuale sau garduri reale în interiorul Uniunii Europene? Vă propuneți să nu mai avem spații diferite? Vă propuneți ca România și Bulgaria, care respectă condițiile din 2012, să fie în spațiul Schengen? Sunt cetățeni care au aceleași drepturi și vreau, domnule prim-ministru și domnule comisar, să vă propuneți și acest lucru pe lângă pilonul social, pe care este nevoie să-l avem, pentru că fără coeziune socială nu putem avea o Europă mai bună. Vă mulțumesc și vă doresc succes!

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the Chamber. As Prime Minister of a small country – a country similar in size to Ireland – I wish you luck.

As a young Prime Minister who hopefully has a long life ahead of him, you will be looking at a long life ahead in the EU no doubt. Within that context, I have a question to ask you about the White Paper on the future of Europe. We were told on 1 March by Jean-Claude Juncker that we would have a series of 'Future of Europe' debates in cities and regions around Europe. I have asked Donald Tusk about these debates. He didn't answer me. I asked Commissioner Hogan about these debates. He told me that maybe he could organise them himself. I have asked Jean-Claude Juncker about them. If I stood on a cat's tail, I would have got a more logical answer. Can you tell me, Prime Minister, when and where these debates are going to take place or is it the case at this stage – as is said around Ireland – that it isn't the White Paper on the future of Europe, it is the invisible paper on the future of Europe.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Miniszterelnök Úrhoz lenne kérdésem: nagy várakozással tekintünk a soros észtlökség irányába, mi magyarok is, és más volt szocialista, illetve kommunista országok is. Utalt arra, hogy a múltunkban sok közös elem van, de nem utalt arra, hogy a jelenünkben is sok közös elem, fájdalom és probléma van. Különösen a hatalmas bér-, illetve jövedelemkülönbségek a közép- és kelet-európai EU-tagállamok és a nyugati tagállamok között, amelynek okán az Önök polgárai is – úgy, mint a magyar állampolgárok, és más, volt szocialista országok polgárai – elhagyják a hazájukat, és kényszerből mennek más országokba nagyobb jövedelemért dolgozni. Mi erről az Ön álláspontja? Tudjuk, hogy Észtország is a kezdeményezői között volt annak a polgári mozgalomnak, amely a bérunióért harcol „egyenlő munkáért egyenlő bér” elve alapján. Mi az Ön hozzáállása, mi az észtlökség hozzáállása ehhez a problémához?

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank Members for this very fruitful debate. Everybody understands that it is impossible in just five minutes to respond to all of the questions raised here today, but I would like to touch on some of the issues.

Taxation was mentioned. I would like to state that this Commission took a very clear position: all taxes have to be paid in the countries where the companies generate their profits. I am absolutely sure that during Estonia's Presidency we will continue to follow that approach in our activities.

Regarding connectivity, as you know, we have set three main connectivity aims for Europe. We would like to achieve those concrete results by 2025. I am talking about the Gigabit Society, 100 megabits-per-second networks and 5G networks. As we know, to reach those aims at least EUR 500 billion in investment will be needed. If we continue on the basis of the existing rules, there will be an investment gap equal to EUR 155 billion. The message is clear: we have to change our rules.

That is why I would like to ask Parliament and also the Presidency to pay attention to those connectivity issues and to deal with spectrum issues for example. When we asked for deeper cooperation in the field of spectrum, we asked about the timing of spectrum allocation auctions. It has to be harmonised. Regarding the duration of licences, there is a minimum of 25 years and, as we know, in some rural areas 25 years will not be enough to break even and start to make profits. This is important in terms of giving predictability to mobile operators and, of course, regarding coverage issues.

As we know, in Finland, Sweden and Lapland, population density is less than one person per square kilometre, but there is excellent access to 4G networks. Here, however, when travelling from Brussels to Strasbourg, there are tens of kilometres without any kind of access to the internet. So we have to change our rules.

Then we have to pay attention to geoblocking. As we know, this is a real headache in the European Union. According to our mystery shopping survey, two per cent of people who wanted to buy goods and services from another EU Member State just could not get access to the websites selling those goods and services, and 27% of people who got access to the websites were not able to register because their IP address was wrong. They were from the wrong countries – from France, from Germany, from Italy, from the United Kingdom, from Estonia, anyway from EU Member States – while 32% of those people who were able to register faced delivery problems. To deal with those problems, we launched our parcel delivery proposal. I hope that, during the Estonia Presidency, we will be able to reach consensus on these issues.

However, 26% of the people who did not have any kind of problem with delivery issues could not pay. In the European Union we have the Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) but, nevertheless, 26% of people could not pay because their credit cards were issued in the wrong EU Member States – in Germany, in France, in Belgium, in the Netherlands, anyway in the wrong EU Member States. All in all, just 36% of all those people who wanted to buy goods and services from another EU Member State were able to conclude their purchases successfully.

The issue here is not just about the single market we would like to have in the European Union, if only every third person is able to conclude purchases successfully: it is much more about discrimination on the basis of nationality or where a person's credit card was issued. We do not have to accept that kind of discrimination in the 21st century in the European Union.

(Applause)

My speaking time has already expired. I hope that, during the Estonian Presidency, we will also be able to achieve concrete results in dealing with cyber security issues and many other important issues. I wish Estonia's Presidency every success.

(Applause)

Jüri Ratas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I would like to say thank you to Members for all their statements and your comments. I have taken note of all your positions and opinions. We will work very closely with you, honourable Members of the European Parliament to make sure that citizens are at the heart of everything we do.

The four economic freedoms of the single market are very important principles of the Union. The European Union has to be strong and united to go forward. I am certain that we will overcome all the current and future challenges.

Now some remarks about your questions or your remarks. First of all, migration. I take it very seriously. It isn't a question for the one or the other State. It is a question for all 28 Member States. Our goal during our Presidency is to find consensus. We must find consensus, and solidarity is an important topic here. I could say it is the cornerstone here.

The first informal Council meeting of our Presidency will take place in Tallinn tomorrow. I would like to stress once more that we are fully committed to finding solutions to the refugee crisis. The issues are difficult but we are working towards a common solution. Solidarity must be there.

The previous presidencies, Slovakia and Malta, have done a good job. Estonia is doing its best to keep the process on the right track in order to help to strengthen a common asylum system. We are highly committed to doing our share.

Also I would like to mention that at the beginning of this week, the Estonian Government decided to allocate EUR 1 million to the EU trust fund for Africa. We encourage all Member States to increase their contributions to this fund.

Some words about security and terrorism. There is no doubt that security and defence are top priorities for Europe. The European Union can only be taken seriously as a global player if Member States strengthen their own security and defence. Hence the need to raise defence expenditure levels. We must also take into account the interconnected nature of our internal and external security challenges. In addition to strengthening defence cooperation with the European Union, we must continue to move forward with EU-NATO cooperation.

Some words about the social pillar. We are taking the social pillar very seriously. It is one of our top priorities. We will move forward on all social files, including the posting of workers and hope to adopt the proclamation endorsing the social pillar together with you.

Some words about Brexit. When it comes to Brexit, Estonia's main goal is the unity of EU 27 and to ensure that the divorce process is as smooth as possible. We must protect the rights of EU citizens in the United Kingdom. The second urgent question is the financial settlement and the third is the border issues with Ireland.

These questions have to be settled before entering the second phase of the negotiations. Estonia fully supports Mr Barnier as the chief EU negotiator and also Parliament. We will be at the service of the Member States and work closely with all EU institutions involved.

Honourable Members of Parliament, Estonia wants to contribute to making the EU a better place to live for everyone. One of our main priorities is a digital Europe and the free movement of data. We must deliver it because the unfinished nature of the digital single market costs us about EUR 400 billion a year. Completing the process is important to improve the everyday lives of our citizens.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I may, I would also like to say some concluding remarks in my mother tongue.

Siin oli arvamusi ka selles osas, et kas Euroopa Liitu on vaja ja kas tal on tulevikku. Eesti usub väga tugevalt, et Euroopa Liidul on ühine tulevik. Me oleme kindlad selles, et meie eesistumise ajal Euroopas tuleb ka näidata neid positiivseid samme, mida Euroopa Liit on pakkunud, olgu see rahu, olgu see inimeste, kaupade, teenuste vaba liikumine või olgu see ühine kultuuriruum.

Auväärt parlamendiliikmed! Ma näen, et teil on väga palju külalisi kõige kõrgemal korrusel. Ja mõned nendest on noored inimesed. Nad on väga õnnelikud, et siin Euroopa Liidus on Erasmus – ja see on ka üks näide Euroopa Liidu ühtsusest. Eesti soovib igal juhul ehitada oma eesistumise ajal sildu, mitte tõmmata piire või ehitada seinu. Eesti soovib igal juhul, et me Euroopa Liidu tulevikku arutame koos, mitte igati eraldi toas. Me soovime, et Euroopa Liit on järgneva kuue kuu jooksul rohkem ühtsem, tugevam ja turvalisem.

Thanks for all these positive comments and to all those wishing us success. We will need good cooperation with all of you to make our Presidency a successful one. Thank you for your attention and thank you for our discussion.

(Applause)

President. – Thank you, Prime Minister Ratas, and you have our good wishes and support.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place shortly.

Written statements (Rule 162)

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – En los últimos años, hemos ido concatenando crisis tras crisis, algunas de ellas todavía vigentes —desde los refugiados hasta la crisis económica—. Pero la llegada de verdaderas amenazas internas y externas, existenciales para la Unión y para todo lo que representamos en el mundo, nos brinda la gran oportunidad de dar pasos hacia adelante en la integración, aprender de nuestros errores y responder al malestar de los ciudadanos dando pasos hacia delante, hacia una Europa más segura y más fuerte, más influyente fuera; una Europa más flexible y eficaz; y una Europa más sensible y justa, que sientan los ciudadanos que les protege. Volver a legitimar el proyecto europeo solo será posible si se dota de una verdadera dimensión social. La Presidencia estonia se encuentra ante esta situación. Con una agenda ambiciosa: una economía abierta e integradora, la protección de los ciudadanos europeos, el medioambiente o los trabajos haciendo frente a la crisis migratoria. Como socialistas, colaboraremos para que estos objetivos se puedan realizar.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Sveikinu Estiją šių metų liepos 1 d. pradėjus savo pirmąjį pirmininkavimą ES Tarybai ir linkiu, kad jis būtų sėkmingas bei prisidėtų prie taip reikalingų sprendimų užtikrinti ES piliečių gerovę suradimo. Susipažinusi su Estijos pirmininkavimo programa ir išklausiusi prioritetų pristatymą, norėčiau pasidžiaugti, kad Estija akcentuoja lyčių lygybės, įskaitant paramos darbo ir asmeninio gyvenimo suderinimui, svarbą siekiant užtikrinti, jog vis didėjantis kvalifikuotos darbo jėgos poreikis, būtų patenkintas. Nevenodas darbo pasidalijimas rūpinantis vaikais, vyresnis amžiaus žmonėmis ir kitais priklausomais šeimos nariais daro įtaką moterų dalyvavimui darbo rinkoje ir vyrų dalyvavimui šeimos gyvenime. Todėl sveikinu Estijos ketinimus tęsti diskusijas dėl šeimos gyvenimo suderinimo, kad

moterys galėtų aktyviau dalyvauti darbo rinkoje ir jų šeimyninių rūpesčių našta mažėtų. Taip pat norėčiau pasveikinti Estijos vyriausybę savo pirmininkavimo programoje akcentuojant, kad visi Europos gyventojai turi turėti vienodas galimybes įgyti reikiamus įgūdžius, aukštos kokybės išsilavinimą, susirasti darbą ar gauti paslaugas, siekiant užtikrinti visuomenės tvarumą ir Europos ekonominę bei socialinę gerovę. Svarbus išlaikyti aukštas socialines garantijas visiems ES piliečiams siekiant deramai užtikrinti laisvą asmenų, darbuotojų ir paslaugų judėjimą. Ir tuo pačiu norėčiau paraginti Estijos vyriausybę nepamiršti ir kitų labai svarbių klausimų, tokių kaip kova su smurtu lyties pagrindu, kova su prekyba žmonėmis, vyrų ir moterų darbo užmokesčio bei pensijų skirtumų mažinimas ir moterys bendrovių valdybose bei sprendimus priimančiose pareigose.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), por escrito. – En los últimos años hemos ido concatenando crisis tras crisis, algunas de ellas todavía vigentes-desde los refugiados hasta la crisis económica—. Pero la llegada de verdaderas amenazas internas y externas, existenciales para la Unión y para todo lo que representamos en el mundo, nos brinda la gran oportunidad de dar pasos hacia adelante en la integración, aprender de nuestros errores y responder a los malestares de los ciudadanos, dando pasos hacia delante, hacia una Europa más segura y más fuerte, más influyente fuera; una Europa más flexible y eficaz; y una Europa más sensible y justa, que sientan los ciudadanos que les protege. Volver a legitimar el proyecto europeo solo vendrá de la mano de una dimensión social. La Presidencia estonia se encuentra ante esta situación. Con una agenda ambiciosa: una economía abierta e integradora, la protección de los ciudadanos europeos, el medioambiente o los trabajos haciendo frente a la crisis migratoria. Como socialistas, colaboraremos para que estos objetivos se puedan realizar.

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Ezúton szeretném üdvözölni, hogy az észtlenség prioritásként fogalmazza meg az inkluzív és fenntartható Európa gondolatát. Fontosnak tartja segíteni az állampolgárokat készségeik fejlesztésében, hogy minél inkább a társadalom aktív résztvevői lehessenek, és hozzáférjenek a minőségi oktatáshoz, a munkalehetőségekhez és a szolgáltatásokhoz. Úgy a Magyar Kormány, mint a magyar civil társadalom e célok érdekében számos erőfeszítést tett már. A magyar példára építve létrejött az Európai Tehetségsegítő Hálózat, amely aktívan hozzájárul a tehetségek felfedezéséhez és fejlesztéséhez kortól, nemtől és társadalmi háttértől függetlenül. Üdvözölöm továbbá, hogy a bel- és igazságügy területén prioritásként jelenik meg az ETIAS rendszer létrehozása, amelynek célja bármilyen lehetséges migrációs, biztonsági, közegészségügyi kockázat időbeni beazonosítása. A dosszié parlamenti jelentéstevőjeként remélem, hogy valóban sikerül komoly előrehaladást elérni az észtlenséggel együttműködésben. Ez a rendszer is hozzájárul migrációs nyomás által jelentett veszélyek csökkentéséhez. Ugyanakkor elengedhetetlen a külső határok megfelelő védelme, valamint a valódi menekültek és gazdasági bevándorlók szétválasztása már az EU határain kívül. Remélem, hogy az észtlenség mindezt prioritásként fogja kezelni.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), por escrito. – En los últimos años hemos ido concatenando crisis tras crisis, algunas de ellas todavía vigentes-desde los refugiados hasta la crisis económica—. Pero la llegada de verdaderas amenazas internas y externas, existenciales para la Unión y para todo lo que representamos en el mundo, nos brinda la gran oportunidad de dar pasos hacia adelante en la integración, aprender de nuestros errores y responder a los malestares de los ciudadanos, dando pasos hacia delante, hacia una Europa más segura y más fuerte, más influyente fuera; una Europa más flexible y eficaz; y una Europa más sensible y justa, que sientan los ciudadanos que les protege. Volver a legitimar el proyecto europeo solo vendrá de la mano de una dimensión social. La Presidencia estonia se encuentra ante esta situación. Con una agenda ambiciosa: una economía abierta e integradora, la protección de los ciudadanos europeos, el medioambiente o los trabajos haciendo frente a la crisis migratoria. Como socialistas, colaboraremos para que estos objetivos se puedan realizar.

András Gyürk (PPE). – Gratulálok az észt elnökség ambiciózus programjához. Észtország kis ország, de a számos szakpolitikai területen elért kiváló eredmény bizonyítja, hogy – erőforrásai nagyságát meghazudtolva – milyen példaértékű teljesítményre képes. Az energetikai programban örömmel olvastam azt, hogy az energetikai piacok további integrációja kiemelt prioritás az energiahatékonyság mellett. Az is üdvözlendő, hogy a Tiszta Energia csomag tárgyalásában gyors előrehaladást kíván az észt elnökség elérni. Arra szeretném felhívni az elnökség figyelmét, hogy bár az elmúlt években sokat beszéltünk és tettünk az ellátásbiztonság növelése érdekében, még mindig sok tennivalónk van ezen a téren. Elegendő az Északi Áramlat bővítési projektjére gondolnunk, amelynek megvalósulása sok közép-kelet-európai országban, így Magyarországon is csökkentené a diverzifikációs lehetőségeket. Az ellátásbiztonsági aggályokon túl a projekt esetleges megvalósulása magasabb energiaárakhoz is vezethet, versenyképességi problémákat okozva ezzel. Arra kérem az Észt Elnökséget, hogy támogassa a Bizottságot azon törekvésében, hogy csak olyan infrastruktúra épüljön és működjön az Európai Unióban, amely az Energiaunió célkitűzéseit támogatja és megfelel a vonatkozó előírásoknak.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), in writing. – In 2017 Estonia will be president of the Council of the European Union for the first time. Estonia was one of the ten countries admitted to the European Union on 1 May 2004 and it is hosting the Presidency of the Council in the second half of 2017. Estonia is among the fastest-growing economies in the EU. Estonia has a strong digital society and economy. One of the major tasks of the Presidency of Estonia will be digitalisation. The main point in the field of digitalisation will thus include the development of cross-border e-commerce and e-services for the benefit of consumers, producers and businesses. Estonia will also push forward the promotion of e-solutions and so it is not surprising that Estonia held the first online elections in 2005 and it is the first country to offer an e-residency. Applications for the e-residency are growing fast. Prospective buyers must pay EUR 100 and wait around one month. After that procedure you can become a digital citizen of Estonia and you have access to the single market. In two years these digital immigrants founded 1 600 companies. The target for Estonia is to get ten million e-residents by 2025.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE), na piśmie. – W dniu 1 lipca 2017 r. Estonia oficjalnie objęła swoje pierwsze od wstąpienia do UE rotacyjne przewodnictwo w Radzie Unii Europejskiej. Przedstawione na posiedzeniu plenarnym priorytety estońskiej prezydencji obejmują m.in. wspieranie otwartej i innowacyjnej gospodarki europejskiej, zrównoważonego rozwoju Unii oraz wzmocnianie bezpieczeństwa. Estonia – mająca bogate doświadczenie w zakresie cyberbezpieczeństwa i nowoczesnych rozwiązań informatycznych – w trakcie prezydencji zamierza skupić się także na sprawach cyfrowych i pomóc w przyspieszeniu realizacji założeń europejskiego jednolitego rynku cyfrowego. Jest to jeden z silnych punktów tego nadbałtyckiego kraju: od czasu ogłoszenia niepodległości w 1991 r. Estończycy aktywnie promują cyfryzację, w tym w administracji, urzędach, edukacji i życiu publicznym. Estonia to m.in. pierwszy kraj na świecie, który wprowadził możliwość głosowania w wyborach przez Internet. Prezydencja estońska będzie więc odpowiedzialna za prowadzenie negocjacji wielu kluczowych projektów technologicznych, w tym w zakresie rozwoju e-handlu i e-usług z korzyścią dla konsumentów, producentów i przedsiębiorstw, nowelizacji prawa autorskiego, nowych zasad dotyczących telekomunikacji i swobodnego przepływu danych. W pełni popieram te ambitne plany i uważam, że jeśli zostaną zrealizowane, wprowadzą Europę na drogę innowacji i modernizacji, ożywią gospodarkę europejską i przyniosą Unii wiele pozytywnych skutków społecznych.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Η εσθονική Προεδρία οφείλει να ανασκουμπωθεί και να αναλάβει σημαντικές πρωτοβουλίες για την αντιμετώπιση και τον περιορισμό των μεταναστευτικών ροών. Κι αυτό απαιτεί τα εξής:

1. Μετεγκατάσταση των προσφύγων από Ελλάδα και Ιταλία, όπως έχει συμφωνηθεί.
2. Χρονική επέκταση του προγράμματος μετεγκαταστάσεων.
3. Άσκηση πίεσης στις τρίτες χώρες προκειμένου να αποδεχθούν τις επαναπροωθήσεις των πολιτών τους, οι οποίοι έχουν μεταναστεύσει παράνομα στην Ελλάδα και στην υπόλοιπη Ευρώπη.
4. Άμεση κατάργηση του Δουβλίνου III που έχει μετατρέψει την Ελλάδα σε αποθήκη ψυχών.
5. Ανάληψη πρωτοβουλιών για την εμπέδωση της ειρήνης στην Μέση Ανατολή.

6. Αντιμετώπιση της φτώχειας στην Αφρική.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF), *în scris*. – Concluziile Consiliului European se doresc a fi optimiste și ferme. Ele doresc să dea un impuls Uniunii, după ce Brexitul și nemulțumirile cetățenilor au pus în discuție legitimitatea politicilor duse de Bruxelles. Cu toate acestea, marile probleme au fost ocolite. După Brexit, bugetul Uniunii va fi cu circa 17 % mai mic. Asta înseamnă fie că proiectele UE vor fi mai modeste, fie că statele bogate vor da mai mulți bani. Germania a evitat să clarifice această dilemă. Tot de bani se leagă și celălalt obstacol de la Consiliu – relocarea refugiaților. Se spune că Polonia, Ungaria și Cehia trebuie pedepsite pentru că nu acceptă refugiați. Amenințarea directă este că aceste state nu vor mai primi fonduri de la UE. Șantajul este revoltător, întrucât nu aceste state au fost cele care au deschis granițele și i-au invitat pe refugiați în Europa. Oare, în 2004 și 2007, statele bogate din Vest au dorit ca Uniunea să se extindă cu membri egali sau au anexat, pur și simplu, niște teritorii ca să aibă surse de materii prime, forță de muncă ieftină și, la nevoie, o debara pentru indezirabili?

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), *par écrit*. – Vous avez fait du slogan «l'unité par l'équilibre» le fil conducteur de votre présidence. En ces temps où l'Union doit faire face à plusieurs défis majeurs, l'unité est plus que jamais une nécessité. Mais pour aborder la crise des réfugiés, relancer l'économie, répondre à l'urgence climatique, l'unité a besoin d'une solidarité retrouvée face aux égoïsmes nationaux. La défense des valeurs européennes doit aussi être au cœur de votre action. La Hongrie et la Pologne continuent de défier l'état de droit et de violer nos valeurs fondamentales. Quelle sera la réponse de votre présidence? Soutenez-vous le Parlement pour l'activation de l'article 7.1? Nous n'aurons plus aucune crédibilité pour nos citoyens si nous sommes incapables de les protéger. Enfin, j'aimerais vous interpellier sur un sujet qui va directement impacter la vie de millions de travailleurs et plus de 500 000 entreprises européennes. Il s'agit du paquet mobilité. Quelle est votre ambition sur ce dossier? Allez-vous chercher à dépasser certains clivages pour dégager une position commune au Conseil? L'intégration du marché intérieur dans le secteur routier a contribué à la dégradation des conditions de travail. Comptez-vous équilibrer ce secteur en renforçant la dimension sociale des transports routiers?

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los últimos años hemos ido concatenando crisis tras crisis, algunas de ellas todavía vigentes-desde los refugiados hasta la crisis económica—. Pero la llegada de verdaderas amenazas internas y externas, existenciales para la Unión y para todo lo que representamos en el mundo, nos brinda la gran oportunidad de dar pasos hacia adelante en la integración, aprender de nuestros errores y responder a los malestares de los ciudadanos, dando pasos hacia delante, hacia una Europa más segura y más fuerte, más influyente fuera; una Europa más flexible y eficaz; y una Europa más sensible y justa, que sientan los ciudadanos que les protege. Volver a legitimar el proyecto europeo solo vendrá de la mano de una dimensión social. La Presidencia estonia se encuentra ante esta situación. Con una agenda ambiciosa: una economía abierta e integradora, la protección de los ciudadanos europeos, el medioambiente o los trabajos haciendo frente a la crisis migratoria. Como socialistas, colaboraremos para que estos objetivos se puedan realizar.

Elnökváltás: GÁLL-PELCZ ILDIKÓ

alelnök

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, just very briefly. From time to time we are able to welcome distinguished people in the gallery. Today we will vote on the agreement with Cuba, most likely positively. Some of us have invited also the representatives of the Cuban opposition. Many of them could not make it, for obvious reasons. So please, allow me just to welcome one of them, someone who spent 16 years in prison in Cuba, Mr Fuentes, who is one of the coordinators of the Cuban opposition. I think they deserve our recognition.

(Applause)

Elnök asszony. – Ön megelőzött engem, mert hogy szeretnék én is egy küldöttséget köszönteni: örömmel üdvözlöm a Japán Országgyűlés küldöttségét önökkel együtt, akik most hivatalos látogatást tesznek a parlamentjeink közötti 37. parlamentközi találkozón. Üdvözljük Önöket! Japán az EU stratégiai partnere. Bízunk abban, hogy lezárulnak a gazdasági partnerségi megállapodásról és a stratégiai partnerségi megállapodásról szóló tárgyalások, amelyeket követően mindkét fél parlamenti ellenőrzésre fogja azt benyújtani. Gotoda Elnök Úr, tisztelt felsőházi és alsóházi képviselők! Üdvözlöm Önöket az Európai Parlament székhelyén és Strassbouban a mai és a holnapi nap folyamán eredményes megbeszéléseket kívánok, s remélem...

7. Merhba

Elnök asszony. – Ön megelőzött engem, mert hogy szeretnék én is egy küldöttséget köszönteni: örömmel üdvözlöm a Japán Országgyűlés küldöttségét önökkel együtt, akik most hivatalos látogatást tesznek a parlamentjeink közötti 37. parlamentközi találkozón. Üdvözljük Önöket! Japán az EU stratégiai partnere. Bízunk abban, hogy lezárulnak a gazdasági partnerségi megállapodásról és a stratégiai partnerségi megállapodásról szóló tárgyalások, amelyeket követően mindkét fél parlamenti ellenőrzésre fogja azt benyújtani. Gotoda Elnök Úr, tisztelt felsőházi és alsóházi képviselők! Üdvözlöm Önöket az Európai Parlament székhelyén és Strassbouban, a mai és a holnapi nap folyamán eredményes megbeszéléseket kívánok, s remélem, hogy sikerrel zárulnak az Önök tárgyalásai.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Madame la Présidente, je serai très bref. Je crains d'avoir été mal compris, hier, lorsque j'ai fait un rappel au règlement fondé sur les articles 3 et 4 relativement au fait que les autorités françaises ne notifiaient pas le nom des successeurs de nos collègues qui ont été élus à l'Assemblée nationale. Il m'a été répondu qu'on attendrait la notification des autorités françaises, ce qui est bien naturel et je respecte la compétence des autorités nationales. C'est évidemment tout à fait de leur compétence.

Le problème est que les autorités françaises refusent de notifier au motif que nos collègues élus font, pour certains, l'objet d'un recours. Ceci, d'ailleurs, ne me paraît pas pouvoir être le cas pour M. Mélenchon, par exemple, qui, selon la rumeur publique, a présenté sa démission.

Par conséquent, Madame la Présidente, ce que je demande, c'est qu'en application de l'article 4, paragraphe 6, du règlement du Parlement, notre Président, comme le règlement le lui permet, et même le lui impose, demande aux autorités françaises de procéder d'urgence à cette notification.

Elnök asszony. – Köszönjük szépen, hogy még egyszer figyelmeztetett bennünket. A következő pont a szavazás.

8. Hin tal-votazzjonijiet

8.1. Ftehim biex jiġi emendat il-Protokoll ta' Montreal dwar sustanzi li jnaqqsu s-saff tal-ożonu, adottat f'Kigali (A8-0237/2017 - Kateřina Konečná) (votazzjoni)

8.2. It-Tniġġis Transkonfini tal-Arja Fuq Distanza Twila sabiex jitnaqqsu l-aċidifikazzjoni, l-ewtrofikazzjoni u l-ożonu troposferiku (A8-0241/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (votazzjoni)

8.3. Il-konkluzjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Approvazzjoni) (A8-0232/2017 - Elena Valenciano) (votazzjoni)

A szavazás előtt:

Elena Valenciano, ponente. – Señora presidenta, solo un segundo para agradecer a los grupos políticos el trabajo que hemos hecho durante estos meses para conseguir traer hoy a esta Cámara este Acuerdo entre la Unión Europea y Cuba. Creo que podemos enviar un mensaje positivo. En un momento en el que el mundo se reordena, la Unión Europea puede mantener una cooperación fructífera con América Latina y el Caribe. Cuba era una excepción y hoy puede dejar de serlo.

8.4. Il-konkluzjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Riżoluzzjoni) (A8-0233/2017 - Elena Valenciano) (votazzjoni)

8.5. Memorandum ta' Qbil bejn l-Aġenzija Ewropea għat-tmexxija operattiva tas-sistemi tal-IT fuq skala kbira fl-ispazju ta' libertà, sigurtà u ġustizzja u l-Eurojust (A8-0215/2017 - Claude Moraes) (votazzjoni)

8.6. Ġlieda kontra l-frodi li jaffettwaw l-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni permezz tal-liġi kriminali (A8-0230/2017 - Ingeborg Gräßle, Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (votazzjoni)

A szavazás előtt:

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, ponente. – Señora presidenta, solo un momento para agradecer encarecidamente a la señora Gräßle, coponente de esta importante iniciativa de legislación penal, y a los parlamentarios que participaron en el debate, nada menos, que pasada la medianoche de esta misma madrugada; una iniciativa de legislación penal que encuadra la legislación penal de los Estados miembros y demuestra que este Parlamento importa, legislando penalmente contra el fraude al presupuesto europeo y, consiguientemente, asegurando los recursos necesarios para reparar el mal-trecho modelo social europeo.

Este Parlamento realmente importa. Legisla sobre derechos fundamentales y sobre legislación penal, y no cabe sino agradecer a los parlamentarios que estuvieron aquí pasada la medianoche, esta misma madrugada, para hacerlo posible.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Madam President, sorry but I think there were several MEPs who were not able to vote during the last vote. The machines on a whole row were not working. Can we please repeat the vote?

8.7. Il-qafas ġuridiku tal-Unjoni għal ksur doganali u sanzjonijiet (A8-0239/2016 - Kaja Kallas) (votazzjoni)

8.8. HIV/AIDs, Tuberkulożi u Epatite C (B8-0436/2017) (votazzjoni)

8.9. Thejjija tal-Programm ta' Hidma tal-Kummissjoni għall-2018 (RC-B8-0434/2017, B8-0434/2017, B8-0435/2017, B8-0450/2017, B8-0451/2017, B8-0454/2017, B8-0455/2017, B8-0456/2017) (votazzjoni)

A szavazás előtt:

James Nicholson (ECR). – Madam President, I rise from my seat to point out that Amendments 19 and 20 to this report refer to the 'North of Ireland'. I am a Member from the north of Ireland and there is no such entity as 'the North of Ireland'. It is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and if Northern Ireland is referred to it should be referred to as Northern Ireland. So please, Parliament's administration, take that on board. This is the second time I have had to point this out in this House, so please, do not require me to do it again.

8.10. Baġit 2018 — Mandat għat-Trilogu (A8-0249/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan) (votazzjoni)

8.11. Lejn strateġija tal-UE għar-relazzjonijiet kulturali internazzjonali (A8-0220/2017 - Elmar Brok, Silvia Costa) (votazzjoni)

8.12. Rakkomandazzjoni lill-Kunsill dwar it-72 Sessjoni tal-Assemblea Ġenerali tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti (A8-0216/2017 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votazzjoni)

Az 1. módosításról szóló szavazás előtt:

Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, sorry, just 30 seconds. I think that one word has accidentally been forgotten in that amendment? It says 'to maintain full support for the efforts undertaken by the UN to facilitate the comprehensive settlement to the division of Cyprus'. We need to add one more word and the word is 'end', i.e. 'to maintain full support for the efforts undertaken by the UN to facilitate the comprehensive settlement to end the division of Cyprus'.

Andrey Kovatchev, rapporteur. – Madam President, the oral amendment I would like us to suggest is 'to end the division of Cyprus'.

(The oral amendment was accepted)

8.13. Il-bini ta' strateġija industrijali ambizzjuża tal-UE bħala prijetà strateġika għat-tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (B8-0439/2017, B8-0440/2017, B8-0440/2017, B8-0445/2017, B8-0446/2017, B8-0447/2017, B8-0448/2017, B8-0449/2017) (votazzjoni)

Elnök asszony. – A szavazások óráját ezzel lezárom.

9. Spjegazzjonijiet tal-vot

9.1. Il-konklużjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Approvazzjoni) (A8-0232/2017 - Elena Valenciano)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caros Colegas, votei a favor desta recomendação porque entendo que este acordo de diálogo político e de cooperação que põe fim à posição comum de 1996 é vital para que a União Europeia afirme a sua presença política em Cuba, num momento em que o regime cubano enfrenta as consequências do colapso económico da Venezuela e do endurecimento das políticas americanas.

Caros Colegas, se este acordo constitui, sem dúvida, uma plataforma para o desenvolvimento da cooperação bilateral, ele é um também um marco para a intensificação do diálogo político. Esta Casa que, por três vezes, atribuiu o prémio Sakharov a dissidentes e opositores cubanos, a Osvaldo Payá a Guilherme Fariñas e às Damas de Branco, não pode deixar de frisar a importância de condicionar a sua aplicação ao cumprimento escrupuloso dos compromissos assumidos em matéria de diálogo político e direitos humanos, incluindo o fim da repressão e a libertação dos presos políticos, o respeito da liberdade de imprensa e a garantia dos direitos de reunião e associação, para que as eleições gerais do próximo ano possam ser livres, plurais e justas e não constituam apenas mais um episódio de monolitismo político e ideológico.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem nepodpořil tento návrh. Jsem přesvědčen, že ve chvíli, kdy na Kubě stále vládne komunistická strana, kdy zde vládne komunistická diktatura, jsou zde političtí vězni, tak bychom měli být více obezřetní v posilování spolupráce s touto zemí. Zkrátka a dobře, pro mě je dnešní přijetí dohody jistou formou obětování principu ochrany lidských práv před ekonomickými zájmy a před zájmy, které bychom měli hájit, to znamená zájmy evropského obchodu a byznysu, a na prvním místě bychom měli hájit principy lidských práv, svobody, demokracie. Jsem pro to, abychom s Kubou spolupracovali, ale ta dnešní forma spolupráce, kdy jde o důležitou dohodu, je podle mého názoru předčasným krokem. Až teprve Kuba ukáže konkrétní změny, konkrétní posuny k demokracii, k ochraně lidských práv, pak bychom podle mého názoru měli takovou dohodu podpořit. Ale v tuto chvíli je to podle mého

názoru předčasný krok.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, *sola mors tyrannicida est*, says Sir Thomas Moore: death is the only way to get rid of a tyrant, and so it proved in the case of Fidel Castro, who survived, by some counts, more than 40 assassination attempts, including an exploding cigar and a poisoned wetsuit. But that has changed the dynamic on the sultry island of Cuba. I was for a long time in this Chamber sceptical of political engagement in the way that we were doing it in this House, refusing in particular to give full weight to the opposition groups. Now, on the other hand, we are in a position of disruptive change. Cuba is in an unfrozen moment, and any disruption tends to be bad for a dictatorship. The thing that will eventually bring about the democratisation of that island and freedom is now economic engagement from the rest of the world. Investment and the rule of law, private property and all the things that bring civil freedoms in their wake.

The United States has changed its policy in a welcome way. We should follow.

9.2. Il-konkluzjoni tal-Ftehim ta' Djalogu Politiku u ta' Kooperazzjoni UE-Kuba (Riżoluzzjoni) (A8-0233/2017 - Elena Valenciano)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Eleonora Forenza, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, faccio una dichiarazione di voto a nome del mio gruppo. Come gruppo GUE/NGL abbiamo votato a favore dell'accordo di dialogo politico e di cooperazione UE-Cuba perché questo accordo rappresenta un passo in avanti nelle relazioni bilaterali fra Unione europea e Cuba, mettendo fine ad una posizione comune che era guidata dalla logica della Guerra fredda.

La stessa logica, però, purtroppo ha ispirato la risoluzione di accompagnamento dell'accordo che, con i voti della destra di questo Parlamento, invece di rafforzare l'accordo stesso e la sua implementazione sembra seguire più l'agenda della nuova Amministrazione statunitense che quella dell'Unione europea, e per questa ragione abbiamo votato contro.

Nella risoluzione, con gli emendamenti votati oggi, la richiesta di revoca dell'embargo economico statunitense, richiesta dall'Assemblea generale dell'ONU sin dal 1992 — vogliamo ricordarlo — viene ammorbidita fino quasi a scomparire. Il Parlamento europeo ha espresso così oggi una posizione più arretrata rispetto a quella del Consiglio e degli Stati membri. Per quale motivo? Per chi, se non per compiacere una visione ideologica che abbiamo sentito poc'anzi esprimere dal collega, per compiacere la destra statunitense, che vuole imporre a Cuba un destino deciso a Miami e non dal suo popolo?

Cuba è bersaglio della destra neoliberista mondiale ed europea perché, nonostante l'embargo, è riuscita a costruire negli anni un sistema sanitario, educativo, sportivo e culturale di eccellenza, esempio per tutti i paesi in via di sviluppo.

Chiediamo la fine dell'embargo. Lo chiediamo assolutamente dentro quest'Aula, con convinzione, l'abbiamo chiesto anche attraverso un appello e una petizione sostenuta da parlamentari non soltanto del mio gruppo parlamentare. Esprimiamo ancora una volta la nostra solidarietà e la nostra gratitudine per la lotta del popolo cubano. *Hasta la victoria!*

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, también en nombre de mi Grupo —del Grupo de la Izquierda—, hemos votado, sin ninguna duda, a favor del Acuerdo de la Unión Europea con Cuba, que supone, por fin, la normalización de las relaciones.

Celebramos además que, de una vez por todas, este Parlamento haya apoyado este Acuerdo, que entierra la infame Posición Común que tenía la Unión Europea contra Cuba, que promovió, además, el Gobierno de Aznar en 1996. Se trató de un mal intento de copia del bloqueo que imponen los Estados Unidos, que afortunadamente la mayoría de los Estados miembros de la Unión no siguieron, ya que mantuvieron, la mayoría de ellos, relaciones bilaterales con la isla.

El aislamiento contra Cuba no ha funcionado, y con buen criterio la Unión Europea ha recapitado; y, como señaló anoche la señora Mogherini, este Acuerdo Unión Europea-Cuba se basa en un diálogo franco, constructivo y sincero, en pie de igualdad entre las dos partes.

Por eso, como también dijo la señora Mogherini, desde la Unión Europea y el Parlamento reiteramos nuestro llamamiento al fin del bloqueo y deploramos el reciente anuncio de la Administración del señor Trump.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem tuto dohodu nepodpořil, protože to, co se tady říká, si myslím, že je poměrně dost velikánský nesmysl. Nemůžeme vést dialog s někým, kdo nerespektuje demokratické principy.

Já jsem na Kubě byl, byl jsem tam 10. prosince v roce 2015 a, milé dámy z komunistické strany, já jsem viděl, jak tam mlátili lidi. Vždycky, když jsem někoho navštívil, tak skončil velmi brzo v base. Skončil ve vězení a ve vězení ho samozřejmě zmlátili. Jak chcete mít s těmihle lidmi dialog? Jak chcete vést s komunisty, kteří vlastně mlátí svoje oponenty a nenechají je mluvit, dialog? Proto já nemůžu hlasovat pro zahájení politického dialogu. Smějte se, já si myslím, že kdo nezažil komunismus, jenom o něm sní a plácá tady nesmysly jako Vy. A Vy to dokazujete neustále i svým chováním teď při vysvětlení hlasování.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Komunizm to nie tylko polityczna dyktatura, to jest totalitarna tyrania, która dyskryminowała całe grupy społeczne, które uznawała za wrogie, i nadal to robi na przykład na Kubie. Na Kubie może w bliskim czasie dojść do zmian, ale jest kwestią otwartą, czy to będzie rzeczywista dekomunizacja czy postkomunistyczna transformacja, a więc przejęcie majątku państwowego przez tych, którzy dzisiaj rządzą, przy pozostawieniu w zależności tych, którzy dzisiaj są prześladowani. Wszystko to, co znamy z Europy Środkowej, a szczególnie jeszcze bardziej z Europy Wschodniej. Niestety nic nie wskazuje na to, żeby Unia Europejska chciała stanąć po stronie rzeczywistego wyzwolenia, rzeczywistej pomocy dla tych, którzy byli prześladowani. W tej rezolucji, którą dzisiaj przyjęliśmy mamy oczywiście – jak zawsze – LGBTI, mamy centra edukacji seksualnej, tylko niestety – ku hańbie tego Zgromadzenia – odrzucono poprawkę w obronie wolności religijnej, w obronie prześladowanych chrześcijan, jak widać to nie jest grupa zasługująca na szczególną troskę Parlamentu Europejskiego.

9.3. Ġlieda kontra l-frodi li jaffettwaw l-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni permezz tal-liġi kriminali (A8-0230/2017 - Ingeborg Gräßle, Juan Fernando López Aguilar)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Egyetértek a jelentéstevőkkel, hogy az irányelv kiemelkedő jelentőségű, hiszen az első lépést jelenti az európai büntetőjog harmonizációja felé az uniós költségvetés sérelmére elkövetett bűncselekmények esetében. Kifejezetten üdvözlöm, hogy a Parlament létrehozta az Európai Ügyészség, ügyész tevékenységének jogi keretét, meghatározza az ügyész hatásköreit, valamint hogy fontos áttörésre került sor a határokon átnyúló hozzáadottértékadó-csalás területén. Örömmel látom, hogy a tagállamok többsége komolyan veszi a korrupció elleni harcot, és elkötelezettek az uniós forrásokat érintő bűncselekmények felszámolását illetően.

Ugyanakkor sajnálatos módon meg kell jegyezzem, hogy a magyar nem tartozik ebbe a klubba.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dnes jsme odsouhlasili ve druhém čtení postoj Rady, a přijali jsme tak směrnici Evropského parlamentu a Rady o boji vedeném trestněprávní cestou proti podvodům poškozujícím finanční zájmy Unie. Název i proces, který vedl k přijetí směrnice, je důležitý. Proto jsem ho tady takto vyjmenovala. Jedná se totiž o první krok směrem k harmonizaci trestního práva v Evropě v případech, kdy jsou spáchány trestné činy poškozující rozpočet EU. Jde o dlouze vyjednávaný konsenzus mezi všemi aktéry, včetně ministrů spravedlnosti členských států. Směrnice v této věci definuje pravomoci evropského veřejného žalobce a zavádí stíhatelnost přeshraničních podvodů v případech, kdy se jedná o ztrátu nejméně 10 milionů EUR ve dvou či více členských státech. Samozřejmě bude nyní záležet na implementaci, včetně činnosti evropského žalobce, jehož činnost budeme samozřejmě sledovat.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, države članice uplaćuju sredstva u proračun Europske unije te je zakonito, namjensko i efikasno korištenje tih sredstava od interesa svih država i njihovih građana. Nikako se ne smije dopustiti da prijevare i kriminalne radnje u korištenju sredstava iz proračuna EU-a ostanu neotkrivene ili neprocesuirane.

Novac iz proračuna EU-a koristi se u svim državama članicama i sve moraju pristupiti s jednakom pažnjom i u cilju postizanja što veće vrijednosti za svoje građane i cijelu Europsku uniju. Dosta je primjera prijevara u korištenju sredstava EU-a i zato mi je drago što smo današnjim glasanjem korak bliže donošenju direktive o suzbijanju prijevara počinjenih protiv financijskih interesa Unije kaznenopravnim sredstvima koja znače usklađivanje kaznenog prava u Europi u svim slučajevima prijevara u korištenju sredstava Europskog proračuna.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Pani predsedajúca, daňové a finančné podvody sú skutočnou stigmu spoločnosti. Poukazujú na hrubú neúctu voči občanom a nerešpektovanie boha ako najvyššej authority, ktorý žiada čestnosť. Žiaľ, takéto skúsenosti mám najmä zo svojej vlastnej krajiny, ktorá je už mnoho rokov sužovaná korupciou a finančnými podvodmi gigantických rozmerov aj práve v súčasnosti na politickej scéne. Nie som zástancom prílišného zasahovania Únie do diania v našich štátoch. Je však zrejmé, že ak si štát nedokáže sám pomôcť, ak zlyháva a stráca dôveru u ľudí, ak vláda svojím nehanebným správaním dáva priestor pre extrémistické prúdy, je nutná pomoc zvonku. Slovensko pokladám za modernú, zvrchovanú, úspešnú krajinu, na ktorú sa prilepil parazit korupcie a finančných podvodov, a preto musí byť odstránený stoj čo stoj. Víтам teda a podporujem rokovania o smernici o boji proti podvodom, ktoré poškodzujú finančné záujmy Únie. Verím, že výrazne pomôžu najmä členským štátom s dedičstvom komunistického režimu, kde kradnúť a klamať bolo bežným javom a pretrváva.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Am votat acest raport pentru că da, este nevoie de armonizarea dreptului penal. Criminalitatea, evaziunea fiscală este transfrontalieră și este nedrept să avem 28 de modalități de a-i pedepsi pe cei care sărăcesc bugetele naționale, îi sărăcesc, până la urmă, pe cetățenii din Uniunea Europeană. Mai mulți ani, comisiile Parlamentului European au analizat această problemă și, chiar și așa, a durat foarte mult. De aceea, cred că, prin votarea acestui raport, trebuie să își preia responsabilitatea atât guvernele naționale, cât și Comisia pentru monitorizarea aplicării acestui raport și a armonizării dreptului penal. Nu cred că e suficient să aprobăm noi, aici, este o responsabilitate partajată, trebuie să responsabilizăm și parlamentele naționale și guvernele naționale, dar Comisia trebuie să aibă grijă să facă o monitorizare a modului de aplicare și să urmărim rezultatele concrete, dacă se diminuează sau nu criminalitatea, evaziunea fiscală și dacă pedepsele sunt aplicate corect.

9.4. Il-qafas ġuridiku tal-Unjoni għal ksur doganali u sanzjonijiet (A8-0239/2016 - Kaja Kallas)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Uniunea vamală este o preocupare a noastră, a Uniunii Europene, pentru că acum, când vorbim, există evaziune fiscală tocmai pentru că nu funcționează sistemul informațional. Am cerut în repetate rânduri Comisiei și comisarului responsabil să existe bugete suficiente și să nu se mai amâne informatizarea sistemelor vamale, pentru că știm bine că evaziunea fiscală este și prin trecerea la frontieră, prin vamă, evaziune fiscală mai ales pe TVA, sumele sunt foarte mari și cred că prin votul acestui raport pe care, subliniez, l-am votat, prin votul acestui raport putem să facem o presiune asupra Comisiei să urgenteze alocarea banilor pentru finalizarea informatizării Uniunii vamale, aplicarea, de fapt, a Uniunii vamale – un raport aprobat încă din 2016, dar care încă nu funcționează și datorită căruia se întâmplă încă evaziune, în mod deosebit pe TVA. Sper să avem o aplicare corectă.

9.5. HIV/AIDS, Tuberkulozi u Epatite C (B8-0436/2017)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, votei a favor desta resolução no reconhecimento de que é necessário um quadro estratégico integrado da União Europeia sobre o HIV, a tuberculose e a hepatite viral.

Fui relator-sombra do relatório aprovado nesta Casa a 2 de março sobre as opções da União Europeia para melhorar o acesso aos medicamentos, na qual a Comissão e os Estados-Membros são exortados a adotar planos estratégicos para garantir o acesso a medicamentos que salvam vidas e a coordenar um plano com vista a erradicar a hepatite C na União Europeia através da utilização de instrumentos como a contratação pública europeia.

A Europa é um espaço de solidariedade e, por isso, incumbe à União Europeia dar cumprimento aos objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentáveis das Nações Unidas, nomeadamente o objetivo número 3, que inclui o objetivo de erradicar as epidemias de HIV e da tuberculose até 2030 e de combater a hepatite.

O Parlamento tem vindo, sistematicamente, a questionar a Comissão sobre as respostas da União em relação ao HIV-Sida, à tuberculose e à hepatite C. Entendo que a Comissão deve tomar todas as medidas para promover soluções públicas eficazes na prevenção destas doenças e eu continuarei a acompanhar, de forma empenhada, este assunto de forma a que os cidadãos europeus tenham um futuro mais saudável e melhores condições de vida.

Bolesław G. Piecha (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałem oczywiście za tą rezolucją, ale muszę powiedzieć, że niepokojącym zjawiskiem u progu XXI wieku jest to, że w Europie wzrasta zachorowalność na choroby zakaźne, zarówno starego typu, jak gruźlica, jak i choroby wirusowe nowego typu, takie jak HIV, AIDS czy wirusowe zapalenie wątroby typu C.

Potrzebne jest wzmoczenie działań profilaktycznych. Wstyd, żeby nowoczesna Europa dysponująca bardzo dobrymi technologiami medycznymi nie potrafiła zahamować tych infekcji. Oczywiście inna jest strategia w chorobach wirusowych – tu liczy się ogromna edukacja, profilaktyka zdrowotna, uświadamianie obywateli. Inna jest taktyka leczenia chociażby gruźlicy. W jednym takim krótkim podsumowaniu, należy dążyć do wzmocnienia badań nad nowoczesnymi lekami – większość chorób i rozwój gruźlicy to niestety lekooporność. Jeżeli chodzi o HIV i zapalenie wątroby typu C, postuluję, żeby koszty nowoczesnych leków w całej Europie były podobne.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Szavazatommal támogattam ezt az indítványt, hiszen egy sor olyan kérdésre világít rá, amelyek a közvélemény számára nem feltétlenül ismertek, így például hogy az Európai Betegségmegelőzési és Járványvédelmi Központ szerint a HIV fertőzöttek körében a hétből egy ember nem is tudja, hogy fertőzött-e, vagy sem, mert a HIV fertőzés és a diagnosztizálás között a becslések szerint átlagosan négy év telik el.

Emellett a tuberkulózis, másik betegség mint légi úton terjedő betegség, határokon átnyúló egészségügyi veszélyt jelent a globalizált világban, ahol a lakosság mobilitása egyre nő. A jelentés helyesen hívja fel tehát a figyelmet a társfertőzések problémájára, különösen a tuberkulózis és a vírus Hepatitis B és C esetében, mivel a tuberkulózis és a vírus Hepatitis nagyon gyakori és gyors lefolyású, valamint magasabb megbetegedési és halálozási arányokat eredményez.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Kedves Képviselőtársaim! Meggyőződésem, hogy a világot olyan emberek fogják megváltoztatni, akiknek az eszük is és a szívének is a helyén van. Meglepetésemre még a Juncker által vezetett Bizottságban is találtam ilyen embert: Andriukaitis biztos személyében, aki litván származású, és az egészségügyért felelős. Mélyen megdöbbent, amikor írtam neki egy levelet, egy tragikus haláleset kapcsán: 18 éves fiú halt meg Magyarországon fertőző agyhártyagyulladás következtében. Egyébként ezt az esetet több másik is követte. Kértem a fellépését az oltás, a védőoltás kötelezővé tétele érdekében. Olyan emberi nagyságról – és ami szintén kivételes a biztosok testületében – szakmai tudásról tett tanúbizonyságot mint orvos, hogy úgy gondolom, hogy amíg ő a Bizottságnak az egészségügyért felelős tagja, megszavazhatom a fertőző betegségekkel szembeni határozottabb fellépésre vonatkozó jelentést, hiszen ő oda fogja tenni magát, köszönöm neki ezúttal is.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Byłam sprawozdawczynią z ramienia ECR. Głosowałam ze sprawozdaniem tym bardziej, że było ono powodem bardzo ciekawej debaty ujawniającej wiele problemów, między innymi nadużyć firm farmaceutycznych zawyżających ceny leków zwłaszcza nowych, podawanych przy wirusowym zapaleniu wątroby, ale także w pozostałych chorobach. I ponownie chciałam zwrócić uwagę na problem ponad 40 milionów zakażonych HIV, którym poza opieką zdrowotną, dożywotnim leczeniem przeciw retowirusom, poprawą diagnozowania trzeba zapewnić pomoc psychologiczną i psychiatryczną, gdyż – jak podkreślałam – najważniejszą rolę w kontrolowaniu epidemii, w zapobieganiu transmisji HIV na inne osoby odgrywają ludzie żyjący z HIV, co rodzi potrzebę ich edukacji z koniecznością informowania partnerów. Także obserwowany siedmiokrotny wzrost zakażeń w grupie MSM wymaga wyciągnięcia wniosków dotyczących zapobiegania z potrzebą informowania i ochrony nie tylko przeciwko

stygmatyzacji, ale informowania o odpowiedzialności chorych, także prawnej.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Am participat la dezbateră în plen înainte de a vota acest raport și am prezentat în plen și domnului comisar argumentele pentru care susțin și votez acest raport. Este absolut de neimaginat să nu votăm, ca oameni aleși aici, o chestiune care ține de viața oamenilor. Nu avem, așa cum am mai spus-o în acest hemiciclu, politici de stânga, de dreapta, de centru. Noi trebuie să susținem viața oamenilor, sănătatea oamenilor. Nu avem un program integrat. Avem acum o mobilitate a forței de muncă, avem migrație din alte continente. Nu există prevenție, nu există informație, nu există acces pentru toți cetățenii la medicamente. Există țări, așa cum este și țara mea, în care oamenii bolnavi de hepatita C nu că nu pot să dea acea sumă mare de bani, prea mare, nu există cantitatea necesară și acest lucru încalcă dreptul la viața cetățenilor. Eu sper să nu rămână doar un raport, eu sper ca domnul comisar, ca om de specialitate, să discute cu guvernele naționale și să găsească un mijloc prin care să aducă acel drept la viață pentru fiecare cetățean.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Pani predsedajúca, vírusová hepatitída, tuberkulóza a HIV sú stále strašiakom ohrozujúcim zdraviu Európanov. Komisia síce uvádza, že prispeje k zlepšovaniu stavu monitorovaním správ a skúmaním pokroku v dosahovaní cieľov trvalo udržateľného rozvoja. Podľa môjho názoru je to veľmi málo, hlavne, keď čítame, koľko ľudí umiera ročne na rôzne typy hepatitíd. Určite je žiadúce, ak vieme, kde je vysoká miera výskytu HIV, tuberkulózy, či hepatitídy, prijať také opatrenia, aby sme zamedzili šíreniu týchto život ohrozujúcich infekcií a nielen ich monitorovali. V roku 2015 som dala otázku Komisii, do akej miery má Komisia zmapované očkovanie detí proti chorobám ako tuberkulóza, čierny kašeľ alebo detská obrna. Odpoveď, že právomoc v oblasti politiky očkovania majú členské štáty nemôže byť uspokojivá, pretože aj dnes máme ohniská ďalších ochorení, na ktoré sa zomiera. Preto sa pripájam k výzve, aby Komisia a Rada zohrávali významnú politickú úlohu v dialógu s členskými štátmi, ale aj so susednými štátmi, a zabezpečili, že prijímú zodpovednosť za boj proti HIV, tuberkulóze, vírusovej hepatitíde a ďalším epidémiám.

9.6. Thejjija tal-Programm ta' Hidma tal-Kummissjoni għall-2018 (RC-B8-0434/2017, B8-0434/2017, B8-0435/2017, B8-0450/2017, B8-0451/2017, B8-0454/2017, B8-0455/2017, B8-0456/2017)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señora presidenta, no sé si somos conscientes —aunque no nos escuchan muchos— de que esta mañana se ha producido una situación bastante extraña, porque no se ha aprobado ningún programa de trabajo que el Parlamento le envía a la Comisión.

Esto sí que me parece bastante ridículo, mucho más que lo que dijo ayer el señor Juncker, porque realmente lo que se ha producido es una falta de acuerdo entre los Grupos para que el Parlamento Europeo le envíe a la Comisión su programa de trabajo para el año que viene. Y, desgraciadamente, no hay propuesta del Parlamento. Y por qué, tendríamos que preguntarnos. Porque cada uno hemos votado nuestra propuesta y la propuesta que ha sido presentada por los Grupos PPE, ALDE y ECR no ha prosperado, porque se han recibido diferentes enmiendas de diferentes Grupos. Lo cierto es que lo que se ha puesto de manifiesto es que no hay una mayoría estable en este Parlamento si no se pacta con el Grupo Socialista.

Esto es lo que se ha visto hoy y, desgraciadamente, este Parlamento ha hecho un flaco favor a su propio prestigio sin poder presentar su documento de trabajo. Esta es la realidad.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Kedves Képviselőtársaim! Meglepetésre elfogadta, befogadta az Európai Bizottság azt az európai polgári kezdeményezést, amelyet nyolc volt szocialista vagy kommunista ország képviselői indítottak annak érdekében, hogy azt a hatalmas jövőbelmi, illetve bérszakadékot, amit a nyugati és keleti országok között tapasztalhatunk, s amely miatt a keleti, illetve a közép-európai tagállamokból hazájukat kénytelenek elhagyni sokan, tragikus helyzeteket eredményezve családokban is és hát különböző munkahelyeken is.

Nos, hiányoltam a Bizottságnak a 2018-as munkaprogramjából, hogy a számos tagállamot érintő jelenséggel elkezdene foglalkozni. Tehát hogy azt mondaná, hogy összeállítok egy komoly szakmai bizottságot, elkezdem feltárni az okokat, a megoldási lehetőséget arra, hogy záruljon ez a hatalmas szakadék a nyugati és keleti békék, illetőleg jövedelmek között.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, s velikom je većinom zastupnika odbijena Rezolucija o pripremi programa rada Komisije za 2018. godinu. Ja sam u glasanju bila suzdržana jer je naravno u Rezoluciji jako puno važnih poruka i dijelova. Međutim, izmjenama koje su prošle tijekom glasanja sadržaj i usmjerenost na ključne aktivnosti izmijenjeni su i zbog toga naravno nismo u potpunosti mogli podržati ovu Rezoluciju.

Ono što je bitno, svi moramo znati da su pred nama ključni izazovi u 2018. godini i da naravno u sljedećem glasanju o tome moramo voditi računa, da se mora pojačati provedba programa, ubrzati provedba programa jer naši građani očekuju rezultate vidljive barem u 2018. godini za ovu perspektivu.

Isto tako upravljanje krizama postalo je naša svakodnevica. Zajednički moramo osmisliti i provesti najbolja rješenja i za borbu protiv terorizma i za upravljanje migracijama.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Pani predsedajúca, program Komisie považujem za veľmi dôležitý z pohľadu obyvateľov EÚ, preto je veľká škoda, že sme sa nevedeli dohodnúť naprieč politickým spektrom na spoločnom návrhu uznesenia. Z mnohých dobrých návrhov sa do uznesenia nedostali napr. posilnenie stratégie pre oživenie priemyslu, ale ani nástroje na implementovanie klimatickej dohody z Paríža. Pred nami sú aj ďalšie naliehavé úlohy, ktoré keď nebudeme riešiť hneď, zajtra už môže byť neskoro. Za takúto akútnu úlohu považujem demografiu a starnutie obyvateľstva, nízku pôrodnosť, slabú podporu rodinného života a nevyvážené pracovného a súkromného života. V súčasnosti starí ľudia sa stávajú príťažou a neriešiteľným problémom v mnohých členských štátoch. Preto očakávam od Komisie jednotnú, koordinovanú stratégiu pre riešenie tohto problému. Na druhej strane sú tu mladí ľudia, ktorí právom očakávajú od nás podporu vo vzdelávaní a v uplatnení sa na trhu práce a v dôstojnom živote pri zakladaní si rodiny. Preto aj program Komisie na rok 2018 by mal vytvárať perspektívu pre mladú generáciu v spoločnej Európe.

9.7. Bağit 2018 — Mandat ghat-Trilogu (A8-0249/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Szavazatommal támogattam, és a plenáris vita során is megerősítettem a mezőgazdaság és vidékfejlesztés költségvetésben betöltött kulcsfontosságú szerepét. Az olyan területek, mint például az aktív gazdálkodók, a termelői csoportok, a küzdelem a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatok ellen, a piaci megfigyelőközpontok, növényegészségügyi intézkedések, és az okos megközelítés jelentős biztonságot nyújtanak.

Felhívom a figyelmet, hogy a brexit is komoly hatással lesz erre a területre, így már a 2018-as költségvetésben közép-pontba kell helyezni ezt a kérdést, és meg kell vizsgálni, hogy a tagállamok a jelenlegi 1%-os EU-költségvetéshez való hozzájárulását lehet-e 2%-ra emelni.

A jelentés továbbá külön kiemeli a kísérleti projektek és az előkészítő intézkedések fontosságát is, amelyek alapvető fontosságú eszközök a politikai prioritások kialakításában, és az olyan új kezdeményezések előkészítésében, amelyek állandó uniós tevékenységgé és programokká válhatnak, mint például az „okos falvak” koncepció.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Od początku kadencji zajmuję się problematyką budżetu, problematyką finansów w obszarze kompetencji: kultura, edukacja, sport i turystyka, i z tego też powodu nie mam żadnych kłopotów z akceptacją mandatu do rozmów trójstronnych, jak i również tego etapu prac nad budżetem. To, na co chcę zwrócić uwagę, to jednak na fakt pewnego równoległego debatowania nad różnymi pozycjami z efektem, muszę powiedzieć, daleko odbiegającym od oczekiwań. Z jednej strony odbiera się kulturze środki finansowe na tworzony Europejski Korpus Solidarności, zapowiadając rekompensatę, której na tym etapie nigdzie zapisanej nie ma. Zwracam uwagę na ten detal, na ten szczegół, bo jest ich bardzo, bardzo dużo. Zarówno tempo, szczegóły techniczne związane z projektowaniem budżetu na 2018 r. budzą moje wątpliwości z tego powodu, że cechuje je daleko idąca niespójność. Niemniej jednak projekt poparłem.

9.8. Lejn strategija tal-UE għar-relazzjonijiet kulturali internazzjonali (A8-0220/2017 - Elmar Brok, Silvia Costa)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękując Elmarowi Brokowi, jak również Silvii Coście za wykonaną pracę, chcę podkreślić, iż w przypadku tego dokumentu mamy dwa mankamenty. Po pierwsze, powstaje on 10 lat po zbudowaniu pierwszej formalnej europejskiej agendy kultury, czyli czas niezwykle odległy. To nie buduje dobrej perspektywy na kolejne narzędzia, w których kultura byłaby traktowana poważnie. A po drugie, chcę jednocześnie powiedzieć, że w tym dokumencie zapisujemy, że ważne są programy „Kreatywna Europa”, programy stypendialne dla młodzieży, program „Europa dla obywateli”, „Horyzont 2020”, a równocześnie „Horyzont 2020” traci środki finansowe na programy inwestycyjne, a z programów dedykowanych kulturze odbiera się środki na nowe projekty bez rekompensaty. Zwracam na to uwagę, dlatego że mamy w tej materii albo pewną schizofrenię, albo przynajmniej niekonsekwencję.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report because undoubtedly culture is a common good; it is inseparably linked to human rights and fundamental freedoms. But culture is also a tool that builds bridges between people and reinforces mutual understanding. Looking from this perspective, I warmly welcome the EU strategy for intercultural relations, because it aims to promote a global order based on peace, rule of law, freedom of expression, intercultural and interreligious dialogue, mutual understanding and respect for fundamental values.

In light of this, I call on the Commission to strengthen the impact of the cultural dimension in international relations by including the cultural dimension systematically in negotiations and in association agreements.

In addition, the Commission and External Action Service have to include international cultural relations in international cooperation instruments and programmes in a horizontal way in order to ensure a coherency and to turn them into efficient tools.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Traktat o Unii Europejskiej deklaruje, że jednym ze źródeł inspirujących współpracę naszych państw jest religijne dziedzictwo Europy. Ale jeżeli spojrzymy do strategii UE w dziedzinie międzynarodowych stosunków kulturalnych, w ogóle potwierdzenia tej deklaracji nie widać. Ten dokument to manifest multikulturalizmu, gdzie „zróżnicowanie tożsamości kulturalnej” ma zastąpić naszą tradycję, nasze wartości duchowe, naszą historię. Unijna strategia kulturalna to jeszcze jeden dokument strukturalnego kryzysu Unii Europejskiej, tak jak nasz sprzeciw, to jeszcze jedno świadectwo tego, że chrześcijańska cywilizacja Europy ciągle żyje.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Madam President, culture and education as soft-power resources in the EU external policy arsenal are still not adequately reflected in our efforts to counter radicalism, resolve conflicts and promote reconciliation and sustainable socio-economic and human development in the world.

These tools could and should be among Europe's most effective weapons in the promotion of the ideas of non-violence, equality and respect for human rights. I would note too that not enough effort has been put in by the EU on protecting the cultural rights of national minorities, including in the Eastern Partnership countries. Effective cultural diplomacy has to be a strong force for the promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity and the preservation of minority languages and cultures.

The slogan 'Unity in diversity' should become a universal approach both within and outside the EU.

9.9. Rakkomandazzjoni lill-Kunsill dwar it-72 Sessjoni tal-Assemblea Ġenerali tan-Nazzjonijiet Uniti (A8-0216/2017 - Andrey Kovatchev)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la Resolución de hoy pide una vez más que la Unión Europea apoye la labor del representante especial del secretario general de Naciones Unidas para el Sáhara Occidental y, para ello, deberá hacer efectivo el derecho a la autodeterminación del pueblo saharaui.

El martes que viene se reanudará el juicio a los presos de Gdeim Izik, en el que observadores independientes han destacado graves violaciones de la legislación internacional, empezando por la Convención contra la Tortura: un juicio político contra el pueblo saharaui y su anhelo de independencia.

La Unión Europea debe actuar y suspender sus acuerdos con Marruecos, tal y como exige incluso el Tribunal de Justicia, hasta que este no cese en su ocupación y colonización del pueblo saharaui.

La legislación internacional y la Carta de las Naciones Unidas son claras: solo un referéndum de autodeterminación puede poner fin al expolio y al destierro del pueblo saharaui. Trabajaremos juntos para llevarlo a cabo.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Madam President, I had to double check but indeed this report says in point (al) that there should be more open expression of opinion, especially by citizens, in the context of migration.

Indeed, go ahead, dear citizens of the European Union, express your opinions like we did in Hungary. This reminded me of, for example, the population of the small jewel called Martonfa, a community near the town of Pécs, who said, 'we do not want a migration camp or a migrants' camp here and we shall stay here in this territory and we shall not leave until it is decided that there shall be no camp here'.

What was the result?

The Hungarian Government decided to watch our borders instead of putting camps into beautiful areas of Hungary. Do the same.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Pani predsedajúca, ako členské štáty Európskej únie sme najväčším finančným prispievateľom do systému OSN, čo je asi 50% všetkých príspevkov. V Európskej únii sa preto chválime tým, že sme poprednými svetovými lídrami, čo udávajú tempo a smer, čo je do istej miery zaiste pravda, a žiaľ niekedy pri takomto líderstve vôbec nemáme byť na čo hrdí. V uznesení odporúčaní Európskeho parlamentu valnému zhromaždeniu OSN znovu raz EP žiadal, aj schválil, aktívne presadzovanie podporných opatrení pre LGBTI osoby, čo som samozrejme nemohol podporiť. Len tento týždeň máme v agende ďalšie tri uznesenia podporujúce tú čudnú a nevedeckú LGBT agendu. Tak sa skutočne pýtam, ako sa spieva v jednej piesni slovenskej speváčky Simony Martausovej: „kam tento svet speje, keď zuby majú byť len biele, vraždy sú aj v leporele, rozum nie vždy ide s vekom, závislí sme vždy na niekom, a zaspávame vďaka liekom, čo robiť s dušou človeka, človek zvláštnym bohom slúži, zo žien sa stávajú muži, čo dobývajú pevnosti“. Ďakujem za pochopenie.

**9.10. Il-bini ta' strategija industrijali ambizzjuza tal-UE bhala prijorità strategika għat-
tkabbir, l-impjiegi u l-innovazzjoni fl-Ewropa (RC-B8-0440/2017, B8-0439/2017,
B8-0440/2017, B8-0445/2017, B8-0446/2017, B8-0447/2017, B8-0448/2017,
B8-0449/2017)**

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, the European Union cannot outsource its industrial capacities to other continents. That is not wise, in the same way that a human organism cannot declare that it will not use its liver because livers are not as cool as kidneys. The result for the organism would be devastating.

My country, Latvia, has lost 25% of jobs in industry since joining the European Union and now my country depends heavily on help from European funds. Without a proper industrial policy, we cannot say that our European economy is sustainable. That is why it is very important to strengthen and modernise the industrial base in Europe. The Commission, together with the Member States, should adopt a holistic European industrial policy strategy.

We cannot only scratch one another behind the ears and call it a modern service economy. We need a modern and developed industry in Europe.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodo predsjednice, danas smo izglasali rezoluciju o ambicioznoj industrijskoj strategiji i to je izuzetno važno za cijelu Europu i za svaku državu članicu jer bez jake industrije ne možemo imati ni jako vodeće gospodarstvo, a mi želimo biti na svijetu lideri.

Industrija, zadnjih dvadeset godina, nažalost, čitavo vrijeme pada i njen udio u BDP-u je pao s 19% na 15%, a naš je cilj u ovoj strategiji do 2020. godine biti na 20%. Kako ćemo to postići? Moramo značajno promijeniti svoje stavove i načine rada, moramo smanjiti ovisnost o sirovinama iz trećih zemalja, moramo povećati energetske učinkovitost. Isto tako sustav obrazovanja mijenjati i uskladiti s potrebama industrije, povezati industriju sa znanosti, poticati inovacije i naravno smanjiti regulatorna opterećenja. Puno je posla pred nama i ova rezolucija to jasno poručuje.

Elnök asszony. – A szavazatindoklások végéhez érkeztünk.

10. Korrezzjonijiet u intenzjonijiet għall-vot: ara l-Minuti

(Az ülést 14.05-kor felfüggesztik, és 15.00-kor folytatják.)

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

11. Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel: ara l-Minuti

12. Rapport tal-2016 dwar it-Turkija (dibattitu)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Kati Piri, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur le rapport 2016 de la Commission concernant la Turquie (2016/2308(INI)) (A8-0234/2017).

Kati Piri, rapporteur. – Madam President, adalet is the Turkish word for justice. As we speak, thousands of people are marching from Ankara to Istanbul in protest at the large-scale purges that started after the failed coup attempt one year ago. The numbers are swelling every day, and more than one million people are expected to attend a peaceful march for justice when they arrive in Istanbul this coming Sunday.

In a deeply polarised country, people from all walks of life are uniting to call for the restoration of the rule of law in their country. That is not only historic, it is also a hopeful sign that many in Turkey do not accept the authoritarian drift in their country. These people are fighting for their democratic rights, and we in the European Parliament stand side by side with all those in Turkey who believe in the same European values as us.

At least half of the population voted against the new constitutional package in the referendum. Turkish students are protesting against the government-appointed rectors in their universities. And teachers fired under government decrees, Nuriye Gülmen and Semih Özakça, began a hunger strike in protest. As their strike neared the 80-day mark and their health faded, they were arrested and they have been in custody ever since.

This shows how little space is left nowadays for freedom of speech in Turkey. But all of these examples also show how millions of people in Turkey are not giving up hope. One year after the failed military takeover, Turkish democracy is under great pressure. A heavy price is being paid by the Turkish people. The parliament and the constitutional court are bypassed as the government rules by emergency decrees. More than 150 000 people have lost their jobs, more than 50 000 people have been jailed, and all without having an opportunity to defend themselves.

The continually deteriorating situation in South-East Turkey deserves special attention. Not only is the leader of the pro-Kurdish People's Democratic Party (HDP), Selahattin Demirtaş, imprisoned, so are 12 of his colleagues and 87 mayors from that region. Especially in the areas where curfews were imposed, excessive force has been used by security personnel, and collective punishment has been applied to the inhabitants. However, this in no way justifies any of the killings conducted by the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), an organisation which has been on the EU's terror list since 2002, and last week's murder of two local Justice and Development Party (AKP) politicians is another sad example of how this conflict affects many people's lives.

The EU believes that there can only be a political solution to the Kurdish question.

When looking at the widespread crackdown on all dissent in Turkey, silence is the worst strategy for the EU to take in reaction. Not only does it leave millions of Turks out in the cold, it also fuels euroscepticism in our own countries and sends the wrong message to the other EU candidate countries in the Western Balkans.

Let us take a look at some examples from the past weeks. Why was there No EU statement when journalists from the *Sozcu* newspaper were targeted? Why was there No EU reaction when the head of Amnesty International's Turkish branch was arrested? And why was there no condemnation when a 14th member of the Turkish Parliament, Republican People's Party (CHP) MP Enis Berberoglu, was jailed and sentenced to 25 years?

We understand that Turkey is an important country and we have many joint strategic interests. We are not pleading for a stop to all dialogue and cooperation with Ankara, but what we are asking the Commission and the EU leaders to do is simply to stand up for our own values. By looking away, we are seriously undermining our own credibility.

We support the Commission's proposal to start negotiations on the modernisation of the current customs union with Turkey. This would not only be beneficial to both sides in economic terms, but it is perhaps also the only leverage the EU still has in making the Government of Turkey commit to European standards. On visa liberalisation, we encourage the Turkish Government to comply with the last five remaining benchmarks.

Finally, while the political Groups in this House have very different views on EU-Turkey relations, I would like to thank especially my colleague rapporteurs from the other Groups in making sure that this Parliament speaks with one, clear and loud voice in condemning the Turkish Government's serious decline in democratic standards, while continuing to support the Turkish population, millions of whom would like to continue to see the EU as an anchor for reforms in their country.

And for all those millions of people in Turkey it is also important that we continue to uphold our own values when dealing with a candidate country. To those in Turkey following this debate, we would like to say that your struggle in difficult times does not go by unnoticed. Together with you, we hope that *adalet* – justice – will return to Turkey soon.

Matti Maasilikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Turkey is a candidate country and a key partner for the EU. We cooperate in many important areas of joint interest, such as counter-terrorism, foreign and security policy, energy, the economy and trade, as well as migration.

The EU-Turkey joint action plan for refugees and migration management and the March 2016 statement continue to be applied in the interest of both parties. So far, this cooperation has led to a significant decrease in deaths at sea and a substantial reduction of irregular migrant arrivals from Turkey. It has also led to an improved situation for Syrian migrants in Turkey.

The EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey has made a significant contribution through additional funding in the areas of humanitarian assistance, education migration management, health, municipal infrastructure and socio-economic support.

We continue to appreciate Turkey for its enormous efforts in hosting and addressing the needs of around 3 million refugees from Syria and Iraq. Work continues on the issue of visa liberalisation, which, however, remains conditional on Turkey's fulfilment of all the requirements of the road map. We look forward to any further progress regarding this issue during our Presidency this year.

We follow the domestic developments in Turkey with deep concern. Regarding the April referendum this year, President Juncker, High Representative Mogherini and Commission Hahn issued a joint statement, which stressed that the constitutional amendments and their implementation will be assessed in light of Turkey's obligations as an EU candidate country.

We share many of the concerns to which you Parliament referred both in its resolution on Turkey from November last year and in relation to the draft resolution recently discussed and voted upon in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Many of these concerns were also reflected in the Presidency conclusions of the General Affairs Council, adopted on 13 December 2016. The significant backsliding in the areas of the rule of law and respect for fundamental rights are deeply worrying and should be urgently addressed by the relevant Turkish authorities.

The unequivocal rejection of the death penalty is an essential requirement for EU membership, and it is also part of Turkey's international obligations. In contacts with Turkey the EU side takes every opportunity to recall these and other concerns, and we will continue to do so. Turkey needs to normalise its relations with Cyprus and fully implement the provisions of the additional protocol of their association agreement.

Nevertheless, continued engagement and an open dialogue with Turkey remain important. The EU should remain the anchor for Turkey's reforms. We continue to expect Turkey to respect the highest standards when it comes to democracy, the rule of law and respect for fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of expression.

As for the situation in the south east of Turkey, the EU will continue to call for an immediate cessation of violence and terrorist attacks. This needs to be accompanied by a return to a credible and inclusive political settlement process and a genuine political dialogue, aiming at a political solution there.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to start by commending the rapporteur's efforts to capture the main challenges in the complex EU-Turkey relationship in a very comprehensive report. I share the strong concerns of this House when it comes to the domestic situation in Turkey as already reflected in the Commission's 2016 country report and in our public positions ever since.

The number of jailed journalists remains very high – currently over 160, including some EU citizens. The situation of academics and of civil society in general has worsened. The opposition finds itself under ever-growing pressure. Honourable Members, I am deeply committed to improving EU-Turkey relations, but only tangible steps by Ankara, reversing the worrying trend on the fundamentals of our relationship, can accomplish this in the mid- and long term. For instance, the ad hoc committee offering remedies to excessive government measures after the attempted coup needs to produce urgent results. Continued close cooperation with the Council of Europe is vital in this context.

I also echo Secretary-General Jagland's call for the release of the two teachers on hunger strike, whose life-threatening situation is rapidly deteriorating. The letter to President Erdoğan, signed by the four largest political groups in this House on the situation of the freedom of the press, will hopefully show its the desired effect.

In short, we cannot and we will not ignore the worrying developments in Turkey, precisely because we want fruitful bilateral relations. Turkey is a candidate country. With the statutes come rules and obligations, obligations and standards to which Turkey itself has subscribed. At the same time, our common challenges are growing by the day, from security in the wider region to the fight against terrorism to the handling of migration and refugees. To tackle these challenges together, it is in our European self-interest to have a stable, democratic, prosperous partner who acts under the rule of law. That is precisely why the EU was among the few first international actors to declare its full support for Turkey, its citizens and its democratic institutions after the terrible coup attempt nearly a year ago – that horrible night during which more than 240 people lost their lives, 2 200 were wounded and the Turkish Grand National Assembly was attacked and severely damaged.

Madam President, honourable Members, when Presidents Juncker and Tusk met with President Erdoğan a few weeks ago, they agreed to pursue our agenda of engagement and open dialogue. This will include a number of high-level thematic dialogues and bilateral visits over the coming months.

Furthermore, last week's steering committee of the facility for refugees in Turkey, the rapporteur, Ms Piri, as well as the Chair of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Arthuis, could witness themselves that the facilities are being smoothly implemented, and it is delivering very tangible results on the ground for the refugees. We have given hundreds of thousands basic livelihoods. We have trained thousands of teachers, and they are giving hundreds of thousands of refugee children a formal education. We are now providing many with a socio-economic perspective. All of this is key to reducing migration pressure. Right after our discussion here today, I will fly to Ankara to meet with Minister Çelik and Minister for the Economy, Zeybekci. I will also visit a health project founded by the EU Facility for Refugees. My message will be clear. The European Union sticks to its financial commitments under the refugee facility. Our support has a clear impact, but our overall relationship can only move forward if there is a clear improvement of the domestic situation in Turkey.

Honourable Members, closely engaging with Turkey is crucial. It is, however, equally important that we make it crystal clear that we all expect positive and tangible developments in and by Turkey. Yes, we engage, but we are not moving the goalposts in either direction. We continue to have a very close eye on what is happening in the crucial areas of rule of law and fundamental freedoms. That is not only a matter of fulfilling EU criteria and universal values; it is, first and foremost, the only way to end the deep divide in Turkish society.

Renate Sommer, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst einmal möchte ich unserer Berichtsteratterin Kati Piri und auch den Kolleginnen und Kollegen von den anderen Fraktionen für die gute Zusammenarbeit danken. Sehr bemerkenswert, wie wir diesen Bericht in diesem Jahr hinbekommen haben.

Wir haben ja dramatische Entwicklungen erlebt in der Türkei, und es ist hier auch eigentlich schon ausreichend dargestellt worden, wie die Situation ist: Tausende Entlassungen, Hunderte Verhaftungen, eine Hexenjagd auf politisch Andersdenkende, eigentlich die Abschaffung des Rechtsstaates und ein Klima der Angst, das vorherrscht in diesem Land. Wie sollen wir also mit so einem Land umgehen?

Und eigentlich meine ich, wir hätten über diesen Bericht, über den wir morgen abstimmen, schon viel eher abstimmen sollen, nämlich vor dem Referendum. Dann hätten wir der türkischen Bevölkerung mit unserem Bericht erklären können, was dieses Verfassungsreferendum eigentlich bedeutet. Denn ich behaupte: Kaum jemand in der Türkei wusste wirklich, um was es bei diesem Referendum ging. Die türkische Regierung hat es geschafft, das eigene Volk in die Irre zu führen. Denn die Verfassungsänderungen sind eben nicht gut für das Land.

Aber für uns ist jetzt klar: Es müssen endlich Konsequenzen gezogen werden. Und dazu muss der Ministerrat auch endlich mal den Mut aufbringen. Unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu Hause verstehen schon lange nicht mehr, warum diese Scheinverhandlungen über einen EU-Beitritt noch aufrechterhalten werden und warum die türkische Regierung nach wie vor beträchtliche finanzielle Mittel von uns erhält.

Natürlich, jedem hier ist klar – das wurde auch schon gesagt –, dass eine enge und privilegierte Beziehung zwischen der EU und der Türkei im Interesse beider Seiten völlig unverzichtbar ist. Aber das kann eben nur verwirklicht werden, wenn die Beziehung auf der Achtung der Menschenrechte, der Grundfreiheiten, demokratischer Werte und der Rechtstaatlichkeit beruht. Schließlich hat die Türkei diese Bedingungen akzeptiert, als sie 1999 Beitrittskandidat wurde. Aber leider weigert sie sich seit Langem, diese Grundwerte als ihre eigenen anzunehmen.

Das zeigt: Ein Beitritt dieses Landes kommt eben nicht in Frage. Und es ist nur folgerichtig, wenn wir jetzt fordern, die Verhandlungen formell zu suspendieren, was im Klartext ja das Ende der Beitrittsverhandlungen bedeuten wird, wenn das Verfassungsreformpaket unverändert umgesetzt wird. Die Verfassungsänderungen verstoßen eindeutig gegen die Kopenhagener Kriterien. Allerdings erfüllt die Türkei schon lange diese Kriterien nicht, und sie hat das jetzt noch einmal unterstrichen mit der Enteignung christlichen Kulturerbes. Konfisziert wurden Kirchen und alle ihre Friedhöfe und an die Religionsbehörde Diyanet übertragen. Es ist ein Hohn, dass die Türkei im gleichen Atemzug sagt: „Und wir wollen weiterhin Mitglied der Europäischen Union werden.“ Das ist ein ganz klarer Verstoß gegen unsere grundlegenden Prinzipien. Das können wir nicht akzeptieren.

Wir müssen uns auf eine andere Ebene konzentrieren, das wird die Zollunion sein. Darauf sollten wir gemeinsam hinarbeiten, aber eben auch das auf der Grundlage der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und der Achtung der grundlegenden Menschenrechte.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, it was a very difficult year for Turkey. A very difficult and dramatic one. The failed coup d'état, the Syrian war in the sixth year, and Turkey has received more than three million refugees. The conflict in the south east continues.

Turkey has faced a series of terrorist attacks. It is important to say it, and I understand that the security environment has change in Turkey as well as in the surroundings of the European Union. Therefore, yes, I'm worried about the Turkish democracy. I'm extremely worried when it comes to the fundamental freedoms in Turkey and the way the mass liquidation of media outlets is the result of the state action. The way in which there are mass arrestation of journalists, academics, judges, elected representatives of the opposition and so on and so forth. Today they are endangered by the actions taken by the current leadership of President Erdoğan. Our report is rightly pointing out all of this. Our commitment to the people of Turkey remains, nevertheless, strong. The civil society and the opposition in Turkey are waiting for us to be further engaged and support them not only in their survival – the physical survival sometimes – but in preserving the remains of the democracy in Turkey. Today they are continuing their march from Ankara to Istanbul, a march for justice and democracy. I salute them, all of them.

So this is not the time to give up on Turkey. It is the time when criticism should be strong when necessary and when a constructive, open and pragmatic dialogue should be maintained. It is the appropriate time to stress that Turkey and the European Union does have a strategic interest and have to continue their cooperation in very important areas – migration, counterterrorism, Syrian war in the Middle East region, where Turkey can play a positive role. It is more than now to say today to put an end to the escalating populism within the European Union, the rhetorics which call to cut the relations with Turkey. And the best we can do is to support the customs union.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe eine ganz kurze Frage zur Geschäftsordnung. Hier werden Reden eine Minute überzogen eine Dreiviertelminute überzogen, und wenn wir, nur eine Minute reden können, dann sollten Sie das gleiche Recht für alle anwenden. Oder gibt es irgendeine Regel, die es erlaubt, dass hier einige eine Minute länger reden, 45 Sekunden länger reden, und bei uns fällt genau bei einer Minute und zwei Sekunden der Hammer? Gleiches Recht für alle, oder Sie erklären uns die Regeln neu!

La Présidente. – Je vous l'accorde, Madame, et nous allons tenter de rétablir...

Non, Monsieur Fleckenstein, tout le monde va se calmer, et nous allons reprendre le cours normal de notre débat. Chacun respecte les temps de parole et ainsi tout ira bien.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Turkije is veel meer dan Erdogan en de AKP. Met genoeg vang ik geluiden op van Turkse burgers met een “open mind” binnen en buiten de eigen landsgrenzen. Deze moedige Turken verdienen ten volle Europese steun.

Twee concrete voorbeelden. Elke week kijk ik uit naar “de brief uit Istanbul” in de Frankfurter Allgemeine van redacteur Bülent Mumay. Informatie en analyse van hoog niveau! Onafhankelijke berichtgeving over Turkije is zeker nu voor de EU van grote waarde, die moeten we ook steunen.

Een tweede voorbeeld. Vorige week vrijdag schreef de Turkse columniste Guzde Berderoglu over het klooster Mor Gabriel (stichtingsjaar 397!): “Mor Gabriel is onze geschiedenis”. Zij vervolgt: “Zolang wij niet begrepen hebben, dat dit onze gemeenschappelijke geschiedenis is, zal ons verval voortduren.”

Deze moedige woorden uit Turkse pen keren zich rechtstreeks tegen de huidige onteigening van tientallen kerken, kloosters en landgoederen van de Aramese gemeenschap rond de stad Mardin. Commissaris, neem het eveneens krachtig op voor een christelijke presentie en christelijk cultureel erfgoed in Turkije, ook vanwege onze waarden en onze geschiedenis!

MdV, mijn laatste woorden reserveer ik voor twee landgenoten, rapporteur Kati Piri en oud-collega Joost Lagendijk. Kati, je combineert expertise met een open blikveld, hebben we nodig, hulde! Joost, ik wens je een spoedige hereniging met je Turkse echtgenote mede dankzij onze Europese steun en solidariteit.

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Türkei ist jetzt seit 18 Jahren Beitrittskandidat, seit zwölf Jahren wird verhandelt. Man sollte denken, dass sich in dieser Zeit die Beziehungen zwischen der Türkei und der Europäischen Union verbessert hätten. Exakt das Gegenteil ist der Fall. Die Beziehungen werden Jahr für Jahr immer schlechter, weil es auf beiden Seiten inzwischen niemanden mehr gibt, der ernsthaft daran glaubt, dass dieser Verhandlungsprozess eines Tages zum Erfolg führen könnte.

Ich glaube, das gilt für Brüssel genauso, wie es für Ankara gilt. Wir haben in der Bevölkerung eine Gegnerschaft zu einem Türkeibeitritt, über die Europäische Union gerechnet, von insgesamt 77 Prozent, in Deutschland fordern 86 Prozent das Ende der Beitrittsverhandlungen. Wir haben mehr Journalisten im Gefängnis in der Türkei als in China oder im Iran, in den Universitäten ist die akademische Freiheit von Forschung und Lehre mit eisernem Besen beseitigt worden, die Justiz ist nicht mehr unabhängig. Ich finde es gut, dass die Kommission sagt, man werde das nicht ignorieren. Ich bin entgeistert, lieber Herr Ratsvorsitzender, wenn ich einen Satz von Ihnen hier höre:

We expect Turkey to fulfil the highest standards in democracy, fundamental rights and judicial independence.

Bitte, lesen Sie nicht nur vor, was Ihnen Ihre Beamten aufschreiben, haben Sie den Mut, Ihren eigenen Verstand zu benutzen. Denn kein Mensch kann glauben, dass das wirklich so sei, wie Sie es hier geschildert haben.

Meine Damen und Herren, das Europäische Parlament schlägt vor, die Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei einzufrieren. Das ist nicht gleichbedeutend mit dem Vorschlag, den Dialog mit der Türkei zu beenden. Im Gegenteil: Es ist der Vorschlag, den Dialog endlich auf eine ehrliche Grundlage zu stellen: über die Energiepolitik, über die Zollunion, über die Visaliberalisierung, über den Tourismus, über Umweltfragen. Wir haben so viele Dinge, die wir gemeinsam mit den Türken regeln müssen und regeln können – auch bei einer schwierigen innenpolitischen Entwicklung.

Deswegen, meine Damen und Herren, machen wir den Dialog mit der Türkei ehrlich! Stellen wir ihn auf eine Grundlage, die funktioniert! Sagen wir ja zum Dialog, sagen wir ja zu den Verträgen, die wir mit der Türkei schließen können! Aber machen wir klar, dass es einen Beitritt nicht geben kann und nicht geben wird. Das Land entfernt sich von Europa. Ignorieren wir das nicht länger, sondern ziehen wir die notwendigen Konsequenzen!

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αυτή είναι μια έκθεση που αντικατοπτρίζει καθαρά, κατά την άποψή μου, την επικρατούσα κατάσταση μέσα στην Τουρκία, που έχει περιγραφεί θαυμάσια και από τον επίτροπο Hahn και -κυρίως- από την εισηγήτρια, την κυρία Piri, την οποία θέλω να ευχαριστήσω ιδιαίτερος για τις προσπάθειες που κατέβαλε -και με τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές- αλλά και συνολικά για τη δουλειά που έκανε για να προκύψει αυτό το αποτέλεσμα. Την ευχαριστώ πολύ, ελκρινά.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, αναμένετε υποθέτω ότι πρέπει να πω και δυο κουβέντες για το Κυπριακό στον πολύ λίγο χρόνο που έχω. Αναμένουμε και από την Ελβετία κάποια στιγμή θετικά αποτελέσματα, ώστε να ξεφύγουμε απ' αυτό το πρόβλημα που βασανίζει όλους τους Κύπριους, αν και μέχρι στιγμής δεν έχουμε όλες τις θετικές πληροφορίες που χρειαζόμαστε. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η Τουρκία κατέχει το ένα τρίτο της Κύπρου. Η ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά είπε ότι παραχωρεί μέρος αυτού του κομματιού που πάρθηκε με τη βία για να τεθεί υπό τουρκοκυπριακή διοίκηση· θα έχουν τη δική τους αστυνομία, θα ελέγχουν τους δήμους τους, τα θέματα παιδείας, θρησκείας, κ.λπ. Θα υπάρχει και ομοσπονδιακή αστυνομία, θα συμμετέχουν στην κεντρική διακυβέρνηση σε όλα τα συστήματα εξουσίας, υπουργικά συμβούλια, Άνω Βουλή, με αναλογία 50% -πολύ μεγαλύτερη από το 20% του πληθυσμού.

Γιατί δεν λύνεται; Γιατί δεν λύνεται το Κυπριακό με αυτή τη λύση, που είναι η απόλυτα σωστή; Διότι η Τουρκία δεν θέλει να φύγει από την Κύπρο. Γι' αυτό πρέπει εσείς εδώ, και οι Επίτροποι και οι εκπρόσωποι του Συμβουλίου και οι βουλευτές, να ασκήσετε όση επιρροή μπορείτε στην Τουρκία, ώστε να φύγει το πόδι της από το σπήθος των Κυπρίων. Τίποτε άλλο δεν μπορείτε να κάνετε και η αναφορά στην αναβάθμιση στην τελωνειακή σχέση που γίνεται μέσα στην έκθεση δεν μας επιτρέπει δυστυχώς να την υπερψηφίσουμε.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Jag tycker att det är oerhört sorgligt att vi ännu en gång står här och beklagar att utvecklingen i Turkiet går åt helt fel håll. Den gick åt fel håll förra året och året innan dess, och jag undrar när vi senast glädde oss åt framsteg som har gjorts.

Sedan militärkuppen inträffade bara några månader efter att vi debatterade vårt förra betänkande har ju undantagstillstånd rått. President Erdoğan har stärkt sitt grepp om makten, han har låtit fängsla regeringskritiska partiledare, parlamentsledamöter, borgmästare och journalister utan rättssäkra rättsprocesser.

Dessutom har långt över 100 000 lärare, statliga tjänstemän och andra avskedats för att ha sympatiserat med oppositionen eller Gülen-rörelsen som Erdoğan lägger skulden på för statskuppets försök.

Men inte bara turkiska medborgare drabbas. En före detta EU-parlamentariker, tillika ordförande i den gemensamma parlamentariska församlingen med Turkiet, Joost Lagendijk som numera bor i Turkiet, har förvägrats att komma hem sedan ett år tillbaka. Vi är glada att hans fall uppmärksammas i betänkandet.

Vi gröna vill inte stänga dörren för Turkiet, men vi står ändå bakom en frysning av förhandlingarna och vi säger också nej till en modernisering av tullunionen i det här läget.

EU och Turkiet har starka band och vi hoppas att de ska bestå, men det är inte lätt idag att försvara fortsatta förhandlingar om vare sig anslutning eller en uppgradering av tullunionen med en regim som inte upprätthåller någon som helst respekt för vare sig de demokratiska spelreglerna, mänskliga rättigheter eller rättsstatens principer.

Nytt i årets betänkande är att vi för första gången uttryckligen talar om att avbryta anslutningsförhandlingarna om de föreslagna grundlagsförändringarna går igenom oförändrade. Det är en stark signal inte bara till Erdoğan utan till det turkiska parlamentet och till de turkiska väljarna. Bollen ligger nu hos dem.

Men betänkandet tar också upp djupare samarbete inom bland annat kontraterrorism och migration, och där överensstämmer inte vår syn helt med majoritetens. Dels anser vi att det inte går att ha ett samarbete om terrorism med ett land som vägrar att ändra den terrorismlagstiftning som i princip kan omfatta alla som yttrar en annan åsikt än presidentens, och dels anser vi att Turkiet inte är ett säkert land att skicka människor tillbaka till.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con il voto di domani l'Aula prenderà finalmente atto di quanto noi affermavamo da tempo: la Turchia non ha le qualifiche per essere un paese candidato all'Unione europea.

Le inaccettabili modifiche proposte alla Costituzione, la campagna referendaria e il referendum stesso, per non parlare delle polemiche contro alcuni Stati membri, delle purghe nell'amministrazione pubblica e della libertà di stampa schiacciata, rendono sempre più evidente una tendenza autoritaria manifestata da Erdoğan che, a dire il vero, noi abbiamo denunciato sin da troppi anni.

Era inevitabile, dunque – e ringrazio il relatore e i relatori ombra per l'ottimo lavoro che abbiamo svolto insieme – che questa relazione annuale infine formalizzasse questo stato di fatto dandoci ragione. La richiesta di sospendere ufficialmente i negoziati quando verranno implementati questi emendamenti costituzionali era ed è doverosa. E così lo è anche dire che parlare di liberalizzazione dei visti oggi è fuori dalla realtà.

Eppure, nonostante questa campagna elettorale dall'OSCE definita iniqua, a causa della mancanza di pari opportunità, della copertura unilaterale e delle limitazioni alle libertà fondamentali, il «sì» in quattro grandi città, nelle quattro maggiori città, ha vinto di misura, anzi ha perso in questi centri di maggiore importanza. Vuol dire che tanti cittadini hanno capito che la società civile è più viva che mai.

Sì, noi non possiamo rinunciare alla Turchia, ma soprattutto non dobbiamo rinunciare al popolo turco. Il futuro di Ankara è scritto negli occhi e nel coraggio degli studenti universitari che hanno protestato contro i rettori loro imposti da Erd-oğan, per difendere la libertà di opinione, di espressione e di insegnamento. È scritto anche negli occhi di chi marcia da Ankara a Istanbul per ribadire i diritti delle opposizioni e delle minoranze, specie quella curda. Sì, noi abbiamo il dovere di essere al loro fianco e di usare ogni leva, inclusa quella commerciale, per difendere con franchezza e coerenza il loro diritto di avere diritti.

Edouard Ferrand, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je crois qu'il y a un certain consensus. Je pense que, tous, nous aspirons à une seule chose: faire en sorte que la Turquie, ce grand peuple, puisse sortir de son marasme. Néanmoins, ici, il y a un double, voire un triple langage.

J'ai entendu M. Lambsdorff et M^{me} von Storch. Permettez-moi de vous dire, Monsieur Lambsdorff, que M. Juncker, hier, a affaibli notre institution. Je pense que ce n'est pas une très bonne chose pour l'esprit démocratique du Parlement européen.

Ensuite, Madame von Storch, certes, on gèle l'accord d'adhésion avec la Turquie mais, néanmoins, au sein de ma commission – la commission du commerce international –, on maintient l'union douanière. C'est un double langage. C'est-à-dire que, politiquement, on s'oppose à la présence de la Turquie dans l'Union européenne mais, économiquement, on continue à mettre en place cette union douanière. Où voulons-nous aller?

Aujourd'hui, le groupe PPE – parce que c'est ce groupe qui a la clé, ici – souhaite le maintien de l'adhésion de la Turquie à l'Union européenne. Selon moi, il serait dommageable que nous soyons sur cette longueur d'onde, parce que je pense que la Turquie n'a rien d'europhé et qu'elle représente un véritable danger, non seulement pour notre union de civilisations, mais aussi pour la cohésion même du Parlement européen. Par conséquent, tant que le groupe PPE n'aura pas compris qu'il faut sortir de cette logique avec la Turquie, nous n'avancerons pas.

Aujourd'hui, malheureusement, je crois que le groupe PPE continuera ce double langage qui nous mènera devant l'abîme, c'est-à-dire vers la fin de notre structure européenne.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, παρά το γεγονός ότι γνωρίζει πολύ καλά, τόσο την αδιάλλακτη στάση της Τουρκίας όσο και τους εκβιασμούς και τις απειλές που απευθύνει, την αντιμετωπίζει με μια πολιτική ενδοτική, φοβική και αντιφατική, που οδηγεί σε αδιέξοδα. Από τη μια πλευρά καταδικάζει την επιθετικότητα της Τουρκίας απέναντι σε όλους τους γείτονές της κι από την άλλη ζητά εμβάθυνση των σχέσεών τους σε θέματα κοινού ενδιαφέροντος. Καταδικάζει τις παραβιάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Τουρκία, παράλληλα όμως ζητά αναβάθμιση της τελωνειακής σχέσης.

Η Τουρκία αντιλαμβάνεται μόνο την πυγμή και την αποφασιστικότητα. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να καταστήσει σαφές ότι όσο η Τουρκία εξακολουθεί να απειλεί την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, όσο δεν αναγνωρίζει την οντότητα της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, όσο δεν αποσύρει τα κατοχικά στρατεύματα από την Κύπρο και όσο δεν παύει τις ροές παράνομων μεταναστών προς την Ελλάδα, δεν πρόκειται να λάβει χρηματοδότηση και θα σταματήσουν επ' αόριστον οι ενταξιακές διαδικασίες. Έτσι πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί η Τουρκία αν θέλουμε να λύσουμε το πρόβλημα που ακούει στο όνομα Τουρκία, εκτός κι αν φοβάστε ότι ο κύριος Erdoğan θα κατηγορήσει κι εσάς ότι ακολουθείτε ναζιστικές μεθόδους.

Μανώλης Κεφαλογιάννης (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ένας χρόνος πέρασε από την απόπειρα πραξικοπήματος εναντίον της Τουρκικής Δημοκρατίας και όλοι εμείς εδώ, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, καταδικάζουμε με τον πιο κατηγορηματικό τρόπο τους πραξικοπηματίες και τις πρακτικές τους και αποτίουμε φόρο τιμής στα εκατοντάδες θύματα του πραξικοπήματος του προηγούμενου Ιουλίου. Όλοι εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο θέλουμε μια Τουρκία που θα είναι παράγοντας σταθερότητας στην ευρύτερη περιοχή. Πολύ περισσότερο δε, όταν έχουμε δύο ουσιαστικά κατεστραμμένες χώρες στην ευρύτερη περιοχή, τη Συρία και το Ιράκ, και στα νότια μας τη Λιβύη. Όλοι θέλουμε μια Τουρκία σταθερά προσανατολισμένη στα ευρωπαϊκά ιδεώδη. Όμως η τουρκική κυβέρνηση -η κυβέρνηση του κυρίου Erdoğan- με τις πρακτικές της για την ελευθερία του τύπου, τα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων, τα δικαιώματα και τη λειτουργία της δικαιοσύνης, τις συλλήψεις εκατοντάδων δημοσίων υπαλλήλων και εκπαιδευτικών και την επαναφορά της ποινής του θανάτου, απομακρύνεται από το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο. Η Τουρκία έχει χάσει το ευρωπαϊκό της όνειρο. Πολιτικά και αξιακά η Τουρκία απομακρύνεται από την Ευρώπη.

Η έκθεση της κυρίας Piri είναι μια ισορροπημένη έκθεση που καταγράφει την πραγματικότητα στην Τουρκία σήμερα. Εμείς θέλουμε να συνεχιστεί ο διάλογος, αυτό κάνουμε και ως Μικτή Διακοινοβουλευτική Επιτροπή Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας, και γι' αυτόν τον λόγο θα υπερψηφίσουμε την έκθεση.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kati Piri! Ich glaube, wir haben hier einen wirklich guten Bericht vorliegen, der nicht nur von Sachverstand zeugt, sondern auch ein bisschen von Empathie – etwas, was nicht bei jedem Bericht so nachzulesen ist.

Die gemeinsame Zukunft mit unserem Nachbarn, der Türkei, ist noch lange nicht beendet. Aber wir werden – wir haben die Gründe gehört –, wenn das Referendum jetzt in konkrete Gesetze umgesetzt wird, Beitrittsverhandlungen suspendieren bzw. dem Rat vorschlagen, sie auszusetzen. Denn es macht wirklich keinen Sinn mehr. Und, Graf Lambsdorff, es ist ja nicht so gewesen, dass die vor 18 Jahren begonnen haben zu verhandeln und es dann das Jahr für Jahr den Berg hinunterging. Gerade Herr Erdoğan war ja einer von denen, die uns mal vor längerer Zeit Hoffnung gemacht haben, dass es ein bisschen bergauf geht.

Es ist ehrlicher, diese Verhandlungen zu unterbrechen oder auszusetzen, und es ist wichtig, weil es auch anderen zeigt, dass man sich entscheiden muss, wohin man möchte. Man kann nicht eine Tür zuhalten und ständig rufen: „Lasst mich rein!“ Es gibt diese Entscheidungsnotwendigkeit.

Es ist aber genauso wichtig, dass unsere Freunde wissen, dass wir sie nicht im Stich lassen. Und unsere Freunde sind diejenigen, die eine andere Türkei haben wollen, die Demokratie und Gewaltenteilung haben wollen, für die Rechtsstaatlichkeit wichtig ist und bürgerliche Freiheiten erst recht. Die Oppositionsparteien, die Journalisten, die Professoren, die vielen jungen Menschen in der Zivilgesellschaft, die in der Türkei oder zum Teil auch in unseren Städten leben, werden wir auch in Zukunft unterstützen. Und es werden konkrete Vorschläge gemacht. Wenn wir die Verhandlungen aussetzen, dann müssen wir eben auch sehen, dass die Heranführungsmittel dafür verwendet werden, dass die Zivilgesellschaft und die Flüchtlinge in der Türkei, aber auch andere Menschen durch Erasmus+, durch andere Dinge zueinander geführt werden.

Wer nicht unsere Freunde sind, muss auch klar sein. Es ist einmal diese Regierung, und es sind zum anderen diejenigen, die putschen oder die Terror ausüben. Es gibt keine guten und keine schlechten ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Madam President, this is by far Parliament's most critical report on Turkey that I have ever seen and it is wholly deserved. Far from dismantling the Turkish deep state and the pursuit of democracy, Erdogan has instead replaced one authoritarian regime with another.

After years of increasing his power base, he has now fully cemented his, and the AK Party's, dominant role across the whole of the Turkish state. Having purged public institutions and silenced the media under the pretext of responding to the attempted coup last year, the referendum this year has now confirmed constitutional changes that ensure that President Erdogan is soon to assume his much-coveted sultanesque role.

Turkey, as a NATO state and EU candidate country, however, is too important and too close to Europe to simply ignore. Difficult choices now lie ahead of us as to how to adapt the EU's relationship with Turkey in the future, but we should take care to ensure that those choices are not dictated purely by necessity, rather than by our common values. I hope, above all, to see a solution to end Turkey's military occupation of Cyprus very soon.

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

James Carver (EFDD), blue-card question. – Thank you, Charles, for taking my blue card. This isn't a personal dig at you, but do you understand my frustration that your party, the British Conservative Party, sits in the same pan-European group, the ACRE, as Erdogan's AKP party? Do you think that is an extremely difficult position for your party, and would you welcome their withdrawal from it?

Charles Tannock (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – Well, thank you for reminding me of that rather unfortunate fact, Mr Carver. It is extremely difficult for me, as somebody critical of AK and what it has been up to in Turkey, so I would call upon the Conservative Party leadership – I am not part of the leadership – to expel the AK Party as soon as possible.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Madam President, for the past years the progress report has become a reflection of regress of the rule of law and of democracy. This regress weighs on the people of Turkey as well as on our relationship. Our group, and this Parliament, have been consistent. We supported accession as we believed it would serve the rights and the freedoms of the people in Turkey. We urged the freezing of negotiations last year after the massive response to the failed coup attempt, however despicable that attempt was. Yes, perpetrators should be held to account, but with fair trial and due process.

The package of constitutional amendments, if implemented unchanged, would *de facto* put an end to the accession process and negotiations. Still, we do not want to slam the door in the faces of the population of Turkey and we insist that any form of a future relation between the EU and Turkey cannot be transactional only, focused on trade security, asylum and migration, but will have to be deeply rooted in the rule of law and respect for human rights.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δώδεκα χρόνια διαρκούν οι ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις της Τουρκίας. Επί δώδεκα χρόνια, η Τουρκία υποκρίνεται ότι είναι διατεθειμένη να συμμορφωθεί προς τους ευρωπαϊκούς κανόνες, ώστε να καταστεί μέλος της Ένωσης και η Ευρώπη υποκρίνεται ότι την πιστεύει. Στην πράξη, το τουρκικό καθεστώς καθίσταται ολοένα και πιο αυταρχικό στο εσωτερικό του, ολοένα και πιο επιθετικό απέναντι στις γειτονικές χώρες. Οι πραγματικότητες αυτές αποτυπώνονται στην έκθεση την οποία συζητούμε σήμερα, αλλά δυστυχώς αυτή καταλήγει σε ανακόλουθα συμπεράσματα, όπως παραδείγματος χάριν ότι πρέπει να αναβαθμιστεί η τελωνειακή ένωση των δύο πλευρών ή ότι πρέπει να υπάρξει απελευθέρωση του καθεστώτος θεωρήσεων εισόδου για Τούρκους πολίτες στο ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος. Εάν δεν απαλειφθούν οι συγκεκριμένες αναφορές, εμείς δεν είμαστε διατεθειμένοι να υπερψηφίσουμε την έκθεση αυτή.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 162 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού))

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Am înțeles problemele și cred că, din raport, rezultă foarte bine ce ați spus dumneavoastră, dar solicitarea de a închide total dialogul și uniunea vamală despre care ați vorbit credeți că aduce pentru cetățenii turci o situație mai bună decât este acum? Credeți acest lucru? Pentru că, în țara mea, există cetățeni turci căroră, din păcate, li se iau pașapoartele și nu mai pot să fie protejați într-o țară din Uniunea Europeană.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL), *απάντηση «γαλάζια κάρτα»*. – Η Τουρκία, κυρία συνάδελφε, αρνείται να συμμορφωθεί προς το καθεστώς τελωνειακής ένωσης και προς τις υποχρεώσεις της, τις οποίες ανέλαβε βάσει των προηγούμενων συμφωνιών της με την Ένωση. Με ποια λογική θα μπορούσε τώρα να αναβαθμιστεί αυτό το καθεστώς, το οποίο η ίδια η Τουρκία δεν σέβεται; Είναι εντελώς ανακόλουθο και επαναλαμβάνω ότι δεν είμαστε διατεθειμένοι να υπερψηφίσουμε κάτι τέτοιο.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the report we are going to adopt tomorrow, which is comprehensive and balanced, calls for the suspension of accession negotiations if the constitutional reform package is implemented unchanged.

Suspension would be bad news for those like me in the European Union and Turkey who would like to see Turkey become a Member State in the near future. We would have preferred to talk about freezing the negotiations instead of suspension, but if we want to see the glass half full, this warning also leaves some room for hope, the hope that the Turkish Government changes its course and goes back to where it should never have departed from: the defence of democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

It is useless to keep pretending that you can negotiate while there are over 100 journalists and over a dozen Kurdish mayors and some MPs in jail, when there has been a huge collective dismissal of civil servants and when many media have been closed down. But if we cannot have negotiations, let's at least keep the door open to dialogue.

James Carver (EFDD). – Madam President, until very recently Turkey, an important NATO ally, was firmly on the path to EU accession, and in this very Chamber speakers praised President Erdoğan's new Turkey. However, since then, Turkey's accession to the European Union, and indeed their commitment to NATO, now both seem questionable. Despite failing to uphold recent nature commitments, citing financial pressure, Turkey has since funded the deployment of 3 000 troops to Qatar at a time of heightened tension across the Gulf. Perhaps symbolic of this change in Turkey's path was instruction to chisel out the poignant words of Atatürk carved into a stone WWI memorial at Gallipoli which I now quote 'Those heroes who shed their blood and lost their lives you are now lying in the soil of a friendly country. Therefore, rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehments to us, where they lie side by side here in this country of ours. You, the mothers who sent their sons from faraway countries, wipe away your tears your sons are now lying in our bosom and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land they have become our sons as well'. How Turkey has changed.

(The President interrupts the speaker)

The desecration of this moving epitaph leads many to suggest this is a further sign of the cultural shift taking place in Ankara. It seems to me that regrettably Turkey, under Erdoğan, is turning its back on secularism.

I call on this House to acknowledge what we have long argued: Turkey is incompatible with EU membership. This report must go further and call for an end to this illusion once and for all. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk must be turning in his grave.

Mario Borghesio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, una breve riflessione rivolta alla relatrice di questa relazione *soft* sulla situazione della Turchia. Supponiamo per assurdo che questo dibattito avvenisse a Turchia già entrata: noi saremmo confinanti con Siria, Iraq e Iran. Supponiamo che alcuni degli oratori che sono intervenuti con toni più critici avessero detto queste cose con la Turchia già in Europa: sarebbero già pronti i mandati di cattura europei da parte dei pubblici ministeri di Istanbul o di Ankara.

Riflettiamo su questo, magari pensando anche al fatto che ieri abbiamo ricordato i valori a cui si ispirava Simone Veil. Cosa direbbe Simone Veil a sentire tutti questi entusiasti della prosecuzione dei rapporti con la Turchia? È una battaglia di libertà quella che si deve combattere nella decisione se proseguire o, come diciamo noi, interrompere definitivamente questi rapporti per i motivi che sono elencati nella stessa relazione.

Io però oggi ho il dovere morale di ricordare un grande combattente di libertà morto poche ore fa in Sardegna, nella sua Sardegna: Doddore Meloni, un combattente di libertà. Vedete, lo Stato italiano, che spesso è molto debole con i veri delinquenti, è stato ossessivamente severo verso questo obiettore fiscale, leader della battaglia d'indipendenza della Sardegna, che io intendo onorare e ricordare debitamente.

È stato un uomo onesto, limpido, un poeta dalla politica, e questa Europa che dovrebbe essere – come egli sperava e pensava, come noi – un'Europa dei popoli, delle regioni e anche delle nazioni, naturalmente, un'Europa che dovrebbe essere un'Europa delle libertà, non dovrebbe consentire l'incarcerazione di persone solo per aver sognato la libertà della propria terra. Onore a questo patriota, e ricordiamo alla Sardegna di essere fiera di questo alfiere della libertà, figlio di una terra che vuole essere libera, disinteressato e limpido lottatore per l'indipendenza dell'isola, di questa bella Sardegna, che voglio ricordare.

Quindi stiamo fuori, teniamo fuori la Turchia e questi controvalori che sono l'esatta negazione di quello a cui aspirano questi patrioti, queste persone che esaltano con il loro esempio l'attaccamento alla propria terra, alla propria libertà. Viva la libertà della Sardegna, no alla Turchia in Europa, mai la Turchia in Europa!

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση για την Τουρκία αντανάκλα την όξυνση των αντιθέσεων Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και τουρκικής αστικής τάξης, σε μια περιοχή όπου αναδιατάσσονται δυνάμεις, μαίνονται ιμπεριαλιστικοί ανταγωνισμοί για τις αγορές, την ενέργεια, τους δρόμους μεταφοράς της, στους οποίους διεκδικεί αναβαθμισμένο ρόλο η αστική τάξη της Τουρκίας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιδιώκει τη συνέχιση της έντονης παρέμβασής της για τα συμφέροντα των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων στην περιοχή.

Η έκθεση υποδεικνύει πάγωμα της ένταξης, επικαλούμενη υπαρκτές επικίνδυνες απειλές και παραβιάσεις κατά γειτονικών χωρών, όπως η Κύπρος, η Ελλάδα, καθώς και την καταπάτηση των δικαιωμάτων του ελληνικού λαού. Ταυτόχρονα, όμως, διατηρεί ανοιχτή την προοπτική της ενταξιακής διαδικασίας, προωθεί την αναβάθμιση της τελωνειακής ένωσης, την υλοποίηση της απaráδεκτης συμφωνίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας για τους πρόσφυγες, τη συνεργασία για δήθεν καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας.

Οι λαοί πρέπει να συντονίσουν και να οργανώσουν την αυτοτελή πάλη τους έξω και ενάντια στους ανταγωνισμούς και στις ιμπεριαλιστικές συμμαχίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των αστικών τάξεων, να απορρίψουν το δηλητήριο του εθνικισμού, εκφράζοντας την αλληλεγγύη τους στον δοκιμαζόμενο τουρκικό λαό.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Dank u wel, mevrouw de voorzitter, en ook dank aan Kati Piri voor het verslag. Het is al door velen gezegd, maar ik denk dat het feit dat opschorting van de onderhandelingen voor een heel grote meerderheid van dit huis geen taboe meer is, een grote stap vooruit is. Want de situatie in Turkije stemt nu eenmaal niet positief en gaat op een heleboel terreinen de verkeerde kant op.

Toch stelt het verslag nog wel wat voorwaarden en mitsen en maren voordat tot die opschorting mogelijk over kan worden gegaan en ik denk persoonlijk dat er nu al redenen zijn om naar zo'n opschorting te kijken. Ik noem u één voorbeeld, want mijn spreektijd is beperkt. En dat is de manier waarop Turkije al heel lang omgaat met zijn minderheden, zoals Arameeërs. Voor de genocide van 1915 — en ik gebruik het woord heel erg bewust — waren er één miljoen Aramese christenen in de regio, 40 jaar geleden nog 70 000 in Oost-Turkije. En nu nog maar 3 000: 20 000 in Istanboel, maar 3 000 in het oosten, de facto in een dorp of zeven-acht. En juist in die regio heeft Turkije onlangs 50 kerken geconfisqueerd.

Ik sluit af, mevrouw de voorzitter. Maar daarmee lijkt Turkije de strategie van het systematisch wegpesten van christenen te vervolgen. Ik vraag de Commissie om dat in elk geval expliciet aan te kaarten.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα παραβιάζονται συστηματικά στην Τουρκία. Πολλές χιλιάδες πολιτών έχουν χάσει τη δουλειά τους ή έχουν φυλακιστεί, χωρίς να υπάρχουν ουσιαστικές αποδείξεις εναντίον τους. Το πρόσφατο δημοψήφισμα και οι συνταγματικές αλλαγές που απορρέουν από αυτό ευτελίζουν τη δημοκρατική λειτουργία και την αρχή διάκρισης των εξουσιών.

Η Τουρκία προκαλεί, σε καθημερινή βάση, με παραβιάσεις του ελληνικού εναέριου χώρου και των χωρικών υδάτων. Επίσης, ανησυχία προκαλεί η απουσία σεβασμού μνημείων παγκόσμιας κληρονομιάς, όπως είναι η Αγία Σοφία. Χθες, ο κύριος Çavuşoğlu δήλωσε, ενώ γίνονται ύστατες προσπάθειες επίλυσης του Κυπριακού, ότι η Τουρκία επιθυμεί να διατηρήσει τον στρατό κατοχής για να έχει δικαίωμα επέμβασης. Ο κύριος Çavuşoğlu μάλλον θέλει να ξεχάσει ότι η Κύπρος είναι μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Χαίρομαι γιατί το δημοψήφισμα είναι μια απάντηση στην επιθετικότητα της Τουρκίας και της κυβέρνησης Erdoğan και παράλληλα μήνυμα στήριξης στον δοκιμαζόμενο τουρκικό λαό, στους δημοκράτες πολίτες, οι οποίοι, όπως και οι υπόλοιποι λαοί της περιοχής, θέλουν να ζήσουν με ειρήνη και ευημερία.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru formand! Når vi står her i dag og ser tilbage på den udvikling, der har været i Tyrkiet, står det fuldstændigt lysende klart, at Erdogan meget kløgtigt har brugt forhandlingerne om EU-medlemskab som et middel til at svække de kemalistiske institutioner i Tyrkiet, der i næsten hundrede år nåede at gøre Tyrkiet til et af de mest velstående, frie og demokratiske muslimske lande i verden. Når vi står her og ser tilbage, må vi samtidigt konstatere, at det Tyrkiet, vi ser i dag, er på vej i den helt forkerte retning. Masseanholdelser, drab, tortur, mord, fyringer fra det offentlige statsapparat er blevet hverdag i et land, der befinder sig i en permanent undtagelsestilstand, og hvor man lige har gennemført en forfatningsreform, som er alt andet end demokratisk. Derfor er tiden inde til nu, at vi ikke bare fryser, men afslutter optagelsesforhandlingerne med Tyrkiet. Tyrkiet har aldrig været og bliver aldrig et land, der er egnet til et medlemskab af Den Europæiske Union.

Nedzhmi Ali (ALDE). – Madam President, concerning the 2016 report on Turkey, we can underline several developments which play a significant role in EU-Turkey relations: the coup attempt, the measures taken under the state of emergency, the delayed process of EU accession negotiations and the outcome of the referendum at the beginning of 2017. Despite making conditions for a formal suspension of the negotiation process, the report invites the Commission, the Member States and Turkey to hold an open and honest dialogue and discussion on all areas of mutual interest.

Several important issues for the reinvigoration of the accession process could be underlined. There are areas in which both sides are interested in continuing to work: counter-terrorism, migration, energy, the economy and trade. Due to the geopolitical challenges, it is necessary for the EU and Turkey to undertake measures for closer cooperation and coordination of their foreign policy activities; a structured and more frequent high-level dialogue on key thematic issues should be supported as well. In order to enhance relations in the future, we should continue to work closely on the upgrading of the customs union, visa liberalisation, the continuation of the EU's long-term sustainment of refugees in Turkey. Stronger cooperation between Europol and Turkish law enforcement agencies is of the utmost importance.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Als mein Freund Selahattin Demirtaş verhaftet wurde, haben alle hier im Haus gesagt: Opposition ist kein Verbrechen. Als immer mehr Journalisten in der Türkei verhaftet worden sind, haben wir gesagt: Journalismus, auch kritischer Journalismus, ist kein Verbrechen. Heute müssen wir endlich auch einmal sagen, dass in einer Schule zu arbeiten oder an einer Universität zu lehren, die zur sogenannten Gülen-Bewegung gehört, kein Verbrechen ist. Und ich denke, dass das Europäische Parlament unbedingt die Idee der kollektiven Schuld und die kollektive Verfolgung, die jetzt eben die Menschen, die zur Gülen-Bewegung gezählt werden, trifft, zurückweisen muss.

Wir haben deshalb dazu einen Änderungsantrag gemacht. Mir ist das – als deutscher Abgeordneter im Europäischen Parlament – ein besonderes Anliegen, weil mein Land ja diese böse Erfahrung über Europa gebracht hat, die gezeigt hat, was das ist, wenn es zu so einer kollektiven Verfolgung kommt. Ich glaube, dass wir dafür sorgen müssen, dass keine Auslieferungen stattfinden – nur mit der Begründung, jemand gehöre zur Gülen-Bewegung. Ich glaube, dass der Europäische Menschenrechtsgerichtshof endlich Pilotverfahren ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Eine spannende Debatte über den Beitritt der Türkei zur EU. Die CDU – Frau Sommer – hat gesprochen und gesagt: Das sind Scheinverhandlungen, sie können nicht zum Beitritt führen, wir müssen aus unserem Reden endlich Konsequenzen ziehen, und die Konsequenzen ziehen heißt: Verhandlungen suspendieren, nicht abbrechen. Herr Fleckenstein für die SPD ist natürlich auch nur für die Suspendierung der Verhandlungen, und das auch nicht wegen des Referendums in der Türkei für die islamische Diktatur, sondern erst wenn dieses Referendum umgesetzt wird.

Die spannende Frage, Graf Lambsdorff, bleibt: Was werden Sie tun? Denn Sie haben gesagt: „Machen wir den Dialog ehrlich. Ja zum Dialog und nein zum Beitritt.“ Ich habe nicht gehört „Abbruch der Verhandlungen“. Aber Sie haben morgen die Gelegenheit, das zu klären. Mein Änderungsantrag trägt die Nummer 2. Es ist eine namentliche Abstimmung, und Sie können dort dem Abbruch der Verhandlungen so zustimmen, dass wir sehen können, dass Sie das auch tatsächlich meinen.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin! Und täglich grüßt das Murmeltier hier im Haus. Es ist, glaube ich, das dritte oder vierte Mal schon, seit ich hier im Haus sitze, dass wir dieses Thema behandeln. Ich sage eines ganz klar: Die Türkei ist schlicht kein europäischer Staat, die Türkei ist schlicht kein demokratischer Staat. Denn wir wissen, dass Erdoğan seit Juli 2016 dieses Land mittels Notstandsdekreten regiert. Erdoğan plant sogar – ganz offen, ohne Umschweife und ohne das verdecken zu wollen – die Einführung der Todesstrafe. Wie kann es sein, dass man dann in diesem Bericht davon ausgeht, dass man diese türkische Verwaltung noch auf europäischen Standard bringen könnte? Wie kann es sein, dass diese Türkei noch immer den Beitrittsstatus genießt? Das ist ein Beitrittskandidat zu diesem Klub, zur Europäischen Union, der auf Zypern einen Teil dieses Landes oder einen Teil eines Mitgliedsstaats mit militärischen Mitteln besetzt. Und nach wie vor hat dieses Land den Beitrittsstatus!

Da werden in fünf Jahren 4,4 Mrd. EUR an Heranführungshilfe an die Türkei bezahlt. Ich frage mich: Was wird da an wen herangeführt? Was passiert eigentlich mit diesem Steuergeld? Sechs Milliarden Euro zahlen wir für diesen vermeintlich so guten Flüchtlingsdeal. Was passiert mit diesem europäischen Steuergeld?

Und es bleibt für mich die Frage doch stehen: Wer betreibt nach wie vor so massiv diesen Beitrittsstatus? Da muss es ganz einflussreiche Kreise geben, die diese Türkei nach wie vor in der Union sehen wollen.

Graf Lambsdorff hat es heute gesagt: Einfrieren der Beitrittsverhandlungen. Was heißt das? Das heißt ja nichts anderes, als dass ich das, was ich einfriere, auch wieder auftauen kann. Wir wollen nichts auftauen. Die Türkei kann keinen Beitrittsstatus mehr haben, es muss beendet werden. Das heißt aber auf der anderen Seite nicht, dass wir jeglichen Dialog mit der Türkei verhindern wollen. Nein, ganz im Gegenteil! Aber klar muss sein – und seien Sie so ehrlich: Es kann keinen Beitrittsstatus für diese Türkei in der Europäischen Union geben.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident, wertee Kollegen! Der Bericht liest sich also wie eine Anklageschrift, und ich verstehe in diesem Hause nicht, warum man überhaupt noch über den Beitritt zur EU debattieren will und die Türen nicht schließen möchte. Was muss eigentlich mit der Türkei noch geschehen? Wir alle wissen doch, dass die Türken Orientalen sind. Sie sind eben keine Europäer. Und im Orient hat man eben andere Vorstellungen von Genderpolitik, von Menschenrechten, von Tierschutz, von Religion als wir Europäer.

Daher finde ich das schon etwas anmaßend, Frau Sommer, wenn Sie hier die Arroganz des Hauses ausdrücken und wortwörtlich sagen, wir hätten der Bevölkerung endlich mal erklären können, was für ihr Land gut ist und was nicht gut ist. Wollen Sie ihnen vorschreiben, was sie tun sollen? Glauben Sie, die Türken sind alle dumm? Nein, halten wir uns raus aus der innenpolitischen Einmischung und sagen wir den Türken klar: Sie haben in Europa nichts verloren, sie sollen ihre Truppen aus Zypern abziehen und die Souveränitätsrechte ihrer Nachbarstaaten akzeptieren! Was sie in der Türkei machen, geht uns nichts an.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, alarming reports are reaching us from the Syriac Assyrians of Tur Abdin in South-East Turkey. They are asking the world to listen to their plight. Their churches, monasteries and cemeteries have been confiscated by the state.

Before today's debate, Kuryakos Ergun, director of the Mor Gabriel Monastery Foundation, sent me the following statement, and I quote: 'While the Turkish Government should protect our roots and our religion, it is instead threatening our existence by grabbing our holy buildings and making us believe that Christianity no longer has a place in Turkey.'

The European Union must act on behalf of the Syriac Assyrians of Tur Abdin and return to them what is rightfully theirs. If Turkey fails to do so, the EU should not freeze negotiations of EU membership but rather consider closing them indefinitely.

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το ερώτημα θα πρέπει να είναι: «τι Ευρώπη πραγματικά θέλουμε να έχουμε»; Δυστυχώς όμως δεν μαθαίνουμε από τα τραγικά μας λάθη. «Θέλουμε την Ευρώπη που οι πολιτικές της θα στηρίζονται σε αρχές και αξίες ή την Ευρώπη που οι πολιτικές της θα στηρίζονται αποκλειστικά και μόνο στα οικονομικά συμφέροντα»; Είναι τουλάχιστον υποκριτικό αλλά και καταστροφικό να μιλά κανείς για την αναβάθμιση της σχέσης Τουρκίας-Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης τη στιγμή που βλέπουμε τις απαράδεκτες συμπεριφορές της Τουρκίας και την Επιτροπή να προσποιείται ότι δεν συμβαίνει τίποτα.

Γνωρίζω πολύ καλά ότι, όταν κάνεις μια συμφωνία, θα πρέπει να κερδίζουν και τα δύο μέρη και θα πρέπει να παίρνεις ανταλλάγματα. Διασφαλίσαμε την αποχώρηση των κατοχικών στρατευμάτων από κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης; Διασφαλίσαμε την επιστροφή των προσφύγων και την εξακρίβωση της τύχης των αγνοουμένων στην Κύπρο; Διασφαλίσαμε τη δημιουργία συνθηκών δημοκρατίας στην ίδια την Τουρκία όπου όσοι σκέφτονται διαφορετικά φυλακίζονται; Τίποτε από αυτά δεν έχει διασφαλιστεί, αντίθετα γίνονται εκπτώσεις που προσβάλλουν τα ευρωπαϊκά ιδεώδη και τους λαούς της Ευρώπης. Ας σταματήσετε να πριμοδοτείτε τις λογικές του Erdoğan και ας επενδύσει η Ευρώπη στην προοπτική μιας δημοκρατικής Τουρκίας.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πόσο αντιδημοκρατική χώρα είναι η Τουρκία το γνωρίζετε όλοι σας, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι. Ωστόσο, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στηρίζει μια αντιδημοκρατική λύση του Κυπριακού, η οποία παραβιάζει τις αρχές και τις αξίες της και τον Χάρτη των Δικαιωμάτων του Ανθρώπου, δίνοντας συνεχώς άλλοθι στην Τουρκία· γιατί μόνο μια τέτοια λύση αποδέχεται η Τουρκία για το Κυπριακό.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κύριε Επίτροπε, εσείς θα αποδεχόσασταν ένα ρατσιστικό πολιτειακό σύστημα, με πολίτες χωρίς ανθρώπινα και πολιτικά δικαιώματα; Δέχεστε να δοθούν οι ευρωπαϊκές ελευθερίες στους Τούρκους πολίτες ειδικά για την Κύπρο; Και τότε, γιατί όχι για όλη την Ένωση; Δέχεστε να γίνει η Κύπρος επαρχία της Τουρκίας; Δέχεστε εγγυήσεις ξένων χωρών σε κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης; Δέχεστε λύση ασύμβατη με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο και τον Χάρτη των Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων; Δέχεστε να ελέγχει η Άγκυρα, μέσω του βέτο των εποίκων, τη στάση της Κύπρου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Δέχεστε το 18 % του πληθυσμού να ελέγχει το 82 %; Αν εσείς δέχεστε, ο κυπριακός λαός δεν θα δεχθεί. Μην εκπλαγείτε από ένα νέο βροντερό «όχι» σε ένα αντιδημοκρατικό σχέδιο. Και τότε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν θα είναι άμοιρη ευθυνών.

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, voilà trente ans que la Turquie a déposé sa candidature à l'Union européenne et douze ans que le processus d'adhésion a commencé.

Quand l'Union européenne cessera-t-elle donc cette mascarade qui déshonore l'Europe autant qu'elle humilie le peuple turc? Faut-il encore et encore marteler que, par sa géographie, sa culture, sa religion, sa langue et son histoire, la Turquie ne peut prétendre être européenne? Ce n'est pas une injure de le dire, c'est un fait que Bruxelles refuse d'admettre.

En voulant faire de Sainte-Sophie une mosquée, le président turc Erdoğan se pose en héritier de l'Empire ottoman, empire dont les conquêtes armées ont gravement mis en péril notre civilisation européenne et chrétienne. Souvenez-vous de Lépante et de Vienne.

À l'heure où les provocations et les meetings de M. Erdoğan, jusque dans cette ville de Strasbourg, ne suscitent que de molles protestations de la part de l'Union européenne, à l'heure où les communautés chrétiennes sont expropriées en Turquie, à l'heure où des partis politiques affiliés au pouvoir turc voient le jour aux Pays-Bas, en Bulgarie, en Allemagne, en Autriche et même en France, ayez enfin le courage de mettre un terme définitif à ces absurdes négociations.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, απορώ σε τι λήθαργο έχει πέσει η Ένωση που ερωτοτροπεί πολιτικά ακόμη με την Τουρκία του Erdoğan. Δεξιοί, νεοφιλελεύθεροι και αριστεροί διεθνιστές ξεχνούν αιώνες τουρκικής θηριωδίας, με επεκτατικούς πολέμους, καταστροφές μνημείων πολιτισμού, βίαιους εξισλαμισμούς, παιδομαζώματα, σκληροπάχαρα και γενοκτονίες Χριστιανών, Ποντίων, Αρμενίων και Ασυροχαλδαίων.

Κάποιοι ονειρεύονται μια δυτικότροπη Τουρκία και συνομιλούν με τον ισλαμιστή Erdoğan, που υποστηρίζει το ISIS, κάνει δουλεμπόριο Χριστιανών, Γιεζίντι και Σύρων Σιτών, εμπορεύεται λαθραίο πετρέλαιο, ναρκωτικά και κλεμμένους αρχαιολογικούς θησαυρούς. Επιβάλλει δε μια ισλαμική τρομοκρατία, με πογκρόμ διώξεων και φυλακίσεων πολιτικών αντιπάλων, δημοσιογράφων, δικαστικών και στρατιωτικών. Σας διαφεύγουν ίσως οι δηλώσεις του Erdoğan για τους Ολλανδούς, ότι είναι ναζί και φασίστες.

Δεν προσβλέπω βέβαια στη στήριξη πολιτικών της συκοφαντίας και της υποκρισίας, ούτε περιμένω να με καταλάβουν οι Βορειοδυτικοευρωπαίοι. Ελλαδίτες όμως και Ελληνοκύπριοι γνωρίζουμε καλά τι εστί Τούρκος. Εγώ προσωπικά δεν προτίθεμαι να γίνω ραγιάς κανενός, ούτε Ευρωπαίου ούτε Τούρκου.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, gospodine povjereniče, dugotrajno izvanredno stanje u Turskoj negativno je utjecalo na temeljna ljudska prava i slobode, prava vjerskih i etničkih manjina, slobodu vjeroispovijesti, slobodu udruživanja i mirnog prosvjedovanja, a nedavno održani referendum o promjeni ustava te u konačnici njegova eventualna provedba u obliku u kakvom je predložena može ugroziti razdiobu vlasti te načela provjere i ravnoteže.

Sve navedeno ključni su elementi ne samo za uspješan nastavak pregovora za članstvo u Europskoj uniji već za iskreno partnerstvo s Europskom unijom, zasnovano na zdravim temeljima i uzajamnom povjerenju. Međutim, ova rasprava, ali i sutrašnje usvajanje rezolucije nema za cilj prekidanje veza i suradnje s Turskom, već ima za cilj kao znak potpore pomoći u pronalaženju rješenja i modela u ostvarivanju transformacije Turske u demokratsko, inkluzivno i tolerantno društvo te nastavak dijaloga i suradnje na visokoj razini s Europskom unijom na ključnim područjima od zajedničkog interesa, a to su borba protiv terorizma, migracije i sigurnost.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, en primer lugar lo que querría hacer es felicitar y reconocer el trabajo que ha hecho la ponente —un año más—, Kati Piri, en este informe sobre Turquía y enviar cuatro mensajes, cuatro ideas.

Uno: es evidente que Turquía vive años convulsos, tiempos muy convulsos, desde el terrible golpe de Estado a la continuidad en el retroceso de los derechos democráticos en el país a la consolidación de ese retroceso democrático en un referéndum muy polarizante sobre una situación extrema; dos: el Parlamento Europeo envía este mensaje con este informe: la Unión Europea debe de reconsiderar la forma con la que coopera con Turquía, sobre todo porque necesitamos una forma más influyente, más influyente; tres: seguimos muy de cerca lo que pasa en el país: la marcha por la justicia, la voluntad, desde la unidad, de buena parte de la oposición de libertad, de reclamar libertad de presos y libertad de políticos; y cuatro: el momento es ahora, con un diálogo de altísimo nivel entre la Comisión Europea y Turquía que debe forjar una nueva relación de cooperación y diálogo, pero aparcando, de una vez por todas, el «business as usual».

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми Комисар Хан, уважаеми колеги, докладът на колегата Пири е критичен, което значи, че до голяма степен е добър. За пръв път в тази зала се чуват толкова критични думи и те имат своето основание. Има малка ирония в това, че три години повтарям тези думи в тази зала и най-после започнаха да се чуват. Както и да е, по-добре късно отколкото никога.

Факт е, нещата, изброени в доклада, са верни: Турция не е демократична държава в момента, Турция на Ердоган. Ердоган нарушава човешките права, нарушава правата на журналистите, подкрепя Ислямска държава в Сирия и в Ирак, воюва незаконно на тези територии и нека добавя – не само това. Ердоган се намесва през фалшиви партии в редица държави – членки на Европейския съюз, между които е и моята родина България.

На тези неща трябва да бъде сложен край. Така не може да се продължава. Тази Турция – Турция на Ердоган – продължава да окупира Кипър и да държи 30-хилядна окупационна армия, и да пречи на сближаването и на обединението на Кипър, като не иска да изтегли своите войски оттам. Така че, уважаеми колеги, хубаво е тези неща да се осъзнават колкото може по-бързо – по-добре. Хубаво е да забравим за политическата коректност и да казваме нещата каквито са.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – К. Πρόεδρε, εδώ και μια εβδομάδα ο Πρόεδρος της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, Πρόεδρος ευρωπαϊκής χώρας, χώρας μέλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, δίνει τον υπέρ πάντων αγώνα, τη μάχη απέναντι στο Σινικό Τείχος της τουρκικής αδιαλλαξίας, για να απαλλάξει χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης από κατοχικά στρατεύματα, από απαράδεκτες εγγυήσεις, για να απαλλάξει τον τόπο του από την κατοχή. Σ' αυτή την προσπάθεια θεωρούμε ότι είναι μείζονος σημασίας η στήριξη και η υποστήριξη που απαιτούμε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Σας καλώ όλους εσάς να συστρατευθείτε για να απαλλάξετε έδαφος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης από τα κατοχικά στρατεύματα, για να καμφθεί η τουρκική αδιαλλαξία. Μέχρι χθες ο κ. Çavuşoğlu τόνιζε με τρόπο προκλητικό, απαράδεκτο και προσβλητικό για την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ότι ο τουρκικός στρατός θα συνεχίζει να παραμένει στην Κύπρο. Είναι η ώρα να στείλουμε, αγαπητέ κ. Επίτροπε Nahm, ένα ξεκάθαρο και ισχυρό μήνυμα ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν μπορεί να δεχτεί κατοχικά στρατεύματα, ότι δεν μπορεί σε χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να υπάρχουν εγγυήσεις και να μην εφαρμόζονται οι τέσσερις βασικές ελευθερίες.

Θεωρώ δε απαράδεκτο να συζητούμε την αναβάθμιση της τελωνειακής ένωσης – ουσιαστικά μια επιβράβευση της Τουρκίας για όλα αυτά που κάνει στο εσωτερικό της αλλά και γι' αυτά που κάνει στην Κύπρο – όταν αυτή την τελωνειακή ένωση δεν την εφαρμόζει και δεν την υλοποιεί. Είναι απαράδεκτο, κ. Πρόεδρε, να λέμε ότι συνεχίζουμε να παρέχουμε ενταξιακή βοήθεια στην Τουρκία, όταν διαπράττει όλα αυτά τα εγκλήματα εις βάρος της Κύπρου.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – A repressão pelo regime de Erdogan, agravada desde o falhado golpe de Estado de 2016, viola em toda a linha os critérios de Copenhaga. A União Europeia tem de tirar consequências e não pode continuar negócios ilegais e imorais que usam refugiados como moeda de troca. As alterações à Constituição turca, votadas num referendo manipulado, violam o princípio da separação de poderes. Chegam-nos inúmeros relatos de violações dos direitos humanos, não só de organizações reconhecidas, mas de cidadãos desesperados que nos escrevem diretamente, desaparecimentos, demissões compulsivas, confisco de propriedade sem base judicial, censura dos *media*, presos políticos, tortura, ameaças de reintrodução da pena de morte.

A União Europeia tem, evidentemente, de continuar a dialogar e a relacionar-se com a Turquia, sua vizinha, incluindo para fazer cessar a divisão de Chipre, mas tem sobretudo que direcionar apoios para a sociedade civil turca que luta contra a repressão. Não há condições para continuarmos o processo de adesão da Turquia à União Europeia neste momento. Por isso apoio a proposta de suspender formalmente as negociações, com esperança, e desejo que a Turquia inverta a trajetória desastrosa em que foi embarcada pela avidez de poder de Erdogan.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – De un an de zile, peste 150 000 de oameni sunt dați afară din funcții în Turcia, peste 60 000 de oameni sunt arestați în Turcia, inclusiv judecători, profesori, activiști de drepturile omului, avocați, oameni de afaceri. Businessurile lor sunt confiscate. Turcia nu mai este un stat democratic, este un stat autocratic, este o dictatură în care numai Erdogan stabilește regulile și Turcia este poporul turc care astăzi este la închisoare. S-au dat afară – intelectualitatea turcă, cum se spune în Turcia, este toată la închisoare. Sunt victime, sunt torturați. Toți trebuie să luăm măsuri împotriva acestui lucru. Nu există că nu ne pasă ce se întâmplă în Turcia, ba da, ne pasă. Aș mai vrea să spun că amenințarea cu milionul de imigranți cărora le-ar da drumul în Europa este falsă. Sper că nimeni nu mai crede în asta. Niciodată nu va face asta Erdogan, pentru că îi va folosi ca să voteze pentru el, le dă cetățenie și-i va folosi în lupta împotriva kurzilor. Și ultimul lucru: în ianuarie anul acesta, a înființat o comisie specială de investigații care să se uite la plângerile depuse la CEDO. Deci blochează, practic, plângerile depuse la CEDO ale victimelor. Peste 120 de plângeri, niciuna soluționată până astăzi.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – |Pane předsedající, myslím, že je nutné turecké straně říci, že nesouhlasíme s tím, co se v jejich zemi děje. Měli bychom jim to říci osobně a jako členka delegace EU-Turecko nejsem spokojená s tím, že nemáme možnost Turecko navštívit a vyměnit si informace se svými kolegy a říci jim náš názor.

Není možné s Tureckem počítat jako s kandidátskou zemí na vstup do EU, to tady zaznívá ze všech stran. Proto zpráva Evropského parlamentu vyzývá k pozastavení přístupových jednání i předvstupní pomoci. Nikdy jsem nebyla pro plné členství, ale považovala jsem tuto možnost za přístup k dialogu, k reformám na turecké straně. A já se domnívám, že také naše zpráva by měla obsahovat výzvu k novému partnerství s Evropskou unií. Měl by to být signál těm, kteří se v Turecku nesmířili se současnou situací, těm, kteří dnes vyšli do poklidných protestů, jako například na pochod spravedlnosti z Ankarý do Istanbulu.

Eugen Freund (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank, Kati Piri! Gähnende Leere auf wunderschönen Stränden, Basare, in die sich kaum Besucher verirren, Hotels, die Angebote machen, mit denen sie kein Geld verdienen können – gestern Abend im Fernsehen. Die Türkei zahlt den Preis dafür, dass sie sich immer weiter von Europa und den europäischen Werten entfernt hat. Wir haben jahrelang die Hand ausgestreckt, von der anderen Seite ist immer öfter die Faust gezeigt worden.

Meine Damen und Herren, überlegen Sie doch einmal: Würden wir heute ein Land, das Journalisten, Richter, Lehrer und Oppositionelle einsperrt, das den Rechtsstaat quasi außer Kraft gesetzt hat, einladen, zu uns zu kommen? Aber reden müssen wir weiter, denn die geostrategische Lage der Türkei ist zu wichtig, und gut die Hälfte der Bevölkerung lehnt den gegenwärtigen Kurs der Regierung ab. Aber über einen EU-Beitritt verhandeln? Unter diesen Voraussetzungen sicher nicht!

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Das türkische Verfassungsreferendum hat mit einem knappen Ja geendet – einem sehr knappen Ja. Viele von uns hat sicherlich das Gefühl beschlichen, dass es dabei nicht mit rechten Dingen zugegangen sein mag. Aber können wir das beweisen?

Meine Damen und Herren, ja, inzwischen können wir es beweisen. Denn vor wenigen Tagen ist eine wissenschaftliche Untersuchung in einem referierten Fachjournal erschienen, das genau diese Art von statistischer Analyse der Wahlergebnisse gemacht hat, die zeigt: Hier wurde manipuliert. Hier zeigt sich eine auffällige Häufung von Wahlbezirken, die eine Wahlbeteiligung von fast 100 Prozent haben und gleichzeitig weit überdurchschnittliche Ja-Ergebnisse gezeigt haben. Hier wurde also statistisch nachgewiesen – mit einer Irrtumswahrscheinlichkeit von weniger als einem Promille –, dass das kein Zufall sein kann, dass hier offensichtlich Wahlurnen mit Ja-Stimmen vollgestopft worden sind.

Meine Damen und Herren, wir haben hier den rauchenden Colt in der Hand. Wir haben es gesehen, wir können es beweisen: Das Verfassungsreferendum in der Türkei wurde manipuliert. Diese Bemerkung fehlt leider in dem Bericht, den wir morgen verabschieden wollen.

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σας διαβάζω απόσπασμα από ένα βιβλίο: «Όμως τώρα, μετά τη δολοφονική απόπειρα, ήταν προφανές ότι δεν κινδύνευε μονάχα η εφημερίδα, το επάγγελμά μου, η ελευθερία, αλλά και η ζωή μου. Πέντε χρόνια και δέκα μήνες φυλάκιση λόγω διαρροής κρατικών μυστικών. Το δικαστήριο μου επέστρεψε το διαβατήριο την ίδια μέρα. Μήπως υπαινισσόταν “φύγε μακριά απ’ αυτή τη χώρα”; Θα ήθελα να απευθυνθώ σε όλους σας: Υποστηρίξτε τον αγώνα επιβίωσης που δίνουν οι δημοκρατικές δυνάμεις της Τουρκίας! Η Ευρώπη μπορεί να αγκαλιάσει τη μοναδική κοσμική δημοκρατία του ισλαμικού κόσμου και να νικήσει την ολοένα εξαπλούμενη ισλαμοφοβία». Αυτά γράφει ο Can Dündar, τέως αρχισυντάκτης της Cumhuriyet, κάτοικος Βερολίνου πια. Και θυμάμαι καθαρά τα λόγια του σε μια εκδήλωση που κάναμε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο: «Μην σταματήσετε την ενταξιακή πορεία της Τουρκίας. Μην κάνετε το καλύτερο δώρο στον Erdoğan».

Η Kati Piri πολύ σωστά συνδέει την ενταξιακή διαδικασία με τα κριτήρια της Επιτροπής της Βενετίας. Ας τα χρησιμοποιήσουμε όχι ως ευκαιρία για να κλείσουμε την πόρτα, αλλά για να πείσουμε ότι από τη μεριά μας είναι ανοιχτή, εάν και εφόσον φυσικά η Τουρκία αποδεχθεί ότι το κράτος δικαίου είναι αδιαπραγμάτευτο.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Dit Turkije-rapport is gitzwart. Maar we wisten wel dat dit er zou aankomen. Hoe vaak heb ik hier gewaarschuwd voor de autoritaire koers van dit regime en heb ik gezegd: “Dit Turkije hoort niet thuis in de Europese Unie, de toetredingsmiddelen mogen niet langer richting Erdogan vertrekken.” 640 miljoen EUR volgend jaar. Geld dat Erdogan investeert in rubberen kogels om de gay pride te beschieten, in inkt om de arrestatiebevelen voor leerkrachten en journalisten te ondertekenen, in bullebakken die Koerdische dorpen tot puin herleiden. Hoe leggen we aan onze burgers uit dat het minnetje op hun loonbrief het plusje is op Erdogans bankrekening? Het getalm van de Unie om te stoppen met de toetredingsonderhandelingen en -financiering speelt Erdogan in de kaart. Meer dan 200 journalisten in de cel. Duizenden academici, rechters en ambtenaren de laan uitgestuurd. Scholen en universiteiten gesloten... Zijn wij er nu echt nog altijd niet van overtuigd dat die koers haaks staat op alle EU-principes? Democratie is voor Erdogan een lastig spook uit het verleden dat hij probeert te verjagen met bruut geweld én met ons geld. Kies nu voor geloofwaardigheid en principes, en stop ermee!

Marju Lauristin (S&D). – Mr President, I will talk in a language the Presidency will understand without translation.

Ma tahaksin öelda seda, et tõepoolest on viimane aeg meil selgesti tunnistada, et Türgi veereb meie kõigi nähes totalitaarse diktatuuri poole, mis on väga hästi teadaolev olukord nii sakslastele kui ka meile, kes me tuleme Nõukogude Liidu alt. Panna silmad kinni ja öelda, et võib-olla kõik paraneb, ei ole enam kuidagimoodi õigustatud. Kati Piri raport on selles mõttes väga tõepärane, kuid me peame endale aru andma ka sellest, et need, keda me peame toetama, on tegelikud inimesed, kes kannatavad praegu. Peame toetama eriti neid Türgi kodanikke, kes on saanud praegu tulla ära, kes on põgenenud Türgist ja ootavad meie tuge ka siin selleks, et siin luua ja anda kuulda oma häält ning oma tunnistusi selle kohta, mis Türgis tegelikult toimub.

Ma väga loodan, et meie demokraatlik meedia, kelle suu ei ole kinni pandud, ja meie oma parlament, kes suudab neid asju arutada avalikult, annab selle võimaluse, et me saaksime korraldada kuulamise (kas AFETi ja LIBEga koos või mingil muul viisil), et saada tegelikku ja objektiivset ülevaadet sellest, mis Türgis tegelikult toimub, mis nende kohtuprotsessidega toimub, mis toimub Türgi meediaga ja kuidas me saaksime Türgiga edasi toimetada niiviisi, et me ei kaota dialoogi, kuid samas ei tee ka nägu, et midagi ei toimu.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση του 2016 για την Τουρκία συζητείται την ώρα που ο Υπουργός Εξωτερικών της Τουρκίας Çavuşoğlu δηλώνει προκλητικά στη Γενεύη ότι η Τουρκία δεν πρόκειται ποτέ να αποσύρει τα τουρκικά κατοχικά στρατεύματα από την Κύπρο. Ταυτόχρονα η Τουρκία συνεχίζει την παράνομη κατοχή του 37 % του εδάφους της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, καθώς και τις απειλές εντός της κυπριακής ΑΟΖ.

Συζητείται η έκθεση για την Τουρκία την ώρα που η Άγκυρα διατηρεί το *casus belli* κατά της Ελλάδος, την ώρα που Τουρκία παραβιάζει τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο και τα θαλάσσια χωρικά ύδατα της πατρίδος μου, την ώρα που η Τουρκία βεβηλώνει την Αγιά Σοφιά. Συζητείται η έκθεση την ώρα που η Τουρκία παραβιάζει τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και προβαίνει σε φυλακίσεις χιλιάδων αντιφρονούντων, την ώρα που η Τουρκία δολοφονεί τους Κούρδους, εισβάλλει στη Συρία και στο Ιράκ και στηρίζει το ISIS.

Απαιτείται λοιπόν, κύριε Πρόεδρε, η άμεση διακοπή των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων με την Τουρκία και η επιβολή κυρώσεων κατά του Erdoğan, διότι μόνο έτσι θα συνειδητοποιήσει τι πρέπει να πράξει στο μέλλον.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem se přihlásil o slovo, abych také podpořil zprávu, která je dneska předložena a o které zítra budeme hlasovat. Jsem také rád, že je věcná, kritická, že se nesnaží realitu přemalovávat na růžovo.

Já si myslím, že ta debata tady jasně ukázala, že absolutní většina poslanců vnímá to, že se Turecko vzdaluje od hodnot Evropy, od hodnot demokracie, právního státu, ochrany svobody, osob, tisku, politických konkurentů, a myslím si, že opravdu nastala doba, aby Evropská komise jasně řekla, že jednání s Tureckem se pouze nezmrazuje, ale zastavuje.

Myslím, že naši občané chtějí slyšet, že do budoucna nebudeme předstírat, že dále pokračuje proces přibližování Turecka k Evropské unii a že je zde nějaká šance, že by Turecko vstoupilo do Evropské unie. Občané chtějí slyšet pravdu, a ta je taková, že Turecko si vybralo jinou cestu. Přesto s Tureckem musíme mít spolupráci a musíme s ním komunikovat. Ale na jiné bázi než na falešné snaze, aby se Turecko stalo členem Evropské unie.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con le scelte politiche compiute nell'ultimo anno, la Turchia si allontana dall'adesione all'Unione europea. Il sostegno a favore della reintroduzione della pena di morte, ripetutamente dichiarato dal presidente turco, le misure sproporzionate adottate a seguito della dichiarazione dello stato di emergenza, che hanno colpito dissidenti e partiti politici d'opposizione, le gravi violazioni della libertà dei media, la revoca incostituzionale dell'immunità di un vasto numero di deputati, l'arresto e il licenziamento di oltre 4 000 giudici e pubblici ministeri, la mancanza di rispetto della libertà religiosa ci portano alla conclusione che in Turchia lo Stato di diritto è messo in discussione.

Tuttavia, l'Unione europea e la Turchia continuano ad avere interessi in comune in molti settori – lotta al terrorismo e crisi migratoria in primis – e la cooperazione in tali settori rappresenta un investimento importante per stabilità e sicurezza. Il dialogo e la collaborazione in questi settori devono continuare, ma a condizione che si rispettino gli impegni in materia di diritti e libertà fondamentali.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Mr President, as many speakers have already mentioned, the situation in terms of freedom, democracy and the rule of law in Turkey is getting worse, and it is hard to watch.

I want to draw your attention specifically to the situation of Christians. Even though the Turkish Government claims to have freedom of religion, on the contrary they have confiscated many churches and monasteries. Just recently they confiscated the buildings of Tur Abdin, giving them to the Turkish religious authority which takes care of mosques.

I call upon the Commission to protest against this and to urge the Turkish state to give these buildings back immediately. A country which does not respect its ethnic and religious minorities, and does not respect human dignity and freedom, has no place in the European Union.

Commissioner, I have to say you admitted that democracy and the rule of law in Turkey have been violated. These things are in the Copenhagen criteria. I therefore call upon you immediately to break off the EU accession talks with Turkey.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χαιρετίζουμε τις εκκλήσεις, που υπάρχουν στην έκθεση, προς την Τουρκία να ξεκινήσει την απόσυρση του κατοχικού στρατού από την Κύπρο, να στηρίξει το έργο της ΔΕΑ, να τερματίσει την πολιτική των εποικισμών, να εφαρμόσει το ψήφισμα 550 για την Αμμόχωστο και το συμπληρωματικό πρωτόκολλο, καθώς και να συμβάλει εποικοδομητικά στη λύση του Κυπριακού, στη βάση της διζωνικής δικαιοσύνης ομοσπονδίας με μία κυριαρχία, μία ιθαγένεια και μία διεθνή προσωπικότητα. Αναμένουμε όμως ενεργό στήριξη και καλούμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να ασκήσει πιέσεις τώρα, αυτή τη στιγμή που διεξάγονται οι συνομιλίες στην Ελβετία, ώστε η Τουρκία να συμβάλει εποικοδομητικά και ουσιαστικά στη λύση του Κυπριακού, να συμβάλει ώστε να υπάρξει μια πλήρως αποστρατιωτικοποιημένη Κύπρος και να τερματιστεί το αναχρονιστικό σύστημα των εγγυήσεων.

Σε ό,τι αφορά την έναρξη των διαπραγματεύσεων για την αναβάθμιση της τελωνειακής ένωσης, αυτές οι διαπραγματεύσεις μπορούν να αρχίσουν μόνον όταν η Τουρκία εφαρμόσει πλήρως όλες τις υποχρεώσεις που απορρέουν από την τρέχουσα τελωνειακή ένωση έναντι της Ένωσης, περιλαμβανομένης και της αναγνώρισης της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Η θέση μας είναι ξεκάθαρη: η ενταξιακή πορεία της Τουρκίας περνά μέσα από τον εκδημοκρατισμό της ίδιας της χώρας αλλά και την υλοποίηση των κυπρογενών της υποχρεώσεων.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Tudi sam se pridružujem tistim kolegom, ki poudarjajo, da je poročilo dovolj kritično, da torej razgali pot, v katero drvi Turčija, in ki mora biti resno tudi opozorilo Evropskemu parlamentu in Evropski uniji, da imamo na drugi strani tako imenovano partnerko, ki ne izpolnjuje tistih standardov, ki se pričakujejo od neke demokratske družbe.

V zadnjem letu se je stanje v Turčiji na številnih področjih močno spremenilo in ne more biti seveda v ponos demokraciji. Zato mislim, da tudi Evropski parlament pri tem ne more biti tiho. Že kolegi pred menoj so govorili o tako imenovanih političnih zapornikih, o preganjanih novinarjih, o zaprtih skupinah, tudi odpuščenih učiteljih, pravzaprav kot da bi šlo za neko čistko, za prevzem popolne oblasti, kar pa je lahko nevaren zgled tudi za širšo regijo.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, απλά και μόνο το γεγονός πως ξανασυζητάμε για ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις με την Τουρκία είναι αστειό. Η χώρα αυτή είναι εχθρική προς την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, δύο κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Καθημερινά σημειώνονται παραβιάσεις στα σύνορα Ελλάδας-Τουρκίας, ενώ συνεχίζεται η παράνομη κατοχή τμήματος της Κύπρου από την Τουρκία. Την ίδια στιγμή, χώρες της Ευρώπης εξακολουθούν να έχουν σχέση με την Τουρκία προωθώντας τα δικά τους συμφέροντα. Η Τουρκία είναι κράτος εκβιαστής και τρομοκράτης και άμεση απειλή για όποιον δεν εξυπηρετεί τα συμφέροντά της. Μόνο μία γλώσσα καταλαβαίνει η Τουρκία, τη γλώσσα της πυγμής.

Σταματήστε τις διαπραγματεύσεις, σταματήστε τις παροχές και επιβάλετε άμεσα κυρώσεις που δεν πρέπει να αρθούν μέχρι η Τουρκία να άρει το *casus belli* κατά της Ελλάδος και μέχρι να αποχωρήσει και ο τελευταίος Τούρκος στρατιώτης από την Κύπρο. Τότε και μόνο τότε θα μπορέσουμε να επανεξετάσουμε εάν θέλουμε και μπορούμε να εμπιστευτούμε την Τουρκία αρκετά ώστε να έχουμε κάποιες εμπορικές ίσως σχέσεις, σε καμία περίπτωση όμως ένταξη. Το κράτος του Σουλτάνου δεν έχει θέση στην Ευρώπη.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, durante as primaveras árabes a Turquia foi apontada como um exemplo de compatibilidade entre islamismo e democracia. Porém, o golpe de Estado falhado de 2016 deu ao Presidente Erdogan o pretexto para eliminar os redutos desse secularismo e das instituições democráticas e, ao abrigo de um estado de emergência que ainda hoje se mantém, despedir mais de 130 mil pessoas e enviar para a cadeia funcionários públicos, jornalistas, juizes, militares e políticos da oposição.

A vitória tangencial no referendo de abril deste ano, a única coisa que fez foi institucionalizar a transformação do sistema parlamentar turco num regime presidencialista autoritário, onde o Chefe de Estado acumula funções executivas, podendo governar através de decreto, dissolver o Parlamento e nomear a maioria dos membros do Alto Conselho de Juizes e Procuradores.

Caros Colegas, já há muitas décadas que não assistíamos a uma deriva autoritária tão marcada pelo desrespeito dos direitos humanos e dos valores da liberdade e do Estado direito na Europa. Esta deriva e a nova Constituição contrariam os critérios de Copenhaga e, por isso, sem prejuízo da necessidade de um diálogo construtivo, as negociações de adesão da Turquia à União Europeia devem ser suspensas e os fundos de pré-adesão canalizados para o apoio da sociedade civil e a melhoria da situação dos três milhões de refugiados neste país.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση αυτή καταγράφει πλείστες υποχρεώσεις της Τουρκίας προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, που περιλαμβάνουν, μεταξύ άλλων, και το πρόσθετο πρωτόκολλο για αναγνώριση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, όπως ελέγχι και από το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο.

Ωστόσο, πρέπει να διερωτηθούμε γιατί η πολιτική που ακολουθήσαμε μέχρι σήμερα έχει αποτύχει. Αυτό είναι ένα ερώτημα που πρέπει να απαντήσουμε. Και μια διαπίστωση: εάν όντως στην Τουρκία έχει επικρατήσει ένα νεοοσουλτανικό καθεστώς, η πρόβλεψη είναι πως κάθε μέρα που περνά με αυτό το καθεστώς στην εξουσία αυξάνεται το ανθρώπινο κόστος που θα πληρώσουν για χρόνια οι λαοί εντός και οι λαοί εκτός Τουρκίας.

Και δυο λόγια για την Κύπρο. Γίνονται τώρα συνομιλίες στη Γενεύη με επίκεντρο θέματα ασφάλειας. Αυτό το ζήτημα αφορά πρωτίστως και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Δεν μπορεί η Τουρκία να ζητεί επεμβατικό δικαίωμα και παραμονή κατοχικών στρατευμάτων στην Κύπρο. Αυτό μας αφορά όλους μας εδώ στην Ευρώπη.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – A török állam potenciális ellenségnek tekinti a kurdokat. Teszi ezt annak ellenére, hogy az ezt megelőző időszakban bizakodásra okot adó tárgyalások folytak a felek között. Ám ahogyan lehetőség adódott a keményebb fellépésre, a puccskísérlet után megtorló intézkedések leple alatt szisztematikus támadás folyik az országban élő kurdok ellen. Az államok gyakran esnek abba a hibába, hogy a területükön élő nemzeti kisebbségeket nem integrálni próbálják, hanem eltaszítják maguktól, nem elismerik történelmi hozzájárulásukat az országépítéséhez, hanem az állam ellenségeinek kiáltják ki és minden eszközzel a társadalom peremére próbálják szorítani őket. Ebből a küzdelemből azonban mindkét fél vesztesként fog kikerülni. Párbeszéd, nyitottság és egymás nézőpontjának elfogadása szükséges. Ettől a jelenlegi török–kurd viszony nagyon-nagyon messze áll, remélhetőleg nem okoznak visszafordíthatatlan károkat egymásnak a felek, mielőtt ráébrednek ennek a párbeszédnek a szükségességére.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, on behalf of Turkish nationals and minorities who live in my North-West England constituency, and also those who live oppressed in Turkey, I would like to say thank you to my colleagues for their work on this file. I would also like to draw attention to the destruction of cultural heritage in the ancient Mesopotamian town of Hasankeyf, where historical sites and artefacts are being destroyed and removed to make way for a new dam. This is a Kurdish-majority and, historically, an Armenian area along the Tigris River.

The Dutch company Bresser is helping the Turkish government remove and relocate historic monuments and take apart ancient tombs on a site whose history goes back 12 000 years. This must stop, and we must let Bresser and the Turkish authorities know that. I ask the High Representative and the Commission to call out to the Turkish authorities on this and make a clear statement that the destruction and removal must end.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, από την αρχή της θητείας μου είχα επισημάνει ότι η πολιτική ανοχής προς την Τουρκία θα οξύνει τα προβλήματα. Η σημερινή, σκληρά επικριτική έκθεση προόδου, παρόλο που άργησε πολύ, το πιστοποιεί. Μετά δε το πραξικόπημα, η κατάσταση ξέφυγε από κάθε έλεγχο και η Τουρκία κάνει πλέον εξαγωγή των εσωτερικών της προβλημάτων. Σωστά επισημαίνει η έκθεση παραβιάσεις θαλάσσιων και εναέριων ευρωπαϊκών συνόρων, casus belli με κράτος μέλος και απειλές για τις ΑΟΖ. Δεν πρόλαβε όμως να συμπεριλάβει τις ευθείες απειλές του Τούρκου Υπουργού Εξωτερικών για δράση του κατοχικού στρατού στην Κύπρο.

Παρ' όλα αυτά και ενώ το Κοινοβούλιο επανειλημμένα έχει πάρει σαφή θέση, το Συμβούλιο δείχνει να περιφρονεί την πραγματικότητα. Αναρωτιέμαι λοιπόν, κύριε Επίτροπε, τι άλλο θα πρέπει να περιλαμβάνει η έκθεση προόδου και τι άλλο θα πρέπει να συμβεί, ώστε να ανασταλούν άμεσα οι ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, c'è un'oggettiva contraddizione che dobbiamo saper risolvere per non apparire incoerenti tra le cose che affermiamo e quelle che pratichiamo. La relazione denuncia le violazioni dello Stato turco in materia di diritti umani e sulla base di ciò giustifica la sospensione del negoziato di adesione, ma nello stesso tempo sollecita l'approfondimento delle relazioni commerciali senza condizioni particolari.

Devo dire che la cosa mi sembra un po' bizzarra, perché dovremmo essere consapevoli che la politica commerciale è una potente leva per spingere in avanti i processi democratici e l'allargamento dei diritti. Mi chiedo se, così facendo, in realtà non rendiamo inefficaci le nostre armi di pressione e, forse per paura del riavvio del processo migratorio, ci consegniamo politicamente ad Erdoğan. Sicuramente così non faremo fare passi avanti al regime turco.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank everyone who spoke today. Listening to the very strong, clear and converging points made in this House today, I think we are all equally concerned that Turkey is moving further away from the European Union and not closer. That is the reality we have to face.

I believe that the best way to strengthen Turkey's democracy is by remaining engaged with it and keeping channels open. We must continue to promote the values on which our Union is based. This is all the more evident when it comes to a strategic partner.

The ball is now in Ankara's court. It must clearly and tangibly move back towards these values and principles, and we stand ready to support it completely. We are ready to do this on many levels, ranging from high-level political dialogues to protection of human-rights defenders in Turkey's civil society and continued investment in the roots of a future open society, from economic support to education, research and free media.

In short, we must continue our principled, firm engagement with Turkey and support the positive currents in Turkish society, and I expect that we will continue the discussion here in the House to follow up on the events in Turkey and to stay in contact and in touch with them.

As some speakers today pointed out, we have to keep in mind that there is a huge part of Turkish society which is very much interested in the European perspective.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Members for this very rich and very timely exchange of views that demonstrates that we, the Parliament and the Council, share deep concerns with regard to Turkey.

As I pointed out earlier, the Council is well aware of existing shortcomings, especially in the field of the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Several ideas were floated about how the European Parliament can help in this respect, not least by Marju Lauristin, on the ways of giving voice to those people who have to flee Turkey. This work must be continued. At the same time, it is important to remember that the EU and Turkey have many ties. Our relations go back a long time. We have had – and are having – close cooperation in many areas, cooperation that has been positive for both parties.

We continue to follow developments in Turkey very closely. We will continue to bring up our concerns in all our meetings and at all levels with Turkey. The EU should remain the anchor for Turkey's political and economic reforms. That is where the continuing expectation of the standards that Turkey must fulfil comes in: continuing expectation enshrined in the Presidency's conclusions from the General Affairs Council last December. The standards are there for all EU candidate and aspirant countries. If anyone says that we should give up on the expectations that those standards are being met, we may wonder whether this sends the right signal.

Foreign policy is a very complex domain, but even there, some things are relatively easy – leaving the chair open, walking away, pulling the plug, if you will. It is so much more difficult and tiresome to engage patiently, with the aim of transforming your partner. That is what the EU's foreign policy is doing in its relation with Turkey, and that is why continued engagement in the accession process with Turkey remains vital.

Kati Piri, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I am grateful to all the colleagues who have contributed to this debate. As I said at the start of the debate, I would like especially to give a warm thank you to the shadow rapporteurs who were also here during the whole debate, because we worked in the third year consecutively towards a very constructive text. I would also especially like to thank colleagues from the extreme right for being here in the debate, because their presence and their contempt for this report shows clearly that the agreement reached by the other Groups is not based on Islamophobia. It is not based on any hate towards the Turkish population and I am proud that you will vote against this report as I absolutely do not share your racist positions.

Allow me to welcome here a former colleague, Joost Lagendijk, who is sitting here with us. For many years, he chaired the Turkish Joint Parliamentary Committee. After having lived in Turkey for the past nine years, he has not been allowed to return to the country where he has been living. We hope he can go back soon and join his wife, Nevin, in Istanbul.

When it comes to the Presidency of the Council, thank you for also participating in this debate. We hope that curtailing migration is not the new priority of the European Union with EU candidate countries. Please allow me to draw your attention to the fact that we also call on the EU Member States in the report to start the resettlement of the most vulnerable refugees from Turkey as we agreed. I very much hope under your presidency we will see more progress on that.

Finally, Commissioner Hahn, we know you are on your way to the airport. We wish you a good stay in Turkey. We look forward to continuing our cooperation and hope that the EU will be more confident in the coming months to stand up for its own values while maintaining an open, constructive dialogue with Turkey. As a final remark, because many colleagues raised the issue, we know the talks on Cyprus are ongoing and we all hope that there will be a viable long-lasting settlement reached.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 6 lipca 2017 r.

Pisemne oświadczenia (art. 162)

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρουνίδη (PPE), γραπτώς. – Η φετινή έκθεση για την Τουρκία καταγράφει ουσιαστικά τη σοβαρή οπισθοδρόμηση της χώρας στην πορεία της προς την ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια. Το 2016 υπήρξε ένα δύσκολο έτος για την Τουρκία ως αποτέλεσμα του πολέμου στη Συρία, της εισροής εκατοντάδων χιλιάδων προσφύγων, μιας σειράς σκληρών τρομοκρατικών επιθέσεων και της αποτυχημένης απόπειρας πραξικοπήματος τον περασμένο Ιούλιο. Ωστόσο, η αντίδραση του προέδρου Ερντογάν εξέπληξε αρνητικά για ακόμα μια φορά την Ευρώπη. Τα μέτρα που ελήφθησαν μετά το πραξικόπημα ήταν παράνομα. Ακολούθησαν σοβαρά γεγονότα όπως παύση λειτουργίας πολλών μέσων ενημέρωσης, αυθαίρετη σύλληψη χιλιάδων πολιτών, δημοσιογράφων, δικαστών και υπερασπιστών των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, κλείσιμο σχολείων και πανεπιστημίων που δεν συνάδουν με τον δυτικό πολιτισμό, καταπατούν τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και θέτουν υπό αμφισβήτηση το κράτος δικαίου. Παράλληλα, η απειλούμενη εφαρμογή των συνταγματικών μεταρρυθμίσεων από την τουρκική κυβέρνηση δεν συμβαδίζει με τα κριτήρια ένταξης στην ΕΕ. Η Τουρκία θα πρέπει να αποφασίσει αν πραγματικά θέλει να συνεχίσει τις ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις και να σταματήσει να υπονομεύει την ενταξιακή της προοπτική με συζητήσεις για την επαναφορά της θανατικής ποινής. Επιπλέον, πρέπει επιτέλους να σεβαστεί πλήρως το διεθνές δίκαιο, τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα και την εδαφική ακεραιότητα της Ελλάδας και της Κύπρου που κατ' επανάληψη και σκόπιμα αμφισβητεί με κλιμάκωση παραβιάσεων και προκλήσεων.

13. Il-Fond Ewropew għall-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli (EFSD) u t-twaqqif tal-Garanzija tal-EFSD u tal-Fond ta' Garanzija tal-EFSD (dibattitu)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Eduarda Kukana, Doru-Claudiana Frunzulicę i Eider Gardiazabal Rubial w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych, Komisji Rozwoju i Komisji Budżetowej w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju (EFZR) oraz w sprawie ustanowienia gwarancji EFZR i funduszu gwarancyjnego EFZR (COM(2016)0586 - C8-0377/2016 - 2016/0281(COD)) (A8-0170/2017).

Eduard Kukan, rapporteur. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the co-rapporteurs, the Council and the Maltese Presidency, as well as the Commission, for their very good cooperation during the preparation of this report.

The European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD) is a milestone in our approach to development and migration. We have been struggling to find the right answers to challenges coming from our neighbourhood and Africa, from countries affected by extreme poverty, conflict, under-development ...

(Interruption)

President. – Minister Maasikas, please can you respect our MEPs?

Eduard Kukan, rapporteur. – Mr President, please take note of the time that elapsed since I had to stop my speech.

We have found ourselves under external pressure from migration flows driven by geopolitical and economic factors. The consequences are deeply felt on a day-to-day basis in many European countries. However, they are only a fraction of the discontent felt in many countries beyond our borders. Facing mounting tragedies in countries thrown into conflict or extreme poverty, our responsibility is to act, to address the root causes of this situation and to help to create the conditions for a better life in these countries.

It is clear that this will not happen from one day to the next, not even after a year. Therefore we need to look for long-term sustainable solutions, solutions which would bring growth, more stability, more jobs opportunities and solutions that would help societies to develop and adapt to the current world. There is no magic spell to solve the problems of the developing world, just as there is no magic spell to safeguard Europe from the increasing pressures of migration. We will be constantly challenged, yet we need to try new approaches and propose new solutions.

I therefore welcome the proposal for the External Investment Plan proposed last year by the Commission. With this framework, we can promote sustainable investment and tackle some of the root causes of migration in Africa and the neighbourhood. The European Fund for Sustainable Development is a vital part of this plan. It provides guarantees in order to stimulate private sector involvement in the socio-economic development of the partner countries.

I think this is the right approach in the long term. We need to match our development and investment expertise to enable the EU and the private sector to cooperate. We need an instrument which will operate in high-risk situations where investment would not be possible without our guarantees. This opens new challenges to boost investments and improve the business climate in the most fragile countries. In order to do this we need to stimulate investment in such areas as socio-economic infrastructure, SMEs or microfinance.

Once again, I am glad that we are ready to make this Fund a reality. It will be a vital instrument to stimulate development in our partner countries and an important tool in our external policies. I hope that its innovative approach will help to improve living conditions in countries where it is needed and address the root causes of migration in the long term.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, rapporteur. – Mr President, as you know, on 14 September 2016, the Commission tabled a proposal for establishing a new European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD) aimed at mobilising up to EUR 44 billion of investment in Africa and the EU neighbourhood. The EFSD is the first pillar of the external investment plan under which the Commission also plans to enhance technical assistance in partner countries (pillar 2) and to work towards improving the investment climate and overall policy environment in those countries (pillar 3).

The main assumption is that supporting investment and private-sector involvement through innovative financing can foster sustainable and inclusive economic and social development and address the root causes of the migration crisis and promote the resilience of the partner countries in Africa and the EU neighbourhood, including in the least developed countries, with a particular focus on growth, the creation of decent jobs, youth and women, socio-economic sectors and, of course, small and medium-sized enterprises.

A final package agreement was approved by COREPER last Wednesday. The progressive points we managed to include in the EFSD text are the following: reference to development effectiveness, resilience, decent job creation, the aim of poverty eradication and Articles 21 of the Treaty on European Union and 208 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in the purpose of the instrument; and the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as objectives. On compliance in respect of tax standards and transparency, we managed to achieve major progress. We have ensured that counterparts are prohibited from entering into operations with entities incorporated or established in jurisdictions listed under the 11th EU policy on non-cooperative jurisdictions, or identified as high-risk third countries or countries that do not comply with the EU and internationally agreed tax standards on transparency and exchange of information.

There is a reference, as well, to the relevant EU policy on non-cooperative jurisdictions for tax purposes and specific reporting by the Commission. We now have greater transparency in relation to financial support provided by EFSD with an obligation for the Commission and counterparts to make information on projects, beneficiaries and expected development benefits publicly available wherever possible.

The participation of the European Parliament in the strategic board as observers is warranted. We made a reference to the principles of development effectiveness and the conformity of objectives with the eligibility criteria for use of the EFSD; fulfilment of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for the projects funded; and safeguard clauses on human and labour rights, including full observance of the UN principles for responsible investment, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises, the UN-FAO Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems, and all ILO Conventions, as well as international humanitarian law.

We insisted on having a particular focus on climate-friendly investments, thus contributing to implementing the Paris Agreement, and setting a binding minimum target of 28 investments for climate action, renewable energy and resource efficiency.

There are more things that I would like to highlight but, because of time constraints and last but not least, I would like warmly to thank the Commission negotiating team and the Maltese Presidency for their good cooperation, enabling us to agree on this new, innovative and important instrument of EU development policy.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, en lo que llevamos de año han llegado a las costas europeas casi 100 000 personas que han tenido que abandonar sus países, sus hogares, sus familias. Esta madrugada, 49 han muerto tratando de llegar a las costas españolas. Porque la mayor tragedia no es que lleguen, la mayor tragedia es que pierden la vida en el intento.

Hoy debatimos en este Pleno la puesta en marcha del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Sostenible, un fondo que, lamentablemente, no va a erradicar totalmente las causas por las que estas personas están obligadas a emigrar, pero que pretende invertir en sus países de origen para conseguir un desarrollo sostenible, para darles la oportunidad de poder vivir en su país y tener un proyecto de vida digno.

Las causas de la migración son muchas y complejas, pero los factores más importantes son los factores de seguridad, los factores económicos, los medioambientales y los sociales. El objetivo de este fondo es precisamente atacar de raíz esas causas, mediante la inversión en proyectos que contribuyan a cumplir los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Porque este fondo tiene que ser un complemento de la ayuda oficial al desarrollo, tiene que perseguir sus mismos objetivos, pero no puede ni debe ser un sustituto. Porque lo que pretendemos es movilizar la inversión privada hasta 44 000 millones, utilizando el presupuesto europeo como garantía, desarrollando mecanismos innovadores y reduciendo así las incertidumbres de los inversores.

Conseguir la implicación del sector privado en el desarrollo económico y social de estos países es un objetivo estratégico. Y este fondo no va actuar solo —ya lo hemos mencionado aquí—, forma parte del Plan de Inversiones Exteriores que tiene un componente de asistencia técnica para ayudar a los países socios a atraer esa inversión, capital privado, y ayudar a preparar y promover proyectos susceptibles de beneficiarse de este fondo. Y tiene también un tercer pilar, fundamental para conseguir los objetivos, que se basa en el diálogo político, con el objetivo de desarrollar un marco legal, unas políticas y unas instituciones que promuevan la estabilidad necesaria.

Este diálogo político cubre desde la lucha contra la corrupción, el fraude fiscal, el crimen organizado, hasta el impulso del emprendimiento, el desarrollo de los mercados locales o una política inclusiva de género.

Este Parlamento, con sus propuestas y durante las negociaciones, ha buscado y conseguido mejorar la definición y la concreción de los objetivos. De esta manera, hemos querido hacer especial hincapié en la financiación de proyectos que tengan un verdadero impacto y que se centren en la creación de empleo en condiciones dignas; que siga una estrategia de crecimiento sostenible e inclusivo, y con una especial atención al empoderamiento de las mujeres y de los jóvenes.

Como decía al principio, la migración tiene múltiples causas, y una de ellas, a las que muchas veces no prestamos la atención que se merece, es la migración por causas medioambientales. Y, en este sentido, creo que los acuerdos que hemos alcanzado Parlamento y Consejo nos permiten destinar más recursos a la lucha contra el cambio climático, a las energías renovables y a la eficiencia de los recursos energéticos.

Por último, me gustaría destacar el importantísimo paso que hemos dado en la lucha contra el fraude fiscal, contra la evasión fiscal, contra el blanqueo de capitales, así como la eliminación de cualquier tipo de relación con las jurisdicciones no cooperativas. Y aquí querría agradecer especialmente a la Comisión Europea su determinación en poner a la lucha contra el fraude fiscal como una prioridad, por impulsar mayores controles, informes país por país y mejorar la rendición de cuentas.

Desde el Parlamento, y me consta que desde la Comisión Europea y desde el Consejo, hemos trabajado contrarreloj para poder lanzar lo antes posible este fondo y que esté operativo con vistas a las Cumbres de la Asociación Oriental y de la Unión Europea-África. Espero que este fondo sea el primer paso de un compromiso renovado de la Unión con el desarrollo de los países de nuestro entorno. No podemos permitir que miles de personas sigan abandonando sus hogares por falta de oportunidades, arriesgando sus vidas, muriendo en el mar o en el desierto, porque desde la Unión Europea no hayamos hecho todo lo que estaba en nuestras manos.

Neven Mimica, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the European Parliament, and notably the three committee Chairs and rapporteurs, for their extraordinary engagement and excellent cooperation over the past months on this file. In spite of its complexity, a compromise was reached. This is a success and I congratulate us all for that. I also thank the Council, and in particular the Maltese and Slovak Presidencies, for their efforts to reach the agreement on the European Fund for Sustainable Development, which delivers on the request of the European Council to do so in the first semester of 2017.

Our ambition must now be to quickly start the implementation of the external investment plan with a view to present tangible progress to the EU-Africa summit in Abidjan and to the Eastern Partnership Summit, both of them in November.

Let me underline that the External Investment Plan with its European Fund for Sustainable Development will become an important instrument for attaining the objectives of the UN 2030 Agenda and will complete our toolbox for development cooperation. This is primarily a development instrument rather than exclusively a banking or financial one. It will steer our development partnership with the private sector in a focused and effective manner in order to contribute to reaching development goals in partner countries.

The plan builds on experience. Since 2007 we have been implementing eight investment facilities which have leveraged a total investment volume of EUR 57.3 billion in our partner countries, with a total of EUR 3.4 billion of EU grants. To a large extent, this cooperation has been successful, as confirmed by the recent external evaluation on lending. The external investment plan is taking lessons learned into account.

Let me reiterate the substance of the plan. It provides a holistic framework to improve investment and therefore decent job creation in Africa and the EU neighbourhood. It has three pillars: financing, technical support and enhanced investment climate. These must work hand in hand, and we are serious when we say that via the guarantees of the fund and existing investment facilities we want to leverage more than EUR 44 billion of investments in Africa and the neighbourhood until 2020.

Our ambition for the European Fund for Sustainable Development is to go beyond existing instruments by supporting innovative financing models developed by partner financial institutions and an enhanced engagement of the private sector, in particular through the innovative new guarantee and the European Fund for Sustainable Development. Let me emphasise that the concept of additionality is very important. For us, it is really important. We do not intend to guarantee investments that the private sector would have made anyway. Under the European Fund for Sustainable Development, our partners must be able to prove that this is not the case by bringing in new products, new ideas, investments sustainably and where they otherwise would not go.

We will also be coherent with the international fight against tax avoidance by making sure that financial vehicles supported under the instrument are not benefiting from any location in non-cooperative tax jurisdictions. All this will be implemented in a transparent and accessible way through comprehensive reporting requirements to the European Parliament and the public and through a new web portal managed by the Commission, and the European Parliament will have observer status on the strategic board. The board's tasks will be to provide strategic guidance on overall investment goals and to ensure external policy coherence. This will give the European Parliament the opportunity to participate in the steering and monitoring of the overall implementation strategies and objectives of the European Fund for Sustainable Development.

Therefore I am very much looking forward to a fruitful cooperation in this regard, also in the years to come.

Paul Rübig, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte zu diesem großen Schritt gratulieren, weil wir unserem Ziel wieder näherkommen, vor Ort, in den Entwicklungsländern und vor allem auch in unseren Nachbarländern Anreize zu setzen, dass Beschäftigung entsteht und dass die Menschen Vertrauen in die Zukunft bekommen. Wir haben vom europäischen Haushalt insgesamt die 350 Millionen zur Verfügung gestellt, mit den 400 Millionen aus dem Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds. Wir haben dann die Garantien und die Mischfinanzierung mit 2,6 Milliarden, und dann vertrauen wir eigentlich darauf, dass der Privatsektor diese Anreize dementsprechend stark annimmt.

Wir wissen, dass wir gerade in den Entwicklungsländern darauf achten müssen, dass die ländlichen Gebiete hier im Fokus stehen, weil natürlich der Zuzug in die großen Städte, in die Slums zusätzliche Probleme bringt und wir deshalb Anreize in den ländlichen Gebieten in den Mittelpunkt stellen sollten.

Die Kollegin hat schon gesagt, dass natürlich kleine und mittlere Betriebe aus der Europäischen Union und Betriebe in unseren Nachbarschaftsgebieten und in den am wenigsten entwickelten Ländern eine Chance haben müssen, in Zukunft miteinander zusammenzuarbeiten – wobei hier der Schwerpunkt vor allem auf der erneuerbaren Energie liegen soll.

Wir haben ja diese 28 Prozent Finanzierungsanteil für den Klimawandel festgezurr, dass wir dort digitale Märkte einrichten können, dass die Aus- und Weiterbildung sich etabliert und dass vor allem auch die sanitären Bedingungen mit Wasser, Abwasser – vor allem auch in den Krankenhäusern – verbessert werden, dass hier auch die soziale Komponente im Mittelpunkt steht. Aber letzten Endes muss es natürlich auch Investitionsverträge geben, weil sich eben das meiste aus Garantien zusammensetzt und das wirkliche Eigenkapital – der Cash – eine sehr niedrige Rolle einnimmt. Deshalb wird die Kommission aufgefordert, diese Projekte so gut wie möglich zu managen.

Linda McAvan, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, many people have talked about this being a first for the Parliament because three committees worked on a codecision file for the first time. So congratulations to our three co-rapporteurs. Not only have they delivered, but they have delivered in record time: in just four months. Special thanks also go to Marlene Bonnici, the Ambassador from Malta, who pushed this through, and our staff, who worked very hard. They know who they are and they deserve our special thanks.

But we don't need it to be speedy just for institutional reasons to get it done under a certain Presidency. We need it because we promised this kind of thing in Addis Ababa two years ago. We promised that aid would be one part of the picture for funding development, and that we would also have private sector leverage and more tax revenues going in to help fund.

I want to make this link with Addis Ababa to remind people that this is not an instrument to tackle migration except in as much as the instrument is to tackle poverty at its roots, create jobs and bring investment. It is not about managing flows into Europe. Most of the money comes from the European Development Fund, so it is right that the fund should focus on the least developed countries and fragile states. When the plans come forward, I hope we will see the funding in those domains. It is also timely because we have the G20 this weekend, the high-level political forum in a couple of weeks in New York and we've got the Africa summit coming up.

A lot of people are talking about a Marshall Plan for Africa. I am not very good at maths, but I worked out that Germany got USD 15 billion of aid in today's money in the late 1940s; about EUR 267 per person. If we do the same thing in Sub-Saharan Africa, that is about USD 66 billion today. So the European Fund for Sustainable Development can be part of the beginning of a new plan for Africa. It is part of the picture. We need to make sure it is spent properly and that it leaves in the aid that we have promised.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD) is the flagship policy of the EU's external investment plan, launched last year in response partly to the migration crisis. High population growth across Africa without the employment opportunities to match is a growing problem, likely to be made worse by the effects of climate change as time goes on. Fragile states with weak public institutions, limited track records in the rule of law, and challenges to democracies are particularly affected and are naturally a deterrent to the necessary private investment required to generate jobs.

The EFSD and the EFSD Guarantee are seeking to try and plug that gap by the European Union and aims at aiding and leveraging investment from private business and institutions. It is projected that EUR 3.5 billion of EU investment could generate as much as EUR 88 billion of total investment. The EFSD will also seek to provide technical assistance to governments in the region in order to mobilise further investment. It is something that I fully support.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, ainoa kestävä ratkaisu hallitsemattoman maahanmuuton hillitsemiseen pitkällä tähtäimellä on elinolosuhteiden parantaminen ja työpaikkojen luominen maahanmuuton lähtömaihin. Tämän vuoksi EU siis nyt perustaa kestävä kehityksen rahaston, ja tämän rahaston yksi keskeisiä tavoitteita on parantaa elämisen edellytyksiä ja aikaansaada kestävä kasvua EU:n lähialueilla ja erityisesti maahanmuuton lähtö- ja kauttakulkumaissa – siis luoda työtä, toimeentuloa ja toivoa.

Rahaston tarkoituksena on siis tukea investointeja Afrikassa ja EU:n naapurustossa. Rahastosta ei myönnetä suoraa rahallista tukea, vaan tuetaan yksityisen sektorin investointeja ja muun muassa myönnetään lainatukia. Kun tämä päätös on tehty, on pikaisesti myös suoritettava toimeenpano.

Erityisen tyytyväinen olen siihen, että parlamentti sai ajettua tähän uuteen asetukseen tavoitteen, jotta investoinneista käytettäisiin 28 prosenttia sellaisiin kohteisiin, joilla edistetään ilmastonmuutoksen vastaisia toimia. Nämä toimet ovat tärkeitä Euroopan ja koko maailman vakauden kannalta, ja kun juuri niillä toimilla estämme ilmastonmuutoksen kehittymistä, me nimenomaan pureudumme näihin maastamuuton ja maahanmuuton juurisyihin.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, yo voy a ser bastante crítico con este Fondo, porque este Fondo Europeo se llama «de Desarrollo Sostenible», pero ni busca la cooperación para el desarrollo ni la sostenibilidad de este desarrollo. Parece nuevamente propaganda de la Unión Europea para limpiar su imagen ante la nefasta gestión de la crisis de fronteras.

Cuando la gente dice que hay que actuar en origen ante la inmigración forzada por la guerra, el hambre o el cambio climático, desde luego no se refiere a este tipo de fondos.

Lo que pretende este Fondo es aliviar conciencias y que los Estados fronterizos hagan de muro a esta inmigración forzada, un estilo que, desgraciadamente, ya inventó el Partido Popular español en la frontera sur con Marruecos.

Para ello, la Unión Europea está recurriendo al mismo truco de magia malo: un fondo al estilo «plan Juncker» que cubrirá las posibles pérdidas de las inversiones privadas, pero que, en este caso, serán pérdidas de multinacionales europeas haciendo negocio en países del sur.

La cooperación al desarrollo no consiste en salvaguardar nuestras espaldas para que otros países hagan de guardianes de nuestras fronteras; no se trata de ver qué artimaña financiera utilizamos para hacer un buen negocio de estas inversiones.

El Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Sostenible debería servir para posibilitar un desarrollo igualitario, ayudar a actores locales, en vez de a transnacionales, y poner unos recursos para un desarrollo endógeno social y sostenible.

Condicionar la política de cooperación al control de flujos migratorios es maquiavélico. Hay que desligar cooperación y política migratoria; de lo contrario, no estamos cooperando, estamos rentabilizando.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I think we have created an innovative development instrument, and a lot depends on the implementation and on the safeguards that have been put in this instrument. We need to make sure that we indeed measure development outcomes already before funding decisions have been made, and we must make sure that we have the best expertise, which should be brought through the other elements of the external investment plan, such as technical assistance and political dialogue. I believe that this is a unique contribution to financing for development commitments. Let us make this a real innovative development instrument.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the disinterested observer can immediately see several problems with the EU's plans for the EFSD. Firstly, these funds appear to be nothing more or less than a means of using taxpayers' money to expand the EU's regional hegemony. The two regional platforms, one for Africa and one for what is ominously termed the 'EU Neighborhood', offer for the purported recipients nothing more than serfdom. The funds come with strings attached, which means there will be strategic boards imposed upon the clients, with Commission and EIB representation. This means, as always with EU largesse, that those who are supposed to benefit have their hands tied and are reduced in their own nations to the role of supplicant. This is surely wrong from the start.

The second major issue one can immediately spot is that citizens' money is expected to leverage private investments, essentially throwing taxpayers' money down a well. Please stop treating other people's money with such contempt.

Maurice Ponga (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, moins d'un an après la proposition de la Commission européenne de créer le Fonds européen de développement durable (FEDD), ce nouvel instrument va entrer en vigueur.

Je suis heureux que nous ayons pu trouver un compromis dans un délai si court avec la Commission et le Conseil sur ce nouvel instrument, dont l'objectif principal est d'aider le secteur privé dans les pays africains et du voisinage oriental, en soutenant l'emploi, la croissance et la stabilité, ce qui contribuera – j'en suis certain – à lutter contre les causes profondes de la migration irrégulière.

Le texte sur lequel nous allons voter demain est un bon texte. Le rôle du Parlement européen a été renforcé, ce qui permettra un meilleur contrôle du Fonds. La dimension «développement» a également été renforcée, mais de manière intelligente, afin de rendre l'instrument flexible et adapté aux spécificités du secteur privé. Enfin, nos institutions financières européennes participeront au FEDD, et une préférence communautaire sera réalisée dans le respect du principe du traitement équitable.

Grâce à cet instrument, nous espérons pouvoir mobiliser jusqu'à 44 milliards d'investissements. Les enjeux pour développer l'Afrique et les pays du voisinage oriental sont considérables, et le secteur privé a un rôle important à jouer. Il est donc crucial que ce secteur se mobilise et que les États membres soutiennent et accompagnent le FEDD, afin d'en faire un instrument de développement durable.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Mr President, the European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD) is for development. A wide array of actors can apply for economic support, but money is never an answer in itself to secure development. In the work of formulating the framework of the EFSD, we have been persistent in securing transparency, a clear gender focus and also a complaints mechanism at the Commission's webpage. I have also been very determined in having explicit references to human rights and also to Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union.

Let me please remind you about Article 21: the Union's action on the international scene shall be guided by the following principles: 'democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law'.

All these are crucial elements if the EFSD is to become successful in addressing the root cause of the migration crisis and promoting resilient societies. I have to be frank, migration is not a problem. People should be able to move freely between places and regions if they wish and like. But it becomes a problem when the conditions in the one region are so bad that people are forced to move due to the impossibility to lead a good life. This is why it should be ensured that the EFSD enhances respect for and the fulfilment of human rights.

Civil society is instrumental in monitoring the human rights record. I call on civil society to use the complaint mechanism and to let us know when there are faults and how to improve the work of securing human rights for sustainable development.

Jean Arthuis (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, je me réjouis de l'accord sur le Fonds européen de développement et j'en félicite nos rapporteurs.

Ce fonds vise à soutenir, à long terme, le développement économique et social des pays africains et du voisinage oriental en vue de lutter contre les causes de la crise migratoire que nous connaissons depuis plus de deux ans, notamment l'émigration économique illégale.

Si ce nouveau fonds vient s'ajouter à la galaxie d'instruments gravitant autour du budget européen, j'ose espérer que la Commission, sous le contrôle du Parlement, saura en assurer la cohérence, la transparence et l'efficacité et saura s'assurer que les institutions financières partenaires servent fidèlement nos règles et nos objectifs politiques, tout spécialement en matière de lutte contre les paradis fiscaux.

Pour que ce fonds soit un succès, il est donc indispensable qu'il s'inscrive dans une vision et une stratégie politique claires. Je compte beaucoup sur la haute représentante, M^{me} Mogherini, ainsi que sur les commissaires Hahn et Mimica pour formuler cette vision et porter cette stratégie.

Il ne suffit pas de se doter d'un instrument supplémentaire: l'heure est venue d'exprimer une ambition et de construire un discours qui parle aux citoyens européens, des citoyens qui appellent de leurs vœux une Europe qui les protège.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Sustentável, inovador e aberto, ao mobilizar 44 mil milhões de euros para África e para os países de vizinhança oriental, vai possibilitar aos territórios beneficiários mais crescimento económico, mais emprego e estabilidade. É também essencial, na aprovação dos projetos e das plataformas, assegurar a diversificação geográfica e temática.

Esta diversificação geográfica deverá também permitir, em simultâneo, assegurar a redução da pobreza e a promoção dos direitos humanos. Os pequenos projetos e as pequenas e médias empresas devem ser acarinhadas. Nem sempre temos consciência de que a União Europeia é o maior doador mundial. Mas temos, em simultâneo, também, de fomentar o empreendedorismo, o bem-estar e a independência financeira dos povos.

Os projetos sustentáveis deverão permitir a criação de emprego e, nomeadamente, de emprego jovem. Este fundo, no respeito da adicionalidade, deve ser utilizado em complementaridade com outros instrumentos financeiros e, também, com o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento.

A Comissão Europeia deverá dar apoio ao designado segundo pilar e deverá dar apoio para a elaboração das plataformas de investimento. É também essencial a transparência na gestão, a transparência na aprovação e depois, também, no acompanhamento e na execução dos projetos. Este é um imperativo que não pode ser esquecido.

Por outro lado, o Parlamento deverá continuar associado a este importante fundo e ser informado relativamente à aprovação das plataformas e dos projetos.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'estensione del cosiddetto piano Juncker ai paesi in via di sviluppo risponde a una necessità ben precisa: non possono esserci integrazione e sicurezza senza un reale impegno a stabilizzare le aree più instabili e più in difficoltà del mondo.

Per farlo, però, è fondamentale mettere dei paletti che siano ben chiari e precisi: nessuna collaborazione europea dovrà sostenere o finanziare regimi che non rispettano i diritti umani e le minoranze o in generale difettano degli standard democratici minimi. Questo è un piano importante, ma è un piano che avrà effetti nel futuro, nel prossimo futuro. Ma nell'immediato, per il presente e per l'attuale situazione migratoria che stiamo vivendo, l'unica risposta possibile da parte dell'Europa è la solidarietà degli Stati membri nei confronti dell'Italia e della Grecia, che vivono situazioni oramai insostenibili.

Nedzhmi Ali (ALDE). – Mr President, the European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD) as a new financial instrument should mobilise more than EUR 40 billion of investment in the states of Africa and the European neighbourhood. It will create growth and employment, deliver innovative products and involve private sector funds. The European Parliament on several occasions has expressed its position, stressing the need to strengthen the link between migration and development policies. By keeping poverty eradication as a main priority, it is necessary to involve the private sector in this effort.

For the successful implementation of EFSD, several conditions should be taken into account. Regarding the nature of the blended finance, financial institutions and private entities should respect EU commitments toward full transparency and accountability, guaranteeing a balanced geographical approach in order to allow potential beneficiaries to have access to funding, providing information and guidance for investors in the development activities as well as assessment of the quality of operations.

Finally, I would like to underline the importance of the external investment plan to the implementation of the new partnership framework. The security dimensions of the plan are unconditional.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, approviamo oggi uno strumento importante, il Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo sostenibile, con la consapevolezza che bisognerà vigilare attentamente sulla sua attuazione, con modalità che questo Parlamento ha voluto mettere nero su bianco, e per questo ringrazio i colleghi che hanno contribuito ad assicurare, nel testo, le nostre priorità.

Risorse pubbliche e aiuti allo sviluppo resteranno essenziali, ma non sono sufficienti per liberare l'enorme potenziale in Africa e in altri paesi del vicinato e per raggiungere gli obiettivi dell'agenda dello sviluppo sostenibile al 2030. Lo scopo del Fondo deve essere quello di contribuire alla lotta contro povertà e disuguaglianze e creare opportunità per i giovani africani.

Vigileremo che non inseguia le scellerate politiche del Consiglio per esternalizzare le frontiere e costruire muri in Africa. I progetti devono essere scelti con rigore, devono portare vera addizionalità, e i benefici devono andare alle popolazioni e alle piccole imprese locali, non alle grandi multinazionali. È cruciale avere inserito delle salvaguardie sulla lotta all'evasione e all'elusione fiscale e i principi di responsabilità sociale delle imprese. Quindi vigileremo e ci aspettiamo trasparenza dalla Commissione.

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Ich danke und gratuliere allen meinen Kolleginnen und Kollegen für die gute Arbeit und dafür, dass der Europäische Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung die Handschrift des Europäischen Parlaments trägt.

Dabei sind drei folgende Punkte besonders hervorzuheben. Erstens: Die Nachhaltigkeitsziele der Vereinten Nationen für 2030 müssen als wichtigstes Kriterium in allen Projekten und Politikbereichen sichtbar sein und als Referenz kenntlich gemacht werden.

Zweitens: Das Pariser Übereinkommen muss von Europa – insbesondere nach der Aufkündigung durch Trump – als wichtigstes Ziel stärker denn je unterstützt und umgesetzt werden. Deshalb begrüße ich, dass wir uns verpflichten, mindestens 28 % der Investitionen für die Bekämpfung des Klimawandels, für erneuerbare Energien und nachhaltige Ressourcen zu verwenden.

Und drittens: Die Projekte, die zur Beschäftigung beitragen, müssen die Arbeitnehmerrechte voll respektieren. Dazu gehören sowohl die Einhaltung der IAO-Kernarbeitsnormen als auch die Verankerung der OECD-Leitsätze für multinationale Unternehmen in den Partnerschaftsabkommen. Ich werde mich dafür einsetzen, dass diese Punkte eingehalten werden.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señor presidente, al aprobar este instrumento no solamente movilizamos en torno a 44 000 millones de euros para crear oportunidades de trabajo en muchos países de África y de nuestro vecindario, sino que, sobre todo, lanzamos una señal: la señal de que la Unión Europea ha cambiado su manera de ver los problemas, que ha cambiado su comportamiento. No trata solamente de responder a las consecuencias de la emigración, o de los refugiados, o de la pobreza en África; trata de atacar las causas que promueven este éxodo, que empobrecen a esos países y que dificultan, a su vez, nuestra gestión de fronteras.

Pero de lo que se trata es de poner oportunidades en inversiones que mantengan la ayuda oficial al desarrollo, que sean coherentes con el cambio climático y la Agenda 2030, que luchen contra los paraísos fiscales y que, finalmente, aporten a los países menos desarrollados oportunidades de trabajo que eviten tener que emigrar o tener que escapar como consecuencia de conflictos.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Zelo podpiram ustanovitev Evropskega sklada za trajnostni razvoj za Afriko v višini 44 milijard, s katerim želimo izboljšati stanje na tem kontinentu. Vemo, da je Afrika kontinent z veliko revščino, kontinent, na katerem manjka osnovne infrastrukture, manjka gospodarske infrastrukture, na drugi strani pa tudi kontinent, na katerem je ogromno vojnih konfliktov, korupcije.

Zato je prav, da ta sredstva usmerimo v razvojne projekte, s katerimi bomo ustvarili nova delovna mesta, pazili pri tem tudi na stanje okolja, kajti okoljski problemi se z naraščajočim številom prebivalstva tudi v Afriki povečujejo. Konec koncev pa na pravi način rešujemo ključni problem, s katerim se tudi danes soočamo, to je z migracijskimi tokovi. Če ne bomo začeli tega problema reševati na izvoru, v tem procesu ne bomo uspešni. In to, da bo Afrika do leta 2050 podvojila število prebivalcev, kaže na jasen znak, da bo tam vedno velik pritisk, v kolikor ne bo situacija v Afriki boljša, kot je danes.

Laima Liucija Andrikenė (PPE). – Neabejotinai sprendimas dėl Europos darnaus vystymosi fondo yra svarbus visai Europai. Jis svarbus įgyvendinant mūsų siekį plėsti ir stiprinti saugumo ir stabilumo erdvę aplinkui Europos Sąjungą. Tikiuosi, kad šis pranešimas bus patvirtintas didelė Europos Parlamento narių dauguma. Noriu pabrėžti tai, kad šis fondas turi prisidėti prie tvaraus vystymosi tikslų, stabilumo užtikrinimo ir skatinti privataus kapitalo investicijas ne vien tik Afrikoje, bet ir mūsų Rytų kaimynystėje. Itin svarbu, kad šio fondo galimybės būtų maksimaliai išnaudotos Europos Sąjungos Rytų kaimynystėje, Rytų partnerystės šalyse ir ypač Ukrainoje, nes nuo Rytų kaimynystės stabilumo ir ekonominio tvarumo ženkliai priklauso visos Europos ateitis.

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, je veux remercier le Président Juncker et surtout son commissaire à la coopération internationale et au développement, M. Mimica, pour ce que je considère comme l'une des meilleures initiatives que cette Commission ait prises.

Cela fait trois ou quatre ans que je me bats aux côtés de Jean-Louis Borloo, ancien ministre français de l'écologie, en vue d'organiser un futur pour les jeunes gens en Afrique. La pauvreté est liée au fait qu'il n'y a pas d'électricité dans les villages. Quand il n'y a pas d'électricité dans les villages, les gens migrent vers la capitale et ses bidonvilles, et s'ils n'y trouvent pas d'avenir, ils paient des mafieux et risquent leur vie pour venir en Europe.

Par conséquent, le seul moyen de combattre ces flots de migrants et leur désespoir, c'est d'apporter l'énergie solaire en Afrique.

La bonne nouvelle, c'est qu'à cette fin, aujourd'hui, le solaire est assez bon marché. Cet instrument nous permettra d'offrir aux pays africains des coûts de capitaux réduits et un dialogue institutionnel pour les aider à mettre en place les lois nationales nécessaires pour attirer les investisseurs.

En conséquence, bravo aussi à tous les collègues qui ont accéléré ce processus!

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η προτεινόμενη χρηματοδοτική στήριξη της Αφρικής και τρίτων χωρών στη γειτονιά της Ευρώπης στηρίζεται σε λάθος βάση. Είναι ανήθικο να κατευθύνουμε χρήματα προς τρίτες χώρες στηριζόμενοι στη ρήση «τα χρήματα δεν μπορούν να αγοράσουν την ευτυχία, μπορούν να κάνουν όμως τη δυστυχία πιο ευχάριστη». Είναι παράλογο να προκαλούμε τη λαθρομετανάστευση επιδιώκοντας φθηνά εργατικά χέρια και επίλυση του δημογραφικού προβλήματος της Ευρώπης, ενώ κατηγορούμε τις χώρες προέλευσης ότι αδυνατούν να κρατήσουν τους πολίτες τον τόπο τους. Είναι δαπανηρό να διοχετεύουμε αβίαστα, εκ των προτέρων, χρήματα ευρωπαίων φορολογουμένων σε αυτές τις χώρες και να ευχόμαστε να μειωθούν οι μεταναστευτικές ροές, οι παραβιάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και η εμπορία ανθρώπων. Προέχει η αντιμετώπιση της συνεχιζόμενης οικονομικής κρίσης στις χώρες του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου, εκτός αν θεωρείτε αυτούς τους ανθρώπους πολίτες τρίτης κατηγορίας.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo sostenibile va ad integrare il piano europeo per gli investimenti esterni e fornirà finanziamenti sotto forma di sovvenzioni, garanzie e altri strumenti finanziari per l'Africa e il vicinato dell'Unione. Servirà ad affrontare le pressioni migratorie scaturite dalla povertà, dai conflitti, dall'instabilità, dal sottosviluppo, dalla disuguaglianza, dalle violazioni dei diritti umani.

Occorre tuttavia svolgere un'attenta fase di monitoraggio: se l'obiettivo è quello di mobilitare investimenti fino a 44 miliardi di euro, serve un monitoraggio non formale ma finalizzato alla qualità degli investimenti, sia in termini di rendimento che di sostenibilità.

Registro con favore la semplificazione concessa a questo Fondo da due piattaforme di investimento regionali, una per l'Africa e l'altra per i paesi della politica di vicinato, che fungeranno da sportello unico per ricevere proposte da istituzioni finanziarie e da investitori. Sarà necessario tuttavia dare la giusta trasparenza, mettendo a disposizione del pubblico le informazioni relative a tutte le operazioni di finanziamento e di investimento coperte dalla garanzia del Fondo.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Neven Mimica, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, Honourable Members, thank you for these encouraging words and the support of the European Parliament in this file. Let me emphasise that the Commission will really regularly report to Parliament about the implementation of the plan. The Commission will take its responsibilities and ensure that the Regulation is respected in all its aspects, such as ensuring additionality, poverty alleviation, more and better and decent jobs for young people and for women, policy coherence for development and value for money.

Let me conclude by underlining that I am very much looking forward to fruitful cooperation under this instrument. Now the real work starts with the implementation of the regulation, setting up the secretariat, preparing and defining the investments windows. I am now waiting impatiently to continue the excellent work with the European Parliament and to invite Parliament's representatives to the first strategic board meeting. Thank you very much for the attention and your cooperation.

Eduard Kukan, spravodajca. – Pán predsedajúci, chcem sa poďakovať kolegyniam a kolegom za ich záujem, ale hlavne za väčšinovú podporu tomuto fondu. Nie som si istý, či niektorí z tých, čo ho kritizovali, boli s ním poriadne aj zoznámení.

Máme pred sebou dôležitý finančný a zahranično-politický nástroj, ktorý má napomôcť udržateľnému rozvoju a rastu krajín, ktoré sú často hlavnými pôvodcami migrácie.

Viem, že fond bez ohľadu na jeho veľký finančný zdroj nevyrieši všetky problémy, ale určite môže prispieť k tomu, aby sa vytvorili podmienky pre ich postupné riešenie.

O angažovanosti súkromného sektora hovoríme preto, aby sa dostali investície, ktoré pomôžu vytvárať pracovné miesta a pracovné príležitosti. Som tiež rád, že sa nám podarilo s maltským predsedníctvom dohodnúť na mnohých otázkach, že sme vytvorili nástroj, ktorý by mal dopĺňať doterajšie finančné nástroje zahraničnej politiky.

Fond bude spravovaný Európskou komisiou, čo zaručí väčšiu možnosť kontroly Európskym parlamentom. Chcel by som povedať zásadnú vetu, že som presvedčený, že sa nám podarilo dosiahnuť dobrú dohodu. Treba ju realizovať.

A preto chcem ešte raz poďakovať kolegom, spravodajcom, Komisii, slovenskému, maltskému a estónskemu predsedníctvu za spoluprácu. Ďakujem pekne.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to mention and address some issues that have been raised by our colleagues in this Chamber.

In fact, we have a clause in the report that the guarantee shall not be used to replace government responsibility for providing essential public services. The Commission now has the obligation to provide information to Parliament prior to the setting up of investment windows. There is an obligation on the Commission to publish on its website direct references to the complaints mechanism of the relevant counterparts, and the possibility of directly receiving complaints related to the treatment of grievances by eligible counterparts, as well as the clearly defined geographic scope – Africa and the EU Neighbourhood – which can be modified only by amending the EFSD Regulation.

We also managed to improve the focus on addressing the root causes of migration by placing it more clearly in the context of fostering sustainable and inclusive economic and social development. The EFSD is addressed at, and is going to focus on, growth, the creation of decent jobs, poverty eradication, youth and women, socio-economic sectors, including small and medium-sized enterprises.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the two other co-rapporteurs and the chairs and coordinators of the three committees. This is the first EP report to have three co-rapporteurs – with three committees involved – and I can tell you that it was a success. I am also looking forward to tomorrow, when the House is going to vote for this very important European Union instrument which will also promote our values in Africa and in our Eastern Neighbourhood.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, ponente. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, como ha podido ver, ha habido un gran apoyo al acuerdo al que hemos llegado con la Comisión y con el Consejo y espero que este gran apoyo se materialice mañana en el voto. Ahora, como decía usted, toca el mundo real y toca ponerlo en marcha.

Si ha escuchado con atención el debate, muchos de los diputados y diputadas han llamado la atención sobre esos compromisos a los que hemos llegado con la Comisión, esa rendición de cuentas, esa coordinación que tiene que haber por parte de la Comisión con el Parlamento, la explicación de las ventanas de inversión; pero también se ha hecho mucho hincapié —y yo lo he destacado en mi primera intervención— en la lucha contra el fraude fiscal y en la no cooperación con los paraísos fiscales.

Así que esperamos encarecidamente que, como decía el señor comisario, sigan al pie de la letra el Reglamento y, sobre todo, el artículo 15, que hace referencia a estos informes de cuentas que tienen que entregar al Parlamento Europeo, y el artículo 20, en el que hablamos sobre la fiscalidad.

Y simplemente me gustaría acabar, evidentemente, dando las gracias a mis coponentes, porque ha sido un placer trabajar con ellos. Es verdad que ha sido complicado coordinar a tres comisiones, pero creo que lo hemos logrado en un tiempo récord. Por supuesto, a la Comisión Europea —ha hecho un papel clave en las negociaciones— y al Consejo —especialmente a la Presidencia maltesa, que ha sido la que ha estado liderando estas negociaciones—; también a los ponentes alternativos, a los presidentes de las comisiones... todos hemos contribuido y trabajado en equipo y creo que el resultado de las negociaciones ha sido bueno porque hemos conseguido trabajar en ese equipo, y, evidentemente, si aún cabe, más que nunca, a las secretarías de las tres comisiones y los tres grupos políticos. Como decía, trabajar tres comisiones ha sido complicadísimo. Ha sido un Reglamento muy delicado y, si no llega a ser por su trabajo detallado, no habríamos conseguido llegar a este acuerdo en ese tiempo récord de cuatro meses. Ahora queda ponerlo en marcha y esperamos que veamos los frutos pronto.

President. – I am also happy to extend thanks to the three rapporteurs and I feel the genuinely positive atmosphere among you, so thank you.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 6 July 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), na piśmie. – Od dłuższego już czasu powtarzamy na tej sali, jak ważne jest rozwiązywanie problemu migracji poprzez działania na rzecz poprawy sytuacji w krajach pochodzenia migrantów. Uważam, że ustanowienie Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju stanowi bardzo konkretne przełożenie tych słów na czyny. Wierzę, że stymulowanie inwestycji w Afryce i krajach sąsiedzkich może w sposób realny przyczynić się do tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy i poprawy koniunktury gospodarczej, a tym samym ograniczyć liczbę migrantów napływających do Europy z przyczyn ekonomicznych. Musimy jednak pamiętać, iż Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju jest jednym z trzech filarów Europejskiego Planu Inwestycji Zewnętrznych i niezwykle ważne jest położenie równego nacisku na dwa kolejne filary, w szczególności zaś działania na rzecz poprawy klimatu inwestycyjnego i ogólnego otoczenia politycznego oraz na rzecz walki z korupcją.

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Proponowany Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju zakłada mobilizację inwestycji wartych 44 mld EUR w Afryce, a także w sąsiedztwie południowym oraz wschodnim. Pieniądze pochodziłyby z regionalnych platform inwestycyjnych, a inwestycje realizowane byłyby we współpracy z instytucjami finansowymi takimi jak EBI, EBOR, a także międzynarodowe, regionalne i krajowe banki rozwoju. Jest to niezmiernie ważne przedsięwzięcie, jako że najskuteczniejszym sposobem radzenia sobie z problemami takimi jak niestabilność czy migracja jest wspieranie rozwoju gospodarczego państw pochodzenia potencjalnych uchodźców i zapewnienie im godziwych warunków życia. W trakcie negocjacji nad dyskutowanym dziś wnioskiem udało się rozwiązać pewne wątpliwości dotyczące finansowania – ustalono między innymi, że państwa członkowskie nie będą zobowiązane do wnoszenia

dodatkowych składek do budżetu. Przyjęcie rozporządzenia planowane jest przed szczytem UE–Afryka i szczytem Partnerstwa Wschodniego, przypadającymi pod koniec tego roku, i jeśli wejdzie w życie, będzie ważnym impulsem dla wzrostu gospodarczego, tworzenia dobrobytu i zagwarantowania stabilności krajów rozwijających się.

14. Azzjoni tal-UE għas-sostenibbiltà – Forum Politiku ta' Livell Għoli dwar l-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli (dibattitu)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on

— the report by Seb Dance, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, on EU action for sustainability (2017/2009(INI)) (A8-0239/2017), and

— the Council and Commission statements on the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (2017/2715(RSP)).

Seb Dance, rapporteur. – Mr President, let me begin by thanking the shadow rapporteurs in the other groups for their excellent work and cooperation throughout this process. And may I please also pay particular tribute to Emily Stewart in my office whose work on this has been exemplary and without whom I would not be able to be standing here and present this report to this House?

I'm also extremely grateful to the committees that put their input into this report, namely the Development Committee, the Agriculture Committee and the Cultural Committee. But I am very disappointed that there were not more committees contributing to this process, because we have had many MEPs put forward their expertise, but we need a full breadth of committees involved in this process, because a key ask of this report is that the Commission use all of its departments and instil the UN sustainable development goals throughout all of the Commission's departments. And unless we practise that in this Parliament, it will be difficult to act as the exemplar for others.

Imagine if you will, a world where no child is born into hunger, where no child is born into poverty, where access to health care and clean water – some of the things you might take for granted – are available to everyone, where well-paid jobs, decent jobs, don't come at the expense of the environment, and where we all act together as stewards, not owners, of this planet, and that we can forward it to the next generation.

This doesn't just have to be a pipe dream, and it certainly doesn't have to be the preserve of one group in this House. This goal is something we as humans must all own and make a reality. The goals defined through the UN's 17 sustainable development goals will achieve this if we put the necessary measures into practice. I am very grateful to the Commission for its initial assessment of progress, again but I have to be perfectly honest, it is not enough to look at existing work and then backfit it into the 17 UN sustainable development goals.

We have to be honest with ourselves, not just about the scale of our ambition, but the scale of the task at hand. When we conduct our trade, when we develop shared energy networks, when we draw up financing rules, when we draw up strategies for transportation, when we evaluate education, when we drive forward change at a local, city, regional, national and European level we must always ask ourselves: 'are we doing enough and is what we are doing delivering the UN's sustainable development goals?'

We and our generation are running out of excuses, and we don't have the excuse of previous generations of ignorance. We know how our actions today will affect the world around us tomorrow. There is a school group up there! Hello, it is your future we're discussing today, and the decisions that we take in this place and across all of the EU's institutions will have ramifications.

It is great news that Vice-President Timmermans will chair the multi-stakeholder forum, but it is essential that the Commission use this forum properly to learn from other actors, to share best practice and to report back to this Parliament. We didn't get everything through that we wanted to in this report and I'm sure we will hear from others about some of the compromises that don't go far enough, and that is a fair criticism. But we must use this infrastructure to have a proper discussion; a proper discussion across all layers of government and hold the Commission to account on its promises, but also have the Commission report to us.

I ask each and every group in this House to have somebody on their Bureau responsible for delivering this, because the world needs leadership. Mr Commissioner, when you go to the UN in New York, we want you to take the views of this House forward, because it is time for the EU to step up and show that leadership.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, the EU was leading the international community when we shaped, negotiated and adopted the transformative, comprehensive, universal 2030 Agenda. The EU must now also demonstrate strong leadership in the implementation of the Agenda, both at home, at the EU Member State level, and in the context of the high-level political forum on sustainable development.

The Council conclusions adopted in June, ahead of the fifth session of the forum this month, stress our full commitment to the 2030 Agenda and the importance that the EU and its Member States attach to driving forward its implementation. Eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions is an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, which must be achieved in all its dimensions in a balanced and integrated manner. There can be no doubt about our commitment to achieving the 17 sustainable development goals by 2030, ensuring that no one is left behind and seeking to reach the furthest behind first. No doubt, we must promote social inclusion, with special attention to those who are disadvantaged, vulnerable and marginalised.

Like the European Parliament, the Council continues to stress the need for the Commission to demonstrate that it takes the implementation of the 2030 Agenda seriously. We call on the Commission to elaborate an implementation strategy, outlining timelines, objectives and concrete measures to reflect the 2030 Agenda in all the relevant EU internal and external policies, taking into account the global impact of the EU's domestic actions. This strategy should be based on a clear vision of how all relevant EU policies will contribute to the realisation of the 2030 Agenda.

There is an urgent need to identify gaps in all relevant policy areas within the EU to assess what more needs to be done by 2030 in terms of EU policy legislation and governance structure for horizontal coherence and means of implementation.

Even though much remains to be done in terms of concrete action, the Council of 20 June welcomed the steps proposed and taken by the Commission with regard to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the sustainable development goal. On 7 June, the Council, represented by the Maltese Presidency, along with the European Parliament and the Commission, co-signed a new European consensus on development, which sets out our shared vision and framework for action for development cooperation. The new consensus aligns the Union's development policy with the 2030 Agenda. This will be our main deliverable when we attended the high level political forum in New York in a few days. The Estonian mission to the United Nations has invited Ms Linda McAvan, chairwoman of the Committee on Development, as a speaker at one of the side events.

We, the EU institutions and Member States alike, should be proud of this achievement. It is our new ambitious collective European development policy, and it addresses in an integrated manner the main focus points of the 2030 Agenda: people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership.

This year's theme at the Forum is at the heart of our new consensus –eradicating poverty and promoting prosperity in a changing world. Indeed, poverty eradication remains the primary objective of our development policy. At the same time, it integrates the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and underlines the links between development and other policies, including peace and security, humanitarian aid, migration, the environment and climate change.

The new consensus also reaffirms our commitment to a rules-based global order with multilateralism and the United Nations at its core. Given the strong link with climate action, through the new consensus we are also giving a timely political signal to reaffirm our strong commitment to implement the Paris Agreement.

The EU Member States consider the High Level Forum as the main forum for sustainable development issues within the UN framework and are committed to progress towards implementation of the sustainable development goals. After the four EU pioneers, including my own country Estonia, which were among the first 22 countries to present voluntary national reviews last year, this year 10 out of 44 reports will be presented by EU Member States.

The European Parliament's report on sustainability goals, adopted in May 2016, shows broad convergence with Council views on how to advance this ambitious agenda through effective implementation and we are looking forward to cooperating with you on this topic to ensure that, together, we reach our goals by 2030.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking Mr Dance for his excellent work as rapporteur. The Agenda 2030 declaration itself acknowledges the essential role of Parliament through their enactment of legislation and adoption of budgets and their role in ensuring accountability for the effective implementation of the Agenda 2030 commitments. So this report is very welcome, and we appreciate the high level of interest that it has raised as a signal of Parliament's own commitment to engage in implementation and the review of progress.

The United Nations 2030 Agenda, adopted unanimously by world leaders in 2015, represents a new global sustainable development framework. It is a commitment to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development by 2030 worldwide, ensuring that no one is left behind. The EU has been instrumental in shaping the 2030 Agenda and it is also committed to remain a frontrunner in the implementation phase.

Sustainable development is a shared responsibility. It implies leadership from the Commission and other EU institutions, but also the full engagement of Member States and all levels of government at national, regional and local level and of civil society.

I therefore welcome the opportunity here today to react to the European Parliament's own initiative report in response to the Commission communication 'Next Steps for a Sustainable European Future' presented in November last year. From the perspective of my own portfolio, I am pleased to see in the report several strong references to how the environment and natural resources underpin the achievement of the broader sustainability agenda. I also welcome the references to the 7th Environment Action Programme, whose objectives map well on to the sustainable development goals (SDG). Indeed, it is crucial to ensure the full coherence between the different policies and ensure that the EU's priorities as highlighted by President Juncker integrate our international commitments. I will ensure that the current 7th Environmental Action Plan evaluation will look at its consistency with our priorities and sustainable development goals commitments to pave the way for the period post 2020.

The Commission's communication of November highlights key EU policies for each of the 17 SDGs, particularly in the context of the 10 priorities of this Commission, and also outlines what further steps are envisaged. The response to the 2030 Agenda includes two work streams. Firstly, to mainstream the sustainable development goals in the European policy framework and Commission priorities, sustainable development becoming a guiding principle for all our policies. We are using our better regulation tools for this purpose. Secondly, further developing our longer-term vision and the focus of sectoral policies after 2020. In addition to that, we have said in our communication that the new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) beyond 2020 will reorient the EU budget contributions towards the achievement of the EU's long-term objectives.

Stakeholder involvement will be crucial in implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Commission will therefore launch a multi-stakeholder platform chaired by the First Vice-President, Frans Timmermans, with a role in the follow-up and exchange of best practices on SDG implementation across sectors. The input of the platform will be very important for developing our vision for the future of SDG implementation through the second work stream. We need to have a good dialog with the European Parliament, the Council and the Member States in the second stream process as well. We are currently reflecting on how to best organise this.

The successful implementation of the SDGs requires consistent monitoring. As requested by this House, the Commission will, from this year, provide regular reporting of the EU's progress on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda based on a reference indicator framework. Stakeholders have been consulted on the choice of these indicators. A periodic report is expected to be published in November this year.

Initiatives, supported by the Commission for the next month, include a non-toxic environment strategy, an ambitious plastics strategy and a comprehensive review of water legislation. The report recognises that economic growth will only be possible by respecting planetary boundaries to ensure a life of dignity for all. The evidence is clear that moving from our linear to a more circular economic model significantly improves resource efficiency and therefore cost efficiency, and creates more jobs.

I also noted the report considers that significant acceleration of green investment, innovation and growth in the EU is needed, including use of new financing tools and different approaches to current investment policy. I particularly welcome the reference in the report to the Commission's joint communication on the future of our oceans and could not agree more with the statement that urgent action is needed in the EU and globally. This was made clear at the UN Ocean Conference in New York last month and will frame the agenda for the EU Our Ocean Conference in October in Malta.

The UN high-level political forum starts in just 5 days and leads to a ministerial meeting on 17 to 20 July. My colleague Commissioner Mimica will attend on 17 and 18 July. We see the high-level political forum as a critical component of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. It is the principal UN body to review progress, identify challenges and make recommendations to help ensure we achieve the SDGs. During his visit, Commissioner Mimica will also highlight progress with the EU's implementation of the 2030 Agenda, both internally as well as externally. He will also make clear that the EU is determined to play its full part in promoting the implementation of the Agenda through its internal and external actions. The Commissioner is also expected to highlight the new European consensus on development as a landmark document for the EU, having been agreed by the Commission, Member States and the European Parliament and applying to both the EU and its Member States, in their national capacity.

The Commissioner will make a statement on behalf of the EU and its Member States in the general debate of the ministerial meeting of the high-level political forum on 17 July. He will also host a separate side-event at the high-level political forum to introduce the new consensus to our international partners. Other sessions of the high-level political forum will cover a range of issues, including sessions on specific sustainable development goals: sustainable development goal (SDG) 1 on poverty, SDG 2 on hunger, SDG 3 on health, SDG 5 on gender equality, 9 on infrastructure and 14 on oceans. In addition, 44 voluntary national reviews will also be presented at this year's high-level political forum, including from ten EU Member States.

Liadh Ní Riada, Dréachtóir do thuairim an Choiste um Chultúr agus um Oideachas. – A Uachtarán, maidir leis an tuarascáil seo atá faoi bhráid an Choiste um Chultúr agus um Oideachas, ba mhaith liom an bhéim is mó a chuir ar SDG 4, cursaí oideachais agus nascacht tuaithe. Ní hamháin go gcaithfidimid forbairt inbhuanaithe a dhéanamh inár gcathracha, ach tá sé tábhachtach dúinn tagairt agus freastal ar ár gcónaitheoirí tuaithe chomh maith. Sin an chúis gur chuireas béim ar mo thuairim ar iompar poiblí mar aon le gnéithe eile.

Tá sé tabhachtach go ndéanfar tagairt faoi leith dóibh siúd nach bhfuil na hacmhainní acu i dtaobh forbairt oideachais agus cultúir. Tá neart cumais ag ár ndream óg agus tá sé tábhachtach maoiniú a chur ar fáil dóibh go háirithe san earnáil chruthaíoch. Is cearta sibhialta atá i gceist i dtaobh ábhair oideachais agus cultúir a chur ar fáil go forleathan. Failtím go mbeidh monatóireacht á déanamh air seo mar a luaigh an Coimisinéir níos luaithe.

Má táimid chun a bheith dáiríre faoi fhorbairt inbhuanaithe a chur i bhfeidhm, caithfear a chinntiú go mbainfidh gach saoránach leas as an bhforbairt a déantar.

Ulrike Müller, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung*. – Der Begriff Nachhaltigkeit wurde vor über 300 Jahren von Hans Carl von Carlowitz in Deutschland geprägt. Er hat 1713 die nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft eingeführt und den Menschen erklärt, dass nicht mehr Holz geschlagen werden darf, als tatsächlich nachwächst. Heute ist die Nachhaltigkeit ein großes, manchmal auch inflationäres Wort. Betreffen tut es uns alle. Die Frage, wie wir Nachhaltigkeit gestalten, wirkt sich unmittelbar auf unsere Gegenwart wie auf unsere Zukunft aus. Die Vereinigten Nationen haben in der Agenda 2030 17 detaillierte Nachhaltigkeitsziele verabschiedet, die auch Grundlage für unseren Bericht waren.

Für mich war im Agrarausschuss wichtig, dass wir die Berücksichtigung aller drei Säulen – der sozialen, der wirtschaftlichen und der umweltpolitischen – als gleichwertig nebeneinander betrachten. Nachhaltigkeit kann funktionieren, wenn sich wieder ein Gespür für Regionalität und Produktionsprozesse in den Primärprodukten entwickelt. Die soziale Säule im ländlichen Raum – mit Tourismus, gelebter Dorfkultur mit Vereinswesen wie freiwilliger Feuerwehr und Musikkapellen – bildet mehr als nur Lebens- und Arbeitsraum.

Laut einer Studie wird die Weltbevölkerung auf neun Milliarden Menschen ansteigen. Das stellt uns Landwirte vor große Herausforderungen. Es geht einerseits um Nahrungsmittelproduktion, aber auch um knapper werdende Flächen aufgrund von Infrastruktur und Wohnraum. Lassen Sie uns endlich aufhören, Land- und Forstwirtschaft als Problem zu sehen, sondern erkennen Sie mit uns die Landwirtschaft als Teil der Lösung an.

Elly Schlein, *relatrice per parere della commissione per lo sviluppo*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio intanto il collega Seb Dance e chi ha lavorato con me al parere approvato in commissione per lo sviluppo.

I nuovi obiettivi dello sviluppo sostenibile sono universali e sono ambiziosi: non possiamo lasciarli sulla carta. Serve una strategia europea di implementazione, che chiediamo dal giorno uno, e anche una chiara *roadmap* per raggiungerli. L'UE deve fare molto di più per la coerenza delle politiche dello sviluppo e fare valutazioni di impatto delle proprie politiche sulla sostenibilità e sui paesi in via di sviluppo. Servono risorse, non solo riconfermando l'impegno di raggiungere lo 0,7 %, ma anche con una lotta senza quartiere contro l'evasione e l'elusione fiscale a livello globale.

Inoltre bisogna abbandonare la pericolosa tendenza a condizionare gli aiuti allo sviluppo al controllo delle frontiere. Colleghi, parliamoci chiaro: con tutto quello che sta succedendo intorno a noi, con presidenti americani che negano il cambiamento climatico e che giocano con il futuro di tutti, l'Unione europea si deve mettere alla guida dell'implementazione della nuova agenda e della responsabilità che abbiamo verso le future generazioni, per un futuro finalmente sostenibile.

José Inácio Faria, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, a diplomacia ambiental e climática da União tem vindo a revelar um papel de liderança na implementação da agenda mundial para 2030 e no compromisso de erradicar a pobreza e alcançar um desenvolvimento sustentável no quadro dos dezasseis objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável e das 169 metas associadas, que abordam todos os aspetos da política da União, e no cumprimento do Acordo de Paris.

Fui designado relator-sombra deste relatório sobre a ação da União Europeia para a sustentabilidade, que constituiu uma oportunidade para o Parlamento Europeu ancorar a sua visão e a sua agenda numa ação europeia para a sustentabilidade. No entanto, cumpre dizer que temos ainda um longo caminho a percorrer. Precisamos da definição da estratégia global para aplicar a Agenda 2030, que englobe os domínios da política interna e externa, de um calendário pormenorizado até 2030, de um sistema eficaz e completo de acompanhamento e monitorização e de indicadores de progresso específicos relativos à aplicação interna dos objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável na União Europeia.

Trata-se, no meu entendimento, de um relatório ambicioso e muito participado. Foram apresentadas 308 emendas pelos diversos grupos políticos e mais de 30 emendas de compromisso. Neste relatório, deu-se destaque à luta contra as alterações climáticas e à descarbonização da economia, à proteção dos oceanos, à economia circular e eficiência dos recursos, à promoção da ciência, tecnologia e inovação, à agricultura sustentável, à conservação da natureza, à integração da Agenda 2030 no Semestre Europeu, ao combate das desigualdades entre outros Estados-Membros e entre Estados-Membros e à proteção dos mais vulneráveis e marginalizados.

Reconhecemos que, para cumprir os objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável, será necessária a participação de todas as partes interessadas da União Europeia e, por isso, instamos a Comissão Europeia a assegurar que a plataforma multilateral anunciada na sua comunicação se torne um modelo de boas práticas para facilitar o planeamento, a execução, o acompanhamento e a revisão da Agenda 2030.

Acredito que o Parlamento Europeu tem de ter um papel claro e determinante na implementação da Agenda 2030 que esteja profundamente alinhado com os princípios e os valores da União Europeia. Acredito ainda que a concretização dos objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável e da Agenda 2030 pode ser o legado que a Europa deixará às gerações futuras.

Termino, Sr. Presidente, dizendo que este relatório mostra que esta casa tem um indeclinável papel na criação de um futuro melhor e mais sustentável, e quero agradecer ao Seb Dance todo o empenho e todo o esforço que dedicou, especialmente em conjunto com os relatores-sombra, para o desenvolvimento deste trabalho, que é um belíssimo trabalho.

Miriam Dalli, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, let me start straightaway by congratulating you, Seb, on the amazing work you carried out. I know it wasn't an easy task, but you managed to come up with a very good and well-balanced report, and congratulations once again for that.

As we have heard today, today's challenges call for both policies and approaches, because we have a number of challenges. For example, global economic growth is far from being robust. Fast technological progress and globalisation are creating opportunities for some, but they are causing immense challenges for others. We have societies that are aging rapidly and others with as much as 66% of the population under the age of 26. The former are finding it difficult to support their aging population; the latter are finding it difficult to create enough opportunities for their young. Many countries are also being impacted by great natural disasters and with climate change, weather events will continue to worsen for decades to come. And this is why we need to make sure that the sustainable development goals are implemented and are not merely words on paper. This is why today and every single day until the goals are achieved, we must take concrete steps to make the world more sustainable. But to do this, leadership in all countries and at all levels of society is badly needed. Governments, parliaments, businesses, civil society organisations, the media and citizens need to be all engaged to find efficient sustainable solutions locally, nationally and also globally. This is an issue of international solidarity. It will not be an easy task. It will take a lot of effort, but it is our responsibility to work together and address this very important issue.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Zrównoważony rozwój dotyczy w równym stopniu każdego z trzech filarów: środowiskowego, gospodarczego i społecznego. Cieszę się, że sprawozdawca zgodził się ze mną w tej kwestii. Jednocześnie jednak muszę zauważyć, że osiągnięcie tych celów nie rozwiąże wszystkich problemów świata; nie możemy przepisami unijnymi ingerować w tak szczegółowe dziedziny życia jak sposób odżywiania się ludzi. Nie mogę zgodzić się na zapisy dotyczące konieczności redukcji hodowli zwierząt tucznych, redukcji konsumpcji mięsa czy też ograniczeń dla paliw rzepakowych. Zdziwiałam, że projekt ingeruje również w prawa reprodukcyjne i seksualne oraz chce wpływać na politykę migracyjną państw. Unia Europejska nie powinna tworzyć recept na życie, wiara w to, że regulowanie każdej dziedziny może naprawić problemy świata, jest naiwna, dlatego też nie możemy poprzec tego sprawozdania.

Stefan Eck, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die rasant wachsende Antibiotikaresistenz ist neben der Klimaerwärmung die größte Gefahr für die Menschheit. Darauf müssen wir uns ganz gezielt konzentrieren. Laut einer Studie der Berliner Charité werden 2050 weltweit zehn Millionen Menschen pro Jahr durch multiresistente Bakterienstämme, die nicht mehr auf Antibiotika ansprechen, sterben, wenn wir nicht umgehend Alternativen für die tierquälerischen und krank machenden Nutztierhaltungssysteme finden, die die Brutstätten dieser tödlichen Keime sind.

Das Ergebnis der Abstimmung über diesen Bericht im Ausschuss wurde von zahlreichen NGOs aus den Bereichen Armutsbekämpfung, Gesundheit, Umwelt und Tierschutz sehr begrüßt. Es ist enttäuschend, wie danach die konservativen Kräfte in diesem Haus wieder einmal alles darangesetzt haben, diesen Bericht zu verwässern. Ich sage Ihnen: Dieses kurzfristige Denken wird nach hinten losgehen. Wir haben es dann zu verantworten, was kommende Generationen ausbaden haben. Ich appelliere an Sie: Geben Sie der Zukunft eine Chance, stimmen Sie für Nachhaltigkeit!

Benedek Jávor, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Seb Dance, for his excellent cooperation and marvellous work. The set of SDGs creates a very important guide of action for environmental, social and economic development, good governance and poverty measures, but is the EU really prepared for a thorough implementation of the SDGs? That is really the question. In the committee, we have concluded a very good report, and I hope that Parliament will remain strong and united at the plenary level and maintain the position as expressed at committee level.

I would like to draw your attention to some specific points. First of all, I argue specifically for due consideration of the social aspects of the SDGs and specific action for vulnerable groups. There are several deficiencies, also within the EU, in access to water, sanitation, along with other natural resources and basic services, such as air, water, affordable and sustainable energy, health and nutrition, which particularly hit vulnerable groups. The Commission and the Member States must urgently ramp up their efforts, correct these deficiencies and provide specific tailor-made support for marginalised, low-income households and groups like the Roma community within the EU.

Moreover, there is a broad agreement on the need for a comprehensive EU strategy for the implementation of the SDGs. Last but not least, there is a pressing need for systemic screening of EU policies and public funding to be in line with the SDGs when we spend the EU's public money.

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa purtroppo è ancora anni luce lontana dal raggiungere molti degli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile previsti dall'agenda ONU. Serve una netta inversione di tendenza per cambiare questa direzione.

La relazione che ha proposto, e su cui abbiamo lavorato, il collega Dance – che ringrazio per il lavoro svolto – contiene molti, molti punti positivi su molti aspetti: sul clima, sulla biodiversità, sulla partecipazione dei territori, sull'agricoltura. Però manca ancora di coraggio e di ambizione su molti fronti: voglio fare riferimento in particolare alla gestione dei rifiuti e all'incenerimento. Io mi aspetto e mi aspettavo che un documento di indirizzo di questo tipo fosse molto più ambizioso, perché penso sia assurdo che non lo sia e che non guardi lontano, che non cerchi di osare un po' di più. E invece ci troviamo a ribadire quello che è già scritto, quello che è già l'ovvio.

Domani abbiamo l'occasione, con gli emendamenti del Movimento 5 Stelle, di chiedere di mettere fine alle sovvenzioni per l'incenerimento, alle sovvenzioni pubbliche, come richiesto dalla stessa comunicazione della Commissione europea dell'inizio di quest'anno.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Ziele der Vereinten Nationen für die nachhaltige Entwicklung sind eine Verpflichtung für uns alle, und es geht um unser aller Zukunft. Deswegen ist es wichtig, dass dieses Parlament morgen mit breiter Mehrheit dem Bericht von Seb Dance zustimmt. Umso mehr habe ich mich geärgert, dass es bei der Abstimmung im Ausschuss Probleme gab, sodass die EVP zunächst nicht zustimmen konnte. Wir empfanden einige Passagen als sehr aggressiv, insbesondere wurden sie von den Landwirten als Angriff auf die Landwirtschaft angesehen. Wir brauchen aber eine nachhaltige Entwicklung mit den Landwirten, mit der Industrie, mit allen Partnern, und deswegen bin ich sehr froh, dass es uns gelungen ist, mit dem Berichterstatter Kompromisse auszuarbeiten, sodass wir das klarer, als es bisher war, im Bericht deutlich machen.

Wir wollen die Menschen mitnehmen, wir wollen alle Beteiligten, die sich auch umstellen müssen, mitnehmen. Ich sage aber auch ganz deutlich: Die Beteiligten müssen auch dazu bereit sein. Man kann auch nicht sagen: In der Industrie darf sich nichts ändern, in der Landwirtschaft darf sich nichts ändern, sondern wir müssen gemeinsam nach neuen Wegen suchen – nach innovativen Wegen –, wie wir Wirtschaftswachstum, soziale Aspekte und Umweltaspekte tatsächlich unter einen Hut bekommen. Ich glaube, wenn wir das morgen in der Abstimmung ein bisschen besser hinkriegen als im Ausschuss, dann werden wir eine große Mehrheit im Parlament haben. Und dann ist meine dringende Bitte an Rat und Kommission, das auch entsprechend aufzunehmen, damit wir das als EU-Organisationen gemeinsam vertreten können – mit allen Beteiligten in eine gute Zukunft für unsere Kinder und für unseren Planeten.

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

Eleonora Evi (EFDD), Domanda «cartellino blu». – Vorrei chiedere al collega Liese se non pensa che il gruppo PPE, il centrodestra europeo, stia di fatto nascondendo quello che si chiama l'«elephant in the room», l'elefante nella stanza, ovvero il grandissimo ed enorme contributo di impatto ambientale che ha l'agricoltura sull'ambiente e anche sulla salute, considerando che il consumo di carne è assolutamente non salutare. Quindi io le chiedo: non state negando l'evidenza?

Peter Liese (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Also zunächst einmal bitte ich ganz dringend, die Europäische Volkspartei nicht in einem Atemzug mit der europäischen Rechten zu nennen. Wir sind die Christdemokraten, wir sind eine Volkspartei der Mitte, und wir sind nicht die europäischen Rechte.

Zum Zweiten ist es so, dass wir natürlich wissen, dass wir im Bereich Landwirtschaft und Ernährung eine nachhaltige Entwicklung brauchen. Aber in dem ursprünglichen Bericht war das so formuliert, als wollten wir den Leuten jetzt in Zukunft vorschreiben, was sie zu essen haben. Und damit haben andere Parteien – in Deutschland z. B. – im Wahlkampf sehr schlechte Erfahrungen gemacht, und das würde ich auch dem Movimento 5 Stelle nicht empfehlen, den Leuten vorzuschreiben, was sie zu essen haben.

Florian Philippot, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, je ne crois pas que l'Union européenne soit en mesure d'agir pour la durabilité, étant donné qu'elle prône un modèle ultralibéral dont la caractéristique première est justement la précarité, c'est-à-dire l'inverse de la durabilité, précarité aussi bien sociale qu'environnementale.

En revanche, je crois en la capacité de nos nations à agir pour la durabilité du monde et pour leur propre durabilité. C'est notamment le cas en ce qui concerne le développement harmonieux de la planète, qui seul sera capable de freiner les immenses mouvements de population du sud vers le nord, dont nous commençons à peine à voir les débuts.

Je voudrais ici vous entretenir du formidable projet porté par M. Jean-Louis Borloo au bénéfice de l'électrification du continent africain. L'énergie est évidemment l'un des premiers droits de l'homme, qui conditionne l'accès à tant d'autres droits de l'homme, que ce soit l'eau, la santé ou l'emploi. L'énergie est un facteur territorial d'équilibre absolument puissant.

M. Borloo, bien sûr, n'est pas de ma famille politique, mais peu importe. J'ai discuté avec lui de ce projet, il me l'a expliqué et je souhaite y apporter ici ma contribution. Nos nations – la France en tête – doivent se mobiliser. L'électrification de l'Afrique aidera naturellement ce continent et ses populations, mais elle nous profitera aussi grandement, en freinant des mouvements migratoires déjà insensés et en accélérant notre propre taux de croissance économique.

Trois milliards d'euros par an pendant dix ans suffiraient. À l'échelle de nos nations, ce n'est pas grand-chose, surtout si elles sont unies dans une saine coopération, bien loin des mécanismes froids et aveugles de l'Union européenne. C'est largement faisable: il faut qu'on se mobilise à fond.

Linda McAvan (S&D). – Mr President, what is happening the week after next in New York is an extremely important meeting – the High-Level Political Forum – because it is a chance for the European Union to show leadership in multilateral governance at a time when others, the US in particular, are moving backwards on this. I think we need to do more, though, to have more influence in New York, and the first thing is we need to do a lot more to coordinate our positions.

The Commissioner said that they are working on an implementation plan on the SDGs, but Seb Dance is right. It is not enough for the Commission to make a list of what it is already doing institutionally. We need to push our Member States to do more, we need to be collecting data from our Member States, finding out if they – as well as the EU institutions – are meeting their targets, and then we need to be pushing to make sure the EU does deliver on the 2030 Agenda, a little bit in the same way as we do on the climate change targets. We have the effort-sharing and we monitor that, and the Commission publishes data and we push that forward. Otherwise, I do not think we will implement the SDGs.

We need to get other donors on the development side to work with us as well. The EU is doing a lot but we need other non-traditional donors to work with us. And finally, we need accountability. You said that you would come back and report to us on a regular basis, but we need to know what you are measuring – are you establishing base lines on statistics, and will you give us regular updates on how that is progressing?

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la política europea de desarrollo debe reflejar el mandato de esta Cámara, empezando por la implementación de estrategias para alcanzar los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible. Pero observamos con preocupación cómo muchos de los principios defendidos desde estas tribunas no encuentran traslación en las políticas de la Unión.

Una política de desarrollo centrada en los intereses de los pueblos y no solo de nuestros negocios requiere enfoques transversales, que no releguen los principios de justicia, equidad y sostenibilidad ambiental a simples palabras bonitas para calmar nuestras conciencias.

Hay principios que se han de respetar para garantizar la coherencia entre las políticas de la Unión, como la no condicionalidad de la ayuda a la externalización y militarización de nuestras fronteras, la implementación de instrumentos vinculantes en política comercial para la defensa real de los derechos humanos y de la justicia ambiental, el cumplimiento del objetivo del 0,7 %, o la promoción de sistemas tributarios justos y transparentes.

No cometamos el error de convertir las políticas de desarrollo en estrategias comerciales o de seguridad y defensa. No pervirtamos los valores fundacionales de la Unión Europea.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, poštovani povjereniće Vella, koristim priliku da istaknem tri činjenice na kojima Europska unija mora više poraditi i biti ambicioznija.

Prva je poput lakih brošura koju izdaje jedna udruga, približiti ciljeve održivog razvoja Ujedinjenih naroda svim građanima Europske unije kako bi oni prepoznali naše politike.

Drugo, borba protiv bacanja hrane. Tu smo potpuno neambiciozni, računajući da 50 milijuna građana Europske unije svaki dan mora voditi brigu o tome kako će se prehraniti, da ne govorimo o ostatku svijeta. I kada prelazimo na jednu ambiciozniju politiku, onda trebamo to pokazati u zakonodavstvu koje nažalost izostaje čak i u paketu cirkularne ekonomije o kojem u ovom trenutku pregovaramo s Komisijom.

I treće, u našim oceanima, u našim morima završava previše otpada. Opet, kada dolazimo na konkretne ciljeve, nedostaje aktivna i ambiciozna politika i Europske komisije i država članica.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wszyscy uznajemy, że te 17 celów, które zostały wyznaczone w agendzie do roku 2030, to cele ważne. Ale wśród nich – w zależności od stopnia rozwoju gospodarczego i problemów społecznych – są cele ważniejsze, bo niewątpliwie dostęp do wody, dostęp do żywności czy ewentualnie bezpieczeństwo, czy zwalczanie ubóstwa, to w niektórych krajach są to ważniejsze cele niż na przykład w krajach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Aby osiągnąć te cele musimy współpracować, współpracować nie tylko w obrębie Unii, ale przede wszystkim na forum międzynarodowym i dzielić się również swoimi doświadczeniami.

To, na co chciałbym zwrócić uwagę jako jeden z kilku celów, to są również działania wewnątrz samej Unii, które będą dotyczyć całej gospodarki. W szczególności mogą się przyczynić do stworzenia na przykład nowych miejsc pracy czy nowych sposobów zagospodarowania surowców. To jest bioekonomia, innowacyjne podejście do surowców odnawialnych, w tym również żywności, ale również i energii, kwestia gospodarki w obiegu zamkniętym konieczna do efektywnego korzystania z zasobów, ale też konieczna po to, aby je wielokrotnie wykorzystywać, polityka energetyczna, która z jednej strony pozwoli na zabezpieczenie dostaw i wykluczenie ubóstwa, ale z drugiej strony będzie się przyczyniała do osiągnięcia celów klimatycznych czy też chociażby czystego powietrza. Wiemy też, jak ważna jest kwestia obszarów wiejskich, obszarów leśnych. One dostarczają wielu dóbr publicznych i nie może być takiej sytuacji, że mówimy, że rolnictwo jest mniej ważne, ono dostarcza tych dóbr, których czasami nawet sobie nie uświadamiamy.

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Zwei Jahre nach Beschließen der UN-Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung hat die Kommission noch immer keine umfassende Strategie und keinen Zeitplan vorgelegt. Ich war selber mit den Kommissaren in New York. Wir brauchen hier mehr Engagement und eine schnellere, aktive Herangehensweise.

Zeitlich verbindliche transparente Strategien, die der Entwicklungsausschuss fordert, beinhalten insbesondere drei Punkte, die ich hervorheben möchte. Punkt eins: die Finanzierung. Die öffentliche Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, also die ODA, muss endlich den Stellenwert des zentralen Instruments für die Verwirklichung der 2030-Ziele erreichen. Dies geschieht nur, wenn alle Mitgliedstaaten und die EU endlich ihrer verbindlichen Zusage nachkommen, mindestens 0,7 % ihres Bruttonationaleinkommens für die öffentliche Entwicklungszusammenarbeit endlich bereitzustellen. Wir sollten weiterhin den künftigen mehrjährigen Finanzplan so konzipieren, dass die Agenda-21-Ziele priorisiert und verwirklicht werden.

Zweitens: der Handel. Die Handelsverträge zwischen der EU und den Mitgliedstaaten sollten verstärkt auf faire und nachhaltige Bedingungen achten. Dazu gehören die Einhaltung der Kernarbeitsnormen der Internationalen Arbeitsorganisation, also die Verankerung und Implementierung der OECD-Leitsätze für multinationale Unternehmen.

Und drittens: Die Klimadiplomatie sollte als das zentrale Ziel verfolgt werden. Die ganze Welt schaut jetzt nach Hamburg zum G20-Gipfel, dem diese Herausforderung als Hauptthema gestellt wird. Hier braucht die Kommission endlich eine Strategie, die vorgelegt werden muss, wie sie zusammen mit dem Europäischen Parlament, den Mitgliedstaaten, der Wissenschaft und der Zivilgesellschaft dieses Ziel erreichen kann.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, falar de desenvolvimento sustentável é promover a soberania alimentar, é promover a soberania energética, é abandonar a agricultura industrial, é marcar objetivos vinculativos para a redução do consumo global de energia de materiais.

Em 2003, a capacidade de regeneração do planeta foi superada em 25%. O planeta não aguentará o desenvolvimento sustentável proposto pela União Europeia, proposto pelo centro. Urge abandonar este desenvolvimento baseado no crescimento económico, na especulação e no massivo comércio global. É preciso promover a realocação das indústrias e da produção, mudar o modelo de transporte de pessoas, privilegiando o uso coletivo sobre o individual. No transporte terrestre de mercadorias, apostar no ferroviário. Acabar igualmente com a espoliação dos recursos naturais dos países em desenvolvimento. Só assim os objetivos de 2030 não se tornarão letra-morta.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señora ministra, la delegación del Parlamento que asistirá la semana que viene al Foro Político de Alto Nivel sobre Desarrollo Sostenible tendrá mucho trabajo.

En Nueva York, bajo el paraguas de Naciones Unidas, se debatirá sobre la erradicación de la pobreza en todas sus formas, un tema clave y, de hecho, la causa común, entre otras, de la pobreza energética, de la pobreza hídrica o de la malnutrición. Debemos atacar la raíz del problema, sin olvidar que en 2014 eran 122 millones de europeos quienes vivían con riesgo de pobreza o exclusión social, según datos de la Comisión.

Se debatirá sobre igualdad, y es la misma Comisión quien afirmó que tardaríamos setenta años, de seguir la progresión actual, en llegar a la plena igualdad. ¿Cómo les explico yo a mis hijas que, por el mismo trabajo, ganarán un 16 % menos que su hermano por el simple hecho de haber nacido niñas y no serán sino sus nietas quienes vivirán en una realidad que hoy ya debería ser normal?

Se debatirá sobre la promoción del bienestar para todas, para todos, a todas las edades, y quiero recordar que, de acuerdo con distintos estudios que tiene la Comisión, la desnutrición entre las personas de edad avanzada en Europa es alarmantemente alta.

Se hablará de seguridad alimentaria, de la industrialización, de emisiones, de innovación, de la protección de nuestros océanos... Temas todos primordiales, y retos gigantes para la Agenda 2030, pues aún nos queda mucho camino por recorrer para transformar las palabras pronunciadas y los objetivos plasmados sobre un papel en hechos que nuestros ciudadanos sientan realizados. Este es nuestro deber: *delivery*.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Vi lærte af FN's verdensmål 2015, at det nytter noget at sætte høje ambitioner for verdens udvikling. Målene viste os, at når vi i fællesskab sætter en retning, så kan vi også skabe en forandring, der virkelig gør en forskel for mange mennesker. Den lektie skal vi have med os i de nye udviklingsmål. FN har sat retningen, nu skal vi andre i gang med at handle! EU både kan og skal tage en førerposition i udmøntningen. Vi har allerede EU-politikker på mange områder. Vi har også pengene, og vi har forskningsmiljøer, ja vi har oven i købet bæredygtighed skrevet ind i vores traktat. Det burde ikke være så svært at få gjort noget. Verden har brug for lederskab. Vi socialdemokrater mener, at EU skal tage det lederskab på sig, vise solidaritet, koordinere og skabe en bæredygtig udvikling i alt det, vi gør, og så i øvrigt måle det også. På den måde er vi med til at gøre verden til et bedre sted for alle, og det har vi virkelig brug for!

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Bodem, water, lucht en klimaat vragen om wereldwijde en Europese inspanningen. Maar de klimaatovereenkomst van Parijs vraagt ook dat de voedselproductie niet in gevaar mag worden gebracht door het klimaatbeleid en dat is een feit. Ik wil er dan ook op wijzen dat de agrarische sector al volop bijdraagt aan duurzame productie. Door onderhoud van het landschap dragen boeren en boerinnen bij niet alleen aan duurzame voedselzekerheid, maar ook aan milieu en natuur.

Er is veel gezegd over duurzame landbouw. Beseffen wij hier genoeg dat het merendeel van de Europese landbouw, veehouderij en tuinbouw al duurzaam produceert? Vergeten we dat niet? Door innovatie en toenemend milieubewustzijn besparen Nederlandse boeren en tuinders CO₂ en leveren producten van topkwaliteit. Die goede voorbeelden moet de Europese Unie beter belonen.

Laten we oppassen voor het verjagen van onze voedselproductie naar derde landen met minder milieuwetgeving. Alleen een gelijk speelveld met effectieve maatregelen en zonder onnodige bureaucratie kan de duurzame landbouw stimuleren. Europese en Nederlandse boeren en tuinders voeden de wereldbevolking nu al jaren op duurzame en grondstoffenefficiënte wijze met vlees, zuivel, granen, fruit en groenten.

Onze Europese boeren en tuinders zijn daarom echte kampioenen van het wereldwijde klimaat, regenwouden en biodiversiteit. En ze willen bijdragen aan het klimaatakkoord en zijn daar volop mee bezig. Maar het moet wel haalbaar, betaalbaar en uitvoerbaar zijn. En een beetje positief hiernaar kijken zou wel heel waardevol zijn.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D). – Señor presidente, en primer lugar mi enhorabuena al señor Dance por un ambicioso informe sobre sostenibilidad. A mí me gustaría centrarme y subrayar el aspecto del medio ambiente y del cambio climático como origen de nuevas desigualdades en el mundo. Y es que, para combatirlo, considero que reconocer el valor socioeconómico que tiene el medio ambiente es crucial. Por eso yo quiero subrayar y celebrar especialmente el punto 23, que pide recursos suficientes para financiar el medio ambiente.

En definitiva, coherencia en la Unión Europea entre las políticas y las acciones que pedimos. Las muchas recomendaciones que se piden desde la Unión Europea para preservar el medio ambiente necesitan ir de la mano de recursos económicos suficientes. Por ello necesitamos fondos específicos y suficientes que financien la Red Natura 2000, la Directiva Habitat o el plan de reforestación de bosques de la Unión Europea.

Por lo tanto, para descarbonizar la economía, primero necesitamos preservar y dar valor al medio ambiente. En definitiva, coherencia entre lo que hacemos y lo que decimos en la Unión Europea, poniendo en valor el medio ambiente.

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Engedjék meg, hogy a Fejlesztési Bizottság által írt vélemény néppárti felelőseként a fenntarthatóság fejlesztéspolitikai szempontjaira hívjam fel a figyelmet. Az éghajlatváltozás napjaink egyik legnagyobb kihívása, mely hosszú távon komoly fenyegetést jelent mindannyiunk számára, hatása viszont a legszegényebbeket és a legkiszolgáltatottabb helyzetben lévőket érinti elsősorban. A klímaváltozás miatt szűkülő erőforrások fokozzák az említett térségekben egyébként is jelen lévő gazdasági és társadalmi feszültségeket. Emberek milliói vágnak neki a fejlett világba vezető kockázatos útnak, leggyakrabban azonban nem találnak új otthonra, hanem táborokban végzik. Ez a családokat szétszakító, gyakran életveszélyes elvándorlás nem hozhat valós megoldást sem a fejlesztéspolitikában, sem a fenntarthatóságot nem szolgálja. Életfeltételeket helyben, illetve egyes régiókban kell megteremteni. Az Európai Uniónak olyan fenntartható, nemzetközi fejlesztési programokat kell kialakítania, amely nemcsak az úgynevezett civil szervezeteket, hanem a régiókban óriási hagyományokkal rendelkező, és gyakran egyetlen szervezetként milliókról is gondolkodó különböző vallási szervezeteket, illetve egyházakat is partnernek tekintik. Ezt is lehet a fejlesztés, a fenntarthatóság részének tekinteni. A posztgyarmatosítási traumákból adódó befogadási kényszertől el kell jutni az egyetlen reális megoldásig: a helyben, az adott régiókban nyújtott segítségi kultúra kialakítása, ez a fenntarthatóság alapja.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, culture is an important driver for behavioural change through the creation of new lifestyles and sustainable development paradigms. This approach must be community based or locally rooted and it implies finding a local understanding of sustainable development. But it could also be global and virtual.

Proper recognition must be given to the mediating and facilitating role of culture, which helps us find a balance between the competing needs of the economic, social and environmental goals of sustainability. Culture is therefore a driver for sustainable growth and innovation, urban regeneration and rural and regional sustainable development, as well as for social cohesion and individual and collective well-being.

It is crucial to maintain a global perspective and not to deal with these various aspects in silos. With determination and creativity we can make our cities, towns and villages more liveable, more sustainable and more inclusive, and promote innovative economic models which are fairer, cooperative and put people and the planet first.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dzisiaj przylatuje do Polski Donald Trump, prezydent Stanów Zjednoczonych. Jutro będzie miał publiczne wystąpienie w Warszawie, zobaczymy, czy choć jedno zdanie poświęci kwestii celów zrównoważonego rozwoju. Wspominam o tym tylko dlatego, że jestem przekonany, iż cele Zgromadzenia Ogólnego Narodów Zjednoczonych na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju do roku 2030 nie będą mogły być osiągnięte bez współpracy i współdziałania państw, które są liderami rozwoju gospodarczego, państw takich jak Stany Zjednoczone choćby czy Rosja, Chiny, Indie i tak dalej. Na razie jednak USA kwestionują na przykład porozumienie paryskie. Przed Unią Europejską jest więc trudne zadanie doprowadzenia do ziszczenia się naszych celów.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, termenul „sustenabilitate” este folosit atât de des, în atâtea contexte, încât mă întreb dacă nu cumva a devenit un clișeu utilizat doar pentru a da greutate unor inițiative. Eradicarea sărăciei, reducerea inegalităților, munca decentă, educația de calitate, creșterea economică și respectul pentru mediu – acestea sunt repere ale dezvoltării sustenabile, dar, în loc să contribuie la realizarea lor, multe voci se folosesc de conceptul de sustenabilitate pur și simplu pentru a justifica interese individuale sau de afaceri, iar oamenii încep să își piardă încrederea în acest concept.

Doresc, totuși, să îl felicit pe raportor, care a făcut o muncă extraordinară pentru a defini provocările la adresa mediului și gravitatea problemei. Suntem, totuși, foarte departe de atingerea ambițioaselor obiective de dezvoltare durabilă asumate de ONU. În loc să repetăm concepte, ar trebui să construim politici care chiar să aducă rezultate concrete pentru oameni.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident! In einer Demokratiewerkstatt hatte ich die Möglichkeit, mit Zehnjährigen über das Thema „nachhaltige Entwicklungsziele“ zu sprechen, und eine ihrer Fragen war: Wieso habt ihr das bis jetzt nicht schon so gemacht? Und sie haben sich gleichzeitig auch die Antwort gegeben. Da kamen harte Urteile wie: „Vielleicht wart ihr zu gierig oder einfach neidisch“. Ein paar haben gesagt: „Wahrscheinlich wird es der Politik egal gewesen sein.“ Und einige waren etwas milder und haben gemeint: „Vielleicht haben sie nicht gewusst, was sie anrichten“.

Unwissenheit über das, was wir anrichten, taugt heute wohl nicht mehr als Entschuldigung, und die Formulierung der 17 Nachhaltigkeitsziele zeigt, dass uns die Zukunft unserer Kinder, die Zukunft künftiger Generationen nicht egal ist. Jetzt gilt es, diese Ziele in ganz konkretes politisches Handeln zu übersetzen. Der vorliegende Initiativbericht ist eine wertvolle Handlungsanleitung im Kampf gegen Hunger und Armut, für Gesundheit und Wohlergehen, für Gleichstellung, Bildung, Beschäftigung, Klima- und Umweltschutz.

Danke, Seb Dance, für diesen hervorragenden Initiativantrag.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli obiettivi di sviluppo dell'ONU rappresentano *target* essenziali per ottenere i risultati migliori in termini di salute, prosperità globale, azioni contro il cambiamento climatico e conservazione dell'ambiente.

Va certamente nella giusta direzione l'integrazione di tali obiettivi nella strategia per legiferare meglio, permettendo alla normativa europea di lavorare a pieno regime tramite l'indicazione chiara degli ambiti nei quali si realizzano gli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile. Gli svariati ambiti di intervento necessitano però di un costante monitoraggio e di una revisione della normativa. Mi riferisco agli effetti che produrranno il sistema ETS e la condivisione degli sforzi, il Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo sostenibile e gli investimenti in efficienza energetica e in fonti rinnovabili, il tentativo di ridurre le disuguaglianze attraverso la politica di coesione, il Fondo per la lotta alla povertà.

Molti obiettivi dalla strategia Europa 2020 strettamente legati a quelli dell'agenda ONU non verranno presumibilmente raggiunti entro i termini previsti. È indubbio che l'Europa, se vorrà continuare a esercitare la *leadership*, deve accelerare l'attuazione delle proprie politiche di sostenibilità.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κ. Πρόεδρε, θα αναφερθώ σε τρία σημεία που έχουν ενδιαφέρον και το πρώτο είναι η ενεργειακή φτώχεια. Νομίζω ότι είναι ένα σοβαρό θέμα που πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί. Έχουμε πληθυσμούς οι οποίοι πραγματικά δεν έχουν πρόσβαση στην ενέργεια. Ιδίως στην Ελλάδα, υπάρχουν χιλιάδες νοικοκυριά τα οποία αυτή τη στιγμή, λόγω των πολιτικών της τρόικας, δεν έχουν πρόσβαση στο ηλεκτρικό ρεύμα. Έχουμε πάνω από 100.000 νοικοκυριά στα οποία έχει κοπεί το ηλεκτρικό ρεύμα. Αυτά τα νοικοκυριά δεν έχουν ούτε πρόσβαση σε θέρμανση. Άλλωστε οι τιμές του πετρελαίου έχουν εκτοξευθεί, διότι η τρόικα έχει επιβάλει αυξημένη φορολογία στο πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης. Αυτό ήταν το πρώτο θέμα. Το δεύτερο είναι η μεταναστευτική πολιτική. Αν δεν υπάρξει μια σοβαρή παρέμβαση, θα συνεχίσουμε να έχουμε τεράστιες μεταναστευτικές ροές στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία και οι πληθυσμοί εκεί δεν αντέχουν άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Το τρίτο είναι η φορολογική δικαιοσύνη. Πρέπει επιτέλους να σταματήσει η ιστορία αυτή με τους φορολογικούς παραδείσους, πρέπει επιτέλους να πληρώνουν οι πολυεθνικές τους φόρους εκεί που κερδίζουν με τη δραστηριότητά τους.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich ganz herzlich bei Seb Dance bedanken. Ich muss sagen: Gerade wie der Bericht vorgetragen wurde, das war sehr eindrucksvoll. Es geht um die Zukunft nicht nur unseres Planeten, sondern vor allen Dingen um die Zukunft unserer Kinder. Nachhaltigkeit ist ganz wichtig. Nachhaltige Entwicklung – wie viele Aspekte sie hat, das haben wir in den Beiträgen gemerkt.

Ich möchte mich vor allen Dingen auf ein Nachhaltigkeitsziel fokussieren, das bis jetzt außer allen anderen nur der Kommissar Vella selber genannt hat. Das ist Ziel vierzehn. Da geht es um den Ozean. Ich bin fest davon überzeugt: Wir leben auf dem blauen Planeten, 70 % ist Wasser. Wenn wir 2050 wirklich neun Milliarden Menschen haben, dann reichen die 30 % Erde nicht aus. Wir werden das Wasser brauchen für Nahrung, für Klima, für Klimaverbesserung, für Energie, für Rohstoffe, für Transport und Handel – für ganz vieles – und auch für Gesundheit zum Beispiel, für Medizin. Und das ist der Punkt. Das Meer ist nicht gesund. Wir müssen unbedingt etwas tun, um die Ozeane gesünder zu machen, um sie zu schützen. Nur dann können wir sie nachhaltig nutzen, und nur dann werden sie auch wirklich diesem Planeten mit seiner Zukunft und den Menschen, die auf ihm leben, dienen.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, os objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável, 17 objetivos que compreendem 169 metas e mais de 300 indicadores fixados pelas Nações Unidas no Rio, em 2012, justificam este debate.

Ele tem duas dimensões: a dos objetivos em si e a da postura da União Europeia perante esses objetivos. Os objetivos vão da erradicação da pobreza à proteção dos ecossistemas, abarcando uma multiplicidade de áreas. São, em geral, objetivos pertinentes e justos, pese embora um certo enviesamento – patente, por exemplo, na sobrevalorização do papel do crescimento económico –, já que, no que respeita ao papel da União Europeia – e propaganda à parte –, a consideração das suas orientações gerais e políticas setoriais obriga à conclusão de que delas não resultará a sustentabilidade desejada – pelo contrário.

A sustentabilidade exige ruturas com o comércio livre e desregulado, com a generalização de modelos de produção intensiva, a desregulação do setor financeiro e a livre circulação de capitais, com a erosão dos direitos sociais e laborais, com o ataque aos serviços públicos, apenas para dar alguns exemplos.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Paní předsedající, když bylo v roce 2015 přijato 17 cílů udržitelného rozvoje, přivítali jejich text také lidé s postižením. Předchozí agenda, tzv. rozvojové cíle tisíciletí, totiž žádným způsobem nezmiňovala jejich práva, zatímco motem cílů udržitelného rozvoje se stalo: „Na nikoho nezapomenout“. Ambicí cílů udržitelného rozvoje je ukončit chudobu ve všech jejich formách všude na světě.

Právě osoby s postižením jsou chudobou ohroženy nejvíce, a to nejen v rozvojových zemích, ale také v Evropské unii. Patří mezi ty, kdo jsou nejvíce vyčleněni ze společnosti, nemají dostatečný přístup ke vzdělání, zdravotní péči nebo zaměstnání. Právě proto je zapotřebí přijmout opatření, která na ně budou myslet, a je důležité, aby byly zahrnuty i do této zprávy. V tomto smyslu jsem proto navrhla 2 pozměňující návrhy a děkuji všem kolegům, kteří se k nim napříč politickými skupinami připojili, a doufám, že ostatní je podpoří během zítřejšího hlasování.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the MEPs for their very valid comments. The Commission welcomes the Parliament's own-initiative report. It is really a great support to better integrate our policies and to develop synergies to achieve the SDGs. It is clearly a call for an ambitious response to the 2030 Agenda and I can assure everyone that sustainable development is and will remain at the heart of EU policy-making. But we have to be operational: sustainable development is complex and interlinked and so must go beyond simple declarations. The Commission is committed to ensure an agenda of results, and I have had the opportunity to remind the Environment Ministers that we will not be judged only on what we announce but on what we do. But we need to make certain that all of the other Ministers of all the other sectors are on board with us as well.

Many MEPs spoke about implementation and accountability and, as I mentioned in my introductory speech, we will be monitoring consistently to ensure the successful implementation of the SDGs. The Commission will provide regular reporting of the implementation progress. The reporting will be based on a reference indicator framework. The indicators were arrived at after extensive consultation with a number of stakeholders, and we will start as of this year, and the report will be published in November this year.

With regards to reporting, I would like to mention here the Environmental Implementation Review and, as outlined in the report, the EIR has already served as a useful tool in highlighting implementation gaps in the Member States, and the Commission has already started to take action based on these. For example, the clean air dialogues will help reach solutions to common challenges, and full implementation of the NHL action plan will help ensure that we meet the objectives of the Birds and Habitats Directives.

Work is already being done by the Commission as well on other fronts. We mentioned circular economy. A lot is also being done on SDG 14 in protecting our oceans to the EU's Ocean Governance Initiative. But let's be very clear: SDGs are not exclusively and only about the environment and development, and in this context, I particularly welcome the proposal in the Seb Dance report for a cross-committee working group on sustainable development goals to ensure a horizontal working within Parliament as well. This would then also provide an opportunity for Members of the European Parliament who have not yet put forward opinions to also engage in this topic.

Last but not least, we are committed to taking the implementation of the 2030 Agenda forward. Together with the European Parliament and together with the Council, also with other European institutions, international organisations, NGOs, civil society and other stakeholders.

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for today's debate, which represents a very important contribution to the whole process of further developing and further shaping a vision for the future of Europe.

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, the debate today shows that we share the same objective of achieving poverty eradication and sustainable development through effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

This will be done only if we work together and if we ensure that we have a clear vision of how all relevant EU policies will contribute to their achievement of the 2030 Agenda. Therefore, we need a clear way ahead and strong commitment by the EU and the Member States to implement the 2030 Agenda in all relevant internal and external policies.

Seb Dance, rapporteur. – Mr President, thank you very much to everybody took part in this debate, and particular thanks to you, Commissioner Vella, because it is very clear that you have listened to what the report is saying and what we are suggesting, and I am very heartened to hear a number of initiatives that you outlined in the response that you gave, including, of course, regular reporting to this place on the progress vis-à-vis the 2030 Agenda and the reference indicator framework which we very much look forward to in terms of seeing how that will be implemented.

Again, I welcome very much your commitment to the side events and the participation at the UN high-level event in New York, because this of course is the opportunity for this place to take forward our ideas and to showcase to the world how we can work collectively. A number of issues did come up in the debate regarding how we go forward. Ms Wiśniewska from the ECR was right: we cannot be prescriptive in telling citizens how they behave and what they eat. That is not the role of this place. However, Mr Eck was also correct in saying we cannot shirk our responsibilities. We cannot pretend that things are not as they are. It is the case that current production methods in meat consumption, for example, are driving us towards an unsustainable future, but that doesn't mean we can't collectively find the solutions. Already across this Chamber we've heard ideas in this place. There are ideas that will be shared in the multi-stakeholder framework. It is only through this dialogue, through this process of conversation, that we will get to a stage where industry and businesses and citizens and NGOs and all of us can work together for that sustainable future. Because I meant what I said at the start: this isn't something that is owned by the left or the right one political group, it is owned by all of us, and it is all of our responsibility to deliver it. And I think together we can do it.

Președintele. – Dezbateră comună a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc joi, 6 iulie 2017.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Андрей Ковачев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Недостатъчните инвестиции в здравеопазването са сериозен проблем в много държави от Европейския съюз. Европейските здравни системи трудно успяват да отговорят на належащите предизвикателства в условията на застаряващо население, недостигащи публични бюджети и нарастващи здравни неравенства. На фона на икономическата криза стабилността на публичните финанси беше изведена на преден план за сметка на устойчивите инвестиции в здравеопазването, но тези цели не са несъвместими.

Гарантирането на равен достъп до качествено здравеопазване е ключът към устойчивите здравни системи, тъй като има потенциала да намали здравните неравенства между и в рамките на държавите членки. Необходими са повече усилия, за да бъдат преодоляни бариерите пред достъпа до здравеопазване на ниво пациенти, доставчици и система на здравеопазване.

Европейският съюз трябва да интегрира своите ангажименти, произтичащи от „Програмата до 2030 г. за устойчиво развитие“, във всички свои действия и политики. Европейският съюз също така трябва да насърчава държавите членки да избягват краткосрочни решения относно инвестициите в здравеопазването и да им помогне да осигурят качествени здравни услуги, които са достъпни и не водят до финансови затруднения за пациентите.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na piśmie. – W dzisiejszych czasach społeczeństwa europejskie stoją przed wieloma wyzwaniami związanymi ze zrównoważonym rozwojem, począwszy od szeroko rozpowszechnionego ubóstwa czy degradacji środowiska, po zagrożenia wynikające ze zmiany klimatu. Cele w zakresie zrównoważonego rozwoju oraz powiązane z nimi zadania są współzależne i niepodzielne. Mają charakter powszechny, bowiem dotyczą wszystkich ludzi. Ze względu na ograniczenia planety, niedobór zasobów, rosnące nierówności i znaczenie trwałego wzrostu gospodarczego dla ochrony naszych systemów opieki społecznej niezwykle ważne jest wspólne europejskie podejście do osiągnięcia celów zrównoważonego rozwoju we wszystkich aspektach pracy Unii. Cele stanowią program współdziałania na wszystkich szczeblach władz publicznych i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, a ich realizację należy kontynuować w ramach partnerstwa ze wszystkimi podmiotami.

Istotą zrównoważonego rozwoju jest godne życie, dlatego konieczne jest wzmożenie wysiłków zmierzających do włączenia celów zrównoważonego rozwoju do przekrojowych projektów i inicjatyw, które przyczynią się do osiągnięcia lepszych i bardziej ujednoliconych wyników pod względem zdrowia, dobrostanu obywateli, przeciwdziałania zmianie klimatu i ochrony środowiska. Musimy sprostać bieżącym wyzwaniom i przygotować się na przyszłość, reagując na tempo i złożoność zmian globalnych, a także na potrzeby rosnącej populacji światowej. Aby zachować europejski model społeczny i spójność społeczną, konieczne jest inwestowanie w osoby młode, pobudzanie trwałego wzrostu gospodarczego sprzyjającego włączeniu społecznemu, rozwiązanie problemu nierówności i odpowiednie zarządzanie migracją.

15. Sede Unika tal-Parlament Ewropew (dibattitu)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind Declarații ale Consiliului și Comisiei referitoare la un sediu unic pentru Parlamentul European (2017/2757(RSP)).

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, you have invited the Council to speak on the issue of the seat of the European Parliament.

As you know, Article 341 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union provides that the seat of the institutions shall be determined by common accord of the governments of the Member States. I would remind you that the matter of the location of the seats of the institutions is addressed by Protocol No 6 to Treaty, which *inter alia* provides that the European Parliament shall have its seat in Strasbourg. The issue of determining the seats of the institutions is thus a matter for the Member States when they discuss treaty changes at the Intergovernmental Conference and not for the Council. You will therefore understand that I am not in a position to intervene further in this debate.

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, under the Treaties the Commission has no role in decisions on this issue. The question of the seats of the institutions is one exclusively for the governments of the Member States to decide by common accord. The present arrangements are set out in a Protocol to the Treaties, and this could only be altered using the process for treaty revision, which notably requires unanimity among the Member States and ratification according to national constitutional requirements. It is therefore not for the Commission as an institution to enter into the debate on the merits of the present arrangements or of any alternative that might be proposed.

President. – Let us hope that our colleagues will have something to say about it.

Anne Sander, au nom du groupe PPE. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, laissez-moi vous dire que ce débat est absurde.

Tout d'abord, pour des raisons juridiques. Dans les traités, ce n'est ni la Commission, ni le Conseil, ni le Parlement européen qui décident des sièges des institutions: ce sont les États. Or, aucun ne demande de changement et, si vraiment nous devons rouvrir les discussions, il faudrait parler de l'emplacement de l'ensemble des institutions et tout remettre à plat: le siège de la Banque centrale européenne, de la Commission, du Conseil, de tout.

Ensuite, j'entends certains proposer d'échanger l'Agence européenne des médicaments ou l'Autorité bancaire européenne, ou même les deux, contre le Parlement. Nous serions ici des marchands de tapis? Nous ferions du troc? Vous oubliez la subsidiarité et le choix souverain de la France de présenter une autre ville.

Certains parlent de faire des économies. Je vais vous en proposer: l'hémicycle à Bruxelles tombe en ruine; le coût des travaux serait de 500 millions d'euros sur quinze ans. Il serait scandaleux de dépenser autant d'argent, alors que nous pouvons accueillir le Parlement ici à Strasbourg et que nous venons d'inaugurer le bâtiment Václav Havel avec de nouveaux bureaux.

Enfin, le siège de Strasbourg ne se réduit pas à des questions juridiques ou financières. En attaquant Strasbourg la semaine même où nous rendons hommage à Helmut Kohl et à Simone Veil, vous attaquez un symbole, un symbole de paix et de démocratie. En proposant cet échange, vous oubliez le sens même du projet européen.

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

Ashley Fox (ECR), *blue-card question*. – Ms Sander, are you aware that, on 27 April 2017, a majority of your Group voted for a single seat by 96 votes to 80. And, Mr President, why is Ms Sander speaking first when she does not even represent the majority of the EPP Group?

Anne Sander (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Cher Monsieur Fox, je voudrais vous dire que le siège unique à Strasbourg, nous l'avons. Si vous nous proposez de renforcer ce siège unique à Strasbourg, qui est déjà dans les traités, j'y suis tout à fait favorable, et la France est prête à accueillir un seul et unique lieu de travail à Strasbourg.

(Applaudissements)

President. – I would appeal to all colleagues to keep the level of the debate as a debate. We should not get emotional about it, although the matter is emotional. I would like to keep it that way.

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, avec tout le respect que je vous dois, vous êtes ici pour organiser les débats. Vous n'êtes pas ici pour faire un commentaire sur ce que peut dire tel ou tel intervenant, député de ce Parlement.

Monsieur le Président, si vous voulez intervenir dans le débat, cédez votre siège et venez vous installer dans les travées. Nous serons heureux de connaître votre position sur le sujet. Vous n'avez pas à prendre parti dans ce débat, vous devez respecter l'équité entre les différents intervenants, qu'ils soient pour ou qu'ils soient contre.

Je trouve que cette méthode est totalement déplacée, avec immensément de respect, Monsieur le Président.

President. – Also with all respect, I made an appeal that we should keep the debate with a certain level of understanding and not highly emotional. This is not checking what you are going to say – or anybody. Anybody is free to say whatever they like and I don't participate in the debate, in spite of your kind invitation.

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, alors même que nous venons d'inaugurer le nouveau bâtiment Václav Havel ici, pourquoi en revenir à la remise en cause de notre présence à Strasbourg?

Cette discussion, comme toutes celles qui l'ont précédée, n'est pas opportune. L'article 341 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne dispose que le siège des institutions de l'Union est fixé d'un commun accord entre les États membres et, quand bien même il nous reviendrait d'en décider, le débat serait toujours peu à propos.

Cependant, puisqu'il est ouvert, je me permets de répondre aux arguments pratiques avancés par les partisans d'un siège unique bruxellois.

Seule la pratique du travail parlementaire a normalisé la fréquence de notre présence à Bruxelles. Les traités, eux, inscrivent le siège officiel du Parlement à Strasbourg. Les réviser pour ôter à Strasbourg ce statut, c'est ouvrir la voie à de multiples remises en question et marchandages sur l'ensemble des institutions et agences européennes.

Par ailleurs, les bâtiments à Bruxelles pourraient nécessiter une rénovation estimée à 300 millions d'euros, voire une reconstruction, qui pèserait encore plus sur le contribuable.

Quant à la proposition d'attribuer le siège de l'Agence européenne des médicaments à Strasbourg, permettez-moi de signaler que Strasbourg a déjà été écartée par le gouvernement français au profit de la ville de Lille.

Mais, plus encore, l'absence d'opportunité du débat n'est pas seulement d'ordre pratique, elle tient, avant tout, à l'importance de notre présence dans ces lieux. Être à Strasbourg n'est pas une fantaisie. Cet emplacement a une histoire, un sens et un avenir. Incontestablement, Strasbourg est l'incarnation même d'une part de l'histoire de la construction européenne, voire de son essence. La ville est précisément le symbole de la fraternité des peuples que l'Union recherche et cimente chaque jour un peu plus. Elle est une manifestation des bénéfices de la paix, de la réconciliation franco-allemande. C'est à Strasbourg que Simone Veil présida le premier Parlement européen élu au suffrage universel. C'est à Strasbourg qu'Helmuth Kohl a reçu, samedi dernier, les hommages qui lui étaient dus.

J'entends le procès fait par certains collègues, mais tourner le dos à cet héritage serait une grave erreur, d'autant plus que le siège unique qui mettrait fin à la transhumance pourrait aussi bien être à Strasbourg.

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

Peter Liese (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin. Es ist sicher unbestreitbar, dass man die Bedeutung von Straßburg als europäische Hauptstadt würdigen muss und dass natürlich eine eventuelle Verlagerung der Europäischen Arzneimittel-Agentur nach Straßburg alleine dieses Thema überhaupt nicht ausreichend würdigt.

Aber trotzdem möchte ich Sie fragen: Sie haben Lille gerade erwähnt. Glauben Sie denn ernsthaft, dass Lille eine Chance hat? Welches Kriterium – zum Beispiel internationale Schulen, Arbeitsplätze, Forschungsumfeld, pharmakologische Forschung –, das die Kommission und der Rat aufgestellt haben, erfüllt denn Lille? Wäre es nicht mindestens unter dem Aspekt unabhängig interessant, einen anderen Vorschlag aus Frankreich zu machen?

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur Liese, je crois que le débat qui nous occupe aujourd'hui ne concerne pas l'emplacement de l'Agence européenne des médicaments, puisque, de toute façon, nous en sommes très loin. Le débat aujourd'hui est de savoir si nous continuons à siéger ici, à voter nos directives et les règlements ici, au Parlement européen.

L'Agence européenne des médicaments n'est pas le sujet, et mélanger – comme nous le disons en France – les torchons et les serviettes n'a aucun sens. Ici, nous parlons d'un travail noble, celui du Parlement européen et celui que nous accomplissons en tant que députés européens.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, very briefly, I want to ask you: what is your policy on blue cards for this debate? Are you going to allow one or two blue cards after every speaker, and how much time have you allocated to the debate?

President. – To be cynical about it, I can allow all the blue cards, because at 7.30 I have to leave. But I am not cynical and I will try to allow everybody who would like to intervene with a blue card to do that, as long as we keep this debate in reasonable conditions. This is my approach to this. We would not, of course, permit seven blue cards to one speaker or anything like this. I think that what is reasonable can be accepted.

Ashley Fox, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, Strasbourg is an historic city. It is beautiful, it is clean, it is safe and, in 1957, it was a symbol of peace and reconciliation. But now, 70 years later, it is a symbol of all that is wrong with the EU. We have two Parliaments, one in Strasbourg and one in Brussels, and the endless travelling circus that we perform means that we are held in contempt by our citizens. Having two Parliament buildings wastes EUR 114 million a year. We emit 19 000 tons of carbon dioxide unnecessarily, and we waste thousands of hours of time of officials, our staff and Members. This Parliament has the power to propose an amendment to the Treaties. I think we should do so. I think it is disgraceful that the EPP and the Socialist Group both put up French speakers who do not represent their Groups. A majority of every Group in this House wants one seat.

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

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le député, cher collègue, il est peut-être inacceptable pour vous que des députés francophones s'expriment dans cet hémicycle, mais pouvez-vous m'expliquer au nom de quoi, vous qui allez quitter l'Union européenne dans moins de deux ans, quand vous serez d'accord entre vous, vous prenez position sur l'avenir de l'Europe et l'avenir du Parlement européen à Strasbourg?

Au nom de quoi vous mêlez-vous de ce débat?

Ashley Fox (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – I have campaigned on this subject for eight years, and I shall continue as a full Member of this Parliament for as long as the United Kingdom pays its membership fee. If you want to suggest that we stop paying our fee now, then I will relinquish my right to vote, but I will wait to hear from you.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, cela fait 18 ans que je suis élue au Parlement, 18 ans de combat pour un siège unique et, enfin, aujourd'hui, ce débat en plénière. Enfin, la résonance que mérite la bonne gouvernance de nos travaux, et ce n'est pas faute d'avoir essayé. Dès 1981, le rapport Zagari se positionnait déjà pour un siège unique du Parlement européen, avec une sorte de statut intérimaire pour Strasbourg.

Les arguments ont déjà été dits et on les connaît: 114 millions d'euros, c'est l'estimation plancher de la transhumance mensuelle imposée par les traités; 89 %, le taux d'inoccupation des bâtiments, que nous investissons quatre jours par mois seulement; deux journées par mois, soit 10 % du temps, perdues à déménager, avec des conséquences désastreuses pour le climat: 19 000 tonnes de CO₂ par an – l'accord de Paris pleure à cause de nos errances. Je m'arrête, je l'ai dit et les arguments sont connus, comme sont connues les prises de position du Parlement européen et, singulièrement, du groupe libéral que je représente ici, toujours plus claires, toujours plus fortes et toujours mal entendues.

La pétition de 2006 pour le siège unique: 1 300 000 signatures venues des quatre coins de l'Europe, une véritable initiative citoyenne européenne avant la lettre, nos votes en commission, en plénière et en groupes de travail successifs et multiples et, surtout aussi, les sondages dans différents pays – dont la France – pour un siège unique. Le Parlement européen est le seul au monde à siéger loin de son centre névralgique.

Nous sommes, nous aussi, chers amis, chers collègues français, attachés viscéralement à notre impératif devoir de mémoire et à la réconciliation qui a fait, qui continue de faire et qui fera notre histoire. Mais les symboles doivent être bousculés, ils doivent être modernisés. Strasbourg, aujourd'hui, est devenue celui de la mauvaise gouvernance en Europe et partout. Pourtant, elle mérite mieux, elle mérite tellement mieux. Pourquoi ne pas profiter de l'occasion que nous offre le Brexit avec le transfert de l'Agence européenne des médicaments?

Simone Veil, dans ses mémoires, rêvait d'une université européenne à Strasbourg: la capitale d'Alsace en pôle européen du médicament et de la biotechnologie en serait une magnifique déclinaison. Il appartient au président Macron, aujourd'hui, d'oser ce saut qualitatif.

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

Anne Sander (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Madame, chère collègue, vous avez parlé du coût du Parlement européen, ici, à Strasbourg, et vous avez parlé de la mauvaise gouvernance de l'Union européenne liée au Parlement de Strasbourg.

Par conséquent, j'aimerais savoir comment vous pensez que nous pourrions justifier auprès des citoyens européens la nécessité d'engager des travaux au Parlement européen de Bruxelles. De plus, comment pensez-vous justifier la mauvaise utilisation de l'argent public et de la mauvaise gestion des bâtiments à Bruxelles?

Frédérique Ries (ALDE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Madame, depuis des années que ce débat nous occupe et nous préoccupe, tout a été utilisé: de la flibuste parlementaire, des arguties les unes derrière les autres... Évidemment, les problèmes structurels du bâtiment bruxellois sont aujourd'hui pain bénit pour vous. Je ne pense pas que c'est avec ce problème, qui est conjoncturel et qui sera résolu, que vous allez pouvoir dire que vous refusez d'avancer sur la résolution d'un véritable problème structurel, qui est celui de cette gabegie et de cette mauvaise gouvernance à Strasbourg. Vous gagnez du temps, vous jouez la montre. Je trouve que c'est un peu court. Il me semble que vous auriez pu trouver mieux, ici.

Les problèmes de Bruxelles seront résolus, si tant est qu'ils soient prouvés, car la chambre secrète où nous pourrions lire les rapports sera ouverte à partir de lundi. Je m'y rendrai et je ne suis pas convaincue que ces problèmes soient de l'ordre de ce qui a été évoqué.

Rina Ronja Kari, *for GUE/NGL-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Tak til alle, der har været med til at starte denne vigtige diskussion. Der er, som man kan høre, mange forskellige holdninger til dette emne. Jeg mener nu ikke, at vi kan undlade at tage borgernes vrede og deres uforståenhed over for, at vi rejser frem og tilbage, meget, meget alvorligt. EU's revisorer vurderer, at det koster 850 millioner danske kroner hvert eneste år. Det fører til en udledning på mere end 10 000 ekstra tons CO₂! Det er da et fuldstændigt vanvittigt spild af borgernes penge og medfører en voldsom ekstraforurening fra et parlament, der påstår, at vi tager miljøet alvorligt. Derfor er det ekstra vigtigt, at vi griber chancen, nu hvor der faktisk er en bevægelse hos medlemslandene. Nu skal vi som parlament stå sammen og presse på over for Rådet og over for medlemslandene, så vi kan få sat en stopper for dette voldsomme spild! Og det skal hellere være i dag end i morgen!

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Ulrike Lunacek, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir diskutieren heute ein Thema, wo die große Mehrzahl der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger das nur mit Kopfschütteln verfolgt, nämlich die Tatsache, dass wir mehrere Sitze dieses Parlaments haben, dass wir jeden Monat einmal für vier Tage nach Straßburg reisen müssen, obwohl wir – wie ich zum Beispiel – eh schon zwei Wohnsitze haben, einen in Wien und einen in Brüssel, wo ich auch den meisten Teil meiner Arbeitszeit verbringe, wie wir alle. Bei vielen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger ist es nicht nur Kopfschütteln, sondern es ist eine dezidierte Ablehnung.

In Zeiten wie diesen 114 Millionen Euro pro Jahr für diesen Wanderzirkus auszugeben – als Grüne sage ich noch dazu, dafür auch 19 000 Tonnen CO₂ zu verausgaben –, nur 48 Tage im Jahr dieses Parlament auch wirklich zu nutzen – die meiste Zeit steht es ja leer –, das geht heutzutage nicht mehr. Kein Unternehmen würde das tun. Es hat auch einen europäischen demokratiepolitischen Aspekt. Wir wollen als Abgeordnete selbst entscheiden, wo wir tagen. Das dürfen wir derzeit nicht. Dieses Parlament hat schon x-mal mit Zweidrittelmehrheiten gesagt: Wir wollen einen Sitz und nicht zwei.

Das heißt, es geht darum, dass wir einen Dialog beginnen wollen – mit dem Rat, den Staats- und Regierungschefs und -chefinnen, aber auch mit der neuen französischen Regierung. Ich möchte daran erinnern, was schon eine Kollegin gesagt hat: Simone Veil hat von einer europäischen Universität in Straßburg geträumt. Lassen wir doch ihre Träume Realität werden, gemeinsam mit den Träumen der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger und der großen Mehrheit der Abgeordneten dieses Parlaments: ein Sitz des Europäischen Parlaments und nicht zwei.

Roger Helmer, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, Ms Lunacek and my old friend Ashley Fox have explained in considerable detail why the two-seat situation for the Parliament is totally indefensible. It is hugely wasteful. It wastes resources; it wastes vast quantities of time including, colleagues, our time. It wastes money, and if you care about it, it wastes CO₂ emissions. But I have to tell you, Mr President, that I personally rather like it, and I'll tell you why I like it, because it serves as a perfect metaphor for the hubris and futility of the European project. It is something that nobody can explain, nobody can justify, and yet nobody can change, and there are many, many policies of the European Union of which you can say the same. I think of the common fisheries policy, I think of the Emissions Trading Scheme. The list goes on.

I have been able to use this metaphor again and again in speeches up and down Britain in order to explain to ordinary people who are not very familiar with the European project the complete absurdity of it, and they catch it straight away. Ms Lunacek said companies would never do this. She is right. I say to people: are you in business? Would you move your business from London to Edinburgh for a week and then back again, and then to Edinburgh for one week every month? Of course they would not, and they see the absurdity of it.

Mr President, I am shortly to retire, and this is, I believe, the last speech I shall make in this Chamber as a Member of the European Parliament. I would therefore like to crave your indulgence to leave one final message. We need a quick, a clean Brexit and we need a fair and comprehensive trade deal. We need that not just for Britain but even more for Europe, and if you fail to deliver it, then you will find that you will be punished by the workers of Stuttgart and Munich and many other European citizens. I leave that thought with you.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, en tant que seul parlementaire citoyen de Strasbourg, même si j'ai d'autres collègues alsaciens, je voudrais d'abord remercier M. le Commissaire et le Conseil, qui n'ont pas pris position, ainsi que les collègues qui ont pris position en faveur de Strasbourg.

Pour le siège unique, pas de problème, Strasbourg est prêt à l'accueillir. Mais qu'est-ce que Strasbourg? Plus qu'une ville, un carrefour de Germains, de Celtes et de Romains dès le Ve siècle. C'est le lieu de toutes les royautés et pouvoirs qui ont fait l'Europe des peuples et des civilisations: les Carolingiens, les Capétiens, le Saint-Empire des Hohenstaufen et des Habsbourg, ceci dans la lignée de Sainte Odile et d'Aldaric. C'est le lieu de tous les enjeux et conflits depuis 1 500 ans entre l'Est et l'Ouest, la pomme de discorde des luttes fratricides et des guerres mondiales, avec cette bannière de la Vierge de Strasbourg, les bras tendus entre l'Est et l'Ouest, qui appelle à cette réconciliation permanente. Ce territoire est l'axe d'équilibre des peuples et des nations, base de l'Europe.

Si vous n'avez pas compris cela – ce que je crains –, vous n'avez rien compris à Strasbourg. Mais vous n'avez rien compris non plus à l'Europe qui ne peut être sous domination unipolaire. La cabale contre le siège de Strasbourg se veut pragmatique. Elle est foncièrement idéologique. Vos arguments ne résistent pas aux faits: Strasbourg coûterait trop cher? Le bâtiment Paul-Henri Spaak a coûté 1,8 milliard d'euros et le rénover coûterait 300 à 500 millions d'euros. Faisons le siège unique à Strasbourg. Strasbourg serait trop loin des autres institutions? Qu'en est-il d'une Europe multipolaire?

Mes chers collègues, si vous abandonnez Strasbourg, c'est parce que Strasbourg est hors des sphères d'influence des groupes de pression. Ceux qui veulent l'abandonner? Des lobbies qui travaillent contre l'Europe. Abandonner Strasbourg, c'est surtout abandonner le Strasbourg d'une Europe véritable dont vous êtes, pour certains, des adversaires. C'est abandonner cette Europe de l'histoire, de l'identité, de la mémoire. Strasbourg, c'est aussi loin de l'OTAN. Elle a l'Eurocorps. Strasbourg, c'est l'Europe de l'équilibre. N'abandonnez pas l'équilibre, sinon, l'Europe ne se fera pas.

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

Stanislav Polčák (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Pane kolego, já se chci vyjádřit, Vy vždycky kritizujete jakoukoliv nehospodárnost, nešetrnost ve fungování Evropské unie, zejména Vaše politická frakce.

A Vy jste sdělil, že Štrasburk je připraven přijmout za sídlo Evropský parlament jako jediné sídlo. Můžete mi říci, jaké úspory bychom dosáhli v tomto okamžiku, kdyby všichni museli cestovat za námi? To znamená Rada, Komise? Jaké úspory by bylo tedy dosaženo?

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Dans l'Europe que je vois personnellement en tant qu'Européen, mais un Européen particulier – j'ai toujours été pour l'Europe des États, l'Europe des Nations –, je pense qu'il y a effectivement une place pour un Conseil et pour une Commission réduite à un secrétariat du Conseil, et que la place de cette nouvelle Europe pourrait être accueillie à Strasbourg.

Je reconnais que nous avons des efforts à faire au niveau du transport, mais ils seront faits. Je reconnais que, pour cela, Bruxelles a un avantage, mais ce n'est pas la raison en termes d'économies, car il est tout à fait possible – je le dis – de mettre toutes les institutions à Strasbourg si nous voulons faire des économies.

Aymeric Chauprade (NI). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il y a quelques jours, à peine, nous recevions dans cet hémicycle la dépouille d'Helmut Kohl, ce grand européen, pilier de la construction européenne. Et voilà qu'aujourd'hui, par une ironie cruelle, nous entendons les arguments de ceux qui veulent en finir avec Strasbourg, lieu de la réconciliation franco-allemande et de l'unité européenne.

Franchement, chers collègues, le choix du siège du Parlement ne saurait être un choix économique. C'est un choix politique qui repose sur des fondements historiques.

Faut-il rappeler qu'un Alsacien né en 1869, qui aurait eu la chance de survivre aux deux guerres mondiales, aurait eu successivement quatre nationalités?

Le château du Haut-Koenigsbourg, non loin de Strasbourg, porte tout à la fois les marques de Charlemagne, de l'entrée de l'Alsace en France en 1648, et des trois H: Hohenstaufen, Habsbourg et Hohenzollern. J'invite ceux de nos amis allemands qui tournent le dos à Strasbourg à aller s'y ressourcer.

Au moment où tant de forces cherchent à détruire la construction européenne, voulons-nous envoyer au peuple français le message suivant: l'Europe s'en va, elle tourne le dos à l'amitié franco-allemande?

Le Brexit n'aura pas suffi à certains, il leur faut le Strasbourgxit!

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

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Señor presidente, señor Chauprade y colegas franceses, francófonos, de Estrasburgo o de donde sean, yo creo que se han equivocado de debate. A mí me gustaría recordar que aquí lo que estamos discutiendo y lo que estamos buscando es acordar si es o no necesario tener una sola sede para el Parlamento Europeo, no decidir si es Estrasburgo o no, no las bondades de Estrasburgo, no hacer una reivindicación histórica, cultural o patrimonial de Estrasburgo.

Si conseguimos decidir juntos que tenemos que tener una sola sede, tal y como llevamos pidiendo años, decidiremos después, con un análisis reposado, cuál es la sede.

Aymeric Chauprade (NI), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Je suis favorable au siège unique à Strasbourg. C'est le siège naturel du Parlement. Les arguments ont déjà été donnés, c'est très clair.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich persönlich liebe die Stadt Straßburg, und ich möchte, dass Straßburg eine Bedeutung als eine wichtige europäische Hauptstadt hat, wenn Roger Helmer und Ashley Fox in diesem Parlament schon längst vergessen sind. Straßburg muss eine europäische Zukunft haben. Aber ich plädiere für eine nachhaltige Lösung, nachhaltig für Straßburg – dass wir nicht jedes Jahr neu diskutieren müssen –, für Frankreich, für die Europäische Union und auch für die europäischen Steuerzahler.

Die anderen Mitgliedstaaten sollten Frankreich ein Angebot machen, damit das Parlament dauerhaft in Brüssel tagen kann, aber Straßburg – wirtschaftlich und was das Prestige angeht – mehr als kompensiert wird. Und dabei kann der Sitz der Arzneimittel-Agentur ein Element sein, ein erster wichtiger Schritt. Dafür hat Straßburg exzellente Voraussetzungen: europäische Schulen, ein internationales Umfeld, ein Umfeld von pharmakologischer und medizinischer Forschung, eine große Abteilung des Europarates, die sich mit diesem Thema beschäftigt. Straßburg ist viel besser geeignet als viele andere Kandidaten und definitiv viel besser als Lille. Und deswegen plädiere ich jetzt dafür, dass alle ihre nationalen Egoismen zurückstellen und wir gemeinsam eine europäische Lösung finden.

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

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Mon cher collègue et ami, j'entends bien votre tentative de faire augmenter le nombre de compensations au fur et à mesure que l'on prend la parole pour dire: «Franchement, vous êtes tellement tristes qu'on vous reprenne Strasbourg qu'on va vous donner encore plus.»

Le gouvernement français vient, il y a moins d'une heure, par la voie officielle du ministre chargé des affaires européennes, de donner une fin de non-recevoir claire et définitive à l'abandon, par la France, du siège du Parlement européen à Strasbourg. Ne pensez-vous pas que nous devrions donc interrompre nos débats, puisque c'est une perte de temps évidente?

(Applaudissements)

Peter Liese (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Also wenn das die Aussage der französischen Regierung war, dann ist das bedauerlich. Dann wird die Debatte aber nicht aufhören. Ich glaube, es wäre eine gute Gelegenheit. Natürlich gibt es immer Zeitabläufe, die uns in Schwierigkeiten bringen. Aber ich glaube, das ist keine nachhaltige Lösung. Und deswegen glaube ich, es wird kein Ende der Debatte geben, sondern sie wird immer wieder aufkommen. Mein Petitum ist wirklich, gemeinsam zu reden, wie wir eine bessere Lösung finden können. Das ist nicht gegen Frankreich gerichtet. Ich persönlich komme gerne hierher, aber wir müssen auch die Steuerzahler und die anderen, die eben pendeln müssen und viel Arbeitszeit verlieren, berücksichtigen, und dieses Problem ist mit dem heutigen Tage sicher nicht beendet.

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

Françoise Grossetête (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le député, vous qui souhaitez des solutions durables, comment expliquez-vous qu'en Allemagne, votre pays, il y ait la capitale à Berlin et encore un nombre important de ministères qui logent à Bonn? Là, vous n'êtes pas surpris qu'il y ait des dépenses inutiles qui soient engagées pour le transfert, toutes les semaines, de vos ministres et de leurs services de Bonn à Berlin?

Peter Liese (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Liebe Kollegin Grossetête, wir sind und ja fast immer einig, aber in dem Fall sind wir uns leider nicht einig. Aber ich glaube, wir sind uns auch einig, dass Lille eine verlorene Kandidatur ist. Nebenbei: Das wird nicht funktionieren, und es wäre wenigstens mal eine Chance – unabhängig von der *single-seat*-Debatte –, dass Frankreich mal einen anderen Kandidaten vorschlägt.

Aber zu Bonn und Berlin: Ich sage das meinen Besuchergruppen jedes Mal. Jedes Mal kommt die Frage: Warum habt ihr dieses zweite Parlament, und warum fahrt ihr so viel hin und her? Ich sage jedes Mal: Wir in Deutschland machen den gleichen Blödsinn mit Bonn und Berlin. Und auch das würde ich gerne abschaffen, und dafür trete ich genauso ein. Aber ich kann doch nicht dauerhaft – und das nehmen mir die Bürgerinnen und Bürger auch nicht ab – den einen Unsinn mit dem anderen Unsinn rechtfertigen.

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte etwas zur Geschäftsordnung sagen. Wir alle haben unsere Termine, und jetzt kommen dauernd diese kleinen Ein-Minuten-Reden hinzu. Wir erfahren nichts Neues! Also, Herr Präsident, ich bitte Sie, dass Sie einfach aus Gründen der Zeitökonomie jetzt keine blauen Karten mehr zulassen. Es kommt auch nichts Neues bei den Fragen! Es kommen nur Ressentiments heraus! Wir wollen eine Sachdebatte führen. Bitte nehmen Sie keine blauen Karten mehr an.

Πρόεδρος. – Επισημαίνω τα εξής: Πρώτον, για όσους είναι εγγεγραμμένοι στη λίστα των ομιλητών και πρόκειται να πάρουν τον λόγο στη συνέχεια, δεν θα τους δώσω γαλάζια κάρτα, για να δοθεί η δυνατότητα και σε όσους δεν είναι εγγεγραμμένοι να αξιοποιήσουν τη διαδικασία του «catch the eye». Δεύτερον, δεν θα δώσω δεύτερη γαλάζια κάρτα στον ίδιο ομιλητή και επίσης επισημαίνω ότι όσοι κάνουν χρήση από εδώ και πέρα του δικαιώματος της γαλάζιας κάρτας, δεν θα τους επιλέξω για τη διαδικασία του «catch the eye». Ελπίζω με αυτές τις ρυθμίσεις να εξοικονομήσουμε λίγο χρόνο.

Τον λόγο έχει ο επόμενος ομιλητής, ο κύριος Weidenholzer, για δύο λεπτά.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! „Alle Jahre wieder“ – das könnte man an den Beginn dieser Debatte stellen. Immer wieder flammt diese Diskussion von Neuem auf. Wir haben uns daran gewöhnt, das scheinbar nicht Veränderbare zu beklagen, um daran anschließend unsere Achseln zu zucken. Niemand versteht diesen Wanderzirkus, niemand versteht dieses Hin-und-Hergerissen-Sein. Wir haben gelernt, das zu akzeptieren. Vielleicht ist das Wort „hinnehmen“ der bessere Ausdruck.

Vor allem unsere Wählerinnen und Wähler verstehen das nicht. Dieser Wanderzirkus ist nicht gerade ein Pluspunkt für das europäische Projekt. Die Menschen wollen klare, verbindliche Antworten von uns, die wir ihnen nicht geben können.

Ja, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, es besteht Handlungsbedarf – jetzt, auch weil einige grundsätzliche Entscheidungen diskutiert werden. Wir sollten diese Diskussion offensiv führen und nicht darauf warten, dass wir sowieso hineingezogen werden. Wir sollten sie seriös führen – die verschiedenen Argumente abwägen – und ohne vorgefasste Meinung.

Es gibt einige Eckpunkte, die wir berücksichtigen müssen. Ja, es gibt verbindliche rechtliche Grundlagen, die in den Verträgen festgehalten sind. Was die Sitzfrage betrifft, ist die Lage eindeutig. Aber es gibt auch eine Vielzahl an Beschlüssen dieses Hauses, die unmissverständlich sind. Wir sind zu Sparsamkeit verpflichtet, müssen den Grundsatz der Zweckmäßigkeit verfolgen und sollten Doppelgleisigkeiten vermeiden.

Je schwieriger die Haushaltssituation der Union ist, desto genauer müssen wir hinsehen. Und wir müssen – so meine ich – akzeptieren, dass diese Grundsätze nur einen Sitz zulassen. Daher, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, bedarf es einer Festlegung durch dieses Haus. Wir können uns nicht leisten, ewig im Ungefähren zu verharren. Für eine endgültige Festlegung muss man das Parlament miteinbeziehen. Deshalb haben wir im November 2013 eine Entschließung zur Festlegung der Sitze der Organe der EU beschlossen, und es liegt an den Staats- und Regierungschefs, diesen Beschluss aufzugreifen.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Chers collègues, définir le lieu du Parlement n'est pas une simple question comptable, mais une question politique. La question est de savoir ce que doit être l'Union européenne de demain: une Union encore plus centralisée ou l'Europe de la subsidiarité?

Au sein du groupe ECR, nous avons toujours plaidé à la fois pour le siège unique et contre le centralisme bureaucratique. Décider aujourd'hui que ce Parlement ira à Bruxelles, c'est accepter le centralisme. Quelqu'un ici croit-il, sans rire, que l'on parlera un jour de «Brussels DC»? Et je n'évoque pas le coût du transfert ajouté à la reconstruction du bâtiment - Spaak...

Tant que le nouveau cap de l'Europe n'est pas fixé, la question du siège doit rester ouverte. Mettre le Parlement à 500 mètres de la Commission peut paraître plus fonctionnel, le maintenir à Strasbourg, politiquement plus fort et porteur de sens à l'heure où les Européens ont besoin de se définir. Quant aux deux agences de Londres, je propose de les accueillir à Copenhague peut-être, mais pas ici.

Le siège unique, oui, mais le choix du lieu, au prochain Parlement.

Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, en effet, comme certains l'ont rappelé tout à l'heure, ce débat est totalement surréaliste pour nos concitoyens, puisqu'ici, dans cet hémicycle, chacun sait depuis longtemps que, pour modifier le siège du Parlement, il faut revenir sur les traités.

Un collègue a rappelé, tout à l'heure, que Nathalie Loiseau, la nouvelle ministre chargée des affaires européennes dans l'équipe de M. Macron, a exprimé une fin de non-recevoir de la part de mon pays, la France, pour une quelconque modification du le siège.

Vous me direz qu'on peut toujours ouvrir la boîte de Pandore, mais, à ce moment-là, on remettra en jeu la Cour de justice européenne, la Banque centrale européenne, le Conseil, la Commission et tutti quanti... Vous savez bien que cette question ne peut être traitée en ce moment, car c'est impossible.

Sans revenir sur les arguments à la fois historiques, politiques et juridiques – la modification des traités –, ceux de la commodité offerte à Strasbourg, ou ceux de la nécessité politique de refuser une centralisation excessive des institutions et de revenir à l'unité dans la diversité, qui est la devise de l'Europe, ne mégotons pas: oui à un siège unique, oui à Strasbourg, ce siège unique.

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE). – Ik zou willen oproepen om toch eventjes *out of the box* te denken. Ik neem nota van wat de minister van Europese Zaken van Frankrijk enige tijd geleden heeft verklaard. En ik herken ook dat Straatsburg een symbool is voor vrede. Het is ook een aangename stad. Ik kom hier sinds 1983, de stad is ook ten goede veranderd.

Maar vele collega's hebben erop gewezen dat dit een grote kost meebrengt en de opportuniteit die daar ligt wegens de Brexit en het overbrengen van een aantal agentschappen na Straatsburg vormt toch een opportuniteit, een moment om te kijken of dit voor Straatsburg ook geen sociaaleconomisch positief verhaal is. Er wordt gezegd: we willen van Straatsburg de unieke zetel maken. Franse collega's, kunnen jullie dit aan in de stad Straatsburg? Het betekent dat op dit ogenblik niet minder dan zesduizend mensen werken in de politieke fracties en in de administratie van het Europees Parlement, zesduizend mensen die hier logies moeten vinden. Het gaat over 751 parlementsleden die hier logies moeten vinden. Het gaat over 1 800 geaccrediteerde assistenten die hier logies moeten vinden. Het gaat over bijkomende logies voor journalisten en lobbyisten!

Kan de stad Straatsburg dat aan? Ik betwijfel het!

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, due minuti sono anche fin troppi per parlare di questo argomento, anche perché è dal 1981 che questo Parlamento è d'accordo sull'avere una sola sede e penso che, se facesimo un referendum tra i cittadini europei, la stragrande maggioranza sarebbe a favore di una sede del Parlamento, e forse qualcuno neanche di una.

Quindi potete capire come 114 milioni di euro l'anno siano un insulto per tutti i cittadini che faticano per pagare le tasse per portare avanti i processi democratici; capite come dalle 11 000 alle 19 000 tonnellate di CO₂ siano un ulteriore affronto a un Parlamento che cerca di prodigarsi per eliminare quelli che sono gli sconvolgimenti climatici legati alle emissioni. Quindi cercate di capire come sia facile, dal mio punto di vista, perché se fossimo al governo in Italia, noi, come Movimento 5 Stelle, saremmo sicuramente a favore di un provvedimento per avere solo una sede.

Qui, in questo Parlamento, sono rappresentati in qualche modo anche tutti i governi che governano l'Europa. Prendete il cellulare, telefonate ai vostri capi di Stato: che si mettano d'accordo in fretta perché i cittadini, il Parlamento e il buon senso si sono già espressi più volte.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, I fully support the European Union abandoning the current situation of two European Parliament locations. I fully support realising the saving of the millions currently wasted stupidly and inefficiently every year by transferring the EU parliamentary machine between Brussels and Strasbourg.

But let's be realistic. The EU is now resorting to the usual fudge and non-credible position, and proposing re-siting two London-based agencies here in Strasbourg, ignoring the fact that Strasbourg is a totally inappropriate location for either, so there will not be any buildings sold, there will not be any operational costs eliminated. In fact, the European Union will stay here, and any cost or efficiency savings will never actually be achieved.

It is a real shame, isn't it, that the European Union learns nothing, and allows politics to override sensible decision-making, which would mean closing its presence in one of the two cities for good. And I would say to a lot of people who keep on citing the war: stop living in the past and get real.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Nie możemy przecież niszczyć symboli, które pomagają zrozumieć, o co w naszej Unii chodzi, jak urodził się ten plan najlepszy w historii naszego kontynentu. Jesteśmy tu w Alzacji, w Strasburgu, w miejscu, które jest wspaniałą ilustracją strasznie trudnej i dramatycznej historii, nad Renem, o którym mówią, że po drugiej wojnie światowej był wypełniony krwią. Tu język, kuchnia, architektura, nazwiska ludzi, historie rodzinne – wszystko świadczy o przezwyciężeniu wojen, okupacji, wrogości i przepracowaniu ich w bogactwo kilku kultur w jednym miejscu, bogactwo otwartości, gościnności i przyjaźni, a to jest możliwe dzięki Unii Europejskiej. Tu się wszystko zaczęło i tu powinniśmy kontynuować, w Strasburgu nad Renem powinniśmy uczyć się o trudnej przeszłości naszego kontynentu i stąd z tego wspaniałego, pięknego, nowoczesnego budynku powinny płynąć plany dotyczące naszej wspólnej przyszłości. Więc jedna siedziba albo dwie, ale w Strasburgu.

(oklaski)

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da molti anni la questione della sede unica viene discussa proprio in quest'Aula, e da molti anni questo Parlamento si esprime per superare la situazione attuale che ci obbliga a dividere il nostro lavoro tra due sedi.

Bisogna evitare, però, un facile errore: quello di svuotare del profondo significato storico le ragioni che hanno portato la sede ufficiale della nostra Istituzione qui a Strasburgo, la città al confine, simbolo della pace. Oggi però la situazione storica è diversa rispetto a molti decenni fa: l'Istituzione che rappresenta i cittadini europei non può più cadere vittima della logica intergovernativa dei veti incrociati tra gli Stati.

Oggi ha il dovere di emanciparsi, richiedendo con forza una riforma dei trattati che non solo ci permetta di decidere dove riunirci, ma che permetta finalmente di cambiare indirizzo – io dico in senso federalista – alle strutture e alle politiche della nostra Unione per superare le innumerevoli impasse che danneggiano i cittadini europei nei campi della politica economica, sociale, di azione esterna comune, ancora prima e ben più della questione pur importantissima della nostra sede comune.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Meine Damen und Herren, so viel Französisch wie heute Abend habe ich hier in diesem Parlament noch nicht gehört.

Madame Grossetête, vous avez tout à fait raison.

Wir haben natürlich auch zwei Hauptstädte in Deutschland. Aber ich mache mal darauf aufmerksam, dass die EU drei Hauptstädte hat – neben Straßburg und Brüssel eben auch noch Luxemburg. Vergessen wir nicht: Erinnern wir uns an Herrn Juncker hier vor zwei Tagen, er hat gesagt: „Das Europäische Parlament ist lächerlich.“ Ich muss Ihnen sagen – nach dem, was ich hier gehört habe: Er hat völlig recht.

Das Parlament hat ja nicht einmal das Recht, seinen eigenen Sitz zu bestimmen. Wo in der Welt gibt es eigentlich so was? Und wir haben hier von den Briten gehört, dass sie gehen. Warum gehen sie? Sie gehen, weil wir zu viel Europa haben. Meine Damen und Herren, wenn wir so weitermachen, dann werden noch mehr gehen. Und dann erledigt sich das Problem von selbst: Dann haben wir nicht mehr zwei Sitze oder einen Sitz, dann haben wir am Schluss gar keinen mehr.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem si tuto debata velmi rád vyslechl a ještě v ní budu tedy setrvávat s Vámi dále, nicméně mně přijde trochu marnivá, možná trochu marnotratná. V zásadě v okamžiku, kdy kolega z Francie prohlásil, že francouzská vláda učinila to rozhodnutí, že nesouhlasí s přesunutím sídla do Bruselu, respektive tedy určení toho jednoho sídla v Bruselu, tak si myslím, že ta debata skutečně nikam nesměřuje. Já ušetřím Váš čas a těch dalších třiceti vteřin se vzdám, to znamená, pokračujme v té debatě.

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen, meine Herren! Straßburg ist nur per Zufall Sitz des Parlaments. Es war die Gemeinsame Versammlung der Montanunion, die hier zu Hause war. Und sie war nur hier zu Hause, weil in Luxemburg kein großer Saal für die Abgeordneten war. Deswegen ging man nach Straßburg. Ja, das ist historisch bedingt, das hat nichts mit der europäischen Geschichte zu tun!

Und dann ist Luxemburg ja etwas ganz Entscheidendes. Man muss sich vorstellen, was der Herr Juncker und alle anderen an Aktivitäten nach Luxemburg geholt haben. Darüber redet niemand. Wir haben einen doppelten Sitz hier. Auch die Luxemburger sitzen da, und die sind nur da, weil es historisch bedingt ist.

Ja, und wenn ich mir das jetzt anschau – ich habe ja meine französischen Kollegen –, das verstehe ich alles. Ich bin ja auch gerne in Straßburg. Aber es ist nicht sinnvoll, zwei Sitze zu haben. Aber wir können uns beruhigen: Wir können uns noch so aufregen, Frankreich wird niemals der Aufgabe des Straßburger Sitzes zustimmen! Und dann wird gesagt: Das kostet 140 Millionen. Ach, das ist doch wenig gegenüber der Verschwendung, die ich sonst in Europa in der Agrarpolitik und Kohäsionspolitik erlebe! Da sollte man doch schweigend darüber hinweggehen, über diese 140 Millionen!

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, estamos aquí porque estar en Estrasburgo nos recuerda nuestra razón de ser. Estamos aquí porque Alsacia nos recuerda cada día por qué los padres fundadores idearon la Unión Europea: para unirnos, para superar las fronteras que nos separan, no para inventarnos problemas donde no los hay.

Los fundadores no podían estar todos equivocados. Kohl, tampoco. Y las imágenes de la azul estrellada sobre los restos del canciller, aquí, en Estrasburgo, con el presidente Clinton cuadrándose ante él, han dado la vuelta al mundo.

Estrasburgo es el símbolo de la reconciliación y la paz entre europeos. Arrancarle el Parlamento es arrancarle el alma y la identidad al proyecto europeo. Los símbolos son importantes, no tienen precio y con ellos no se juega.

Termino, señor presidente, en relación con el debate sobre las agencias. ¿No les parece bien Lille, señor Liese? Apuesten por Barcelona, está preparada. El Gobierno de España está trabajando codo con codo con la Generalitat de Cataluña y el Ayuntamiento, de manera ejemplar, unidos, para que dicha agencia termine en Barcelona. Es un proyecto estratégico fundamental por el que competiremos a fondo y hasta el final.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, ovakvo ustrojstvo Europskog parlamenta na tri različite lokacije, u Bruxellesu, Strasbourgu i Luksemburgu, skupo je, neučinkovito, štetno za okoliš i predstavlja velik relikv prošlih vremena. Konačno smo dočekali službenu raspravu o ovom problemu i to mogu samo pozdraviti.

S godinama se oko svakog od sjedišta Parlamenta stvorila cijela mreža političkih i gospodarskih subjekata koji profitiraju od ovakvog ustrojstva pa je sasvim logičnu racionalizaciju u vidu preseljenja kompletne infrastrukture na jedno mjesto praktički bilo nemoguće ostvariti. Vjerujem da ćemo na kraju ipak uspjeti, unatoč ogromnim otporima.

Strasbourg kao mjesto pomirenja ima veliki simbolički značaj, ali mislim da je vrijeme da Parlament prestane plaćati cijenu simbolike. Preseljenjem na jedno mjesto uštedjet ćemo stotine milijuna eura i tisuće radnih sati koji se troše na putovanja u Strasbourg te biti puno produktivniji u svom radu. Mislim da sve to dugujemo poreznim obveznicima.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, today we are reaching out to France to engage in a constructive and positive dialogue for a better Europe, closer to citizens. We in the Single Seat campaign want a more efficient, less polluting and less costly European Parliament. We are for – not against – democracy, for dialogue, for Europe, and not against Strasbourg. It is time to overcome this taboo. Strasbourg is – and should remain – a European capital, but we do not want a symbol of peace to become a symbol of waste.

Let's be honest: the travelling circus upsets our citizens. We have a responsibility not to let the single seat issue be used by populists against Europe.

It is not a matter of horse trading. It is building consensus around a table for a win-win solution, providing both economic and political benefits for France, recognising its key role in Europe. Today we are calling for a legislative report asking for Treaty change, for Parliament to decide when and where to meet, and for the Council Presidency and Member States to draw up a roadmap for a single seat.

In conclusion, the President of France, Mr Macron, has asked to change the Treaty for other reasons. We hope he will receive us in the Elysée. There is no mission impossible when citizens ask for it.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Ik begrijp natuurlijk de emotie van alle collega's die hier vandaag gesproken hebben. Ook ik was hier afgelopen zaterdag toen we afscheid namen van Helmut Kohl. Juist hier, en terecht hier in Straatsburg als symbool van het "nooit meer oorlog". En toch moeten we het over die dubbele zetel hebben.

De Commissie en de Raad hebben zojuist laten zien dat ze de moed niet hebben om dat te doen. We moeten het erover hebben, niet alleen omdat het 200 miljoen EUR per jaar kost, maar ook omdat het de legitimiteit van onze gemeenschappelijke Unie aantast. Als jullie dit niet kunnen aanpakken, hoe moeten we jullie dan nog geloven en hoe zijn jullie dan nog geloofwaardig als het om de échte, serieuze problemen gaat.

Ja, dit parlement debatteert met emotie, en nee, we zijn het niet altijd met elkaar eens, maar we hebben wel de moed om het op de agenda te zetten. Dit in tegenstelling tot veel leiders in de Raad die thuis wel klagen, maar zich nu in stilzwijgen hullen. Tegen die leiders zeg ik: *put your money where your mouth is*. Ofwel, je klaagt thuis en je doet er wat aan. Als je niet bereid bent om er iets aan te doen, dan wil ik de Raad en wil ik ook mijn eigen leiders thuis er de komende vijf jaar niet meer over horen.

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, une minute pour vous dire tout ce que je pense de ce débat, c'est à la fois trop court, car, pour répondre à chacun des arguments contre Strasbourg, il me faudrait des heures. L'Association européenne des jeunes entrepreneurs l'a d'ailleurs déjà parfaitement fait; je vous incite à lire son rapport. Mais c'est aussi bien trop long, car consacrer une minute à ce débat stérile sur un sujet sur lequel nous ne sommes pas décisionnaires, c'est déjà une minute de trop.

Aussi à ceux dont l'idée qu'ils se font de leur mandat est celle d'un joueur de Monopoly – «contre deux hôtels et un hémicycle, je te donne une agence des médicaments et une école» –, je leur dis de prendre garde car, à force d'oublier pourquoi nous siégeons ensemble ici, à Strasbourg, et pas ailleurs, ils vont au-devant d'un réveil qui pourrait être brutal et dangereux.

Permettez-moi à cet égard de citer simplement M. Wolfgang Schäuble, ministre allemand des finances, qui a fait de la préservation des deniers publics une quasi-religion. Il a déclaré, en 2013, qu'aucune autre ville n'explique de façon aussi émotionnelle le sens du lien européen. Nous devons sans cesse rappeler que l'Europe ne peut fonctionner que lorsque Strasbourg est forte. Nous devons sans cesse rappeler aux députés l'importance de Strasbourg. L'Europe ne peut fonctionner qu'avec plusieurs centres.

(Applaudissements)

Διαδικασία «Catch-the-Eye»

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Pán predsedaajúci, je mi smutno z politikov, ktorí nemajú úctu k histórii. Úcta k histórii sa nedeclaruje, tá sa žije.

Je mi smutno z ľudí, ktorí chcú ničiť tradície, pretože necítia hrdosť na to, čo dosiahli ich predchodcovia. Je mi veľmi smutno z kolegov, ktorí namiesto toho, aby vlastnou prácou obnovovali odkaz, ktorý nesú európske symboly, chcú tieto symboly zničiť.

Sídlo Európskeho parlamentu, o ktorom tu hovoríme, to nie je políčko v hre Monopoly, na ktorom sme sa náhodou ocitli po vrhu kockou. Je to priesečník našej spoločnej európskej minulosti a prítomnosti.

Pre tých, ktorí to nechápu, sú dejiny len rozprávkou, Európa len trhom a verejný rozpočet len excelovou tabuľkou.

Občanom sa denne snažíme vysvetliť oveľa zložitejšie problémy, ako je sídlo Európskeho parlamentu v Štrasburgu. Ďakujem.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da decenni, ogni anno, l'Unione europea spreca centinaia di milioni di euro per mantenere le due sedi del Parlamento di Strasburgo e di Bruxelles. Nonostante *austerità*, tagli ed emergenze reali come l'immigrazione, ogni anno ci ripetiamo questo discorso sulla doppia sede, ed ogni anno il Consiglio non fa un passo avanti nella modifica dei trattati.

La petizione per la sede unica, firmata nel 2015 da oltre un milione di cittadini, è passata inosservata, così come centinaia di articoli di giornale e reportage su questo spreco incredibile ed apparentemente inarrestabile. Trovo imbarazzante che l'Unione europea imposti le sue priorità sulla gestione efficiente delle risorse, sulla sostenibilità e sull'economia circolare, per poi mantenere in piedi uno spreco così evidente ed inutile.

Una delle due sedi va dismessa definitivamente se vogliamo restituire credibilità alle istituzioni europee. Abbiamo il dovere di dimostrare ai cittadini che siamo i primi a credere in quel rinnovamento che quotidianamente promuoviamo.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Στρασβούργο έχει επιλεγεί για λόγους ιστορικούς διότι αποτελεί έκφραση της γαλλογερμανικής προσέγγισης και αυτό πρέπει να το λάβουμε σοβαρά υπόψη. Δεύτερον, θα πρέπει να υπενθυμίσουμε σε ορισμένους συναδέλφους ότι, σύμφωνα με το Πρωτόκολλο 6, αναφέρεται ρητά ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχει έδρα το Στρασβούργο, όπου γίνονται οι 12 συνεδριάσεις. Έδρα των επιτροπών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου είναι οι Βρυξέλλες και έδρα της Γραμματείας είναι το Λουξεμβούργο. Αυτά λέει η Συνθήκη. Επίσης, η Συνθήκη λέει ότι οι έδρες ρυθμίζονται με κοινή απόφαση των κυβερνήσεων και η Γαλλική κυβέρνηση δήλωσε ότι δεν θα αλλάξει γνώμη, επομένως δεν πρόκειται να αλλάξει τίποτε.

Καλώ όμως τους Γάλλους συναδέλφους, οι οποίοι θέλουν να λειτουργεί εδώ το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, να κάνουν σοβαρές προσπάθειες ώστε να υπάρξει ένα σοβαρό αεροδρόμιο, για να μπορούμε να ερχόμαστε με την άνεσή μας και να υπάρξει σύνδεση με όλες τις πρωτεύουσες. Επενδύστε λοιπόν εδώ στο Στρασβούργο και στο αεροδρόμιο και στις υπόλοιπες υποδομές για να έχουμε μια σοβαρή παρουσία.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, los populistas han convencido a muchos de que las instituciones de la Unión Europea tiran el dinero: es una gran mentira; pero los populistas y los nacionalistas no necesitan la verdad para nada, les basta con pequeñas verdades que mezclan con grandes mentiras para engañar a los ciudadanos. Para derrotar al populismo debemos hacer dos cosas: desvelar sus mentiras y dejarlos sin argumentos.

La Unión Europea en general no despilfarra, pero mantener dos sedes del Parlamento Europeo supone un sobrecoste de 180 millones de euros al año y un coste medioambiental de 19 000 toneladas de CO₂: es un despilfarro inaceptable en una Europa que todavía tiene que recuperarse de la crisis y que, además, se encuentra en una nueva fase de euro-peísmo eficiente y reformista.

Los eurodiputados queremos una sola sede y lo hemos dicho muchas veces; una Unión Europea ágil y eficaz ya lo habría resuelto. Pero además del coste económico, hay un coste político: al no suprimir una de las sedes estamos dando argumentos a los enemigos de la Unión.

Estrasburgo es un símbolo de paz y reconciliación, no podemos permitir que se convierta en un símbolo del despilfarro. Y este es el momento.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Zaupanje državljanov Evropske unije v evropske institucije ni tako visoko, kot bi si želeli. In mislim, da moramo tudi s svojim ravnanjem pokazati, da nam je mar do Evropske unije in pa seveda tudi do evropskih institucij in pa racionalnosti. Še zlasti potem, ko smo šli čez težko ekonomsko krizo, ko smo zapovedali varčevalne ukrepe mnogim državam, kar še danes pušča ogromne posledice, mi še vedno porabimo letno 114 milijonov za selitev iz enega sedeža na drug sedež in to predstavlja čez 6 % proračuna Evropskega parlamenta.

Kolegi so že povedali tudi o drugih učinkih, ki seveda niso zanemarljivi. Zato se mi zdi vredno ponovno razmisliti o tem, ali so te selitve res racionalne in ali s tem morda ne spodbujamo še dodatne jeze na račun potrate, in mislim, da kot odgovorni moramo o tem resno razpravljati.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση για την ενιαία έδρα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου είναι παλαιά και φυσικά δεν πρόκειται να ολοκληρωθεί, κατά τη γνώμη μου, ούτε σήμερα ούτε στο προσεχές μέλλον. Επειδή όμως το θέμα αυτό επηρεάζει τη ζωή και τον τρόπο εργασίας όλων μας, θα πρέπει η απόφαση που θα ληφθεί να είναι απαλλαγμένη από συναισθηματισμούς και πολιτικές σκοπιμότητες και θα πρέπει να γίνει προσπάθεια για να δοθεί λύση σε ένα υπαρκτό πρόβλημα. Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι η έδρα του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου πρέπει να είναι ενιαία.

Αυτή τη στιγμή, όλες οι εγκαταστάσεις του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου βρίσκονται στις Βρυξέλλες και εκεί, κατά την άποψή μου, πρέπει να βρίσκεται και η έδρα. Αν λάβετε υπόψη τις μετακινήσεις που γίνονται, την τλαιπωρία που υφίστανται οι ευρωβουλευτές και οι εργαζόμενοι, τον όγκο του υλικού που μετακινείται, τότε επιβάλλεται να αντιμετωπιστεί το πρόβλημα αυτό με έναν τρόπο ρεαλιστικό. Η ύπαρξη της έδρας στις Βρυξέλλες δεν σημαίνει συγκεντρωτισμό, σημαίνει μια λογική αντιμετώπιση του θέματος.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, it is obvious that having two seats for the European Parliament is both illogical and unsustainable. Could you imagine if every school in Europe met in one location for three weeks of the month and then went off a couple of hundred miles away for one week every month? People do not understand this, and it needs to change.

I would ask my good French colleagues to look at the situation and, if they are sincere about a single seat, let us decide on a single seat first and then decide whether that seat is Brussels or Strasbourg. I would also appeal to the French, who played such an honourable and central part in the COP 21 climate summit in Paris. How can they be so proud of that and, at the same time, condone and wish to continue a situation where 19 000 tons of CO₂ are emitted every year unnecessarily? It is time for change.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE). – Arvoisa puhemies, brexit tarjoaa meille ja EU:lle ainutkertaisen mahdollisuuden järjeistää EU:n toimintaa ja siirtää yhteen toimipaikkaan, lopettaa sekä ajan että rahan tuhlaus. Täällä on vedottu historialisiin syihin. Ymmärrän erittäin hyvin, että silloin kun tämä järjestö on aikoinaan perustettu, toimipaikaksi on pistetty Strasbourg. Se on ollut silloin hyväksyttävää ja sillä on ollut kunniakkaat syyt.

Mutta aikaa on kulunut, EU on laajentunut ja tällä hetkellä se, että on kaksi toimipaikkaa, tarkoittaa tuhlausta ja järjetömyyttä. Nyt on aika siirtää siis yhteen toimipaikkaan. Me emme voi olla historian emmekä myöskään Ranskan vankeja tässä asiassa. Missään asiassa tilanteen ei pidä olla niin, että yksi jäsenvaltio pystyy blokkaamaan päätöksen kokonaan.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, obviamente que não cabe ao Conselho nem à Comissão, nem sequer a este Parlamento, decidir esta questão. A decisão compete à unanimidade dos Estados-Membros mudarem os tratados e permitirem a determinação de uma sede única para o Parlamento Europeu. No entanto, acredito que devemos aproveitar a eleição do Presidente francês – o mais pró-europeu dos candidatos das eleições francesas – e as negociações do Brexit para relançar o debate acerca da revisão dos tratados que permita a esta Casa reunir num só local.

Não se trata de lançar nenhuma campanha anti-Estrasburgo, lugar simbólico da reconciliação franco-alemã e ponto de partida da construção europeia. Trata-se, sim, de pôr de lado egoísmos nacionalistas e chegar a uma solução mais eficiente do ponto de vista económico, ambiental e do próprio trabalho parlamentar.

A deslocação mensal a Estrasburgo de eurodeputados, assistentes, intérpretes e jornalistas custa cerca de 114 milhões de euros e representa emissões adicionais de 19 mil toneladas de CO₂ por ano. Estes valores não são justificáveis perante quem aqui todos representamos – os cidadãos europeus – e a quem foram exigidos tantos sacrifícios na sequência da crise de 2008. O Parlamento pode não ter competência para decidir, mas certamente que, em nome da de quem representa – o povo europeu – pode e deve discutir este assunto. E para além do mais, relativamente à Agência Europeia dos Medicamentos, está provado que Portugal é o local ideal para ter a agência.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, this umpteenth discussion about one seat is being conducted on the wrong basis because it's not a question of choosing between Strasbourg and Brussels. Many of my colleagues have already quoted the Treaty and it is clear: our activities here are legal in Brussels. The issue, however, is not one of geography, it is a question of power. Most of us want to be in Brussels because then we can be closer to an executive branch of power, closer to Commissioners, life-time contracted civil servants and all that kind of 'glamour'.

I believe that our French colleagues would support me when I call on this Chamber to study carefully the works of Montesquieu, Rousseau and others. That means we must change the Treaties and give this Parliament more power. For instance, vote down Commissioners, Jean-Claude Juncker included if need be, and only after that can we discuss whether we like Strasbourg more than Krakow, for instance.

Λήξη της διαδικασίας «Catch-the-Eye»

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I have listened with interest to all the speakers today but I will not enter into the substance of the issue. As I said at the beginning, decisions on the seats of the EU institutions are not a matter for the Commission.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Πέμπτη στις 12 το μεσημέρι.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Het voorstel om het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau (EMA) na de brexit naar Straatsburg te verhuizen, vindt steeds meer bijval. In ruil voor het felbegeerde EU-agentschap kan er eindelijk een einde komen aan de maandelijkse verhuizing van het Europees Parlement naar Straatsburg. 80 % van de EP-leden is voorstander van één zetel; laat ons daar dan ook werk van maken. De maandelijkse verhuizing kost niet alleen handenvol geld, maar is ook enorm belastend voor het milieu. Het einde van dat gependel zal tot 114 miljoen euro per jaar besparen en de CO₂-uitstoot met 19.000 ton verminderen. Het huisvesten van het Geneesmiddelenbureau in Straatsburg heeft ook onmiskenbaar economische voordelen voor de hoofdstad van de Elzas: 1.000 hooggeschoolde (permanente) personeelsleden en een dagelijks komen en gaan van honderden experts zullen grosso modo voor extra inkomsten zorgen voor de hele regio.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – Quello sulla sede unica del Parlamento europeo appare ormai un dibattito surreale. Costantemente riproposto da più di 30 anni, praticamente fin da quando il Parlamento europeo venne eletto per la prima volta a suffragio universale, sembra ormai essersi ridotto ad un dialogo tra sordi. Lo testimoniano le dichiarazioni rese in questo dibattito dal Consiglio e dalla Commissione che declinano ogni responsabilità rimettendola agli Stati membri dell'Unione. Non starò adesso qui a richiamare gli sprechi, le inefficienze e le incongruenze che giustificherebbero una sede unica e sostenibile del Parlamento europeo. Mi limito a rilevare che anche su questo tema, così come sui principali altri all'ordine del giorno dell'agenda politica dell'Unione, e tra tutti l'immigrazione, ancora una volta la tanto strombazzata retorica dell'Unione, della fratellanza e della solidarietà cede il passo, senza opporre alcuna resistenza, al cinico, ma molto più realistico, egoismo degli Stati membri.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *kirjallinen*. – Kaksi asiaa on tullut täysin selväksi niiden vuosien ja vuosikymmenten aikana, kun parlamentti on hajauttanut toimintansa kuukausittain Brysselin ja Strasbourgin kesken. Ensinnäkin edestakaisin kulkeminen on kallista, aikaa vievää, saastuttavaa ja suunnattoman epäsuosittua. Sekä valtaosa kansalaisista että valtaosa Euroopan parlamentista vastustaa sitä. Strasbourg on valtavan ihana kaupunki, mutta tämä eripura saattaa EU:n yhteistyökyvyn ja toiminnan kyseenalaiseksi. Toiseksi on tullut selväksi, että jäsenmaat eivät näytä pääsevän Brysseliin siirtymisestä sopuun, koska Ranska on vastustanut Brysseliin siirtymistä.

Pöytäkirja Euroopan unionin toimielinten ja tiettyjen elinten, laitosten ja yksikköjen kotipaikan sijainnista määrittää, että Euroopan parlamentin kotipaikka on Strasbourg, jossa pidetään kaksitoista kuukausittaista täysistuntoa. Järkevin vaihtoehto olisi muuttaa sopimuksia siten, että Euroopan parlamentti saa itse päättää työskentelypaikkansa.

Mikäli Ranska ei suostu muuttamaan nykyistä järjestelyä, ehdotan, että Strasbourgin viikkoja lyhennetään ensin kolmeen, sitten kahteen ja lopulta yhteen päivään, kun taas Brysselin täysistuntoja pidennetään. Matkustusrumba Strasbourgiin jatkuisi edelleen 12 kertaa vuodessa, mutta parlamentti istuisi täällä vain yhden päivän kullakin kerralla. Ehkä siinä vaiheessa voitaisiin avata perussopimusta edes vähentämällä matkustuskertoja. Ei siinäkään ole mitään järkeä, mutta se on vähemmän hölmö järjestely kuin nykyinen.

Kenties tämä avaa myös Ranskan silmät. Tuen lämpimästi vaihtokauppaa, jossa Ranska saisi brexitin yhteydessä Britanniaista pian vapautuvat virastot, mikäli maa suostuu vastineeksi luopumaan Strasbourgin istunnoista.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), schriftelijk. – Jaar na jaar stemt drie vierde van de EP-leden voor één enkele zetel voor het Europees Parlement. Wij vertegenwoordigen de Europese bevolking, dus je kunt zeggen dat een overweldigende meerderheid van de Europeanen de geldverslindende verhuizing tussen Brussel en Straatsburg verwerpt. Dat bleek trouwens uit een door 1,7 miljoen Europeanen ondertekende enquête. Het hardnekkig vasthouden aan meerdere locaties voedt bovendien het euroscepticisme in de Unie. Niemand kan een verspilling van 180 miljoen euro per jaar én een extra uitstoot van 19.000 ton CO₂, evenveel als 4900 vluchten tussen Berlijn en New York, verantwoorden.

Dat Straatsburg symbool staat voor de verzoening tussen Frankrijk en Duitsland na WO-II én daarom voor de diepere betekenis van de Unie is een valabel argument. Net daarom mag Straatsburg niet afgeschreven worden. We beschikken over een uniek momentum om Straatsburg de zetel te maken van het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau. Die verplaatsing levert een nieuw argument, namelijk dat de economische opbrengst voor de stad groter zal zijn dan de 20 miljoen euro aan economische input die Straatsburg ontvangt door de maandelijkse verhuizing van het Parlement. Laten we van dit momentum gebruikmaken en een win-winsituatie creëren, zowel voor Straatsburg als voor het Europees Parlement en de Europese bevolking.

16. Il-promozzjoni tal-koeżjoni u l-iżvilupp fir-Regjuni Ultraperiferiċi tal-UE (dibattitu)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η έκθεση του κ. Younous Omarjee σχετικά με την προώθηση της συνοχής και της ανάπτυξης στις εξόχως απόκεντρες περιοχές της Ένωσης: εφαρμογή του άρθρου 349 της ΣΛΕΕ (2016/2250(INI)) (A8-0226/2017).

Younous Omarjee, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je tiens tout d'abord à remercier l'ensemble des rapporteurs fictifs et mes collègues pour leur contribution à ce rapport, ainsi que la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural (AGRI) pour son avis.

Ce rapport arrive à quelques mois de la publication, par la Commission européenne, de sa nouvelle communication relative aux régions ultrapériphériques de l'Union (RUP), décision que je veux saluer. Mais plus que d'une nouvelle stratégie, ce dont les RUP ont désormais besoin, c'est de mesures concrètes, rapides et efficaces pour l'emploi des jeunes, pour la pêche, pour leur accès à tous les programmes horizontaux de l'Union et aux réseaux transeuropéens de transport, de l'énergie et des télécommunications. Tout ceci par la pleine mise en œuvre de l'article 349. D'autant plus que nous avons, aujourd'hui, la force juridique pour le faire, avec la décision de la Cour de justice du 15 décembre 2015.

Ce que nous demandons, au fond, ce n'est pas un effort budgétaire plus important – ce débat viendra peut-être –, mais simplement la mise en œuvre de politiques mieux adaptées à nos situations particulières, comme l'autorise le traité.

Ce que j'appelle la culture RUP doit être mieux irriguée et mieux partagée au sein de toutes les politiques de l'Union, au sein de toutes les directions générales, ce qui n'est, vous en conviendrez, pas toujours le cas. La question qui, de mon point de vue, est essentielle, est celle de la nécessaire transversalité et de la mise en cohérence des politiques européennes. Car il n'est pas cohérent que les efforts importants déployés, d'un côté, dans la politique de cohésion par la commissaire Crețu, dont je veux saluer, ici, l'engagement, se trouve annihilés, de l'autre, par d'autres politiques, par d'autres commissions qui se refusent encore à la pleine application de l'article 349 et à la prise en compte des particularités des RUP. C'est précisément ce qu'il faut corriger. C'est d'ailleurs ce que le Président Juncker, lui-même, avait souligné lors du Forum des RUP et c'est ce changement que ce rapport préconise aujourd'hui.

Je pense à la politique commerciale et aux accords de libre-échange qui, vous le savez, sont très souvent dévastateurs pour nos économies fragiles et qui doivent, de notre point de vue, prendre en compte en amont, dans la négociation même, les intérêts de nos productions, comme le sucre pour La Réunion, la banane pour les Antilles et le lait pour les régions ultrapériphériques portugaises et espagnoles, qui sont d'ailleurs, déjà, très fragilisées par la disparition des quotas.

Le Parlement européen a donc souhaité, par ce rapport, faire un bilan objectif de la mise en œuvre de l'article 349 et formuler un certain nombre de propositions.

Pour conclure, je veux vous dire l'inquiétude qui est la nôtre sur l'avenir de la politique de cohésion au-delà de 2020. Je veux vous dire notre inquiétude sur son risque de dénaturation par rapport à ces objectifs de solidarité. Je veux vous dire que, si les instruments financiers venaient se substituer aux subventions, les objectifs que nous posons pour les régions ultrapériphériques seront alors très difficilement atteints.

C'est pourquoi, dans l'avenir de la politique de cohésion, les régions les moins développées d'Europe, comme les régions ultrapériphériques, quelle que soit cette politique, devront être sanctuarisées.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Omarjee for his report. The situation of the outermost regions is unique, as is recognised in Article 349 of the Treaty. This report comes at a very appropriate time as the Commission is preparing a renewed strategy on these regions, which should be adopted by the end of October 2017.

The report calls for more extensive use of Article 349 of the Treaty. I would like to reassure you that the Commission, within the framework of the upcoming renewed strategy on the outermost regions, and on the basis of Article 349, will look at all EU policies and consider, when relevant and justified, whether specific measures and adaptations are necessary.

However, I would remind you that the Commission has already proposed specific provisions, spanning various EU policies, to take into account the situation of the outermost regions. The Commission will take stock of the progress made since 2012 when the last strategy for the outermost regions – for their smart, sustainable and inclusive growth – was proposed. Since then a lot has been done to boost the competitiveness of local enterprises and to reduce the 'accessibility gap'.

Let me take the recent example of state-aid-specific provisions, to which my colleague Commissioner Vestager has devoted a lot of attention, addressing the concerns expressed by these regions. However, major challenges remain, including high unemployment rates, which, of course, affect young people in particular. Hence we need to pool our efforts to address the concerns of ordinary people in these regions and offer them better prospects.

The report sends important messages about the collective role of all EU policies and programmes in the development of the outermost regions. Cohesion policy plays a crucial role and specific provision for these regions addresses their needs and location. The Commission also agrees on the importance of investing in research and innovation, helping these regions to deploy their smart-specialisation strategies.

We are committed to further boosting the outermost regions' strengths and building on their extraordinary assets, their rich biodiversity and their unique position in the world. We would like to help them to have a leading role in fields such as renewable energies and the blue economy.

In parallel, helping the regions to close their accessibility gap will be crucial. Here we are thinking not only about transport links but also about digital connectivity. Cohesion policies have helped considerably to reduce this gap. The collective involvement of all parties – the outermost regions, Member States, and all relevant stakeholders in the European Union – will be crucial to ensure that assets and specific issues are taken on board in an appropriate manner. This renewed strategy will guide our joint work in the years to come.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, *relator de parecer da Comissão da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, congratulo o relator Younous Omarjee pela iniciativa deste relatório e pelo seu conteúdo final.

O desenvolvimento de uma Europa social e economicamente coesa e solidária é uma tarefa quotidiana. O tratamento diferenciado das regiões ultraperiféricas por parte de todas as instituições e serviços da União está juridicamente consolidado, mas impõe um aperfeiçoamento contínuo. Enquanto responsável pela opinião emitida pela Comissão da Agricultura, destaco a necessidade de consagrar a consistência das dotações doPOSEI no próximo quadro financeiro plurianual.

O Posei foi um precioso auxílio, reconhecido aliás pelas análises independentes promovidas pela Comissão Europeia. Realço também a necessidade de o Observatório do Mercado do Leite da União incluir as regiões ultraperiféricas, de forma autónoma e independente, na avaliação dos preços do e no estabelecimento, claro, dos critérios para a definição da crise.

Maurice Ponga, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport sur la promotion de la cohésion et du développement dans les régions ultrapériphériques (RUP) permet de faire un premier bilan de l'application de l'article 349 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne. C'est également l'occasion de préciser les positions du Parlement en vue de l'adoption, par la Commission européenne, d'une nouvelle stratégie pour les RUP avant la fin de cette année.

Dans ce rapport, nous soulignons le soutien apporté par l'Union européenne aux régions ultrapériphériques, ainsi que la nécessité de mieux valoriser leurs atouts. Cela se traduit par des propositions concrètes dans différents domaines clés pour les RUP.

Tout d'abord, au niveau agricole, nous appelons à maintenir le programme d'options spécifiques à l'éloignement et à l'insularité (POSEI) et à apporter une attention particulière à certaines filières, notamment celles de la banane et du sucre. Nous exhortons également la Commission européenne à mettre en œuvre les recommandations que nous avons adoptées, le 27 avril dernier, dans le cadre d'une résolution sur la gestion des flottes de pêche dans les RUP.

Au niveau du commerce international, en raison de la fragilité de l'économie des RUP, nous insistons sur la nécessité que l'Union en tienne compte lorsqu'elle conclut des accords commerciaux avec des États tiers. Si des clauses de sauvegarde doivent être prévues, il est important qu'elles soient efficaces afin de protéger nos producteurs ultramarins.

Concernant la politique de cohésion, nous appelons à maintenir, après 2020, les dispositifs spécifiques pour les RUP et à renforcer la flexibilité afin de mieux s'adapter à leurs spécificités.

Enfin, pour ce qui est des politiques relatives à la recherche, à l'éducation, à l'environnement, à la compétitivité des entreprises, aux transports ou encore aux télécommunications, nous invitons la Commission européenne à mieux prendre en compte les RUP afin d'assurer leur participation effective aux différents programmes.

Je suis heureux que le Parlement ait insisté sur le programme Erasmus afin de permettre une participation effective de tous les ultramarins – RUP et PTOM confondus – au programme en adaptant les bourses à l'éloignement du continent. La Commission adoptera dans quelques mois sa nouvelle stratégie pour les RUP. J'espère donc qu'elle sera ambitieuse et aura des pistes concrètes pour assurer le développement durable des régions ultrapériphériques.

Louis-Joseph Manscour, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, mes premiers mots seront d'abord pour souligner la qualité du rapport de mon collègue Omarjee et surtout le féliciter pour ce travail collectif.

Bien qu'elle soit absente, je veux aussi saluer l'engagement constant de M^{me} la commissaire Crețu en faveur des régions ultrapériphériques.

Mes chers collègues, ce rapport est une contribution du Parlement à la communication que la Commission publiera d'ici la fin de l'année. Je forme le vœu que cette dernière en reprenne le contenu, et ce afin de nourrir l'espoir qu'a fait naître l'arrêt rendu, le 15 décembre 2015, par la Cour de justice européenne.

Cet arrêt est fondamental. En effet, il vient clore un conflit d'interprétation sur le champ d'application de l'article 349 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne et surtout confirmer que ce dernier peut être utilisé pour déroger tant au traité qu'au droit dérivé.

Or, chers collègues, pendant que nous affichions nos divergences de vues sur cet article, les handicaps dont souffrent nos régions demeuraient. J'en veux pour preuve le récent mouvement social qui a paralysé la Guyane durant de longues semaines. Il nous rappelle l'urgence d'agir.

L'Union européenne, grâce à cet article, dispose de moyens puissants pour adopter des mesures spécifiquement dédiées aux RUP. C'est exactement ce que propose le texte. En l'adoptant demain, le Parlement européen démontrera qu'il reste fidèle au traité et aux valeurs de solidarité qui fondent notre Union.

Sławomir Kłosowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowny Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo dziękuję posłowi sprawozdawcy za zaangażowanie w prace nad sprawozdaniem. Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów jest przyjacielem regionów oddalonych. Życzymy im rozwoju i pokonania trudności. Uważam jednak, że przywołane w sprawozdaniu regiony nie wykorzystują w pełni możliwości artykułu 349 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej. Zwracam uwagę, że polityki krajów, w których granicach pozostają regiony oddalone, umożliwiają dodatkowe wsparcie. Na kontynencie europejskim pozostaje wiele obszarów przeżywających podobne problemy z powodu oddalenia, klimatu, topografii lub zapóźnień wynikających z pozostawania pod dyktando komunizmu. Obszary te potrzebują wsparcia analogicznego jak regiony oddalone. Dlatego uważam, że regiony oddalone powinny zabiegać przede wszystkim o pomoc sektorową, strukturalną i inwestycyjną w państwach, w których granicach pozostają.

Matthijs van Miltenburg, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Ik wil allereerst de rapporteur, mijnheer Omarjee, bedanken voor het vele werk dat is verricht. Er is een grote afstand tussen de ultra-perifere gebieden en het Europese continent. Maar sinds ik zelf een aantal van deze regio's bezocht heb, is de gevoelsafstand voor mij verkleind. Ik draag deze gebieden en hun bevolking een bijzonder warm hart toe.

De ultra-perifere gebieden zijn een integraal onderdeel van de Europese Unie, maar vanwege hun specifieke geografische ligging worden zij voor bijzondere uitdagingen in hun ontwikkeling gesteld. Het is dan ook niet meer dan logisch dat wij Europees beleid, daar waar nodig, aanpassen aan hun speciale situatie. En daarbij komt dan het veelbesproken artikel 349 om de hoek kijken. En dat artikel 349 legt de juridische basis voor maatwerk in Europees beleid. De Europese Commissie mag daar best wel wat innovatiever mee omgaan.

Maar daarbij moet worden opgemerkt dat specifieke maatregelen voor de ultra-perifere gebieden wel in balans moeten blijven en wellicht dat wij in het verslag soms iets te enthousiast oproepen om extra steun te verlenen voor producenten van bananen, van rietsuiker en voor de melkproductie op de Azoren. Maar ik moet zeggen dat ik de globale strekking van het verslag onderschrijf. Laten we vooral ook de kansen zien voor ontwikkeling van de ultra-perifere gebieden, of het nu gaat om duurzame energieopwekking, het versterken van de unieke biodiversiteit, het toerisme of the *blue economy*.

Laten we die kansen verzilveren met behulp van het cohesiebeleid. De ultra-perifere regio's kunnen dan wat ik zou noemen "de eilanden van excellentie" worden. Duurzaam verbonden met de rest van Europa.

Ángela Vallina, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, me gustaría en primer lugar dar las gracias al ponente, al señor Omarjee, por la calidad y la precisión del informe. No solo es importante defender los derechos de las regiones ultraperiféricas, sino que es necesario hacerlo con argumentos contundentes y apelando al cumplimiento de los Tratados y los Reglamentos, en los cuales se enfatizan las particularidades de estas regiones en cuanto a su estructura socioeconómica y a su posición geográfica.

Estas regiones también tienen potencialidades diferenciadoras en cuanto respecta a la sostenibilidad, biodiversidad y desarrollo de la economía en sectores como la agricultura, la pesca o las energías renovables o también, por qué no, el turismo. Pero todo ello no sería posible sin las adecuadas políticas de la Unión y la coordinación entre instituciones y administraciones. No sería posible sin la protección de las economías locales.

Debemos recordar también que serán las regiones más afectadas por las consecuencias del cambio climático y, por tanto, se debe poner la atención ya en programas de adaptación y prevención. Y por último, y no menos importante, el informe constituye un recordatorio de la importancia que tiene la política de cohesión en la Unión Europea, que parece que a veces nos olvidamos de las diferencias que hay entre regiones.

Monika Vana, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Auch ich möchte mich zunächst ganz herzlich beim Herrn Berichtersteller Omarjee für die ausgezeichnete Zusammenarbeit beim Bericht zur Förderung von Kohäsion und Entwicklung in den Gebieten in äußerster Randlage bedanken. Der Bericht kommt ja wirklich genau zur richtigen Zeit – vor der Vorstellung der Präsentation der Strategie der Kommission.

Als Grüne begrüße ich sehr, dass in dem Bericht große Aufmerksamkeit auf die Unterstützung und Ausbildung junger Menschen gelegt wurde – insbesondere die Teilnahme an der europäischen Jugendbeschäftigungsinitiative – und dass Studierende und JungunternehmerInnen verstärkt vom neuen Programm Erasmus+ profitieren sollen. Wie schon angesprochen wurde: Durch die geografische Lage sind ja die Gebiete in äußerster Randlage für die Forschung in den Bereichen Klimawandel und Artenvielfalt besonders interessant, und das ist auch eine Stärke, die hervorgehoben werden sollte.

Wir Grünen machen uns natürlich stark für nachhaltige Energieselbstversorgung in diesen Gebieten – speziell für den Ausbau von erneuerbaren Energiequellen, Energieeffizienz und den Ausbau der Kreislaufwirtschaft. Der Bericht geht eindeutig für uns in die richtige Richtung, und wir bedanken uns.

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io devo esprimere il mio apprezzamento per il lavoro del collega Omarjee e voglio sottolineare con lui in questa relazione che, sia per le regioni ultraperiferiche che per le regioni che sono in difficoltà, il principio di solidarietà non deve essere soltanto una mera dichiarazione di intenti, ma deve essere importante sia in fase di progettazione che in fase di attuazione delle politiche europee.

Nella relazione parliamo molto di sostenibilità ambientale e di crescita blu, ma devo qui sottolineare due pericoli maggiori che i nostri mari purtroppo corrono. I primi sono i rifiuti, i rifiuti marini, i quali sono una vera e propria emergenza globale. Secondo uno studio della stessa Commissione europea essi, oltre a causare gravi danni ambientali alle comunità costiere, alle economie, al turismo, alla navigazione, alla pesca e alla biodiversità, costano ai contribuenti europei almeno 630 milioni di euro.

Devo segnalare un altro pericolo imminente: l'estrazione del petrolio e del gas, l'esplorazione alla ricerca di minerali nei depositi di acque profonde. Questi hanno gravi ripercussioni sulle zone marine sensibili e danneggiano in maniera irreversibile le specie marine e gli ecosistemi vulnerabili.

Signori, se non affrontiamo questi temi e se non fermiamo le multinazionali, i poteri forti, che aggravano i problemi ambientali e distruggeranno le nostre economie con il TTIP, con il CETA, anche un'attuazione coerente ed uniforme dell'articolo 349 non riuscirà a contribuire ad un vero sviluppo armonioso ed equilibrato delle regioni ultraperiferiche, dotate di un incredibile patrimonio naturalistico da tutelare e valorizzare.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señor presidente: muchas gracias al colega Omarjee por su informe.

La lejanía, la insularidad, el tamaño reducido, la difícil topografía y la dependencia económica de unos pocos productos son rasgos permanentes de las regiones ultraperiféricas, entre ellas Canarias. La respuesta de Europa a estos hándicaps debe ser también permanente y tiene su sustento en el artículo 349 del Tratado.

Tres apuntes.

El POSEI desempeña un papel esencial en el mantenimiento y desarrollo de la producción agrícola y la industria de transformación en estas regiones, que sufren tasas de paro mucho más altas que los promedios nacionales. Por ello, es absolutamente necesario mantener, y reforzar, en su caso, estos programas: sin POSEI, no hay futuro para el sector agrario.

Sector pesquero, donde la necesidad de reestructuración y desarrollo, uno de los principales objetivos del POSEI, es acuciante. Necesitamos volver a disponer de un POSEI-Pesca. Es fundamental la modernización de la flota. La flota, por razones de seguridad, con antigüedad de más de veinte años, es peligrosa, ineficiente y contaminante. Con estrictas condiciones, no se tiene por qué poner en peligro la pesca sostenible.

Por último, en breve afrontaremos el nuevo marco financiero plurianual. Necesitamos que ese nuevo marco cumpla con las expectativas: no las defraudemos.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, ao Deputado Omarjee queria felicitar o produto final deste relatório e dizer, de facto, que a União Europeia deve ter em conta a situação social, económica e estrutural destas regiões, que são regiões afastadas pela insularidade, pela pequena superfície, pelo relevo, por climas difíceis e pela sua dependência económica em relação a um pequeno número de produtos.

Por isso todos nós devemos empenhar-nos na salvaguarda da competitividade e especificidade das suas indústrias tradicionais aquando da celebração de acordos de livre comércio entre a União e países terceiros num aumento do investimento conseguido através do Fundo Europeu para investimentos estratégicos, de forma a dar resposta às deficiências do mercado nestas regiões, mas também aos índices elevadíssimos de desemprego, particularmente o desemprego jovem, na criação de um programa de investigação específico que permita a colocação em rede das respetivas universidades, dos centros de investigação e de empresas inovadoras. As RUP têm, de facto, todas as características de laboratórios de experimentação. Também considero que a internacionalização da acessibilidade das RUP através das infraestruturas e rotas de transporte são fundamentais.

Queria ainda salientar que fico particularmente satisfeita por estarmos aqui a falar a uma só voz em relação ao que é que pretendemos para as RUP e ficamos, de facto, a aguardar pela estratégia para as RUP já no próximo Outono.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, destaco cinco pontos neste relatório que defendemos.

Primeiro: a criação de um POSEI Transportes pelos constrangimentos na mobilidade de pessoas e mercadorias nestas regiões face ao seu afastamento e aos custos acrescidos associados.

Segundo: não redução do POSEI Agricultura, que é um fator fundamental para o desenvolvimento económico e social, bem como para a coesão territorial destas regiões.

Terceiro: proteção dos produtos sensíveis para as regiões ultraperiféricas no âmbito dos acordos comerciais europeus cujo impacto deve ser pré-avaliado. É necessário definir claramente o que é uma crise de mercado nestas regiões.

O relatório também defende a necessidade de o Observatório do Leite ter também os dados deste setor das RUP de uma forma autónoma.

Quarto: recuperação do POSEI Pescas, cuja integração no FEAMP FOI um tremendo erro, que deve ser corrigido, causando danos que prejudicam os pescadores, bem como levou à perda da autonomia na gestão deste importante fundo.

Quinto: o aumento da aplicação do artigo 349.º. Há uma responsabilidade acrescida dos Estados-Membros de garantir que o âmbito de aplicação deste artigo não se limite ao financiamento, atuando e exercendo influência para que os documentos da Comissão já demonstrem o respeito pelo Tratado e não apenas a atuar na remediação desta situação.

Por último, queria enaltecer o excelente trabalho do colega Omarjee.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario, todo el reconocimiento al ponente, nuestro colega Omarjee, por este informe, que es el primer documento estratégico sobre las regiones ultraperiféricas después de la relevante sentencia de 15 de diciembre de 2015, la sentencia sobre Mayotte, que señala que hay base jurídica no solamente para excepcionar el Derecho derivado, sino también para especializar las políticas respecto de las regiones ultraperiféricas para compensar su lejanía y su insularidad. Y lo hace en la perspectiva de una planificación estratégica: la Europa después de 2020, entre 2020 y 2030, un documento estratégico para las RUP, que señala un cambio radical de orientación.

En primer lugar, porque no estamos ya hablando exclusivamente de política regional o de política agrícola, sino de un conjunto de variedades que van desde la política comercial a la política exterior. En segundo lugar, porque se dice con claridad que ser una región ultraperiférica no es una desventaja, sino que puede ser un apoyatura estratégica. Pero, en tercer lugar, porque señala el potencial de la inserción de las regiones ultraperiféricas por su conectividad en las redes transeuropeas de innovación, de energía, de nuevas comunicaciones, de telecomunicaciones, lo que significa una enorme palanca de futuro para, de una vez por todas, señalar la presencia de las regiones ultraperiféricas como una condición singular de la política regional europea.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doresc, în primul rând, să-l felicit pe domnul Omarjee pentru munca depusă. Personal, am fost în două regiuni ultraperiferice, respectiv în Martinica și în insulele Azore, împreună cu Comisia de dezvoltare regională. Aici am putut să constat îndeaproape care sunt dificultățile cu care se confruntă aceste regiuni, fie că vorbim de distanțele foarte mari față de continent, de condițiile climatice, de topografia dificilă ori de dependența economică de un număr restrâns de oportunități. Regiunile ultraperiferice, parte a spațiului european, au nevoie de un sprijin puternic în vederea creării de locuri de muncă, dezvoltării economiilor încă fragile și asigurării unei protecții adecvate a mediului, dar și a biodiversității și a valorilor culturale.

Implementarea strategiei privind creșterea albastră, dezvoltarea cercetării și a turismului, dar mai ales valorificarea potențialului agricol trebuie să devină realități în aceste zone. Este nevoie de o mai bună informare și comunicare în același timp a beneficiarilor Fondurilor europene din cadrul politicii de coeziune și nu numai despre oportunitățile oferite de acestea, corelativ, însă, cu întărirea colaborării între autoritățile de resort responsabile de implementarea acestora.

Διαδικασία «Catch-the-Eye»

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, as regiões ultraperiféricas encontram-se numa situação única no seio da União Europeia, num contexto natural marcado pela insularidade, pelo clima tropical e por um relevo acidentado e vulcânico.

Estas regiões encontram-se muito afastadas do continente europeu, mas têm uma história relevante: desempenham um papel estratégico na proteção das rotas marítimas da Europa e na defesa das suas fronteiras exteriores. As RUP's são espaços privilegiados com um potencial de atividades relacionadas com o crescimento do turismo, do crescimento azul, da exploração das energias renováveis, do desenvolvimento da economia circular e da valorização do seu rico património natural e vasta biodiversidade.

O meu país, Portugal, tem a sua história intrinsecamente ligada ao mar e à expansão marítima. O mar foi, durante séculos, a matriz identitária do povo português e o nosso relacionamento com o mar, ao longo de toda a nossa história coletiva, fez com que fosse possível resgatar um espaço único de conhecimento e oportunidades para toda a Europa.

Entendo, por isso, que as RUP's portuguesas, Açores e Madeira, constituem uma oportunidade única para uma Europa mais sustentável com o reforço da sua visão e dimensão marítima. Por isso penso que a União deve permitir que as RUP's ultrapassem as suas dificuldades e tirem proveito dos seus ativos e bens únicos e, ao mesmo tempo, que os Estados-Membros assumam uma maior responsabilidade relativamente à utilização dos instrumentos disponíveis da União que lhes permita assegurar um desenvolvimento sustentável das RUP's. Este é o desígnio que queremos para todas essas regiões e quero cumprimentar o Senhor Omarjee pelo excelente trabalho que fez neste relatório.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το άρθρο 349 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης καθορίζει ένα ειδικό καθεστώς για τις εξόχως απόκεντρες περιοχές κι αυτό είναι πάρα πολύ σωστό. Θα ήθελα όμως, με την ευκαιρία αυτή, να πω ότι θα πρέπει να στηριχθούν, λόγω της νησιωτικότητας η οποία επίσης αναφέρεται στη Συνθήκη, και τα νησιά σε όλη τη Μεσόγειο και κυρίως τα νησιά του Αιγαίου, του Ιονίου και η Κρήτη. Ιδίως δε τα νησιά του Αιγαίου, τα οποία πλήττονται αυτή τη στιγμή από τεράστιες μεταναστευτικές ροές. Όμως, αντί να στηριχθούν αυτά τα νησιά, έχουμε με εντολές της τρόικας αύξηση του ΦΠΑ στα νησιά του Αιγαίου.

Πρέπει λοιπόν, κύριε Πρόεδρε, για όλα τα νησιά της Μεσογείου να υπάρξει ενίσχυση της γεωργίας, να υπάρξουν φορολογικά κίνητρα, ιδίως στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, του Ιονίου και στην Κρήτη, να υπάρξει αντιστάθμιση του μεταφορικού κόστους και ενίσχυση της αλιείας και του τουρισμού. Με έναν τέτοιο τρόπο μπορούμε πραγματικά να στηρίξουμε την περιφερειακή ανάπτυξη και τη συνοχή στα νησιά της Μεσογείου.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, suscribo la hoja de ruta de este informe para que, de acuerdo con las previsiones del artículo 349 del Tratado, se adapten con éxito el ordenamiento jurídico y todas las políticas y los programas europeos a las necesidades de las regiones ultraperiféricas, como las islas Canarias, para garantizar así el acceso de sus ciudadanos a todos ellos.

La combinación entre distancia y diversidad ha penalizado los resultados de un esfuerzo que reconocemos y que ha aportado mucho y, para mejorar, destacamos la necesidad de tener en cuenta en los acuerdos comerciales con terceros países que son producciones primarias, que son producciones europeas, pero con más dificultades; la urgencia de adaptar a las RUP el funcionamiento de los fondos horizontales y la política de cohesión y el mantenimiento de consideración de «regiones menos desarrolladas», reforzando el POSEI agrícola y un POSEI pesquero; considerar la dimensión de la economía de las RUP cuando se juzguen programas de ayuda al desarrollo económico que, en otro contexto, podrían afectar en términos de competencia al mercado interior; y, por último, la integración del potencial de las RUP

en el ámbito de la economía azul y las energías renovables en el catálogo de oportunidades que ofrecen estas regiones a toda la Unión. Y las islas Canarias son un ejemplo para ello.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, as regiões ultraperiféricas enfrentam fatores de natureza estrutural, como o afastamento, a insularidade, entre outros, que constroem de forma permanente o seu desenvolvimento. Esta é a base que justifica uma discriminação positiva que assegure a estas regiões medidas e disposições específicas, que as ajudem a fazer face a estes constrangimentos. Ora, esta discriminação positiva tem sido aplicada de forma muito insuficiente e limitada pela União Europeia. Concordamos, por isso, com a proposta do relator – que aproveite para saudar – para a criação de um plano de ação para as RUP que potencie e alargue os efeitos desta discriminação positiva.

É necessário acabar com a devastadora desregulação dos mercados, apoiar mais as produções regionais, dinamizar os mercados locais, apoiar inclusivamente a criação de mercados inter-ilhas, por exemplo na região da Macaronésia, os transportes e a mobilidade de pessoas e mercadorias com a criação de um POSEI Transportes. É necessário assegurar às RUP o controlo sobre a totalidade da sua zona económica exclusiva, apoiar a investigação e o desenvolvimento em áreas como as energias renováveis, a biodiversidade, entre outras, e entre outras medidas que podem e devem integrar este plano de ação.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl poděkovat panu Omarjeemu za výbornou zprávu. Cení si na ní především to, že nás obrací k hledisku solidarity. To je, myslím, hledisko, které už občas ze zřetele ztrácíme, a rozhodně to není šťastné. Vzdálené regiony si zaslouží naši podporu, mají mimořádný status přiznaný nejen na základě primárního práva, ale i na základě již deklarovaného rozsudku. Já jsem přesvědčen, že tyto vzdálené regiony musí zůstat v ohnisku územní soudržnosti. Oni se potýkají s problémy, se svými znevýhodněními, a co jiného je, než odstraňovat tyto znevýhodnění, a to je i rovněž politikou koheze, to znamená té územní soudržnosti.

Proto jsem byl trochu překvapen z toho, co řekl pan Kłosowski, který řekl, že jejich problémy mají být řešeny uvnitř těch států, to si myslím, že právě opouští to hledisko solidarity, a myslím si, že bychom jej neměli ztrácet opravdu ze zřetele i ve vztahu k těmto vzdáleným regionům.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, najudaljenije regije zbog svog se geografskog položaja suočavaju s izazovima koji ne muče dobar dio kontinentalne Europe. Iako je riječ o teritorijima koji su dio Europske unije, prometna izoliranost i geografska udaljenost od političkog centra Unije, Bruxellesa, utječe na njihovo konzumiranje prava i europskih politika. To se mora promijeniti i najudaljenije regije moraju postati ravnopravan dio Unije u svakom pogledu.

Iako je njihova problematika specifična, one nažalost nisu usamljene u prometnoj izoliranosti i slabom iskorištavanju instrumenata kohezijske politike.

Dat ću primjer hrvatskih otoka jer na jednom od njih i sama živim. Demografsko i ekonomsko odumiranje otoka na hrvatskoj strani Jadrana također traži hitnu reakciju. Jednostavnijim procedurama u korištenju europskih fondova i novim politikama razvoja otoka možemo obrnuti ovaj proces te otocima, kao i najudaljenijim regijama, znatno pomoći u gospodarskom razvoju i očuvanju lokalnih zajednica.

Λήξη της διαδικασίας «Catch-the-Eye»

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to remind you that the report calls for a new chapter to be opened in relations between the EU and the outermost regions. The Commission is willing to build on the specific partnership the EU has with these regions, and to engage further with them to support their development, as President Juncker also stressed at the Forum of the Outermost Regions, which we hosted in Brussels at the end of March this year.

The report also recognises the important contribution of EU policies and funds, and calls for better integration of the outermost regions in EU horizontal programmes. For instance, the report rightly mentions the need fully to exploit the research potential in these regions and to do so by improving their participation in Horizon 2020 with regard to the trans-European networks in the field of transport. For instance, the report calls on the Commission to ensure the effective integration of these regions. The Commission will explore how to include these regions better in the trans-European transport network, as connectivity remains an important challenge to address.

The report also highlights the importance of specific regimes, such as specific taxation schemes. The Commission is aware of the role these schemes play in terms of supporting the outermost regions in developing their economies. However, their evaluation and possible adaptation over time are needed.

The report also acknowledges the importance of agriculture – as you have already said – and specific support for the outermost regions to address their particular agricultural challenges. Without prejudice to the negotiation on the future EU multiannual financial framework (MFF), the Commission is committed to maintaining the specific aid provided by the Programme of Options Specifically Relating to Remoteness and Insularity (POSEI).

Regarding your concerns about the situation of the fishing fleet, we agree on the need for safer and more efficient vessels. However, the total fishing capacity should be commensurate with the sustainable exploitation of fisheries stocks. In order to achieve that, we need data on the state of the stocks, which we currently lack. To fill this information gap, we will need the active involvement of both the Member States and their outermost regions so as to understand the situation of these stocks better and to recognise if management measures are needed.

As for aid towards the construction of new vessels, something currently not eligible for public funding in the EU, the Commission understands the concerns of the regions and is examining ways, within its competences, to address them while remaining consistent with its internal and international commitments. The Commission will also look at the proposal for a dedicated support system for sustainable fisheries in these regions in the context of preparation for the post-2020 MFF, following close consultation with stakeholders and on the basis of an appropriate impact assessment.

With regard to international trade agreements, the Commission will continue to pay attention to outermost regions' concerns, not only in the negotiation phase but also in the implementation and review phases of the agreements, in particular the relevant economic partnership agreements.

We cannot react here to all the important points that this report raises. However, I would like to assure you that the Commission will pay great attention to the full report as an important contribution to preparing the renewed strategy vis-à-vis these regions.

In conclusion, let me again thank Mr Omarjee for this report and let me also take this opportunity to welcome the excellent cooperation demonstrated by the Conference of Members of the European Parliament from the Outermost Regions in the effort to boost the EU strategy towards these regions.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

Younous Omarjee, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, c'est à mon tour de remercier l'ensemble de mes collègues, et j'espère que la Commission européenne a noté la très belle unanimité des groupes, de tous les groupes politiques du Parlement européen en soutien aux régions ultrapériphériques (RUP).

Ce rapport est un rapport collectif que nous avons élaboré ensemble, et le vote de demain, qui sera celui du Parlement européen, sera un signal très fort adressé à la Commission européenne pour que les avancées que nous attendons interviennent dans les meilleurs délais possibles.

Les régions ultrapériphériques, pour l'essentiel, à part la Guyane, sont des îles. Mais la gestion de ces régions à l'intérieur de la Commission européenne ne peut pas être et ne doit pas être insulaire.

La cohésion, la politique régionale, c'est là où les principales avancées vis-à-vis des régions ultrapériphériques ont été enregistrées, mais nous savons tous aujourd'hui – et cela a été souligné par nombre de mes collègues – que les potentialités de développement futur pour les RUP se situent dans la création d'une haute valeur ajoutée, l'innovation, la recherche et le développement. C'est pourquoi il faut que cette transversalité dont je parlais joue et qu'au moyen des programmes horizontaux, nous puissions avoir accès à un certain nombre d'instruments nouveaux.

Je veux, enfin, souligner le caractère essentiel du programme d'options spécifiques à l'éloignement et à l'insularité (POSEI), qui doit être non seulement sauvegardé, mais aussi renforcé.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 6. Juli 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – Ahogy azt az EUMSZ 349. cikkelye is elismeri, az EU legkülső területei különleges státuszú régiók, ebből adódóan esetükben speciális adottságokhoz igazított, egyedi innovációs politikát kell folytatnunk. A geos-tratégiai jelentőségen túl ezen régiók számos olyan adottsággal rendelkeznek, melyek többek között a megújuló energia-források, a kék gazdaság, a kutatás-fejlesztés, valamint a turizmus megfelelő kiaknázásában rejlenek. Előre kell mozdítani a fenntartható fejlődést az adott régiókban, hosszú távú beruházásokra van szükség, korszerűsíteni kell a hagyományos ágazatokat, támogatni és versenyképesebbé kell tenni a helyi termelést, valamint újabb munkahelyek teremtése szükséges, különösen a fiatalok számára. A digitális lefedettség, valamint a nemzetközi szintű infrastrukturális megközelíthetőség ugyancsak hozzájárul a helyi életszínvonal növekedéséhez. Az említettek mellett kiemelt fontosságú, hogy további befektetéseket létesítsünk a tenger- és óceánügyben, folytassuk a sikeres POSEI-programot, valamint meggátoljuk a piac felosztását és versenyképességét csökkentő harmadik országgal kötött megállapodásokat, valamint a nagy monopóliumok egyeduralmát. Az Unió vállalt szerepe mellett mindenképp szükség van az érintett tagállamok felelősségvállalására is. Köszönöm a figyelmet!

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), napisan. – Nedvojbeno je da je kohezijska politika od posebnog značaja za najudaljenije regije te je stoga potreban diferencirani i usklađeni pristup koji će uzeti u obzir njihovu jedinstvenost u okviru provedbe europskih politika. Gospodarski i socijalni položaj najudaljenijih regija zahtjeva usklađene i djelotvorne strategije kojima bi se istima omogućilo približavanje prosječnoj europskoj razini razvoja.

Što se tiče poljoprivredne politike, diferencijacija proizvoda može dodatno stimulirati i potaknuti lokalnu proizvodnju, preradu i marketing prehrambenih proizvoda te time doprinijeti smanjenju razlika koje postoje između najudaljenijih regija i ostalih regija EU-a. Povrh toga, u okviru Programa mogućnosti za udaljena i otočna područja – POSEI, od ključne je važnosti fleksibilnost dana državama članicama u definiranju programa.

Međutim, presudno je da strategije, s jedne strane, uzmu u obzir specifične potrebe država članica, a da s druge, poštuju sveobuhvatne ciljeve Unije. U tom kontekstu, smatram da je potrebno jačati kohezijsku politiku kako bi se osnažio gospodarski, socijalni i održivi razvoj najudaljenijih regija.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Labiausiai atokiausių regionų poreikiai yra apšvarstomi Europos Sąjungoje keletą metų. Tačiau vis dar per mažai dėmesio yra jiems skirta, o naudoti metodai labai skiriasi priklausomai nuo įvairių Europos Komisijos generalinių direktoratų apšvarstomų aspektų. Taip atsiranda trūkumai įstatymų sanglaudoje, kurie yra tiesioginiai motyvai nepilno bendradarbiavimo tarp ES ir atitolusių šalių. Taigi, teisingai aptariamąjoje ataskaitoje buvo įtraukta apeliacija, kurioje kreipiamasi į Komisiją, Tarybą, suinteresuotas valstybės nares ir labiausiai atitolusius regionus, kad veiktų kartu, siekiant užtikrinti šioms šalims didesnę integraciją visiškai atsižvelgiant į jų ypatumus ir poreikius. Turėtume rasti kiekvieną atvejų konkrečius problemų sprendimus, siekiant užtikrinti visoms šalims prieigą prie visų horizontaliųjų Europos Sąjungos programų. Ypatingas dėmesys turėtų būti skirtas žemės ūkio politikai. Atokiose šalyse turėtume labiau skatinti žemės ūkio įvairinimą su specialiuoju atsižvelgimu į taip vadinamuosius tradicinius žemės ūkio sektorius, ypač bendrosios rinkos organizavimo ribose. Reikalingas yra labiau nei bet kada politikos strategijų nuoseklumo užtikrinimas, kad atokiausiuose regionuose skirtingų žemės ūkio sektorių padarytos pastangos, kurių tikslu yra modernizuoti ir padidinti konkurencingumą, nebūtų pažeidžiami dėl laisvosios prekybos sudaryti susitarimai tarp Europos Sąjungos ir trečiųjų šalių. Deja, pernelyg dažnai tai atsitinka. Europos žemės ūkio rinkos apsauga visada turėtų būti mūsų prioritetu.

17. Kompożizzjoni tal-kumitati: ara l-Minuti

18. In-nirien fil-foresti riċenti fil-Portugall u fi Spanja: L-istrumenti ta' rispons tal-UE u l-proċeduri dwar il-prevenzjoni u l-protezzjoni ċivili (dibattitu)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu den jüngsten Waldbränden in Portugal und Spanien: Instrumente und Verfahren für die Reaktion der EU im Hinblick auf Prävention und Katastrophenschutz (2017/2753(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, as you know, on 17 June, several regions in Portugal started to face massive forest fires that tragically resulted in the loss of the lives of 64 people and injured another 210. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to express my renewed condolences to the families and the loved ones of the victims and I would also like – this cannot be repeated too often – to pay tribute to the courage and the outstanding work of the brave firefighters who fought the blaze. I know about the firefighters personally. I saw them in many areas on the ground.

Europe is about solidarity and I am proud that the EU could help Portugal at a time of great need. On 18 June, Portugal requested assistance through the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. The European Union responded swiftly and substantially. Within hours, France, Spain and Italy sent firefighting aircraft and firefighters. Greece and Cyprus also offered to send firefighters through our mechanism. I would like to warmly thank those countries. I would also like to thank the Portuguese authorities for publicly recognising and praising this EU assistance because in that way they communicated the EU solidarity to their citizens. In these critical times, it is our duty to make each citizen aware of what the European Union truly stands for.

Let me mention the specific assistance provided to Portugal via the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. Firstly, seven aircraft and 135 firefighters with 29 vehicles were sent to Portugal. Over a week, a total of 747 water drops were carried out. In addition, 61 EU Copernicus satellite maps were produced to help assess the damage.

Through the Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC), the Commission monitored the situation around the clock and was in constant contact with the Portuguese and other Member States' authorities. The European Union stands ready to support the response to any new forest fire emergency in the EU in the coming months. During the recent forest fire emergency Spain too asked our ERCC for Copernicus satellite maps. Emergency management services were therefore activated. As of today, 12 maps have been produced and 14 are in the making. For the 2017 forest fire season, reinforcement measures have also been taken. Our ERCC is continuously monitoring the situation across Europe and civil protection experts from our Member States, including Spain, are working on our ERCC premises in Brussels.

However, the EU has no assets of its own and no firefighting planes. We rely on our Member States to make resources available. On that point, more could be done. As the Commission pointed out in February this year in its report on progress and the remaining gaps, the aerial forest firefighting capability should be further strengthened. This is a very important point.

But the EU civil protection legislation goes beyond disaster response. As you well know as parliamentarians, it also includes disaster risk management as an equal priority. The Commission has recently produced an overview of disaster risks that the EU may face, based on the work carried out by Member States in developing national risk assessments, for it is important to have a better understanding of all disaster risks in Europe, including forest fires. As the recent tragic events have sadly demonstrated, prevention is always better than cure.

The Commission provides funding for prevention and preparedness projects and exercises. Apart from these activities, the means to fight forest fires in all parts of our continent are to be improved under the annual work programme of the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. In addition, the regional funds also play an important role in addressing climate change adaptation, disaster risk prevention and management, and environmental protection in all our Member States. Portugal and Spain benefit from these funds, which also cover protecting people from forest fires. Added to that, both countries receive further support through the cross-border, transnational and interregional programmes with a specific focus on forest fire protection measures.

Fernando Ruas, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, solicitei este debate para o qual contei, de imediato, com o apoio dos colegas da comissão REGI no seguimento da terrível tragédia que assolou o meu país e a minha região. Morreram 64 pessoas, mais de 200 ficaram feridas, sendo que 47 perderam a vida a fugir do incêndio num troço de uma estrada nacional que, curiosamente, não se encontrava encerrada ao trânsito. Foi um incêndio anormalmente destruidor, uma enorme catástrofe que a todos chocou imenso. Cabe-nos agora, depois do fogo extinto e dos prejuízos contabilizados, concentrarmo-nos no apoio aos familiares e aos amigos das vítimas, no apoio aos feridos e sobreviventes e no esforço da reconstrução das infraestruturas, habitações ou empresas, devolvendo a esperança a quem tudo perdeu.

Alerto, por isso, para a necessidade de uma ajuda célere e simplificada às famílias dos sobreviventes, aos trabalhadores que perderam os seus postos trabalho, às empresas afetadas e às autarquias que, por força deste trágico acontecimento, têm pela frente um trabalho hercúleo e muito difícil.

É necessário, uma vez por todas, fazer uma prevenção ativa e uma gestão responsável das florestas, um planeamento adequado do coberto vegetal e dos usos do solo, elaborar o cadastro da propriedade rústica, proceder a uma efetiva valorização dos territórios do interior, concretizando os princípios da coesão económica, social e territorial, através de políticas contra a desertificação humana e infraestrutural de que são alvo há algumas décadas.

É claro que cabe, em primeiro lugar, a Portugal e ao Governo agir, mas a União Europeia pode ajudar, pode ajudar através da negociação de acordos de parceria, que concretizam parte do quadro financeiro plurianual, concretamente os fundos europeus estruturais e de investimento ou mesmo através do plano Juncker. Pode promover uma maior coordenação e coerência das políticas florestais, bem como permitir sinergias com outros setores interligados à gestão florestal ou mesmo às tecnologias da informação.

Pode aumentar a profundidade da ação da Proteção Civil Nacional e de resposta à crise através de um mecanismo europeu e sobre a resposta de emergência da União Europeia a este incêndio em particular, nada temos para já a apontar, tendo Portugal contado, como o Sr. Comissário disse, com ajuda de diversos Estados-Membros, em meios aéreos e humanos e temos pois, claro, Sr. Comissário, e assim vou terminar, que saber qual a avaliação que a Comissão faz desta cooperação com as autoridades portuguesas e conhecer de que forma e quando a ajuda europeia se irá processar no âmbito do Fundo de Solidariedade e das novas regras relativas ao Fundo Desenvolvimento Regional, pois os prejuízos ascendem a cerca de 500 milhões de euros de acordo com as estimativas governamentais.

Carlos Zorrinho, em nome do Grupo S&D. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, este debate é muito oportuno, não apenas para Portugal e Espanha, mas para toda a União Europeia. Os mecanismos europeus de resposta a esta emergência funcionaram. Os fundos necessários serão disponibilizados, cobrindo 95 % dos prejuízos patrimoniais identificados. Hoje mesmo este Parlamento aprovou o reforço do fundo solidariedade. No entanto, a dimensão das tragédias e os fenómenos climáticos que os tornaram devastadoras, do ponto de vista humano e patrimonial, demonstram, Senhor Comissário, que o nível de risco subiu e é necessário prepararmo-nos para outro nível de resposta. Sim, Senhor Comissário, a União Europeia fez muito, mas tem que estar preparada para, no futuro, fazer mais. A segurança e a defesa abrangem hoje áreas que vão muito para além das áreas tradicionais. O combate ao terrorismo, aos efeitos das alterações climáticas são dois novos desafios que exigem um trabalho conjunto da União Europeia, um trabalho conjunto na resposta à emergência em que devem ser reforçados os meios disponíveis e a prontidão de acionamento, mas também, e sobretudo, um trabalho conjunto na cooperação para a prevenção e para a recuperação do tecido económico e social e do património destruído.

A criação de um mecanismo europeu permanente, com recursos próprios de prevenção e resposta a catástrofe naturais, permitirá também um processo de aprendizagem partilhada. Que os incêndios ocorridos em Portugal e Espanha, Senhor Comissário, nos ajudem a criar depressa estas novas capacidades da ação.

António Marinho e Pinto, *em nome do Grupo ALDE*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o incêndio florestal que há cerca de três semanas deflagrou em Pedrógão Grande, Portugal, e que se consubstanciou na morte de 64 pessoas, a maioria das quais dentro dos seus automóveis, numa estrada pública, quando fugia das chamas, interpela-nos a todos na dimensão mais profunda do sentido de responsabilidade política. Como é que isto foi possível em pleno século XXI num país da União Europeia?

E quase um mês depois Portugal ainda não foi esclarecido sobre o que, na realidade, se passou, sobre o que falhou na prevenção e no combate a essa tragédia. Sabemos apenas que os sucessivos governos portugueses transformaram o país num imenso eucaliptal. Portugal é hoje, na Europa, o país dos eucaliptos. Sabemos também que os vários organismos criados para gerir as florestas e para prevenir e combater os incêndios não se entenderam entre si e falharam rotundamente e que o sistema de comunicações de emergência, adquirido há alguns anos atrás por centenas de milhões de euros, também falhou porque não funcionou.

Enfim, sabemos que o Estado português falhou nas suas funções mais elementares e como que para demonstrar esse falhanço cerca de quinze dias depois dessa tragédia, grandes quantidades de armamento de guerra, incluindo potentes engenhos explosivos e lança granadas foram roubados de um estabelecimento militar devido a inaceitáveis e evidentes falhas de segurança e no meio desta irresponsabilidade generalizada o Primeiro-Ministro de Portugal foi de férias e entregou a responsabilidade do seu Governo a um seu subordinado.

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, no relatório que votamos esta manhã sobre as negociações do Orçamento valorizamos o facto de ter sido possível incluir a proposta que fizemos de reforço do Fundo de Solidariedade, tendo em conta os brutais incêndios que varreram a zona centro de Portugal.

Sublinhamos a necessidade de algo que há muito defendemos: a modificação das regras de mobilização do Fundo, assegurando uma mobilização mais flexível, atempada e cobrindo um leque mais amplo de catástrofes. Perante a tragédia em Portugal, é necessário acorrer às vítimas, apoiar as populações e restabelecer o potencial produtivo das áreas afetadas. Mas é preciso mais. Em 2010, este Parlamento aprovou uma resolução, da qual fui relator, sobre uma abordagem comunitária à prevenção de catástrofes. Sete anos decorridos está quase tudo por fazer.

Destaco a proposta de criação de um quadro financeiro apropriado à prevenção de catástrofes capaz de financiar ações em domínios como o ordenamento florestal ou a manutenção da atividade agrícola em áreas afetadas pelo despovoamento, entre muitas outras propostas.

Senhor Comissário, é tempo de a Comissão Europeia olhar com olhos de ver para estas recomendações e agir em conformidade.

Florent Marcellesi, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, ante todo quiero trasladar mis condolencias por las pérdidas humanas en los incendios de Portugal.

Ahí, y en España, las causas de estos superincendios son bastante claras: el cambio climático, en el origen de la sequía y las temperaturas extremas; el monocultivo del eucalipto y el pino, muchos beneficios para la industria de la madera pero una caja de cerillas para nuestros montes; la especulación urbanística y la falta de ordenación territorial, reforzando el peligro para las poblaciones locales; y el abandono del monte, donde «desarrollo» hoy rima con «despoblación rural».

En cambio, necesitamos otra cosa: reordenar el territorio; priorizar las inversiones en zonas de alto riesgo de incendio y una mayor prevención a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural; integrar de forma central el cambio climático en la prevención de incendios y en la gestión forestal sostenible; y, sobre todo, repensar la política agrícola común para cerrar la página del monocultivo y abrir la de un modelo agroforestal diverso y ecológico, con empleo, riqueza y vida en el mundo rural.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso (PPE). – Señora presidenta, el fuego ha atemorizado a un país entero: Portugal. Las llamas no solo arrasaron más de 40 000 hectáreas, sino que se llevaron por delante —y esto es lo peor— la vida de 64 personas; más tarde, en España, aisló a pueblos enteros.

Las tragedias no fueron mayores gracias a los bomberos, a los agentes forestales y demás profesionales que arriesgaron su vida por salvar otras. Recuerdo la foto de esos bomberos exhaustos tras pasar la noche entera luchando contra el fuego: su sacrificio retrata la base de la Unión Europea, que es la solidaridad. Europa es solidaridad en el dolor, pero también en la esperanza. Europa es esa mano tendida que, con los fondos de desarrollo regional, ayuda a los pueblos que más lo necesitan. Europa estuvo con Italia en los terremotos, y Europa estará con Portugal y también con España, más incluso porque en junio aprobamos el informe que permite dar ayuda adicional a los países afectados por catástrofes naturales. Esta decisión hará que Europa financie las labores de reconstrucción al 95 %, es decir, el doble que antes. Cada año el Fondo de Solidaridad puede movilizar 500 millones para dar flexibilidad y ayudar a los afectados en situaciones de emergencia. Por eso es tan importante que el *brexit* no quite ni un euro a los fondos regionales y a la PAC.

Y, señor comisario, el verano acaba de empezar. En los pueblos de España se madruga para recoger ramas secas, que serían pasto de cualquier fuego; aquí debemos seguir trabajando para frenar la despoblación rural, para dar oportunidades a quienes quieren volver al campo, porque la aridez que atrae a las llamas se combate repoblando los lugares remotos, impulsando la agricultura sostenible. La hoja de ruta es clara: prevención activa, concienciación y gestión forestal efectiva.

En los últimos quince años, 250 000 incendios calcinaron 1 700 000 hectáreas en España. Entenderá, señora presidenta, que nuestra preocupación es real.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar quiero mostrar mi solidaridad con Portugal, especialmente con sus víctimas; por supuesto, reconocer la eficacia de todos los efectivos que participaron en la sofocación del incendio que asoló la península ibérica —Portugal y España— entre el 17 y el 24 de junio. Y es que se dio uno de los incendios más devastadores que se recuerdan en las últimas décadas y que afectó, en concreto en España, a una zona de especial protección medioambiental, como es Doñana, con más de 190 000 hectáreas protegidas y que pertenecen a la Red Natura 2000.

El origen, el mismo: el cambio climático y, al fin y al cabo, la ola de calor que asoló la península ibérica; cambio climático como uno de los mayores retos a los que se enfrenta hoy la humanidad y que la Unión Europea debe prevenir y combatir, también con acciones específicas cuando ocurren estas circunstancias.

Por ello, pedimos que se tenga en cuenta en el Fondo de Solidaridad como regiones vecinas a España y Portugal y se pueda resarcir este desastre, en concreto en el caso de Doñana, por el alto valor socioeconómico de la zona. También, a medio y largo plazo, que el Fondo de Solidaridad sea modificado para que tenga en consideración estas zonas de especial protección medioambiental, como las que pertenecen a la Red Natura, así como que los criterios económicos se adapten mejor a la riqueza real de la región más que al volumen del PIB, porque regiones pobladas o regiones grandes realmente pueden tener dificultad para acceder a este tipo de fondos, a pesar de su riqueza real.

En definitiva, coherencia entre las políticas y las acciones de la Unión Europea en política medioambiental. Hay que dotar de recursos suficientes al medio ambiente para poder preservarlo. En concreto, la Red Natura cuenta solamente con el programa LIFE, que apenas cubre un 20 % de la financiación que necesitan este tipo de áreas para su conservación y mantenimiento.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señor Ruas, señor Marinho, señor Ferreira, señor Zorrinho, en primer lugar, nuestro abrazo a ustedes como representantes de los portugueses y un abrazo a esas familias a las que espero que atiendan correctamente.

Hay una leyenda —no sé si en Portugal, pero sí en España— que dice que el griego Estrabón escribió que una ardilla podría recorrer la península ibérica sin bajarse de los árboles. Primero, ya no podría; y, segundo, la ardilla no habría ido por pinos y eucaliptos, con los que se han repoblado peligrosamente España y Portugal: cuando arden, matan, generando tragedias sin precedentes como las que estamos ahora deplorando. Y está la muerte lenta de los terrenos, que erosiona y degrada el entorno desde hace décadas, y, además, la sequía.

Los bosques en España y en Portugal no están limpios y no existe una política de limpieza de bosques y montes que funcione. Alrededor del 90 % de los fondos de la Unión destinados a bosques provienen del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Rural —es verdad— y hay fondos en Red Natura y en la Directiva marco del agua, pero no tenemos una política de prevención europea que distinga vulnerabilidades. El sur y el Mediterráneo se están quemando y hay tragedias humanas.

Necesitamos por tanto una política forestal centrada en la prevención, en las buenas prácticas, en las estrategias, en los instrumentos políticos y financieros, para evitar tragedias, desde hoy.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, assistimos em Portugal a uma tragédia que tantas vidas levou. Honrar as vidas dessas pessoas e as suas famílias e daquelas pessoas que tudo perderam é fazer tudo o que tem de ser feito. A União Europeia tem no seu orçamento uma verba dedicado ao mecanismo de prevenção.

Em Portugal, a medida de prevenção mais urgente em matéria de incêndios é fazer o cadastro florestal. É uma urgência que pode salvar vidas e enquanto não for feito o cadastro não há gestão florestal que possa ser eficaz. Como sempre temos um problema: é muito caro. Por isso pergunto-lhe, Senhor Comissário, está a Comissão disponível para que o Governo português realize uma despesa extraordinária neste âmbito, com o máximo de comparticipação possível? Está a Comissão disponível para que essa despesa extraordinária não seja contabilizada para o défice? Responda por favor, Senhor Comissário. A prevenção é o melhor remédio, mas Bruxelas tem de ajudar, não pode estender uma mão e retirar com a outra, como tem feito nos últimos anos.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Madam President, it is exactly as Mr Ruas has already said, that, when we immediately debated this tragedy in the Committee on Regional Affairs, we also said we have to be efficient in our support. Let me touch on a couple of things the Commissioner also said about it.

It is very important that we have recently changed the regulations so that we can use the regional funds, the Regional Development Fund, and this means that for Portugal, if you look into the figures, we have some EUR 500 million available – if the Member State asks for it, and there are 12 weeks for documented requests to come in, also for the Solidarity Fund that we revised in 2014 and that is now under revision in the omnibus, to make it even better, to take these two possibilities together to have a vast support for people [now] and also for the future.

This is combining help on one hand, for emergencies as the Commissioner said, and prevention for the future. There can be a combination of those tools. It is not just this debate that we say is important, but also the question for the Commissioner to act immediately when the request of the Member State comes, because we are ready to help and to show our solidarity in concrete matters. So it is good that we are here, and also that we stand there in solidarity for other situations which we hope do not occur during the summer.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, os incêndios em Portugal, no mês passado, ficarão inscritos da memória coletiva como uma das maiores tragédias nacionais. Já aqui foi dito, morreram 64 pessoas e houve mais de duas centenas de feridos.

Os danos totais ou parciais às habitações equivalem a 28 milhões de euros, 31 milhões em prejuízos para as atividades económicas dessa região, 21 milhões de euros em prejuízos para as atividades agrícolas, 22 em infraestruturas e equipamentos municipais. Temos quase duzentos milhões de prejuízos diretos, isto sem contabilizar os indiretos.

Isto passou-se numa área do interior do país que por vezes fica à margem das nossas preocupações, o envelhecimento da população e o abandono do território, uma região que é a melhor justificação para a existência de uma política de coesão forte e eficaz.

Portugal irá recorrer ao fundo de solidariedade europeu, mas seria bom que houvesse uma maior dotação deste fundo e que se adaptem as regras para a sua mobilização flexível. Portugal ainda está de luto e agradece a solidariedade europeia e a dos seus parceiros europeus.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, antes que nada quiero mandar mi recuerdo, solidaridad y apoyo al pueblo hermano de Portugal, en estos momentos tan difíciles.

Cada vez va a ser más frecuente que nos encontremos ante olas de calor y mayores riesgos de incendio, en el contexto de cambio climático en el que estamos, sobre todo en el sur de Europa. Tengamos claro que los operativos de extinción de incendios, por desgracia, van a verse muchas veces superados; por eso es necesario poner el foco no solamente en los planes de prevención —que, por cierto, muchas veces no se cumplen—, sino también en una adecuada gestión del territorio. Porque, en primer lugar, los montes, para que no ardan, hace falta cuidarlos y, para cuidar los montes, hace falta gente que habite el mundo rural.

En segundo lugar, combatir el grave problema ambiental que estamos teniendo es también combatir el problema del cultivo de especies como el eucalipto, que ya se ha visto en Portugal lo que es capaz de llegar a hacer. En España, los informes medioambientales ya alertaban hace cinco años, pero parece que las alarmas siguen cayendo en saco roto. Mientras tanto, el negocio del fuego sigue haciendo ricos a una minoría, a cambio de privatizaciones de servicios de extinción de incendios y a cambio también de que los trabajadores que se juegan la vida defendiendo los montes cobren muchas veces menos de 600 euros.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le statistiche ci dicono che nell'Unione europea le vittime causate da un disastro sono in diminuzione, mentre i danni materiali sono in sostanziale crescita. Ma queste statistiche non ci bastano quando vediamo quanto è accaduto in Portogallo: quanto è accaduto in Portogallo ci dice che dobbiamo fare di più e che dobbiamo fare meglio.

La relazione della Commissione, che ha evidenziato sia i progressi che le lacune, ci dice che dobbiamo lavorare per colmare queste lacune. Lei, caro commissario, ha ragione quando dice che l'Europa vuol dire solidarietà. L'Europa vuol dire solidarietà, e noi dobbiamo lavorare per questo. Avevamo inserito proprio la prevenzione come nuovo capitolo nel nuovo meccanismo di protezione civile europea, ma dobbiamo lavorare di più su questa prevenzione, dobbiamo lavorare sulla cultura, perché i cittadini tante volte non sanno come reagire di fronte alle catastrofi. Dobbiamo creare una cultura di prevenzione, di autoprotezione, cominciando dalle scuole, anche dalle piccole cose: in California, per esempio, le persone hanno sulla porta di casa una locandina dove ci sono le istruzioni su come comportarsi di fronte a una catastrofe, a un evento di pericolo in ogni caso.

Il Parlamento è stato decisivo nella scorsa legislatura. Noi saremo ancora accanto a Lei per fare quanto è possibile per costruire questa Europa che piace ai cittadini.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, eu queria começar por agradecer aos países que ajudaram Portugal num momento tão difícil, Grécia, França, Espanha, Itália e Chipre. Queria deixar uma palavra de agradecimento também ao povo irmão de Timor, que exatamente do outro lado do mundo, apesar das suas circunstâncias igualmente difíceis, aprovou uma ajuda de 1,5 milhões de dólares a favor de Portugal.

Queria deixar uma palavra aos bombeiros portugueses que fazem do seu sacrifício todos os dias o auxílio a todos os outros e queria sublinhar, em relação ao Sr. Presidente da Comissão, que não nos basta aqui debater a questão do aquecimento global, que é real, precisamos de uma política florestal europeia adaptada às necessidades de cada país da Europa, principalmente dos países do sul da Europa, os mais afetados pelas questões climáticas e os que menos contribuem para o agravamento do seu fenómeno. Esta é a palavra final que eu gostaria de deixar ao Sr. Comissário, tenho a certeza até que por razão da sua nacionalidade não deixará de ter esta preocupação muito em conta.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, en primer lugar, quisiera sumarme al recuerdo de todas las víctimas de los incendios de semanas atrás, así como agradecer el trabajo de los bomberos italianos, franceses y españoles que se sumaron a sus colegas portugueses en la lucha contra el fuego. Quisiera agradecerle también, señor comisario, la pronta respuesta para poner todos los medios posibles para ayudar en esta lucha.

Los bosques que se incendian son víctimas del cambio climático, pero son, de hecho, también causantes, a su manera, del cambio climático. Un ejemplo: en España, entre 2005 y 2015, los incendios emitieron 15 millones de toneladas de CO₂.

Por eso, nuestra actitud no puede ser pasiva ante la situación de los bosques sureuropeos: son bosques muy distintos a los del norte; por ello, necesitan una gestión diferente, mucho más activa, que mantenga el bosque limpio y su entorno, habitado. El bosque mediterráneo no es una simple plantación de árboles.

Necesitamos dotarnos de una estrategia forestal mucho más ambiciosa y adaptada que sea un obstáculo al fuego, un instrumento más de lucha contra el cambio climático, y que evite así que nuestros bosques sean puro combustible para unos fuegos que, como ya se ha dicho, elevan nuestras emisiones y atacan nuestro futuro.

Trabajemos más en el día a día, preventivamente —lo decía usted, señor comisario—, para que los servicios de la Comisión y de los Estados miembros en materia de emergencias estén alerta, pero no trabajen.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, no sábado, dia 17 de junho, Portugal viveu uma brutal tragédia resultante de um incêndio florestal. Morreram 64 pessoas. Não é aceitável, não é normal. Senhor Comissário, realço a sua prontidão e o seu empenho.

O pedido por parte do Governo para acionar o mecanismo de proteção civil da União Europeia só ocorreu no domingo, dia 18. Mas 60 minutos depois do pedido já havia aviões a caminho de Portugal. O Governo de Portugal tem de utilizar os Fundos Estruturais, que podem ir a uma taxa de cofinanciamento de 95 %, e o Fundo de Desenvolvimento Rural para a recuperação dos danos. Estou a falar de mais de 26 mil milhões de euros disponíveis.

A Comissão, o Parlamento e o Conselho têm de mobilizar rapidamente o Fundo de Solidariedade. É tempo de reconstruir e ajudar as populações afetadas, mas também é tempo de tirar ensinamentos e tudo fazer para evitar tragédias deste tipo e em matéria de incêndio, essa é uma competência de cada Governo.

Por fim, uma mensagem de solidariedade a todos os que foram afetados e uma palavra de reconhecimento à coragem dos bombeiros de Portugal.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, começo por saudar os bravos e corajosos bombeiros portugueses e espanhóis. Os incêndios que assolaram Portugal no mês passado foram particularmente dramáticos e o meu país continua, neste momento, a arder, à semelhança do que acontece todos os anos por esta altura.

Durante um século Portugal foi um dos países onde a floresta mais cresceu. Mas porque esse crescimento se fez à custa de uma política de reflorestação errada, que substituiu espécies autóctones pela plantação desordenada de monoculturas de eucalipto e de pinheiro bravo, Portugal foi também um dos países que mais floresta destruiu nos últimos 25 anos.

Todos os anos, perante estas tragédias, ouvimos em Portugal o mesmo discurso, as mesmas promessas e justificações, mas a verdade é que os governos se sucedem, as políticas erradas permanecem iguais e no final o drama das vítimas é sempre o mesmo: mortes, perdas de vidas inteiras de trabalho e prejuízos ambientais irreparáveis.

Em abril aprovamos o desbloqueamento de 3,9 milhões de euros para a reconstrução das zonas afetadas pelos incêndios de agosto de 2016 na Madeira. A dimensão da tragédia de Pedrógão Grande e Gois, que causou 200 feridos, a morte de 64 pessoas e prejuízos de 400 milhões de euros torna urgente uma mais rápida disponibilização do Fundo de Solidariedade Europeu. É isso que os portugueses esperam da Europa e é isso que a Europa deve aos seus cidadãos.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, this is a tragedy of enormous proportions, which I think drew the sympathy of all Europeans and, indeed, people worldwide.

It is only when you know somebody involved that it really comes home to you. The day before the tragedy in Portugal I met people on the European Union Interreg programme in my home town of Killarney, and the following day I heard that the entire family of one of the ladies on that programme had been wiped out. So obviously it is rather chilling to be aware of that, and it is so important as well that the European Union should show solidarity with these people, and indeed those who suffer from all types of tragedies, especially when caused by climate change. That is something we are trying to deal with.

Mr van Nistelrooij's point about the Solidarity Fund both to help in the immediate aftermath and also to help with prevention in the future, especially in relation to forest fires, is very important.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – O incêndio de Pedrógão Grande foi uma tragédia em vidas humanas, como aqui já foi dito. No setor agrícola as perdas estimam-se acima dos 20 milhões de euros. O Governo português correspondeu de imediato e os agricultores afetados poderão candidatar-se a compensações. Ficou claro que os fundos europeus de resposta a catástrofes são fundamentais e deverão agora ser aplicados em cooperação com as autarquias locais. A Comissão também correspondeu rapidamente ao pedido de assistência através do seu mecanismo de proteção civil. Os Estados-Membros da União ajudaram. Estes apoios foram vitais.

Apesar de ninguém poder garantir o que motivou a ignição, o facto é que as condições meteorológicas extremas presentes em Pedrógão, com uma humidade inferior a 30 %, temperaturas acima dos quarenta graus e ventos superiores a cinquenta quilómetros por hora, são condições que não podemos dissociar das alterações climáticas globais. Aconteceu em Pedrógão e acontecerá noutros locais do sul da Europa. Temos de nos preparar de forma solidária como europeus.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, εκφράζουμε τα θερμά μας συλλυπητήρια στους συγγενείς των θυμάτων των καταστροφικών πυρκαγιών στην Πορτογαλία. Ταυτόχρονα, εκφράζουμε την αλληλεγγύη μας προς τον πορτογαλικό λαό, αλλά και προς τους πολίτες της Ισπανίας. Οι καταστροφικές φωτιές δίνουν την ευκαιρία να ξανασυζητήσουμε ποια πρέπει να είναι η πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, διότι είχαμε καταστροφικές φωτιές και πέρυσι στην Κύπρο και στην Ελλάδα. Ακόμη και τώρα, αυτή τη στιγμή, έχουμε καταστροφικές φωτιές στη Μάνη και στην Κρήτη και νομίζω ότι η συζήτηση αναδεικνύει τα εργαλεία που πρέπει να χρησιμοποιούμε.

Πρώτον, είναι σημαντική η νέα ρύθμιση μέσα από τη στήριξη του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης. Δεύτερον, η στήριξη από το ταμείο αλληλεγγύης, αλλά εδώ πρέπει να επισημάνουμε ότι, δυστυχώς, για να ενεργοποιηθεί το ταμείο αυτό οι ζημιές πρέπει να είναι τεράστιες και πρέπει να βρούμε άλλες ρυθμίσεις. Συμφωνώ με την πρόταση που διατυπώθηκε: οι δαπάνες που θα πραγματοποιηθούν για την αποκατάσταση των ζημιών στην Πορτογαλία, αλλά και σε άλλες χώρες, να μην υπολογίζονται στο έλλειμμα το οποίο ρυθμίζεται από το δρακόντειο σύμφωνο σταθερότητας.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, θα ήθελα κι εγώ να εκφράσω τα θερμά μου συλλυπητήρια στους πορτογάλους συναδέλφους για τους νεκρούς των πρόσφατων πυρκαγιών και τη συμπάθειά μου για τους τραυματίες. Οι πυρκαγιές αυτές έφεραν στην επιφάνεια ένα ακόμη σοβαρό πρόβλημα το οποίο θα αντιμετωπίσουμε τα επόμενα χρόνια, κυρίως στον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο. Γνωρίζουμε ότι η κλιματική αλλαγή έχει αυξήσει την ξηρασία και τις θερμοκρασίες και έχει δημιουργήσει ανέμους σε πολλές περιοχές. Αυτό, σε συνδυασμό με το γεγονός ότι πολλοί πολίτες κατασκευάζουν σπίτια μέσα ή κοντά σε δασικές εκτάσεις χωρίς να λαμβάνουν τα προβλεπόμενα μέτρα προστασίας, θέτει δυστυχώς τις προϋποθέσεις και για άλλες τέτοιες τραγωδίες στο μέλλον. Αυτό πρέπει να αποφευχθεί.

Πρέπει όλα τα κράτη να συνειδητοποιήσουν πώς πρέπει να αντιμετωπίζονται οι πυρκαγιές, πώς πρέπει να προλαμβάνονται και, όταν αυτές εκδηλώνονται, θα πρέπει να συνεργάζονται αποστέλλοντας αμέσως πυροσβέστες και πυροσβεστικά μέσα, ούτως ώστε να τις αντιμετωπίζουν. Τα δάση είναι πολύ σημαντικά για την επιβίωση του πλανήτη και πρέπει να τα προστατεύσουμε.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, quero começar por manifestar pesar pelo falecimento de 64 pessoas e solidariedade para com as restantes vítimas. Agradeço a pronta resposta da Comissão Europeia e o apoio dos colegas face a uma tragédia que não pode voltar a acontecer.

Não existe sistema de prevenção de incêndios nas florestas eficaz se não estiverem inseridos numa estratégia florestal, sedimentada no tempo, que projete o futuro e contribua para o desenvolvimento rural. Isto não se faz num mês.

Aos Estados-Membros compete potenciar os apoios europeus ao desenvolvimento rural e especialmente os que concernem aos serviços básicos e de renovação das aldeias, de reflorestação e a melhoria da viabilidade das florestas e de prevenção e reparação dos danos causados às florestas por incêndios e outras catástrofes, destacando os apoios europeus à criação e manutenção de infraestruturas de proteção, à dinamização de atividades locais de prevenção contra os incêndios, incluindo a utilização de animais depois de pastoreio e à criação e melhoria das estruturas de controlo dos incêndios florestais.

Queria, por último, expressar o meu grande apreço pelo trabalho e dedicação dos bombeiros portugueses.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – No dia 17 de junho uma tragédia nacional de 64 mortos, aos quais presto tributo, como presto tributo aos nossos bombeiros e a todos aqueles que trabalharam para minimizar os danos. Nós apreciamos o apoio pronto do Sr. Comissário e de outros parceiros europeus, dos bombeiros espanhóis, em particular, mas precisamos de mais apoio europeu, porque há problemas para além da prevenção de catástrofes deste tipo que têm a ver com questões estruturantes de ordenamento do nosso território, de ordenamento das nossas florestas, de impedir o despovoamento do interior do país porque de outra maneira não se combatem este tipo de fogos florestais e sobretudo quando vivemos o impacto das alterações climáticas.

Precisamos de apoio para reorganizar a nossa Proteção Civil, coordenarmos as florestas, o território nacional, precisamos de apoio para não continuarmos a comprar equipamentos que depois não funcionam, em contratos que de resto são corruptos, precisamos que a União Europeia nos ajude a que isso não continue e precisamos absolutamente, além do reforço do Fundo de Solidariedade Europeu, que o investimento nacional que vai ser feito neste esforço de reorganização não conte para o garrote do défice, porque sem dúvida o programa de austeridade neoliberal teve também muitas responsabilidades no enfraquecimento das capacidades do Estado português para reagir a uma tragédia desta natureza.

Die Präsidentin. – Ich möchte hier erklären, dass ich angesichts dieser menschlichen Katastrophe mit den Redezeiten etwas großzügiger war. Ich hoffe, dass die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die nachher noch drankommen, deshalb nicht böse sind.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you very much for this very interesting debate, for your constructive intervention, for your suggestions in all aspects of this very sad situation. It definitely comes at a very crucial time.

We already recognise that Europe faces numerous natural disasters; some may be predicted or anticipated while others come as a surprise. You already mentioned about the impact of the climate change, but regardless of any criticisms I would like to remind you, and myself of course, that the European Union remains the most pioneering political organisation across the world regarding climate change, and is definitely against new approaches by the new administration of the USA.

It is quite important for us to recognise this in order to show that, as Europeans, we remain very committed in this very difficult political landscape about climate change. And for this reason we must stand ready to help when there are surprises in many areas, in particular in the south of Europe. We cannot predict when forest fires will break out and when spring comes we know that sooner or later they will indeed break out. This is the destiny of some areas.

As I said, the actions taken to respond to the forest fires that broke out in Portugal in June and took so many human lives are a clear example of EU solidarity. I followed all the actions, I followed all the activities by our Member States and by our ERCC. We have here the director of this coordination centre, and I would like to say thanks for your commitment because, as I said, I followed moment by moment, minute by minute and I saw that yes, the European Union's Civil Protection Mechanism is the manifestation of a tangible solidarity on the ground. It is very critical to recognise and to realise this in order to achieve more through this mechanism.

Definitely, the Commission will continue work to fight all emergencies, but also to prevent new ones. In fact, the work of the Commission goes well beyond pure response to disasters. We need to anticipate through our actions, to prevent future catastrophes and, as I said, prevention is better than cure. This is why we focus on prevention and preparedness. Of course a lot of other policies and actions have to be there in practice, but in our competence there is only this mechanism, and in some other areas you know from our Treaties they are national competences. It is as simple as that.

This is our structure and I think it is difficult to change this structure in this framework, particularly in the current times. In this respect I would like to stress again that the European emergency response capacity, the so-called voluntary pool, is composed of civil protection assets in expertise from our Member States that are put at the disposal of other Member States affected by a disaster. It is real example of tangible EU solidarity and this solidarity comes when it really, really matters. As the saying goes, actions speak louder than words. I am convinced that we as Europeans can be proud of putting theory into practice. We can be proud of exercising solidarity to help fellow European citizens when they need it to save lives. Improving our response capacity should be our ultimate goal for the benefit of all those who may need help one day.

Some specific answers: Mr van Nistelrooij and Mr Kelly have already spoken about our ability through the Solidarity Fund. I am sure that you know that the national authorities need to apply for this Fund's support and provide an assessment of the damage, and then the Commission reviews the application and determines if EU support could be activated and for what amount and specifically, I think 12 weeks after. Portugal, maybe you know, has received since 2003 through this Solidarity Fund, including for the forest fires on Madeira last summer, around EUR 80 million, so the Solidarity Fund has already been activated about this request.

It is quite important to recognise that the south of Europe is more sensitive as a region for forest fires and this is why my intention as Commissioner responsible for the ERCC and the Civil Protection Mechanism is to see more improvements in our action through this mechanism, but you know that we need some new legislation or some amendments. I would like to sit together to exchange views on how to increase our cooperation and to see how this mechanism can be more effective and efficient.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Aussprache geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), por escrito. – Los incendios que han asolado el parque natural de Doñana y el centro de Portugal ponen de manifiesto la vulnerabilidad de los países mediterráneos ante el riesgo de los incendios en la temporada estival, lo que se agrava por la sequía del sur de la península ibérica. La UE cuenta con un mecanismo de protección civil para asistir a los países durante catástrofes junto con el Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE, que compensa daños a partir de un límite mínimo, calculado en función de un porcentaje del PIB. Este método penaliza a regiones grandes y pobladas, que pueden tener dificultades para acceder a esta financiación. Por ello, sería conveniente que se tuviera en cuenta la renta per cápita, que es un mejor reflejo de la economía real. Aunque la prioridad del fondo ha de ser las catástrofes humanitarias y aquellas en las que la vida humana se ve afectada, como ha sido el caso en Portugal, los destrozos del medioambiente y los espacios especialmente protegidos han de tener también su cabida. Doñana pertenece a la Red Natura 2000, pero esta especificidad ni contempla actuaciones concretas con financiación específica ni es reconocida como tal en el Fondo de Solidaridad Europeo.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), por escrito. – Los incendios que han asolado el parque natural de Doñana y el centro de Portugal ponen de manifiesto la vulnerabilidad de los países mediterráneos ante el riesgo de los incendios en la temporada estival, lo que se agrava por la sequía del sur de la península ibérica. La UE cuenta con un mecanismo de protección civil para asistir a los países durante catástrofes junto con el Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE, que compensa daños a partir de un límite mínimo, calculado en función de un porcentaje del PIB. Este método penaliza a regiones grandes y pobladas, que pueden tener dificultades para acceder a esta financiación. Por ello, sería conveniente que se tuviera en cuenta la renta per cápita, que es un mejor reflejo de la economía real. Aunque la prioridad del fondo ha de ser las catástrofes humanitarias y aquellas en las que la vida humana se ve afectada, como ha sido el caso en Portugal, los destrozos del medioambiente y los espacios especialmente protegidos han de tener también su cabida. Doñana pertenece a la Red Natura 2000, pero esta especificidad ni contempla actuaciones concretas con financiación específica ni es reconocida como tal en el Fondo de Solidaridad Europeo.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Considerando a gravidade do que aconteceu em Portugal e a experiência galega de anos sofrendo o flagelo dos incêndios nos quais, além dos impactos conhecidos, também tivemos de lamentar a perda de vidas humanas durante as operações de extinção: É tempo de pôr fim ao modelo florestal baseado nos pinheiros e na monocultura de eucaliptos, estendidos de forma continuada ao longo de quilómetros e com núcleos rurais, urbanos e estradas rodeadas de pirófitas; sem esquecer o esgotamento das águas provocado pelo eucalipto. Reclamamos que o eucalipto seja declarado espécie invasora e que as instituições atuem em conformidade. Outro fator que contribui são os anos e anos de políticas agrárias que provocam o abandono da agricultura e, com isso, o abandono do meio rural. A experiência mostra que um território ordenado, bem gerido, com camponeses e camponesas assentadas no território, cuidando do meio através da produção de alimentos é fundamental para que quando há um fogo, este não se estenda. Também é preciso, especialmente no caso galego, acabar com a cultura do negócio do fogo, consolidando um serviço público de extinção de incêndios. Devemos acabar com a precarização e insegurança destes trabalhadores e dignificar a profissão de bombeiro e bombeira florestal.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), por escrito. – Los incendios que han asolado el parque natural de Doñana y el centro de Portugal ponen de manifiesto la vulnerabilidad de los países mediterráneos ante el riesgo de los incendios en la temporada estival, lo que se agrava por la sequía del sur de la península ibérica. La UE cuenta con un mecanismo de protección civil para asistir a los países durante catástrofes junto con el Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE, que compensa daños a partir de un límite mínimo, calculado en función de un porcentaje del PIB. Este método penaliza a regiones grandes y pobladas, que pueden tener dificultades para acceder a esta financiación. Por ello, sería conveniente que se tuviera en cuenta la renta per cápita, que es un mejor reflejo de la economía real. Aunque la prioridad del fondo ha de ser las catástrofes humanitarias y aquellas en las que la vida humana se ve afectada, como ha sido el caso en Portugal, los destrozos del medioambiente y los espacios especialmente protegidos han de tener también su cabida. Doñana pertenece a la Red Natura 2000, pero esta especificidad ni contempla actuaciones concretas con financiación específica ni es reconocida como tal en el Fondo de Solidaridad Europeo.

19. Mekkanizmi għas-Soluzzjoni tat-Tilwim dwar it-Tassazzjoni Doppja fl-Unjoni Ewropea (dibattitu)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Michael Theurer im Namen des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Rates über Verfahren zur Beilegung von Doppelbesteuerungsstreitigkeiten in der Europäischen Union (COM(2016)0686 - C8-0035/2017 - 2016/0338(CNS)) (A8-0225/2017).

Michael Theurer, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst mal möchte ich mich bei den Kollegen Schattenberichterstattern ganz herzlich für diese konstruktive und intensive Zusammenarbeit an diesem Bericht bedanken. Wir haben gute Kompromisse gefunden.

An dieser Stelle und zu später Stunde in diesem Hause rufen wir ein wichtiges Thema auf, das viele Unternehmen, aber auch Privatbürger in Europa betrifft, nämlich das Thema Doppelbesteuerung.

Wir haben uns in verschiedenen Ausschüssen hier vor allen Dingen darum gekümmert, dass Steuerschlupflöcher geschlossen werden, dass also aggressive Steuervermeidungsmodelle ausgeschaltet werden, weil wir nicht akzeptieren, dass der Normalbürger seine Steuern bezahlt, aber internationale Großkonzerne nicht. Gleichzeitig ist es diesem Haus aber auch ein Anliegen, dass eben Steuern auf dasselbe Einkommen oder auf dasselbe Kapital nicht doppelt bezahlt werden müssen. Wir wollen also weder die doppelte Nichtbesteuerung noch die Doppelbesteuerung, und vor dem Hintergrund begrüßen wir ausdrücklich die Initiative der Europäischen Kommission, hierzu einen Gesetzgebungsvorschlag vorzulegen.

Damit kam die Kommission auch einer Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments aus dem Juli 2016 nach. Darin hat das Europäische Parlament festgestellt, dass ein klarer Zeitrahmen für Streitbeilegungsmechanismen den Schlüssel zur Erhöhung der Effektivität des bisherigen Systems darstellt. Die *Arbitration Convention* war ja im Kompromiss zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten schwierig zu erreichend. Sie soll jetzt durch den neuen Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission abgelöst werden.

So viel des Lobes an die Kommission, so sehr bedauern wir, dass der Rat, der heute Abend bei der Debatte auch nicht anwesend ist, nicht auf die offizielle Verabschiedung unseres Berichts hier im Europäischen Parlament gewartet hat. Der Rat hat bereits seine Beschlussfassung abgeschlossen. Wir wollen an dieser Stelle unser Missfallen zum Ausdruck bringen. Wir glauben, dass es, auch wenn das Europäische Parlament nicht zustimmungspflichtig ist, doch ein Gebot der Höflichkeit gewesen wäre, die Beendigung unserer Beratungen hier abzuwarten, und bitten das Präsidium des Hauses, dies auch dem Rat gegenüber zum Ausdruck zu bringen.

Wesentlicher Gegenstand des Berichtes ist, dass wir die Streitbeilegungsverfahren, die bisher ineffizient sind, verbessern wollen. Wir wollen Rechtssicherheit erreichen. Die 10,5 Milliarden Euro – um die es da im Moment geht, bei über 900 Fällen zeigen: Das ist keine kleine Summe, es kann Steuerzahlern passieren, dass sie eben mit ihrer Steuererklärung keine verbindliche Auskunft bekommen, wenn sie in mehreren Ländern der Europäischen Union tätig sind. Hier wollen wir Rechtssicherheit, wir wollen ein Verfahren, das dafür sorgt, dass von den Bürgerinnen und den Bürgern nicht jahrelange Rechtsstreite mit hohen Kosten angestrengt werden müssen. Deshalb ist es gut, dass ein konkreter Vorschlag vorliegt, der nun die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ein Streitbeilegungsverfahren aufzusetzen.

Ich persönlich hätte mir gewünscht, dass hier auch ein ständiger Ausschuss eingerichtet wird, also dass permanent Experten aus den Steuerverwaltungen von den Mitgliedstaaten abgestellt worden wären. Die anderen Fraktionen konnten sich hierzu leider nicht entschließen, aber immerhin haben wir einen gemeinsamen Vorschlag unterbreitet, der beinhaltet, dass die Fristen, die jetzt im Ratsvorschlag enthalten sind, noch mal deutlich verkürzt werden sollen: statt zwei Jahren ein Jahr, statt einem Jahr sechs Monate. Wir wollen also, dass der Bürger schneller eine Auskunft bekommt, ob seine Beschwerde überhaupt angenommen wird, ob sie berechtigt ist. Denn wir halten es für völlig inakzeptabel, wenn Steuerbürger und Unternehmen über Jahre hinweg warten müssen, bis sie eine Erklärung bekommen, ob ihre Beschwerde gegen eine Doppelbesteuerung rechtskräftig ist oder nicht – also hier ein ganz klares Plädoyer für Rechtssicherheit und Transparenz.

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, on behalf of my dear colleague Pierre Moscovici, I would like to thank the rapporteur, the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) for their high-quality report and their very constructive and comprehensive work on the Directive on Tax Dispute Resolution Mechanisms.

This directive is yet another building block in the Commission's action towards a fairer, more efficient, more competitive and at the same time, more transparent corporate tax system in the EU.

Whilst proposing stricter rules against tax avoidance and ensuring that taxes are paid where profits are generated, the Commission is also very much concerned about providing legal certainty for taxpayers and ensuring that when they operate cross-border they pay taxes on their income and capital only once, not twice.

Double taxation occurs when two or more countries claim the right to tax the same income or profits of a company. There are estimated to be around 900 double taxation disputes ongoing in the EU today between Member States, under the current dispute resolution mechanisms, mainly dealing with transfer pricing issues.

Double taxation is a serious obstacle to cross-border investment in our single market, leading to uncertainty and discouraging cross-border trade. Under the existing procedures, unresolved double taxation disputes between Member States represents EUR 10 billion in the EU. From an investor's perspective, robust, reliable and stable procedures and predictable behaviour on the part of tax administrations as regards eliminating double taxation are important factors for doing business in a country.

To remedy the current situation, the directive provides for mandatory and binding dispute resolution mechanisms with clear timelines and an obligation to reach results. It significantly improves the existing mechanisms for resolving disputes between Member States. The text allows for a 'mutual agreement procedure' to be initiated by the taxpayer, under which Member States must reach an agreement within a set deadline. If the procedure fails, an arbitration procedure is launched to resolve the dispute within specified timelines.

The directive is also a direct response to the calls of this House included, for example, in the ECON resolution from December 2015, known as TAXE, and its TAXE II resolution of July 2016.

ECON's report highlights some key elements of efficiency and effectiveness, such as setting ambitious timelines, ensuring independence of the members of the arbitration commission, deciding on disputed cases and enhancing transparency.

As regards timelines, setting up ambitious time limits had to be balanced against the international environment and the procedures set out in tax treaties. Other elements, such as the increased number of cases, fostering the capacities of tax administration, as well as business realities and the global tax environment, involving more complicated and sophisticated cases, were also considered.

As far as independence of the members of the arbitration commission is concerned, the Commission recognises the high importance of the issue. That is why we are fully committed to ensuring the right balance between the criteria of independence and integrity towards competence of the independent person, given the increased complexity and sophistication of the cases involved.

With regard to increasing transparency, the publication of a summary of each decision on disputed cases, is regarded as highly beneficial. Furthermore, the Commission has also ensured that taxpayers' rights and obligations throughout the procedure are significantly improved. Finally, the directive ensures that the mechanisms do not result in double non-taxation situations. If the affected taxpayer cannot prove that there is double taxation, Member States can decide to deny access to the procedure.

I count on Parliament's full support for this important file, so that we can continue delivering our ambitious agenda for a competitive and growth-driven tax environment; full speed ahead!

The most crucial imminent steps in this regard are: the introduction of a common consolidated corporate tax base (CCCTB). The CCCTB is exactly the fair, efficient and competitive corporate tax system that the EU desperately needs – now and for the future.

First, because the CCCTB will create a simpler, more stable and more attractive environment for businesses and investors inside Europe. Second, it will encourage growth-friendly business activities and will boost the competitiveness of the EU as a whole. And finally, the CCCTB will make corporate taxation fairer and more efficient. It is the ultimate tool for combating tax avoidance.

Neena Gill, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, fair taxation is at the core of our agenda on jobs and growth. That means closing loopholes exploited by large companies to avoid paying their fair share, but also ensuring that we address anomalies like double taxation, which disproportionately affect small— and medium-sized companies who often end up footing the bill twice when they are doing business cross-border. For many SMEs this uncertainty keeps them from taking the leap towards supplying their goods and services across borders. This is where the European Union has tremendous added value.

The directive being voted on tomorrow will speed up procedures to settle tax disputes, reduce compliance costs and administrative burdens. We have managed to halve the timescale to align the process with the annual business and investment cycle. The next step, of course, is to ensure we fully implement a common consolidated corporate tax base that will prevent double taxation being charged in the first place.

Let this be a strong message to those who doubt the EU's key role in cutting red tape and making cross-border business a possibility for all. My congratulations to the rapporteur, Michael Theurer, on achieving this goal.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner, *ECR-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, kaksinkertaisen verotuksen välttäminen on tärkeä tavoite. On myös perusteltua, että siihen liittyvät kiistat saadaan ratkaistua mahdollisimman tehokkaasti. Tässä suhteessa uusi direktiivi on selkeä edistysaskel. Päällisin puolin parlamentin hyväksymien muutosten muotoilut ovat hyviä ja parantavat alkuperäistä komission esitystä. Ainoa asia, josta kannan huolta, liittyy parlamentin lyhentämiin käsittelyaikoihin.

Alkuperäiset komission esittämät takarajat olivat linjassaan direktiivistä tehdyn vaikutusarvion kanssa. Osa parlamentin tekemistä aikataulumuutoksista on huomattavasti tiukempia kuin tämän vaikutusarvion realistisina pitämät ajat. Vaikutusarviossa todetaan, kuinka "rajat ylittävien arvoketjujen ja liiketoimintamallien lisääntyminen ja monimutkaistuminen voi johtaa vain käsittelyaikojen kasvuun." Tästä syystä olisin itse kannattanut käsittelyaikojen pitämistä lähempänä komission esittämiä aikoja. Nyt vaarana on, että päätöksistä tulee hätäkohtia, mikä ei palvelisi ketään.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, acabar con la evasión fiscal de las empresas debería ser la prioridad de la Comisión y de los Gobiernos. Las grandes empresas europeas llevan a cabo prácticas de erosión de la base fiscal y transferencia de precios para tributar en los países con las tasas más bajas.

Este es uno de los principales problemas de la fiscalidad europea, y no la doble imposición sobre la que trata este informe. Porque todos sabemos que el problema es que las grandes empresas no paguen impuestos; y no que los paguen en dos países. Consideramos que el secretismo está fuera de lugar en los casos de fiscalidad internacional, y la publicación es de interés general. Por eso hemos presentado enmiendas en este sentido. No es entendible que una empresa tenga hasta tres años para reclamar por un supuesto caso de doble imposición y que, sin embargo, el Estado tenga solo un año para examinar este caso.

Necesitamos dar más tiempo y recursos a los inspectores de Hacienda, que son como David ante el Goliath de las grandes corporaciones. Por último, rechazamos la idea de garantizar la impunidad de los delitos fiscales cuando haya disputas de doble imposición abiertas. Esto es inadmisibles.

Dejémonos de hipocresías. Nuestro discurso no puede ser una supuesta lucha contra la evasión fiscal, mientras legislamos justamente para favorecer los intereses de las multinacionales y el poder corporativo, a costa de los derechos sociales de los pueblos de Europa.

Por cierto, que este documento, que este informe, ya esté aprobado por el Consejo, sin que haya pasado por el Parlamento, que aquí no esté el Consejo y que no esté ni siquiera el comisario de Economía, eso sí que es una burla al Parlamento.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, agradecerle al señor Theurer la buena colaboración en este dossier y que haya estado abierto a nuestras propuestas, como, por ejemplo, a que en la fase de arbitraje la comisión que tiene que pilotar esta fase esté compuesta de expertos íntegros e independientes, y a que recomendáramos que fueran incluso funcionarios de las agencias tributarias —que nos parecía mejor—, así como también a la idea de que la Comisión Europea tenga capacidad de hacer una evaluación sobre los representantes independientes en los paneles.

También quiero anunciar que votaremos a favor de las enmiendas del Grupo GUE/NGL para una mayor transparencia en el caso de la conclusión de los casos de arbitraje.

Pero yo quiero terminar dirigiéndome al Consejo. Punto uno: que hayan cerrado el dossier sin esperar a la consulta, como han dicho muchos de los compañeros, es una auténtica tomadura de pelo; y ya encima que no estén aquí... prefiero ahorrarme el comentario.

Y segundo: qué rápido cierran estos dossieres que favorecen la actividad de las compañías y cuánto cuesta en el Consejo sacar transparencia fiscal, base mínima común imponible, etcétera, etcétera.

Desearía realmente otra actitud del Consejo, porque esa actitud sí que es ridícula.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, it's a funny old world, isn't it? On the one hand, we have people who pay little or no tax and, on the other hand, we are talking tonight about people who are subject to double taxation. Thankfully, both the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs – and colleagues here like Mr Theurer – and the Commission are beginning to come to grips with it. That is the way it should be.

We passed legislation yesterday on tax avoidance and country-by-country reporting, which will help to close the loopholes allowing big multinationals to escape paying most of the tax they should have paid – and that is good. But, equally importantly, people should not be paying more tax than they are due to pay. It is rather extreme that there is EUR 10.5 billion in dispute at the moment and 900 cases, but I think we are beginning to move in the right direction on this. The Commission has come forward with a proposal which everybody accepts is good. That should be promoted because it shows that the European Union is trying to be fair to everybody, and rightly so. So well done, Commissioner.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, έχουμε παρακολουθήσει τις διαδικασίες με τις οποίες οι πολυεθνικές προσπαθούν να φοροαποφύγουν και να φοροδιαφύγουν, μέσα από τις τριγωνικές σχέσεις, και αυτό είναι το κυρίαρχο στοιχείο που πρέπει να απασχολεί το Κοινοβούλιό μας. Από την άλλη πλευρά βεβαίως, θα πρέπει να προσδιοριστεί ότι οι πολυεθνικές θα πληρώνουν φόρους εκεί όπου παράγουν τα κέρδη. Φυσικά, αυτό δεν σημαίνει ότι πρέπει οι φόροι να επιβάλλονται δύο φορές κι έτσι λοιπόν θα πρέπει να ισχύσουν οι διαδικασίες περί αποφυγής της διπλής φορολογίας.

Θα ήθελα να θέσω υπόψη στον εισηγητή και στον κύριο Επίτροπο ότι πρέπει να εξετάσουμε και την περίπτωση των φυσικών προσώπων, διότι πάρα πολλές χιλιάδες συμπολίτες μας έχουν μεταναστεύσει από τις χώρες του Νότου σε άλλες περιοχές. Από την Ελλάδα, έχουν μεταναστεύσει πάνω από 400.000 χιλιάδες νέοι επιστήμονες και όλοι αυτοί αντιμετωπίζουν προβλήματα διπλής φορολογίας. Επίσης, πρέπει να δείτε και το θέμα της προσφυγής στη δικαιοσύνη. Στην Ελλάδα, για να προσφύγει κανείς στα φορολογικά δικαστήρια, πρέπει να καταβάλει το 30% της απαίτησης που υπάρχει από πλευράς κράτους και αυτό είναι κάτι που δεν διευκολύνει την απονομή δικαιοσύνης.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, tax certainty, fairness and transparency will improve the functioning of the internal market and benefit investment and trade in the EU.

Parliament has already focused on this, and I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on this very important report. At the same time, the swift resolution of disputes and the obligation to remove double taxation within a set time frame are crucial to position the EU at the forefront of developments in this area.

This directive aims to create a coordinated common framework and the same level playing field for businesses in the Union, both big and small. And this amounts to our efforts to create a fair and effective corporate tax system in the EU, and also to tax fairness in general, since not only business, but also individuals, will benefit from the new rules.

Creating a better way to solve double taxation disputes is only one additional step on the long road towards an improved tax system in the EU. More needs to be done to achieve our objective, we have all recognised this already. And your full support will be needed to provide companies through Europe with a common consolidated corporate tax base and a modern VAT system.

Michael Theurer, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst einmal begrüße ich als Taxe-1- und -2-Sonderberichterstatter, dass sie hier die Notwendigkeit verbindlicher Steuerregeln, um aggressive Steuervermeidung zu stoppen, noch mal bekräftigt haben. Insbesondere die GKKB/GKB ist entscheidend. Die Debatte hier hat gezeigt, dass vor allen Dingen kleine und mittlere Unternehmen unter Doppelbesteuerung leiden und dass es deshalb für die Funktionsfähigkeit und für den fairen Wettbewerb erforderlich ist, den hier diskutierten Streitbeilegungsmechanismus in Kraft zu setzen.

Wichtig ist, dass ein Steuerzahler, der Beschwerde einreicht, dann in dieser Zeit eben nicht herangezogen wird. Es ist ebenso wichtig, dass die Entscheidungen vollständig veröffentlicht werden. Sollte jedoch ein Beschwerdeführer Angst haben, dass Betriebs-, Geschäfts- oder Handelsgeheimnisse betroffen sind, sollten die betroffenen Behörden die sensitiven Teile der Entscheidung dann entsprechend löschen.

Als letzten Punkt wollen wir als Parlament Sie, Herr Kommissar, und die gesamte Kommission in die Pflicht nehmen, dass Sie dafür sorgen, mit diesem richtigen Schritt nach vorne nicht stehen zu bleiben, sondern bei der entsprechenden Evaluierung der Richtlinie dafür sorgen, dass der Geltungsbereich erweitert wird, etwa auf indirekte Steuern, Einkommensteuer, Erbschaftsteuer oder auch die Besteuerung von beruflichen Pensionen. Hier gibt es ebenfalls Probleme mit grenzüberschreitenden Steuerbescheiden, und in diesem Sinne glauben wir, dass der vorliegende Gesetzentwurf ein großer Schritt nach vorne ist, aber eben noch nicht der Endpunkt im Sinne von Bürgerfreundlichkeit in der Europäischen Union sein kann.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 6. Juli 2017, statt.

20. Deċiżjoni tal-Qorti tal-Ġustizzja tas-16 ta' Mejju 2017 dwar l-FTA bejn l-UE u Singapore (dibattitu)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über das Gutachten des Gerichtshofs vom 16. Mai 2017 zum Freihandelsabkommen EU-Singapur von Bernd Lange, Daniel Caspary, David Martin im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel (O-000057/2017 - B8-0323/2017) - (2017/2739(RSP)).

Bernd Lange, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Sie haben es gesagt, Frau Präsidentin: Am 16. Mai hat der EuGH über die Anfrage der Kommission geurteilt, ob und wie ein Handelsabkommen zu ratifizieren ist, welche Zuständigkeit bei der Europäischen Union liegt und welche Zuständigkeit bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt. Der Spruch ist ziemlich eindeutig – fast alles ist EU-Kompetenz: Dienstleistungen, Transportdienstleistungen, Fragen des geistigen Eigentums, natürlich die Marköffnung, öffentliche Beschaffung und auch die Frage der Nachhaltigkeit und der Arbeitnehmerrechte.

Der EuGH hat gesagt, Arbeitnehmerrechte sind integraler Bestandteil von Handelsabkommen. Das fand ich sehr erfreulich. Zwei Dinge hat er als nationale Kompetenz ausgenommen: die Frage von Investitionen – wenn sie sehr umfassend sind, Portfolioinvestitionen – und Investitionsstreitbeilegungsmechanismen, wenn sie insbesondere nationale Rechtssysteme nicht ausschöpfen. Da wird ja eigentlich klar, worum es geht. Und nun sind ja 50 Tage vergangen, und ich habe noch nichts von der Europäischen Kommission gehört. Dabei ist es doch wichtig zu wissen, wie sich eigentlich unsere Partner darauf einstellen sollen und natürlich wie die Bürgerinnen und Bürger sich darauf einstellen sollen, wer wie in Zukunft Handelspolitik zu entscheiden hat. Da spielt die Kommission U-Boot, sie taucht unter.

Dabei gibt es eigentlich klare Optionen, die man diskutieren kann. Eine Option ist: Wir machen weiter wie bisher, mit allen Problemstellungen, die damit verbunden sind, wie wir bei der Diskussion um das Kanada-Abkommen CETA erlebt haben, mit vielen Verwerfungen und vielen Unklarheiten bis hin zu einem Prozess, der mehrere Jahre in der Ratifizierung dauern wird. Ob wir das wollen? Ich glaube eigentlich nicht.

Oder die zweite Option: Man trennt den Handelsteil mit den Elementen, die ich eben skizziert habe – wo der Gerichtshof gesagt hat, das ist EU-Zuständigkeit – von einem Investitionsabkommen, was dann gemischte Zuständigkeit ist und durch die EU-Mitgliedstaaten und deren Parlamente zu ratifizieren ist. Also zwei Abkommen. Das gibt Klarheit. Und auch das Verfahren ist transparent und effizient und schnell.

Oder man kann auch sagen: Wenn die Kriterien des Europäischen Gerichtshofs so sind, dass nur Direktinvestitionen EU-Zuständigkeit sind, dann lässt man Portfolioinvestitionen einfach weg, und wenn es so ist, dass ein Investitionsgerechtshof nur in die EU-Zuständigkeit kommt, wenn alle nationalstaatlichen Rechtsmittel ausgeschöpft sind, dann macht man das halt verpflichtend, erfüllt also die Anforderungen des Europäischen Gerichtshofs und packt das in ein Abkommen. Das wäre auch eine Möglichkeit.

Ich glaube, das müssen wir inzwischen mal wirklich auf den Tisch haben, welche Möglichkeiten wir denn eigentlich weiterverfolgen wollen. Ich tendiere eher zu der mittleren – also dies zu trennen –, aber das muss man diskutieren. Und da möchte ich von der Kommission einmal wissen, was die sich jetzt in den letzten 50 Tagen überlegt haben. Denn das ist ja keine abstrakte Überlegung, Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sondern gerade heute gab es eine politische Verständigung über das Japan-Abkommen, wo diese Frage ja wieder auftaucht. Dann gibt es Verhandlungen mit Mexiko, dem Mercosur und Chile usw.

Ich glaube, da müssen die Partner Klarheit haben, und vor allem unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger müssen Klarheit haben. Deswegen bin ich gespannt auf Ihre Antwort.

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I am here on behalf of my colleague Cecilia Malmström. About the many questions raised by my colleague, the Commission sought the opinion of the European Court of Justice on the EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement, to obtain clarity about the division of competences on trade and investment and to check if the EU could sign and conclude the FTA alone.

The Court's opinion provided this clarity in an unequivocal manner. Therefore, we have now a unique opportunity to put the governance of the EU trade policy on a more stable and effective footing, allowing the EU to remain a credible negotiating partner that can better deliver for citizens. Our objective is outlined in the Reflection Paper on Harnessing Globalisation according to which 'the EU must be able not only to negotiate broad agreements to tackle a wide range of global issues, but also to ensure these agreements can be ratified and implemented'.

Let me now proceed to your specific questions as already understood. The Court confirmed that the EU has exclusive competence for most matters that were included in the Singapore FTA, such as: trade in goods; trade in services, including transport; government procurement; intellectual property; competition; trade and sustainable development; Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) liberalisation, and the substantive standards of protection for FDI.

The Court concluded that the competence is shared with the Member States for only two areas. First, non-direct investment, and second, Investor-to-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) with regard to both direct and non-direct foreign investments. Therefore, and despite the majority of the agreement being considered as coming under the EU's exclusive competence and the remaining parts as shared competence, the Court considered that the agreement as it stands cannot be concluded by the EU alone. This means that unless the FTA is modified, it cannot be ratified as EU-only, but would need to be presented as a mixed agreement and ratified by all national and, where appropriate, regional parliaments.

The opinion gives us an opportunity to look afresh jointly with this House, the Council of course, and Member States, at ways to make EU decision-making for trade and investment policy more sound and efficient. This discussion will need to take into account the legal and political implications deriving from the Court's opinion: in particular, we will need to respond to the questions as to whether we consider that the status quo, meaning a similar ratification process as in the case of the FTA with Canada (CETA) is sustainable, or not.

Or should we rather use the clarity provided by this opinion to move to a more credible and efficient ratification process, taking into account that the EU has exclusive competence for the full scope of our new generation progressive trade and investment agreements but not for certain elements of investment protection and ISDS? How can we best respect the allocation of competences while presenting trade and investment agreements that are coherent and maximise the benefits for citizens?

Last but not least, we will need to explain collectively that, whatever path may be chosen, the EU's trade and investment policy decision-making process is, and will continue to be, a fully democratic one by the European Parliament and the representatives from the democratically elected governments of the Member States in the Council.

Further to the proposals and actions made by the Commission to enhance the transparency of trade negotiations and to ensure the proper involvement of all stakeholders during the negotiations, we are keen to explore further ways to assist the Member States in strengthening the involvement of national parliaments early on in the process.

Once our exchanges produce more clarity and consensus on these matters, we will be in a position to propose concrete steps related to the distinction between EU exclusive and shared competences in the ratification process of our free-trade agreements and the negotiating mandates that will be needed for future FTAs.

(Interjection from Mr Lange: 'When?')

Once. We will see!

Christofer Fjellner, för PPE-gruppen. – Fru talman! EU:s handelspolitik har befunnits sig i kris det senaste året. Idén om att de handelsavtal vi sluter inte bara ska godkännas här i Europaparlamentet och av alla medlemsstater, utan även godkännas i 38 nationella och regionala parlament runtom i Europa, har omöjliggjort EU som en seriös förhandlingspartner med många utav våra stora förhandlingspartner runt om i världen.

Det här var ju något som Kanada lärde sig den hårda vägen: När Kanadas handelsminister Freeman gråtande, bokstavligt talat, lämnade Vallonien efter att den socialdemokratiska regeringen där, representerande 3,5 miljoner i en belgisk region, vägrade acceptera frihandelsavtalet mellan EU och Kanada, och då vägrade 500 miljoner européer och 35 miljoner kanadensare att skörda frihandelsfrukter, jobb och tillväxt.

Hela grundidén är ju att vi polar suveränitet, att vi byter självständigt beslutsfattande mot reell påverkan och bättre beslut, och just nu kämpar vi för att göra precis det på migrationspolitikens område. Med samma logik.

Men just handelspolitiken, där har vi ju haft idén om gemensamt beslutsfattande ända sedan Romfördraget 1947 och etableringen av tullunionen, och att nu inte försvara ett gemensamt beslutsfattande, det kommer att ha ett oerhört högt pris. För det är början till slutet på det som i 60 år har varit grunden i Europasamarbetet.

Och att 3,5 miljoner européer i Vallonien ska hindra Sverige och alla andra europeiska länder från att skörda frihandelsfrukter, det kommer jag aldrig kunna förklara för mina medborgare, för alla européer förlorar på den ordningen.

Men för att göra något åt det här så behöver vi ha mod. Mod från kommissionen att våga föreslå handelsavtal, rena handelsavtal, som EU-kompetens.

Men det behövs ännu mer mod, tror jag, från politiker. Framför allt från medlemsstaterna för att försvara frihandel, att försvara gemensamt beslutsfattande och att stå upp för de handelsavtal vi har förhandlat fram, och att inte sprida myter om dem. För annars kommer vi aldrig att lyckas.

David Martin, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, as we have heard, this case was referred to the Court more than three years ago, which means a trade deal that we negotiated over years and initialled has been in the deep freeze for that time period.

Apart from the damage that has done to us as trade negotiators, my fear about this is that it is not actually going to bring any more clarity to the situation than we had before the court case. I am afraid that nothing the Commissioner has said tonight has given me hope that this would be different. The logical consequence of the court ruling should be to leave investment out of the Singapore Free Trade Agreement and proceed as quickly as possible with a goods-only agreement. That could be ratified very speedily and it would also take a toxic matter out of the agreement.

I hope that the Council, which should have been part of this debate tonight, will actually agree with this and take the matter forward but, as the committee Chair has said, this goes beyond the Singapore Free Trade Agreement. The Commission has done this, and I pleased to hear that. The Lisbon Treaty makes it very clear that this House, which is legitimately elected by the EU citizens, is the only Parliament entitled to ratify EU-only free trade deals.

In future, the Council should not artificially add to the mandate for free trade agreements in order to maintain mixity. Secondly, as Mr Fjellner has said, by not doing this, we can avoid the potential scenario of any one of 43 national and regional parliaments holding our trade agreements hostage.

The Court has given us a unique opportunity to put new impetus into our trade agreements. I think a majority in this House is willing to grasp that nettle. I am not yet convinced that the Commission is, and I am very worried that we have had radio silence from the European Council on this matter.

The Council should be prepared to act and give trade policy a chance.

Sander Loones, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Ik ben een Vlaming. Ik ben een Vlaamse patriot, een Vlaams-nationalist en mijn nationalisme is een zeer open nationalisme. Wij staan in de wereld open, overtuigd en gedreven als Vlamingen.

Maar ik stel vast dat anderen zich wel opsluiten, dat ze geen handel willen drijven met andere landen, dat zij alles wat vreemd is als een bedreiging zien. En die onzekerheid moeten we wegnemen, met daadkracht en met lef. En met het benadrukken ook van wat evident is: onze identiteit, ons verhaal, ons merk, ons kwaliteitslabel. Vlaming zijn met alles wat daarbij hoort, alle vrijheden, alle rechten en plichten, alle normen en waarden.

Ik wil dan ook alle Vlamingen oproepen: kom alsjeblieft uit de kast en ga in de etalage staan, trots, evident, ongedwongen, als Vlaming.

Hier vanuit dit Europees Parlement wens ik jullie alvast allemaal een schitterende feestdag, een schitterende 11e juli toe. Leve Vlaanderen, leve de Vlamingen.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I am very happy that Commissioner Malmström is absent for a good reason tonight. I know she is finalising the EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement (FTA).

This is very good news for Europe. The EU must accelerate on trade deals now that the USA has decided the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is not a priority. With regard to Singapore, I was and am a very strong supporter of this FTA, as I really believe it offers a win-win commercial deal. I am as frustrated as our Singapore counterparts that this FDA has taken so long and that it was stuck in court for such a long time.

As our oral question points out, negotiations were launched in March 2010. Seven years, colleagues, is a positively biblical cycle. If we take so long with a rule-of-law country like Singapore, imagine how long we will take with bigger, more problematic countries. The Court of Justice ruling of 16 May 2017 places almost all the EU-Singapore FTA provisions within the exclusive competence of the Union. However, the two remaining areas of mixed competence have a clear effect and will probably constitute a precedent for future FTAs that the EU will negotiate.

Europe will grow not with more public debt but rather through further trade deals with countries all over the world. Time is always important, and now there is a favourable international momentum for Europeans to grasp.

I want to raise three questions. What will the consequences of this Court ruling be beyond the ratification of this FTA? Can we expect the ratification next year? What will be the consequences in terms of future mandates for the negotiation of FTAs and the procedures for their ratification?

Anne-Marie Mineur, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – De uitspraak van het Europees Hof van Justitie viel me een beetje tegen. Dat zal ik meteen toegeven. Ik had gehoopt dat het Hof dichter bij het advies van advocaat-generaal Sharpston was geweest en meer bevoegdheden bij de lidstaten had gelaten. Maar het Hof heeft wel gesteld dat arbitrage en indirecte investeringen een nationale bevoegdheid zijn.

De vraag is nu: gaat de Commissie haar best doen om de nationale, regionale parlementen zoveel mogelijk buiten spel te zetten of gaat zij toch proberen om een handelsbeleid te voeren met een zo groot mogelijk draagvlak? Ik ben bang dat het het eerste is. De Commissie laat dat zien bij het verdrag met Japan dat ze morgen wil aankondigen. Er is nooit gelegenheid om in de openbaarheid te debatteren over hoe onze handelsverdragen eruit moeten zien. De Commissie heeft alle informatie, maar zij praat vooral met het bedrijfsleven en veel minder met ngo's en burgers.

Wij Europarlementariërs hebben een klein deel van de informatie, maar we mogen er niet over praten. En de burger heeft de informatie al helemaal niet en hoort alleen achteraf wat het geworden is of door lekken van organisaties als Greenpeace wat er besloten wordt. Dat is niet goed voor de democratie. Europa heeft leiders die steeds meer losgezongen zijn van de burgers en de kloof tussen u en ons wordt steeds dieper.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, for me there are two essential conclusions from the Singapore judgment. One, referred to by Mr Lange, Chair of the Committee on International Trade, is that sustainable development, including labour protection, is an essential part of EU trade agreements. This means that we have to take it seriously, that it is not a side issue but rather a very important part of our trade negotiations, which also makes the agreements more legitimate and accepted by people.

The second is that we need to balance efficiency with democracy. I am quite pleased when I hear from the Commission that it is now thinking about how to involve the national parliaments at an earlier stage, because if we go for more EU-only trade agreements, it means that if the Member States, including the national parliaments, are going to have any say, this has to happen very early. So here my strong call to the Council is this: please publish the negotiating mandates because that is where the political discussion in the future will happen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, as a member of the ASEAN delegation and rapporteur for the EPP on the Singapore Agreement, I obviously have a keen interest in this topic. I must say, like other speakers, I was a bit disappointed a few years ago when this was referred to the ECJ because I thought it was a bit unfair on the people of Singapore, but thankfully it has worked out quite well, and indeed great credit is due to the Singaporean authorities for their patience in this regard.

Two weeks ago I had the pleasure of meeting their Trade Minister here, also their Ambassador to the European Union, and last weekend in Dublin I met the Ambassador to Ireland. They are very enthusiastic about this, they are very understanding of the European Union's position, but now we look forward to the implementation of the agreement.

That is the first thing the Commission will have to do, to try and get this implemented as soon as possible. They have got their clarity now regarding ISDS. Indeed the Commission is working on a new framework for that and I agree completely with the last speaker, Ms Hautala, that if the Member States are to be involved in future, they are involved at the early stages, as soon as possible, and not to be allowed to hold up agreements as we have seen in the past, especially in relation to CETA.

So this is actually a good result, provided the Commission has the courage to take the result in their hands and do what they are being given the competence to do and make trade work for European citizens.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Das Urteil des EuGH legt klar fest, dass die Hauptzuständigkeit für die europäische Handelspolitik auf EU-Ebene liegt, bei umfangreichen Abkommen aber auch die nationalen Parlamente mitentscheiden werden. Damit haben wir endlich Klarheit bei den Kompetenzfragen. Das Urteil des EuGH hält aber auch laut Randnummer 161 fest, dass es bei einem Verstoß gegen Sozial- und Umweltvereinbarungen zu einer Aussetzung bzw. Beendigung des Abkommens kommen könnte. Damit könnten arbeitsrechtliche Standards, Sozial- und Umweltstandards wirkungsvoll durchgesetzt werden.

Herr Kommissar, mich würde nun Folgendes interessieren: Erstens: Wann könnten die Verhandlungsparteien die Aussetzung bzw. die Beendigung des Abkommens anwenden, und ist dies überhaupt vorgesehen? Zweitens: Wie wäre der Ablauf dieses Verfahrens? Und drittens: Gilt dies dann für alle Abkommen oder nur für das Abkommen mit Singapur?

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για όσους από εμάς ασχολούμαστε χρόνια με το δικαίο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου ήταν αναμενόμενη, διότι υπάρχουν αρμοδιότητες αποκλειστικές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που έχουν σχέση με την άσκηση εμπορικής πολιτικής, αλλά υπάρχουν και θέματα στα οποία η αρμοδιότητα είναι συντρέχουσα, όπως είναι φερ' ειπείν η δικαστική επίλυση των διαφορών, τα θέματα των επενδύσεων, όπως θα είναι αύριο η τήρηση της εργατικής νομοθεσίας και όπως θα είναι τα περιβαλλοντικά πρότυπα που μπορούν να ισχύσουν.

Επομένως, θεωρώ ότι ξεκαθαρίζεται η κατάσταση. Ισχύει αυτό που είχα πει από το 2014 που ήρθα σε αυτήν την αίθουσα, ότι η συμφωνία CETA, όπως και η TTIP, είναι μικτές συμφωνίες και χρειάζονται κύρωση και από τα κράτη μέλη. Η Επιτροπή το ήξερε αυτό κι έκανε ένα τρικ, δηλαδή ενέκρινε μια προσωρινή ισχύ της CETA, ενώ ξέρεi ότι χρειάζεται κύρωση απ' όλα τα κράτη μέλη και ότι τα κράτη μέλη και τα κοινοβούλια πρέπει να συμμετέχουν. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να πάψει να υπάρχει έλλειψη διαφάνειας στη διαπραγμάτευση της CETA και -κυρίως- της TTIP.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I appreciate the valuable comments and questions raised in this debate. We have just started to discuss this subject with you and other stakeholders. Although we have an interest in concluding these discussions as soon as possible, we are aware that, due to their legal and political complexities, they may require time.

It is clear that we have the same objective. We all want to make the EU's trade and investment policy to be more stable, effective and credible for the benefit of our EU citizens. Our analysis and discussions apply to all trade agreements that have not been ratified yet. This also includes free-trade agreements with Vietnam and Singapore.

We are considering all options that could strengthen the EU's trade and investment policy, but we do not want to prejudge the outcome of this process before having properly discussed it with this House, Member States and other stakeholders.

We are therefore looking forward to further exchanges on these issues with the European Parliament. This is a difficult position for me as I hold a different portfolio, but this is the Commission position.

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Verfasser! Ich denke, das letzte Wort ist in dieser Aussprache noch nicht gesprochen.

Damit ist die Aussprache geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Pese a lo que insinúa el texto de la pregunta, la sentencia del TJUE tiene graves consecuencias para la «nueva» agenda comercial de la Comisión y su pretensión de aplicar tratados de libre comercio sin la autorización unánime de los Estados miembros. Esto supone una victoria de la democracia frente al intento de imponer los ISDS (tribunales de arbitraje entre multinacionales y Estados) y los mecanismos de «cooperación» regulatoria como actores legislativos frente a las cortes y Parlamentos nacionales. Una victoria, por lo tanto, frente a quienes están impulsando nuevos tratados de comercio (como el ACS y el ATCI) para desregular la economía europea, en lugar de someter sus propuestas al voto popular.

21. Atti delegati (Artikolu 105(6) tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti

22. Trasferiment ta' approprijazzjonijiet: ara l-Minuti

23. Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti

24. L-aġenda tas-seduta li jmiss: ara l-Minuti

25. Għeluq tas-seduta

(Die Sitzung wird um 23.00 Uhr geschlossen.)

Tifsira tas-simboli użati

*	Proċedura ta' Konsultazzjoni
***	Proċedura ta' Approvazzjoni
***I	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinaria: l-ewwel qari
***II	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinaria: it-tieni qari
***III	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinaria: it-tielet qari

(It-tip ta' proċedura tiddependi mill-bażi legali proposta mill-abbozz ta' att)

Abbrevjazzjonijiet użati għall-Kumitati Parlamentari

AFET	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Barranin
DEVE	Kumitat għall-Iżvilupp
INTA	Kumitat għall-Kummerċ Internazzjonali
BUDG	Kumitat għall-Baġits
CONT	Kumitat għall-Kontroll tal-Baġit
ECON	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Ekonomiċi u Monetari
EMPL	Kumitat għall-Impjiegi u l-Affarijiet Soċjali
ENVI	Kumitat għall-Ambjent, is-Saħħa Pubblika u s-Sikurezza tal-Ikel
ITRE	Kumitat għall-Industrija, r-Riċerka u l-Energija
IMCO	Kumitat għas-Suq Intern u l-Harsien tal-Konsumatur
TRAN	Kumitat għat-Trasport u t-Turiżmu
REGI	Kumitat għall-Iżvilupp Reġjunali
AGRI	Kumitat għall-Agricoltura u l-Iżvilupp Rurali
PECH	Kumitat għas-Sajd
CULT	Kumitat għall-Kultura u l-Edukazzjoni
JURI	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Legali
LIBE	Kumitat għall-Libertajiet Ċivili, il-Ġustizzja u l-Intern
AFCO	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Kostituzzjonali
FEMM	Kumitat għad-Drittijiet tan-Nisa u tal-Ugwaljanza bejn is-Sessi
PETI	Kumitat għall-Petizzjonijiet
DROI	Sottokumitat għad-"Drittijiet tal-Bniedem"
SEDE	Sottokumitat għas-"Sigurtà u d-Difiża"

Abbrevjazzjonijiet użati għall-Gruppi Politici

PPE	Grupp tal-Partit Popolari Ewropew (Demokristjani)
S&D	Grupp tal-Alleanza Progressiva tas-Socjalisti u d-Demokratiċi fil-Parlament Ewropew
ECR	Grupp tal-Konservattivi u Riformisti Ewropej
ALDE	Grupp tal-Alleanza tal-Liberali u d-Demokratiċi għall-Ewropa
GUE/NGL	Grupp Konfederali tax-Xellug Magħqud Ewropew - Xellug Aħdar Nordiku
Vers/ALE	Grupp tal-Hodor/Alleanza Hiesla Ewropea
EFDD	Grupp għal Ewropa tal-Libertà u d-Demokrazija Diretta
ENF	Grupp tal-Ewropa tan-Nazzjonijiet u tal-Libertà
NI	Membri mhux Affiljati