

C/2024/3010

3.5.2024

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 3 OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3010)

EUROPEES PARLEMENT

ZITTING 2017-2018

Vergaderingen van 2 t/m 5 oktober 2017

STRAATSBURG

Inhoud	Bladzijde
1. Opening van de vergadering	3
2. Samenstelling fracties: zie notulen	3
3. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (debat)	3
4. Stemmingen	41
4.1. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017) (stemming)	41
4.2. Beperking van het gebruik van bepaalde gevaarlijke stoffen in elektrische en elektronische apparatuur (A8-0205/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (stemming)	42
4.3. In het verdragsgebied van de ICCAT geldende beheers-, instandhoudings- en controlemaatregelen (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (stemming)	42
4.4. De economische empowerment van vrouwen in de particuliere en openbare sector in de EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh) (stemming)	42
4.5. Het aanpakken van de steeds beperktere ruimte voor het maatschappelijk middenveld in ontwikkelingslanden (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (stemming)	42
4.6. De strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi) (stemming) ..	42
4.7. De politieke betrekkingen tussen de EU en ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer) (stemming)	42
5. Stemverklaringen	42

Inhoud	Bladzijde
5.1. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017) .	42
5.2. In het verdragsgebied van de ICCAT geldende beheers-, instandhoudings- en controlemaatregelen (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato)	47
5.3. De economische empowerment van vrouwen in de particuliere en openbare sector in de EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh)	48
5.4. Het aanpakken van de steeds beperktere ruimte voor het maatschappelijk middenveld in ontwikkelingslanden (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)	51
5.5. De strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi)	52
5.6. De politieke betrekkingen tussen de EU en ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer)	54
6. Rectificaties stemgedrag/Voorgenomen stemgedrag: zie notulen	55
7. Hervatting van de vergadering	55
8. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen	55
9. De situatie in Moldavië	55
10. De uitbanning van kindhuwelijken (debat)	67
11. Prioriteiten van het partnerschap EU-Egypte voor de periode 2017-2020 (debat)	84
12. Rectificatie (artikel 231 van het Reglement): zie notulen	92
13. VN-Klimaatconferentie 2017 in Bonn, Duitsland (COP23) (debat)	92
14. Duizenden annuleringen van vluchten door Ryanair en de naleving van de verordening inzake passagiersrechten 261/2004/EG (debat)	110
15. Bezwaar tegen een uitvoeringsmaatregel: wetenschappelijke criteria voor de bepaling van hormoonontregende eigenschappen (debat)	128
16. Samenstelling fracties: zie notulen	138
17. Veiligheidsvoorschriften en -normen voor passagiersschepen – Registratie van de opvarenden van passagiersschepen die vanuit of naar havens in de lidstaten varen – Inspectiesysteem voor de veilige exploitatie van ro-ro-veerboten en hogesnelheidspassagiersvaartuigen op geregelde diensten (debat) (debat)	138
18. Agenda van de volgende vergadering: zie notulen	148
19. Sluiting van de vergadering	148

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 3 OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Opening van de vergadering

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.00)

2. Samenstelling fracties: zie notulen

3. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (debat)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sul tema «Stato di avanzamento dei negoziati con il Regno Unito» (2017/2847(RSP)).

Jean-Claude Juncker, *President of the Commission.* – Mr President, September was a month rich in speeches. I started with my State of the Union address on the future of Europe here in this House, where I laid out the road map for a more united, stronger and more democratic Union. This debate on building a more united, stronger and more democratic Europe continued at the Sorbonne in Paris: President Macron gave a very bold and a very European speech, and I would like to congratulate him and thank him once again. Prime Minister May's speech, on the other hand, was about separation. In Florence, she struck an optimistic tone on the future relationship between the United Kingdom and the Union.

When it comes to Brexit, we still cannot talk about the future without real clarity. This is because the condition of Article 50 and the mandate given to us by the leaders of the EU 27 are very clear: we first need to agree on the terms of the divorce and then we will see if we can, half-lovingly, find one another again. The Prime Minister's speech in Florence was conciliatory, but speeches are not negotiation positions and, as Michel Barnier, the Commission's excellent chief negotiator, said last week, work still remains to be done. We have not yet made the sufficient progress needed.

The negotiators have made good progress on citizens' rights, but the indispensable role of the European Court of Justice in guaranteeing those rights still needs to be agreed. I am pleased that Prime Minister May and her team recognise that the UK has financial obligations which it must respect. The devil will be, as always, in the detail, but the taxpayers of the EU 27 should not pay for the British decision. And when it comes to Ireland we can only talk of solutions that fully respect EU law and the Good Friday Agreement. I will not go into any more detail here, as negotiations continue next week and Michel Barnier will complete what I have just been saying.

For those who think that the UK should just go over Michel Barnier's head, I would remind them that the Commission was appointed by the 27 Member States, and my choice of Michel Barnier was welcomed by them. He acts on their behalf on the basis of clear negotiating mandates and he will report to them at the next European Council. To date, I cannot say that we are ready to enter the second phase of the negotiations.

Monsieur le Président, après le départ du Royaume-Uni, une page de l'histoire européenne se tourne et une autre est en train de s'écrire pour décider de l'avenir que nous voulons construire à vingt-sept.

Trop longtemps, nous avons repoussé des questions cruciales à des lendemains incertains. Trop longtemps, nous avons préféré nous livrer à de longues discussions institutionnelles au lieu de débattre clairement avec les peuples d'Europe de la finalité de notre Union. Tout cela doit changer et tout cela est en train de changer. Les débats sur l'avenir de l'Europe se multiplient dans tous les États membres. C'est bon signe car cela témoigne de la santé et de la vigueur de la démocratie européenne. C'était l'objectif que visait la Commission avec le livre blanc sur l'avenir de l'Europe, les documents de réflexion et les nombreux dialogues citoyens qui se sont multipliés dans tout le continent.

Mais il ne faut pas se disperser. C'est pourquoi j'ai voulu placer la poursuite de ce débat public dans le contexte d'une feuille de route structurée avec des échéances précises sur des propositions concrètes. Cette route nous mènera jusqu'au 30 mars 2019, au sommet spécial de Sibiu-Hermannstadt, en Roumanie, où nous donnerons notre vision d'avenir pour l'Europe et où nous déciderons de ce que nous serons prêts à défendre et à construire ensemble, à vingt-sept.

Notre avenir ce n'est pas le Brexit, c'est l'Europe.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef pour le Brexit*. – Monsieur le Président, je tiens à remercier votre assemblée de me donner l'occasion de m'exprimer, aux côtés du président Juncker.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les présidents et parlementaires, cher Matti, je suis très heureux de me trouver aux côtés du président Juncker, que je remercie de sa confiance personnelle et de son soutien, et aux côtés de Matti Maasikas, que je félicite et remercie pour la qualité de la présidence estonienne, tout au long des semaines passées.

Nous étions réunis au sein de cet hémicycle pour débattre du même sujet le 5 avril 2017, au moment où vous adoptiez votre première résolution. Vous fixiez alors le cap politique de cette négociation, comme l'a fait, de son côté, le Conseil européen sous l'impulsion du président Tusk, en adoptant peu après des lignes directrices très précises.

Six mois plus tard, alors que l'horloge tourne, et à quelques jours du Conseil européen des 19 et 20 octobre, nous faisons donc à nouveau le point sur cette négociation, et votre projet de résolution démontre aujourd'hui, au-delà des sujets concrets qu'elle aborde, l'implication pleine et entière du Parlement européen dans ces pourparlers. Je rappelle souvent à l'extérieur de cet hémicycle que votre assemblée aura le dernier mot, au moment de la ratification.

Depuis le premier jour, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous savons que cette négociation est extraordinaire, qu'elle est extrêmement complexe, qu'elle est lourde de conséquences humaines, sociales, juridiques, financières, techniques, économiques, et souvent d'ailleurs, ces conséquences sont sous-estimées.

En tant que négociateur de l'Union, c'est à la Commission qu'il revient, avec votre confiance, de négocier au nom des 27 et de toutes les institutions de l'Union.

Notre plus grand atout, je peux vous le dire, à la place où je me trouve, c'est notre unité. Nous savons que cette unité ne se décrète pas, elle ne tombe pas du ciel, elle se construit jour après jour par la transparence que nous avons entretenons tous les jours avec le président Juncker, par le débat public et par la confiance.

Je veux d'ailleurs, Monsieur le Président Tajani, vous remercier personnellement, ainsi que Guy Verhofstadt, coordinateur pour le Brexit, les présidents de groupe et les membres du *Brexit Steering Group*, que je rencontre très souvent, comme cela a été le cas hier encore, pour la qualité et la franchise de nos échanges.

Forts de votre soutien, nous nous attachons depuis le début de cette négociation à mettre en œuvre le mandat qui nous est confié par le Conseil, en pleine cohérence avec votre résolution et avec les orientations adoptées par le Conseil européen.

Ce mandat est simple: il consiste à nous mettre d'accord avec le Royaume-Uni, le plus tôt possible, sur les conditions de son retrait – un retrait ordonné de l'Union européenne – et sur les principes de ce retrait, afin de commencer au plus vite les étapes suivantes de la négociation.

Vous le savez, Mesdames et Messieurs, dans le contexte de ce retrait, il y a beaucoup de sujets qui ne sont pas négligeables – Euratom, les procédures judiciaires, les procédures administratives, les biens placés sur le marché, la gouvernance –, mais les trois sujets principaux de ce retrait ordonné concernent d'abord les citoyens, soit 4,5 millions de personnes, puis l'Irlande et enfin le règlement financier. Ces trois sujets sont indissociables, et constituent les trois sujets clés de ce retrait ordonné.

Comme vous le dites-vous-même dans votre projet de résolution, et comme vient de le rappeler le président Juncker, la première ministre, Theresa May, a proposé plusieurs ouvertures dans deux discours qu'elle a prononcés vendredi dernier à Florence.

L'équipe de négociation, comme je le souhaitais, a commencé la semaine dernière à traduire ces ouvertures en propositions concrètes et à apporter un certain nombre de clarifications, sur lesquelles je reviendrai brièvement dans un instant.

Nous avons donc pu avancer notamment sur notre priorité, qui reste la protection des droits des citoyens. Nous convergions également sur les principes communs qui guideront notre réponse aux questions sensibles que soulève la situation unique de l'Irlande.

À côté de ces points positifs, que je dois mentionner, pour dresser un bilan objectif de l'état de la négociation, il nous reste des divergences sérieuses, en particulier sur le règlement financier.

Sur cette question, dont j'ai déjà parlée ici, les choses sont également simples. Nous n'accepterons pas de payer à 27 ce qui a été décidé à 28, c'est aussi simple que cela. Les contribuables des 27 États membres de l'Union n'ont pas à payer les conséquences d'une décision qu'ils n'ont pas prise, rien de plus, rien de moins.

(Applaudissements)

Nous avons aussi des divergences sur le moyen de garantir les droits des citoyens. Nous connaissons et partageons, tout comme vous connaissez, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, puisque vous les représentez, l'inquiétude de ces 4,5 millions de citoyens, britanniques et originaires des 27 autres pays de l'Union, qui souhaitent aujourd'hui simplement continuer à vivre et à travailler là où ils sont, avec leur famille, comme avant le Brexit.

Cette inquiétude, vous le rappelez dans votre résolution, est d'ailleurs aggravée par certaines mesures discriminatoires prises depuis quelques mois par les autorités britanniques, et nous nous en inquiétons.

Pour garantir ces droits, effectivement, nous avons besoin de plusieurs éléments. Premièrement, il faut que l'accord de retrait ait un effet direct pour permettre aux autorités et aux juges britanniques de s'appuyer directement sur cet accord, sans quoi, évidemment, ces droits pourraient être modifiés au fil du temps.

Deuxièmement, nous avons besoin d'une interprétation cohérente de l'accord de part et d'autre de la Manche, que, de notre point de vue, seule la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne peut assurer.

Au-delà de cette question de gouvernance, nous attendons aussi des garanties du Royaume-Uni sur le regroupement familial et sur la jouissance à l'étranger des avantages sociaux acquis au Royaume-Uni.

Concernant le deuxième sujet principal, celui de l'Irlande, tant l'Union européenne que le Royaume-Uni reconnaissent qu'elle se trouve dans une situation tout à fait exceptionnelle et que toute solution devra en tenir pleinement compte.

Comme je l'ai mentionné à plusieurs reprises, les solutions que nous devons trouver devront respecter à la fois l'intégrité de l'ordre juridique de l'Union et l'accord du vendredi saint (*Good Friday Agreement*) dans toutes ses dimensions.

À ce stade, il s'agit notamment d'élaborer les modalités concrètes qui permettront de poursuivre durablement les très nombreuses coopérations Nord-Sud prévues dans cet accord et de perpétuer la zone de voyage commune. Et cette tâche nécessite encore un travail précis et détaillé, dans lequel nous sommes engagés avec la délégation britannique de manière constructive.

En définitive, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, et vous le dites à juste titre dans votre projet de résolution, en ce qui concerne ces trois sujets clés indissociables, nous n'avons pas encore réalisé aujourd'hui de progrès suffisants pour entamer en toute confiance la deuxième phase de la négociation. Il s'agira tout d'abord de prévoir une éventuelle période de transition, dans des conditions qui ont été clairement définies par le Conseil européen et auxquelles vous êtes vous-même attentifs, puis de définir le cadre de notre future relation de partenariat avec ce grand pays.

Un cinquième cycle de négociation se tiendra la semaine prochaine à Bruxelles. Notre attitude restera résolument constructive, parce que nous voulons mener à bien et l'accord sur le retrait ordonné et la discussion sur notre future relation avec le Royaume-Uni.

Avec le Royaume-Uni, qui deviendra un État tiers, en toute hypothèse, puisque c'est son choix, le 30 mars 2019, nous voulons établir un partenariat ambitieux et durable, bien sûr en matière commerciale, puisque telle est sa demande, à travers un accord de libre-échange dans des conditions dont nous discuterons, mais aussi au-delà du commerce, en matière de sécurité, de lutte contre le terrorisme et de défense ou encore en matière de recherche et d'innovation.

Plus vite nous nous mettrons d'accord sur les principes de ce retrait ordonné, plus vite nous pourrions nous concentrer sur cet objectif fondamental qui relève de notre intérêt commun, à savoir la construction de ce partenariat nouveau avec le Royaume-Uni.

Mesdames et Messieurs, notre approche s'appuie sur les principes fondamentaux de notre Union: l'unité, l'intérêt des 27 - États membres et des institutions, notre autonomie de décision, l'intégrité de notre marché intérieur et les quatre libertés de circulation qui en sont le fondement. Ces quatre principes sont au cœur de notre projet politique depuis son origine. Le Royaume-Uni les connaît bien pour les avoir partagés avec nous pendant 44 ans, et ils ne sont pas négociables.

Une fois encore, comme l'a dit la chancelière allemande, il y a quelques semaines et comme vient de le rappeler le président Juncker, nous savons désormais que l'avenir de l'Union est bien plus important que le Brexit.

Il est de la responsabilité des 27 États membres et du Parlement européen de construire ensemble cet avenir et de relever ensemble les défis; nous voyons bien dans l'actualité qu'ils sont graves et nombreux. Une page se tourne, ou va se tourner. C'est le choix souverain du Royaume-Uni, et nous le respectons. C'est à nous de faire en sorte, comme vient de le dire Jean-Claude Juncker, d'écrire de nouvelles pages pour l'Union européenne.

(Applaudissements)

Matti Maasilta, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, this debate is taking place barely two weeks before the October European Council and with one round of negotiations still to take place. The matters under discussion are serious ones with an impact on the rights of millions of citizens, on the budget of the Union and on the continuation of peace in Ireland.

Following Prime Minister May's speech on 22 September, we have noted a more constructive spirit and it seems to be providing new momentum to the negotiating process. However, we can only assess progress based on official negotiation. What actually matters is the position paper presented at negotiations as an official position. When reviewing progress, we take as a benchmark the guidelines set by the European Council on 29 April and supplemented by the negotiating directives of the Council adopted on 22 May, both setting principles and priorities shared in the European Parliament resolution of last April.

I am confident that, this time, the views expressed in the resolution due to be voted on by your institution right after this debate will again tally with ours, and with the assessment of the Union negotiator, Michel Barnier. Indeed, it is on the basis of this assessment that, on 20 October, the European Council will consider the state of play in these negotiations and how to move from there. We have noted that the UK is now acknowledging the need for a transition of sorts. The principle of transitional arrangements is indeed recognised, subject to clear conditions set in the European Council guidelines I referred to earlier. A transition could be welcome in easing the impact of the withdrawal and mitigating the uncertainties affecting citizens and businesses but, again, in order to be able to consider transition in good time, we need far more clarity than has been provided so far.

Likewise, concerning citizens' rights, we do see improved convergence on key rights and on how to ensure they can actually be enjoyed by European citizens in the UK on the basis of simple procedures. But a number of issues remain open and there is not yet any satisfactory assurance that these rights will be implemented in a consistent manner on both sides of the Channel.

Turning to Ireland and its unique situation, both sides are certainly close in terms of principles and continued support for the Good Friday Agreement and what could be achieved within its framework, and on the continued operation of the Common Travel Area and what it means for Irish citizens. But this is not enough in terms of certainty.

Last but not least, the financial settlement is also one of the key issues on which sufficient progress must be made before moving to the next phase of the negotiations. No doubt, positive words have been said but we are still awaiting concrete proposals. All this leaves us still wondering about the conclusion we can draw as to progress – an uncertainty which I read, too, in the draft motion for a resolution before you. European Parliament resolutions are valuable for the Council.

As I noted earlier, there are still 15 days and one round of negotiations to go. I was glad to conclude the meeting of the General Affairs Council (Article 50) on 25 September by noting that the EU 27 is united, that we have a single line of negotiations with a clearly defined mandate and we fully support the work of Michel Barnier. A certain new momentum has recently been instilled into the negotiations. Let us build on it. Let us achieve watertight solutions for our citizens, for our businesses and for our Union.

(Applause)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, firstly I think the top question for the moment is: who should I call in London who speaks for the government – Theresa May, Boris Johnson or even David Davis? On reading Johnson's attacks against his own prime minister, he shows that the British Government is trapped by their own party quarrels and political contradictions. First Florence, then Manchester: we are listening to a lot of speeches but substance, dear friends... London is being very creative in putting red lines on the table in order to please party supporters. However, it is failing to give any solution to the voters and citizens. I fully agree with Theresa May on at least one single point, when she said 'we can do so much better than this'. Theresa May, please do not put your party first; please put Britain first, please put the citizens first; and please, no more speeches. Show leadership on content. And the best thing would probably be to please sack Johnson, because we need a clear answer as to who is responsible for the British position.

(Applause from certain quarters)

A second point is the perspective of the citizens in the European Union. They can see what leaving the European Union means. We have a downgrading by the rating agencies. We have a lot of European companies who are saying they will not invest any more, and the growth rate in Great Britain when we look at the OECD data is going down from 1.6% to 1%, so only half of the gross rate which we have today in the eurozone. That is the result when you do a Brexit.

The third point I want to put on the table is what are we doing in the next steps? First of all, the British Government has to understand that cherry-picking is over. What we saw through the summer break was the British Government presenting a lot of new ideas, but with these ideas they showed that they want to keep ties, they want to keep contact. They did not explain to us what leaving the European Union really means. Another point is that we should not speak too much about the transitional period because we are already in a transitional period, dear friends. We need clear results in 2019; otherwise the consent of the European Parliament is not guaranteed. A country outside the Union cannot have the same advantages as a country which is a member of the club.

(More general applause)

The last two points: I think it is obvious to everybody what the Commission President and Michel Barnier underlined, that for the moment there is not sufficient progress on the negotiations on the table, so I think the EU leaders, the European Council, has to understand that there is no chance of entering into the second phase of the negotiations.

Finally, I want to thank Jean-Claude Juncker and Michel Barnier for their great job, for keeping the European Union together. I also want to thank Guy Verhofstadt for doing a great job for us as an institution, as the European Parliament, in bringing our voice to the table. We are prepared and we can be proud of the job we have done in the last months.

(General applause)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quando Theresa May arrivò a Downing Street promise che la Brexit sarebbe stata una passeggiata. Sì, una brevissima passeggiata di appena 500 giorni. E ancora c'è nebbia fitta attorno al negoziato e la responsabilità – come è stato ricordato – è del governo conservatore e delle sue divisioni. Noi però vogliamo essere positivi. In gioco ci sono gli interessi dei cittadini.

È stato ricordato dal presidente Juncker e dal negoziatore Barnier, che la signora May ha fatto un discorso dai toni più costruttivi a Firenze. Ci fa piacere: ma nel merito restano ancora molti punti oscuri. Bisogna innanzitutto rispettare l'ordine, la sequenza dei negoziati. Quando due coniugi vanno alla disunione, prima negoziano i termini del divorzio e poi le future relazioni e quindi prima bisogna negoziare le questioni del recesso e poi si può parlare di periodo transitorio. E deve esser chiaro che anche in questo periodo transitorio, se ci sarà e quando ci sarà, si applicheranno le quattro libertà e la Corte di giustizia, come ha ricordato il presidente Juncker, resterà competente.

Devo dire che anche sugli impegni finanziari, il governo britannico è troppo vago, gioca sui numeri senza mai prendere impegni precisi. E sull'Irlanda del Nord davvero fatico a capire come le autorità britanniche possano opporsi al mercato unico e volere allo stesso tempo un confine leggero con l'Irlanda: vogliono i vantaggi del mercato unico senza farne ufficialmente parte! La pace nell'Irlanda del Nord è un pilastro dell'Europa, per cui invito Londra e invito il governo britannico a tenere un atteggiamento responsabile e realistico su questo punto.

Nell'accordo di recesso bisogna riconoscere tutti i diritti dei cittadini, così come quelli dei loro familiari, ed è inammissibile che già da ora le autorità britanniche facciano gravare sui cittadini europei che vivono nel Regno Unito adempimenti amministrativi e burocratici che di fatto li discriminano. E io voglio dire a nome del mio gruppo che noi non accetteremo mai che ci siano cittadini di serie A e cittadini di serie B ed esigiamo lo stesso impegno anche da parte di Londra.

Finché su questi punti il governo britannico non prenderà impegni chiari e irrevocabili, il negoziato sulle relazioni future non potrà iniziare. Io non devo dare consigli a nessuno, tanto meno alla signora May. Noi parliamo attraverso il voto delle nostre risoluzioni: ancora una volta il Parlamento è fortemente unito, grazie all'opera di Guy Verhofstadt e dei nostri negoziatori, insieme all'amico Barnier e al presidente Juncker. Però, se mi posso permettere, segua il governo britannico la nostra strada: la strada dell'equilibrio e della saggezza, la strada che porta ad un successo per l'Europa e per lo stesso Regno Unito.

(Applausi)

Raffaele Fitto, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono ormai passati più di sei mesi dal 29 marzo, giorno in cui il Primo ministro britannico ha attivato l'articolo 50 per l'uscita del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. In questi sei mesi i negoziati non hanno prodotto quello che tutti quanti noi auspicavamo ma, come ha ricordato poco fa il Commissario Barnier, il discorso di Theresa May di alcuni giorni fa a Firenze e i timidi, anche se non ancora sufficienti, progressi del quarto *round* dei negoziati della scorsa settimana ci inducono ad essere più ottimisti per il raggiungimento di un accordo.

Sarebbe un grave errore perseverare nel cercare di dividere entrambe le parti, di far prevalere l'una rispetto all'altra, un errore che non possiamo permetterci. I nostri concittadini e le nostre imprese chiedono certezze nella loro vita quotidiana, chiedono un accordo su un rapporto quanto più stretto possibile ed equilibrato in termini di diritti ed obblighi. Ecco perché non penso, sinceramente, anche avendolo ascoltato questa mattina, che sia utile a nessuno polemizzare addirittura all'interno di un governo e creare elementi di contrasto e contrapposizione, che certamente non agevolano il percorso di fronte al quale noi stiamo andando. Io ho ascoltato dal Commissario Barnier, questa mattina, parole molto positive e costruttive, che non corrispondono alle parole che ho ascoltato successivamente e me ne dispiace molto, perché non penso che questo sia il clima utile per raggiungere questo importante accordo.

D'altronde, come ribadito dalla Premier britannica, il Regno Unito abbandona l'Unione europea ma non abbandona l'Europa: problematiche come l'immigrazione, il terrorismo e la sicurezza globale possono e devono essere affrontate e risolte solo se siamo in grado di stare tutti quanti insieme, a prescindere da quelle che sono le posizioni giuridicamente che ci vedono divisi da una parte o dall'altra. Queste sono le sfide del futuro che ci vengono di fronte e su queste sfide è il momento della chiarezza, della concretezza e della responsabilità. Ormai manca poco al 2019 e non possiamo concederci il lusso di un mancato accordo o di un accordo al ribasso: le conseguenze sarebbero inimmaginabili e sicuramente indebolirebbero entrambe le parti e i cittadini non ce lo perdonerebbero.

Mettiamo da parte in questo momento, in quest'Aula, nel rapporto fra i diversi livelli istituzionali, nel rapporto con il governo inglese, i motivi di discordia e impegniamoci per superare questa fase dei negoziati, dove sono i dettagli e non i principi a creare le divisioni.

Siamo tutti concordi nell'evitare il ripristino di barriere fisiche tra Irlanda e Irlanda del Nord. Siamo tutti convinti di dover garantire continuità e stabilità al processo di pace e tutti crediamo che gli impegni presi in termini finanziari, alla fine, sulla base di un confronto debbano essere rispettati. I diritti e gli interessi dei cittadini dell'Unione europea e dei cittadini britannici che risiedono e che hanno risieduto negli Stati membri o nel Regno Unito, devono essere la priorità. Creiamo le condizioni affinché lo status di queste persone sia soggetto ai principi di reciprocità, equità e non discriminazione.

Per questo motivo dobbiamo essere molto più realistici di quanto la politica spesso ci porta a non esserlo: lo voglio dire con molta franchezza. Dobbiamo trovare un compromesso e tenere in considerazione che nel 2019 il Regno Unito sarà, di fatto, un Paese terzo.

Come gruppo dell'ECR ci rammarichiamo del fatto che il Parlamento, proprio attraverso questa risoluzione, pur comprendendo le ragioni che sono state indicate, non abbia accelerato sull'avvio della seconda fase dei negoziati. Ritardare l'avvio della seconda fase non rappresenta infatti una soluzione; anzi rischia di complicare la situazione. E noi abbiamo il dovere di definire con chiarezza il futuro rapporto e di garantire un quadro giuridico certo, a livello commerciale ed economico, sia per le nostre imprese che per le future relazioni tra l'Unione europea e il Regno Unito.

Non possiamo permettere di lasciare il sistema produttivo e commerciale dell'Unione europea e del Regno Unito in balia dell'incertezza più totale: qui è in ballo, come è stato ricordato, il presente e il futuro di milioni di lavoratori e delle loro famiglie, che deve essere garantito. Al tempo stesso, anche qui, come per quanto riguarda i diritti dei cittadini, la soluzione non può essere l'imposizione di una posizione rispetto a un'altra, ma deve necessariamente essere un'occasione d'intesa.

Quanto avevamo già affermato in Aula alcuni mesi fa lo vogliamo ribadire oggi: per noi la Brexit, che è un fatto deciso dai cittadini, piaccia o non piaccia, non deve essere un motivo di scontro ma io mi auguro che ci possa essere l'occasione per diventare un'opportunità per stabilire dei rapporti futuri, di cui mi sembra che questa Unione europea abbia fortemente bisogno.

Questo è il lavoro, l'impegno e il contributo che, come conservatori e riformisti, noi daremo a partire da oggi a questo dibattito.

Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, first of all, I have to say – and I am addressing my words to Mr Fitto also – that I deplore the fact that we have come to a resolution saying there is no sufficient progress. Our idea – and I think Michel Barnier's also – was that by October we would see sufficient progress. But Mr Weber is right in his analysis of the situation on the other side of the negotiating table: there is a lack of clarity; there is even disunity. There is opposition between Hammond and Fox, and opposition and divisions between Johnson and May. It is difficult to make sufficient progress and it is difficult to take the steps towards the second phase of the negotiations.

So I deplore the fact that we cannot put before the plenary a resolution other than today's resolution. On the other hand, it does demonstrate the unity among ourselves – and I hope, Mr Fitto, that we can keep that unity in this House, and even that you can join it when we vote in a few moments' time, because that unity is absolutely needed. Parliament and Council – not Parliament only, but Parliament and Council – for once, and I have never seen it before, I have to tell you, in my political life, are going beyond national differences and considerations of party obedience, and are really defending, together with the negotiator, the interests of the citizens in all 27 Member States.

So my call to you, and to everybody in the plenary, is to join this unity: let us keep this unity.

I have three worries – three points that I think need to be addressed in the debate. The first is Northern Ireland. I have to tell you that I went to Northern Ireland. I had never been in Northern Ireland before, I had never been in Belfast before, but I went there. I had thought: 'Yeah, it's been 20 years now since this has been on our television screens and the problems are solved. It's a bit like Berlin: the Berlin Wall has disappeared, and everything is going well.' So I can tell you it was a shock to come to Belfast, because the reality is that the problems are not over. There is peace, due to the Good Friday Agreement, but there are still these tensions. There are fences that are 12 metres high – today in the 21st century!

I have to tell you that keeping this Good Friday Agreement is key. It is a ceasefire. It is a little bit of a guarantee in a frozen conflict. The worst thing what can happen is that we lose the peace that Europe has brought there, to Northern Ireland, with the efforts that we in the European Union have made. I stood next to memorials where you see pictures of young people aged 15 or 16 who died in a conflict based on nationalism, based on extremism. So, to ensure that the violence does not return is, I think, an absolute priority for this House.

(Applause)

And that means – and this is a question I would put to the negotiator – why not attach the Good Friday Agreement as a declaration to the withdrawal agreement that we are going to secure? And, of course, let us not return to a border there on the island of Ireland because then the violence will certainly return.

My second worry is about citizens' rights. You will be aware of the so-called deportation letters that were sent out by the UK authorities a short time ago. There have been excuses by the UK Government, saying that it was a mistake, but I have difficulty believing that. Why do I say that? Well, when it comes to collectively securing the rights of EU citizens living in the UK, the UK authorities tell us it is not possible: they don't know them and they don't know where they are. Yet, when it comes to sending a deportation letter, they find their addresses! So I want to say – in all honesty and very calmly – that I do not think we can accept a situation in which three million of our citizens would need to ask for settled status in Britain, with the huge administrative burden that would entail.

Our proposal is very simple: let us recognise this collectively; let us give EU citizens living in the UK the same rights that they have now. And let's do exactly the same for the UK citizens living on the continent.

(Applause from certain quarters)

I am asking myself why we are still discussing this. This can, in fact, be solved immediately by recognising their rights – recognising the rights of all citizens.

Lastly, on the financial settlement, I will not repeat what has already been said. We are fully in agreement that you cannot pay with 27 what has been committed by 28.

To conclude, it is true, Mr Fitto, that Ms May made a number of clarifications in her Florence speech, but not enough – let us be honest – for even you to say that there is sufficient progress. So what I hope is that, in her address tomorrow to the Conservative Party conference, she will bring further clarity so that, on that basis, concrete proposals can be put on the negotiation table before Michel Barnier. Finally, I hope that the ECR Group too will show massive support for this resolution in the vote at midday.

(Applause)

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – (inaudible) That includes the part where the consent of the people of Ireland – both North and South – would be required to alter the constitutional position of the North. It includes the agreed areas of cooperation – environment, agriculture, tourism, health, transport and education – plus it allows for more. It includes a Bill of Rights – rights resisted by the DUP – and also, importantly, it includes conformity with EU law.

The Good Friday Agreement in all its parts includes, as this resolution recognises, being in the single market and the Customs Union. Britain should remain in the single market and the Customs Union, but if it does not, then the north of Ireland must.

There are different ways that this could be done: ‘in some form’ could mean the North of Ireland staying in the EU, or it could mean Irish unity. And the Good Friday Agreement has provisions for a unity poll – a right to decide. Otherwise, we are not upholding the Good Friday Agreement in all of its parts.

This resolution is balanced with regard to citizens’ rights and the financial settlement, and it is an important step forward in recognising that the requirements of the North of Ireland are different from those of Britain. Hence the need for special status or the need for the special circumstances to be taken into account.

Finally, I would like to welcome the comments from Guy Verhofstadt that we will explore how to give legal protection to the Good Friday Agreement in the Withdrawal Agreement. If you support the Good Friday Agreement, if you support the peace process, then please support this resolution.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear British citizens, my fellow European citizens, the clock is ticking. You know where we Greens, and the European Free Alliance, wanted your country to be: to remain at the heart of the European Union. But the majority of those British citizens who voted decided otherwise. While we accept the result of the referendum, this decision will produce no winners. Not only the business we do with one another but also the interests of both UK citizens and citizens of the EU 27 will be harmed by the separation.

British citizens come to see me every week, to alert me to the damage that will be inflicted on your healthcare system or on the quality of research in your top universities, where so many EU nationals are working day in, day out. Above all, both British citizens in the EU 27 and UK citizens on the continent have been thrown into total disarray, and Europeans in the UK have started experiencing administrative vexations before Brexit has even started. If we want to limit the inevitable damage that will be caused by this lose-lose situation we should waste no more time, and negotiate in good faith.

But make no mistake about it, no deal by March 2019 would be the worst deal for everyone and, firstly, for our respective citizens.

Allow me at this stage to point to two contradictions in the position of your own Prime Minister. The first concerns Ireland. How can she say, on the one hand, that there will be no border and, on the other hand, that she will take the United Kingdom out of the Customs Union, the single market and the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice? This will create a border, and I do not know where to place it while at the same time respecting the Good Friday Peace Agreement.

The second contradiction is this idea that in order for Britain to become global it needs to cut its ties with its closest neighbours, with whom it shares history and geography. I believe that, rather than being an impediment to Britain being global, the European Union is the only way for it as a European country, and one of a number of former imperial powers, to have any influence in a world where it represents barely one percent of the population. In the 21st century, more than ever, size matters.

Let me conclude with a few words on democracy. As your Prime Minister explained, the decision to leave the European Union is a statement as to how you want your democracy to work. I take exception to the idea that only if the UK leaves the EU would decisions that affect your daily lives be taken by people directly accountable to you. Who adopts EU law? On the one hand, this European Parliament was elected by, and is accountable to, the very same people who elect your national parliaments. On the other hand, the Council is 28 governments who are accountable to their citizens via their national parliaments. In other words, every EU law is decided by people who are directly accountable to you sitting at the table and taking part.

But let's be frank with one another: what seems unacceptable to some is that, in certain cases, Britain might be outvoted. That, I am afraid, is a rule of democracy, and one that your own government has no qualms about invoking by remarkably overruling the pro-remain majorities in Scotland and Northern Ireland. If democracy can be had only at the level of the nation state, I know many regions which would immediately aspire to become one.

(Heckling)

Indeed! And if a democratic union is possible, Mr Farage, between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, then it can certainly be possible between European nation states. A majority of the British voters instructed Her Majesty's Government to negotiate Brexit. Let us respect the democratic vote and do just that, without further delay. But if we want to be fair to those same citizens, let them, or at least those people who have been elected to represent them, have the last word on this story. When confronted with the result of that negotiation, who knows what they might ultimately decide?

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, whilst we debate the really important issue of Brexit, I think European citizens – those that do take any interest in what happens here – will be stunned that Mr Juncker comes here for his one appearance in the Strasbourg session this week, and there is absolutely no mention made of the dramatic events that have taken place inside a European Union Member State that is, allegedly, a modern democracy.

One of the reasons why I always wanted Brexit was because I thought the system of law-making whereby the Commission has the sole right to initiate legislation was something that would in fact damage, and in the end destroy, any concept of national democracy. And yes, I've called the European Union undemocratic; I've called it anti-democratic, but never in my fiercest criticisms here did I think that we would see the police of a Member State of the Union injuring 900 people in an attempt to stop them going out to vote. Whether or not it was legal nationally for people in Catalonia to have a vote, surely, people are allowed to express an opinion. We saw women being dragged out of polling stations by their hair, old ladies with gashes in their foreheads. It was the most extraordinary display – and what do we get from Mr Juncker today? Not a dicky bird. In fact, previously we heard that the rule of law must be maintained, and it is quite extraordinary to realise that this Union is prepared to turn a blind eye.

Can you imagine if the British police roughed up a couple of Scottish National Party protesters, or if something happened against a pro-Brexit rally? You would all be screaming blue murder. Indeed, the calls would be that the United Kingdom must go before the European Court of Human Rights, and yet you don't even want to talk about this. Knowing, as I do, your advanced plans, with seven of the Member States here having their military police – your European Gendarmerie Force – all I can say once again is 'thank God we're leaving'.

Brexit was an act of liberation. It was a voice of national self-determination that cannot, and will not, be stopped. But throughout this negotiating process, you have treated us as if we're some kind of a hostage from the start, and unless we pay a ransom, unless we meet all of your demands, then you won't even have an intelligent conversation with us about trade heading on from here.

There are no guarantees that – whatever Ms May says or does – you will ever come to us, even when we have met your demands, and want to have a sensible trade agreement. It was sad, in fact it was pitiful, to see the British Prime Minister in Florence. I have heard you saying that she is being conciliatory, that she is being grown up, that people are happy with what she said. Actually Ms May, I am sad to say, is not worldly enough to recognise that when you face up to a bully, the one thing that you do not do is try to appease them. She is begging you to give her a transition period and there is no guarantee that you will do it, so I do actually agree with the criticisms that I have heard around the room about the mixed messages coming out from the UK government.

I just hope that in Manchester the Conservative Party starts to say in public what they are all saying to me in private: that she is a waste of space, that she needs to go, and that we need a proper prime minister who says to Monsieur Barnier 'okay, here's a deadline, here's a date, we work towards that date. If we can't reach a sensible deal on trade and everything else, then we are simply leaving and reverting to WTO rules'. This charade cannot go on year after year. After all, we voted Brexit.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Janice Atkinson, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, what can I say? I agree with everything that Nigel has said. The British people listen to you, and they hear that you want us shackled to the ECJ, and they say ‘no’. The British people see that you are getting an EU army and, given what happened in Catalonia on Sunday, most of you so-called leaders were silent on this matter. You saw what happened, with the violence against its people, its women (and some of them are children), and they wonder what it will be like under Mrs Merkel, and also Mr Macron, when they get their hands on the guns and the tanks. The British people say ‘no’. They vote to take back control of our borders, and you say ‘no’. The UK said ‘yes’ to leaving the single market and the Customs Union, so you should just cut a deal on a free trade agreement. But you can’t. Has Mrs May met Mrs Malmström, our resident former sociology lecturer who is in charge of trade? She is incapable of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’, because she has never worked in business. Last night at the Conservative Party Conference, a former Brexit minister, with the Brexit Secretary David Davis in the audience, said that the Brexit department are drawing up plans for a no-deal. Listening to Mr Barnier today, they had better get on with it, because that is what is going to happen.

Mr Weber, you ask who you should you call in London. I agree with you. Mrs May will be gone soon. I suggest you get Boris or Jacob on speed dial.

Mr Verhofstadt, do not lecture us and try and rewrite history on Northern Ireland. I think it is you that is inciting violence, sitting in this Chamber.

Last June we voted to take back control of our laws, our courts, our borders and our money. Anything else is a betrayal. 17.4 million people. Watch and learn from Catalonia.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Diane Dodds (NI). – I will focus on only one aspect of the resolution today, and that is my constituency, Northern Ireland. I am encouraged by agreements in Brussels, London and Belfast that there should be no hardening of the border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. I’m encouraged by reports of fruitful progress on the issue of the Common Travel Area. However, it is not flexible or imaginative to claim that a trade solution can only be found if Northern Ireland remains inside the single market or the customs union. Let’s be absolutely clear: Northern Ireland’s Brexit solution will be part of the United Kingdom’s Brexit solution. There can be no question of a deal that cuts us adrift from our most important market and erects barriers within the United Kingdom single market. The interlinked nature of the Brexit negotiations means that we need to move swiftly to phase two of the negotiations for a full resolution on this issue. Northern Ireland is not a bargaining chip in these negotiations. Genuine concerns in my constituency should not be exploited in pursuit of every British pound.

And finally, a word to Mr Verhofstadt, who claimed that Europe had brought peace to Northern Ireland: peace in Northern Ireland was hard-fought and hard-won by its people and by the bravery of its security forces in the face of an awful terrorist campaign, that killed thousands of our people. Europe has helped, but it has not been the sole arbiter of peace in Northern Ireland.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor Presidente, después de escuchar al señor Farage, dejo sobre la mesa el discurso que tenía porque tengo que responderle, aunque él se esté marchando.

Mi país no puede aceptar lecciones de democracia de quien no considero que sea un demócrata; y la prueba de que no es un demócrata es que ni siquiera se queda a escuchar lo que tengo que responderle.

El señor Farage hace que me alegre del *brexit*, porque gracias al *brexit* se marchará de esta Cámara la extrema derecha. Lo único bueno que tiene el *brexit* es que no tendremos que escuchar jamás al señor Farage.

Si quería hacer un favor a los independentistas de Cataluña, les ha hecho justo lo contrario, porque estoy convencido de que quienes están intentando ilegalmente la independencia de Cataluña lo último que esperaban era el apoyo de la extrema, extrema, derecha europea, lo que, al final, nos demuestra a todos qué es lo que realmente está sucediendo en Cataluña y a qué se enfrenta realmente el Gobierno de España.

Tenían una oportunidad de hablar de Gran Bretaña y del *brexit* y la han dejado pasar. Prefieren hablar de España que de Gran Bretaña porque de su país, aparte de gritar, ustedes no tienen nada que decir.

Y les diré —hablando exactamente de Gran Bretaña— que mi grupo parlamentario está preocupado, como el señor Verhofstadt, por Irlanda del Norte, y muy preocupado por Irlanda del Norte, porque es un problema único que requiere una solución única y que va a exigir lo mejor de nosotros.

Señorías, en contra de lo que hoy dice el señor Farage y algunos independentistas en Cataluña, España es una democracia consolidada, un socio leal y un buen amigo de toda la Unión Europea, que necesita la ayuda de todos. Y a los únicos que no necesita allí, porque yo no aportan nada, es a la extrema derecha, por más que quieran apuntarse a la fiesta.

(Aplausos)

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Mr President, we are now at a decisive moment in our negotiations. A lot of time has been lost, and we now see a more positive dynamic. At the same time, a number of fundamental issues have yet to be clarified, and problems remain to be solved. For this reason, it is very important that the message that comes from this Parliament is clearly heard and understood. A positive conclusion of the first phase of the negotiations is possible, but we are not yet there. The Parliament is, and will be, open and constructive in its assessment, but we are, and will be, equally firm on our principles.

First, of course, a full safeguard of citizens' rights, which is our first priority. The positive principle of direct effect of the agreement must be underpinned by an effective mechanism which allows the Court of Justice to ensure a consistent interpretation of its provisions.

Second, as we are safeguarding existing rights and not discussing future UK immigration rules, we will not accept to depart from any of the current provisions, in particular about future family members of eligible citizens that should have the same rights as current family members, about the declaratory nature of documents, about the need to avoid any burdensome administrative procedure, and on the possibility to export social benefits.

On Ireland, our resolution is extremely clear, and on financial settlement it is extremely important that the now-shared principle, apparently, that all commitments made by the UK during its membership of the Union shall be honoured is implemented fully and consistently.

On the basis of this short analysis of the points, it is clear that, despite some positive steps forward, a lot of work is still required in order to move to phase two of the negotiations. So, as we say in the resolution, unless a major breakthrough takes place next week, the European Council should postpone its assessment of sufficient progress. By stating this obvious element, we are not closing a door. We are pointing out a way forward that is fair for both the EU and the UK. In this respect, we have to be clear on the transition.

First, it can be discussed and agreed only after sufficient progress on the withdrawal agreement. Second, it should be based on the full existing EU regulatory, budgetary, supervisory, judiciary and enforcement instruments and should, of course, fully include the free movement of citizens. Third, while some objective links between the withdrawal agreement and the transitional phase might be explored, any attempt to buy access to parts of the single market through concessions on the financial settlement would be rejected.

So we are in the middle of a very difficult journey. There is only one path clearly laid out if we want to get to our final destination. The path is the one indicated by the EU, and we will follow you, Michel, along this way.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, for decades, during some very dark times, Europe was a good friend to Northern Ireland without taking any side. I will always remember, at the time of the ceasefires in 1994, when I went with my other two MEP colleagues from Northern Ireland to the meeting with Jacques Delors which brought about the Peace programme. At that time, over GBP 2 billion in extra funding was given to Northern Ireland and to the border counties in the Republic.

However, in this resolution, it is clear to me that you are now taking sides in Northern Ireland, Mr Verhofstadt. Let me make it clear to you, Mr Verhofstadt, that peace in Northern Ireland was won by the leader of my party, now Lord Trimble, and the leader of the SDLP, Mr John Hume. They bore the brunt at a time when the other party leaders, represented on both sides in this House, who are now that the lead parties in Northern Ireland, stood on the sidelines and did nothing to help to bring peace in Northern Ireland. In fact, they have messed it up big time, which does not make the situation we have today any easier.

Shortly after those ceasefires, by calling for Northern Ireland to remain in the single market and the customs union with the rest of the United Kingdom, Mr Verhofstadt is essentially calling for an international border to be placed between Northern Ireland and the rest of Great Britain. Let me make it very clear: I will not accept any attempt by anyone in this Parliament to use Brexit as an excuse to break up my country. At its heart, this proposal goes against the Belfast Agreement the Parliament is mandated to protect and defend. The Belfast Agreement is clear: Northern Ireland is a full part of the United Kingdom, and we entered into the then EEC as one United Kingdom and we will leave the European Union as one United Kingdom.

This is a sad day for me. If the Parliament supports this text, it will be turning its back on decades of good relations with all communities in Northern Ireland. Mr Verhofstadt, you can no longer be deemed to be neutral after this resolution. That is your mistake. It is a huge mistake, and today I have heard nothing new. Unless we have a change in the direction this is heading, we are heading for a crash.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Mr President, as Chair of the Petitions Committee it is my responsibility and duty to listen to and respond to the concerns of EU citizens. My committee has received a large number of petitions expressing grave anxiety about citizens' rights in a post-Brexit era. They all have something in common: they are all the result of the insecurity people feel that they have been thrown into due to a very unclear withdrawal of the UK from the European Union. Some of them have tens of thousands of signatures.

From also the perspective of the Conference of Committee Chairs, let me just express that there is an immense task we are all aware of in front of us for all the committees. I know how important it is that realism and pragmatism is allowed to inform and shape the debate and the negotiations, and we are lucky to have an excellent negotiator in Michel Barnier.

In this context, the European Parliament proposal of a transitional period is very much welcomed, because it ensures that we have sufficient time to ensure that we have an orderly and civilised divorce at the end of the process, where citizens' rights are secured both for the EU citizens residing in the UK and vice versa, the UK citizens residing on the continent.

I really look forward to a more dignified debate after this. I pay attention to Mr Farage, who has now left the room, but he is not willing to discuss Brexit; he wants to discuss anything but Brexit. I think it should have been raised as a point of order, and he should have been made aware by you, Mr President, to actually pay attention to what the subject is for today.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con la risoluzione congiunta che sarà messa al voto, questo Parlamento esprimerà un giudizio che approvo. Ancora non è possibile parlare di progressi sufficienti sui diritti dei cittadini e la questione nordirlandese non è risolta. Fin d'ora, tuttavia, mi chiedo quale sarà la sorte degli accordi il giorno in cui li considereremo sufficienti sui cittadini. Come potremo metterli al riparo da improvvise regressioni dettate dal principio secondo cui «*nothing is agreed until everything is agreed*». Saremo veramente disposti a chiedere ancora agli europei nel Regno Unito e agli inglesi nell'Unione di mettere in *stand-by* il loro futuro in attesa dell'accordo finale?

Un'altra domanda concerne la libertà di movimento: quel che temo è che si profitti del Brexit per ridurre anche da noi tale libertà, soprattutto per i lavori non qualificati. Spero non vi saranno compromessi su questo, che proteggeremo lo status di tutti i cittadini europei, senza alcuna condizionalità. Nonostante l'evidente unicità dell'accordo di recesso, è più che mai necessario spezzare il vincolo di dipendenza dell'accordo sui diritti da altri capitoli negoziali. In gioco non è solo una questione di certezza giuridica ma la garanzia concreta che dovremo dare a favore di milioni di cittadini.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I am struck as ever by the unity of purpose across the Council and the Member States, and indeed across this House, amongst the EU 27. I commend our coordinator, Mr Barnier, for keeping that unity in check. But where the EU is united against the UK, I assure you the UK is anything but united.

I represent Scotland within this House. We desire to remain within our family of nations; 48% of the UK population want to remain. The idea that Theresa May leads a united government is a risible proposition, as we see on a daily basis from our own colleagues who are treating her as a Viking longship that they are going to float out into the North Sea, having piled as much nonsense onto it as possible, and then they'll set fire to it. They're fighting amongst themselves like ferrets in a sack, while the UK's national interest, however we define it, is ignored by them utterly. Shame on them. It is not good enough for Europe, it is not good enough for the UK either.

And from Scotland, we agree with the tone and content of this resolution. We have seen nowhere near enough progress on citizens' rights, on Ireland or in the financial settlement. On citizens' rights, I am receiving emails on a daily basis that would break your heart – people who have made choices about their lives, about their residence – on the basis of rights which they face having taken away. Our first duty in this House is to them.

On Ireland, north and south, Scotland's close neighbours and friends, solutions are possible; solutions could be found, but we need to see a lot more seriousness from the UK government than we have seen to date. The Good Friday Agreement is fragile; it must be respected. We need to see seriousness from the UK administration.

And on the financial settlement, it says just how far the UK's reputation has been trashed, that the idea that the UK will meet its financial obligations is news. If Global Britain's first act is to walk away from international financial contributions, it is just not a serious prospect. I fear for the future unless we see some real seriousness in these discussions. Scotland wants to find solutions, colleagues. We must see more seriousness from the UK in that endeavour.

(Applause)

Presidente. – *(Rivolgendosi all'onorevole Coburn)* Se si tratta di una polemica con altri paesi, io non lo tollero, perché la discussione è sulla Brexit e non è per fare polemica con questo o quel paese. Per essere chiaro: la Spagna è un paese democratico; il suo re si è battuto contro il colpo di stato; Felipe Gonzales e Adolfo Suarez hanno costruito una grande democrazia, quindi vi prego di evitare polemiche tra un paese e un altro perché non è questo il luogo per farlo.

David Coburn (EFDD). – It is not about Spain, Sir. I must say it is disgraceful that European politicians should exploit the tragedy of Northern Ireland for their own purposes. That is a disgrace! I think it is a point of order, that we are not discussing ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Presidente. – Onorevole, io sono abituato a rispettare tutti i deputati ma pretendo anche i deputati rispettino la Presidenza. Se Le do la parola per intervenire su un punto all'ordine del giorno e Lei non lo fa, vuol dire che sta prendendo in giro la Presidenza. E questo non lo posso accettare.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Mr President, we're here to discuss the state of play of the negotiations and what progress has been made. Well, very little. And there are two main reasons for that. One, of course, is that you don't want us to leave. You're going to do everything you possibly can to make it as difficult as possible, to delay it as long as possible, so that either we end up with a very, very bad deal or we reverse the decision of the referendum. The second reason, of course, is Mrs May, who simply doesn't have a clue. She has neither the courage, the will nor the resolve to actually see these so-called negotiations through.

But Mrs May has made some very serious and dangerous concessions already. What has she actually said? 15 months already after the referendum, nothing much has changed. She intends that we should leave the European Union on March 2019. We will leave the Commission, we will leave the Council, we will no longer have members of the European Parliament. We've left. But nothing much very changes, nothing much at all changes. She's said that we are going to incorporate all EU law into UK law. And then she wants another two years transition period, which will take us up to five years from the referendum, during which case nothing much changes on immigration, the laws don't change, and she has made one very, very, very dangerous concession, which is talking about an EU treaty on security and defence. We will continue to be bound to your military ambitions. We will continue to be bound to your security policy and foreign policy and to all the police and criminal justice measures like the hated European arrest warrant. She has not got a clue. And what she'll end up with is a withdrawal agreement whereby we leave in name but we do not leave in reality.

Now, Mr Barnier, Mr Juncker: I don't understand why you don't actually make it easy for us to leave. Why don't you kick us out as quickly as possible? Because then you can get on with your ambitions for full economic, financial, political and military integration. You can create your United States of Europe. Make it easy for us to go, so that we can get on with pursuing our freedom and independence, prosperity and our future in the world, not in the EU. Do yourself and us a favour, please!

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Im Juni 2016 gab es in Großbritannien das Referendum über den Austritt aus der Europäischen Union, und 52 % der Briten haben gesagt: Ja, wir wollen die Europäische Union verlassen. Eineinhalb Jahre Schockstarre, eineinhalb Jahre Chaos, eineinhalb Jahre Ratlosigkeit! Das was hier – und zwar auf beiden Seiten – passiert, ist nicht professionell, es erinnert mehr an einen Kindergarten.

Ich kann nur an Sie appellieren: Respektieren Sie diesen demokratischen Volksentscheid und machen Sie hinter den Kulissen keine Tricks! Denn das, was ich vernehme und was auch hinter den Kulissen zu hören ist, ist, dass längst an einem Plan gearbeitet wird, die Briten mit einem zweiten Referendum, mit einem Hinauszögern der Verhandlungen und mit vielen weiteren Tricks doch in der Europäischen Union zu halten und diesen demokratischen Volksentscheid zu sabotieren und zu boykottieren. Ich appelliere an Sie: Respektieren Sie die Entscheidung des britischen Volkes! Gehen Sie fair und professionell damit um! Achten Sie darauf, dass beide Seiten keinerlei Nachteile erhalten! Als Vertreter eines Nettozahlerlandes kann ich nur sagen: Achten Sie darauf, dass Länder wie Österreich dadurch keinen Euro mehr an Belastungen zu erfahren haben.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, Abraham Lincoln famously once said: 'you can fool some of the people all of the time; you can fool all of the people some of the time; but you can never fool all of the people all of the time'. Well, the British people are no longer fooled that the EU wants to negotiate a fair Brexit agreement, or even negotiate at all. From Verhofstadt to Juncker, to Barnier and to Tusk, the message is clear: the EU will delay, damage and deny Brexit.

When President Tusk says the UK can't have its cake and eat it, what he actually means is the EU wants its cake – our cake, the morning croissant, afternoon tea and, finishing it, we're taking a pound of Britain's economic flesh, washed down with a glass of subsidised EU chianti.

As Shakespeare said: 'this England never did, nor never shall, lie at the feet of a proud conqueror'. It is clear that the EU will not change its tune, so it is time for the UK to walk away and end this charade.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen, lieber Michel Barnier! Wenn ich Farage und Co. hier höre, habe ich den Eindruck, wir hätten den Antrag auf Brexit gestellt, nie sie selbst. Jetzt haben sie das Problem damit und versuchen, uns zu beschimpfen.

Wir sollten das eine sehen, und da schließe ich mich Michel Barnier an: Wir verhandeln inzwischen in einer besseren Atmosphäre als vorher. Es sind Fortschritte erreicht worden – nicht genügend Fortschritte, aber es sind Fortschritte erreicht worden –, und das soll man weitermachen. Das ist das Normalste in Verhandlungen. Und wir sollten feststellen, dass wir in einer solchen Atmosphäre Schaden begrenzen wollen. Der Eindruck von Farage und anderen ist: Sie wollen den Schaden! Sie wollen den Schaden provozieren und nicht nüchterne Verhandlungen zur Schadensbegrenzung. Und dafür müssen sie natürlich die Bedingungen entsprechend erfüllen mit den drei Fragen: Bürgerrechte, die Fragen mit der Finanzierung und die Fragen mit Irland.

Auch müssen wir sagen, dass wir keine Verhandlungsstrategien akzeptieren können, die sagen: Die finanziellen Verpflichtungen sollen auf den Zeitpunkt verschoben werden, wenn wir die zukünftigen Beziehungen verhandeln, um das für die Verhandlungen dann als Verhandlungschip einzusetzen. Die vernünftigen Beziehungen zu organisieren, ist im gemeinsamen Interesse. Da braucht man nicht Geld, um sich gegenseitig zu erpressen. Deswegen möchte ich Michel Barnier, Jean-Claude Juncker und die Kommission auffordern, die bisherige Verhandlungsstrategie beizubehalten. Die Verhandlungsstrategie ist richtig. Wir brauchen ein Scheidungs-Agreement, das all das beinhaltet, was da hineingehört. Wenn das geschaffen ist, kann man für eine gewisse Zeit eine Übergangsregelung machen, um für einen Freihandelsvertrag oder was auch immer Zeit zu gewinnen. Aber wir wissen bis heute nicht, was Großbritannien wirklich will. Ich habe den Eindruck, die schreiben Papiere, in denen sie einen Antrag auf die Mitgliedschaft im Binnenmarkt stellen wollen, aber nicht die Belastungen dafür tragen wollen. Das scheint mir doch einer der Punkte zu sein. Hier erbitten wir Klarheit.

Ich meine aber, dass der Wille vorhanden ist und die Atmosphäre vorhanden ist, zu einem vernünftigen Ergebnis zu kommen, und dies sollten wir uns nicht durch diese Propagandareden kaputt machen. Die große Mehrheit dieses Hauses will eine konstruktive Lösung mit Großbritannien für zukünftige Beziehungen. Daran sollten wir arbeiten.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Mr President, it is increasingly obvious to all that the negotiations are not proceeding as fast as they should and have no chance, or little chance, of reaching the stage of being able to move on to the second phase. It is also growing increasingly obvious to everyone where the blame lies for this: the chaos, the confusion and the divisions within the British Government, a government which is now a minority government, having lost an election on a platform of going for a particular form of Brexit that the public did not support.

Mr Barnier, you will recall the very first meeting of the negotiations, one year after the referendum. The British Government did not put a single position paper on the table at that meeting. Here we are, six months after triggering Article 50, and we have no agreement on the issues in the first phase of those negotiations, despite David Davis, rightly or wrongly, accepting the sequencing that was proposed for those negotiations. This is just not good enough.

The motion for resolution before Parliament hopes that progress can still be achieved by the next meeting of the European Council – only two weeks away. There is indeed another negotiating round. I suppose this hope is based on the fact that maybe, after the Conservative Party conference has finished this week, there may be some movement in the Conservative Government. I would say, ‘don’t count on it’.

Mrs May’s Florence speech was not so much to improve and clarify her positioning for the negotiations with the 27, it was to improve her negotiating position within the British Conservative Party, and it has clearly failed even to do that. They are still at loggerheads, they are still divided, and sometimes I wonder whether they don’t even want to move on to the second phase of the negotiations because they do not yet know what kind of relationship they want to secure for the future. They are still too split, they are still at loggerheads, and there is still no clarity on that from the British Government.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to make it very clear from the beginning: I was against Brexit. Mr González Pons made the point that after Brexit, people like Farage are leaving this Parliament. I would like to remind you: not only him, but all British people are leaving this Parliament, and these are the last advocates in this Parliament who are in favour of competitiveness, of decentralisation and of self-responsibility of a country for its debts. But it was – and let's not forget – the Junckers, it was the Broks, it was the Verhofstadts in this Parliament who carry a lot of responsibility for the Brexit in the first place. It was their mantra for more Europe, more centralisation, more socialisation, which led to the referendum in the first place. And it was their inflexibility on the immigration issue which gave the arguments for the Johnsons and the Farages to swing the results towards Brexit.

To minimise the damage, we now need to do three things. First of all, Mr Verhofstadt, people like you should stop this arrogance vis-à-vis the British voters. Secondly, Mr Barnier, you should stop giving the impression that you want to punish the British for their decision. And here is a message to London: they should really get their act together and come up with a stable and unified government to face this Commission in this critical phase.

(Applause from the right wing of the House)

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). – Mr President, so Mrs May has never felt at home in the EU. Well, she's not talking for me, nor the millions who voted to stay in and still want to stay in. We have millions of EU citizens who need clarity now with a stand-alone agreement, whatever the negotiations deal. But what Mrs May really meant is that the Brexiteers in her own party haven't bothered to find out the benefits of the EU. They stay at home and think that the British Empire still owes them a living.

Mrs May is surrounded by Brexiteers. They are in control, and she is too weak to deal with them. Brexiteers constantly blame Brussels for their own failings. They said: 'In the EU we can't control our borders!' That's nonsense. We can manage EU migration; we just haven't adopted the laws to do it. They say they have a plan for Ireland, but so far, nothing. They said that the EU stops us making trade deals, but we have over 50 international trade deals now. So where is the vision for Brexit? May's Florence speech has left more waffle, fudge and half-eaten cake on the table than is good for anyone's cholesterol.

Prime Minister, get a grip, or pack your bags and leave now. We can exit from Brexit, so allow those of us who do feel European to sort this mess out democratically.

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident! Ein CEO von Rolls Royce in Ludwigsfelde in Deutschland, unweit von Berlin, sagte mir auf meine Frage zu seinen Sichten, Fragen und Problemen mit den Brexit-Verhandlungen: Er habe nur eine Sorge, ein wichtiges Anliegen: Gewährleistet die Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit durch die Verhandlungen! Es geht also auch in der globalen Wertschöpfungskette, der internationalen Produktion, in Absatz, Forschung und Entwicklung eines der britischen Weltkonzerne insbesondere um die Absicherung der erworbenen Rechte und die eindeutige, garantierte rechtliche Absicherung dieser für die Zukunft. Deshalb auch an die Kommission und den Rat gewandt: Seien Sie doch konkret! Wo sind die konkreten Probleme? Wo fallen die Interessen auseinander? Sagen Sie, was in den zwei Jahren Übergangsphase passieren soll und was bereits vorher!

Als wären sie nicht mehr Mitglieder der Europäischen Union, reisen Delegationen von der Insel durch die Welt – auch in der letzten Woche beim WTO-Public-Forum – und versuchen, Freihandelsverhandlungen bereits vorzubereiten. Die Rechtslage des Verhandlungsverbots wird schlicht ignoriert. Jedem, der will, wird radikaler Freihandel angeboten. Das wirft Europa zurück, schreiten Sie deshalb ein! Denn unser künftiges Vertragswerk mit dem Vereinigten Königreich muss konstruktiv sein und unseren gesamten wirtschaftlichen und gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen im Rahmen einer Welt globaler Wertschöpfungskette einen Dienst erweisen und sie adressieren.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as we debate the Brexit negotiations here in Strasbourg, back in Manchester Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson is preparing to deliver his speech to his party conference. He encapsulates the disaster that Brexit is for my country. He was complicit in the biggest lie in the history of British politics and, with his Tory cronies, he has used Brexit as a power grab for himself.

In her Florence speech, Theresa May said that the United Kingdom has never felt totally at home in the European Union. Personally, I have never felt less at home in the UK since the vote to leave the EU. Such a sentiment is echoed by many people: by the majority of young people who still consider themselves European, by people living in our diverse and multicultural cities and, of course, by those European citizens who have chosen – for reasons of love, work or study – to make the UK their home. If Brexit is a divorce, then we are the children of the divorce and the process is a painful and troubling one.

(Applause)

Patrick O’Flynn (EFDD). – Mr President, the Commission’s attitude to the wishes of the British people to leave the EU has been a disgrace. You would apparently rather harm other European nations by placing trade in peril than meet your own obligations to be constructive. If you were truly confident about what the EU has to offer, you would be content to let go an unwilling participant in the process of ever-closer union, but instead you wish to punish us to discourage the others: Poles and Hungarians dismayed by migration bullying; Greeks and Italians disgusted by the consequences of monetary union.

Britain is holding out the hand of friendship, confident of its place in the world, connected to a Commonwealth and to an Anglosphere, as well as to European neighbours. You, by contrast, are the hollow men, afraid that our success will show up your failings. We will not be intimidated. We will not be deterred. Once again, we will set an example to Europe. We are going to show that being free, democratic and truly global can see a great future for our country.

Laurențiu Rebeca (ENF). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, Brexitul a creat un fenomen de dependență. Nu există sesiune plenară fără o doză de dezbateri despre această chestiune. Încerc să ies din logica grupurilor politice și să intru într-o logică normală. Prin activarea articolului 50, politicul a vorbit deja. Acum să lăsăm echipele de negociatori să își facă treaba. Dacă noi, Parlamentul, ne amestecăm în negocierile tehnice, Brexitul se va produce la calendele grecești. Or, interesul ambelor părți este ca despărțirea să se producă rapid și lin, fără să lăsăm schelete în dulap.

Pe de altă parte, subliniez că Brexitul produce un precedent nu numai prin ieșirea din Uniune, ci și prin faptul că, la un moment dat, orice stat poate să dorească acest lucru. De asemenea, orice stat care a ieșit, după un anumit timp, poate dori să se reintroducă.

Europa nu poate urma Statele Unite. Avem nevoie de un alt model, mai modern și mai dinamic. Uniunea Europeană va supraviețui și se va dezvolta numai dacă va înțelege că între central și local trebuie să existe un echilibru dinamic. Or, este clar că acum viteza cu care au loc schimbările depășește viteza procedurilor noastre, care sunt centralizate, greoaie și ineficiente.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, well it is certainly ‘bash-up the Brits day’, isn’t it? I would like to give the Parliament here a gold medal for political bullying, because that is quite frankly what we have heard so far.

A number of people have referred to the lack of clarity of documents coming from the United Kingdom. Can I remind everybody that there was an agreement between both parties to keep those details confidential, and it has taken individuals in this Parliament to divulge them and to criticise the United Kingdom for not being forthcoming. Well I have got more faith in my politicians that abide by confidentiality agreements than I have in a number of the individuals in the Parliament this morning.

One of my political colleagues back in the United Kingdom during the referendum campaign made a very, very strong statement, which is: ‘the United Kingdom should not be a star on somebody else’s flag’. It quite clearly appears to be that this Parliament wants to erase the United Kingdom from the flag but it wants to keep everything that the United Kingdom contributes, be it money, be it defence forces, be it knowledge – whatever it might be. Well, if you want that, go back to the negotiating rules. Go back and understand what negotiation actually means. It means giving a bit to get something back in return. You have not given one iota.

It is all very well holding 27 Member States together in terms of unity but, quite frankly, what we are seeing now is a facade and theatre from Parliament in terms of the negotiations. They are not serious and the sooner this country, the United Kingdom, leaves, the better.

(Applause from the right)

Presidente. – Onorevole James, per Sua informazione, le stelle sulla bandiera dell'Unione non rappresentano gli Stati membri.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, I speak as the Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, which in a year from now will be working, hopefully, on the consent procedure of this House.

Michel Barnier said in his introductory remarks that 15 days and one negotiation round separate us from an important meeting of the European Council that will debate and decide. That meeting will be a chance for the European leaders to take stock of the results so far and decide whether to expand the negotiating mandate, allowing for parallel discussions on the future agreement and the transition. But maintaining the new dynamics of the negotiation process depends heavily on whether the UK Prime Minister's speech in Florence will be translated into new negotiation positions and concrete proposals as soon as possible. Accelerating the pace of meetings has to go hand in hand with progress on content.

On content, I will make four points. We need reassurance on how the direct effect will work in practice. We need reassurance that bureaucratic burdens will be avoided. We also need to avoid the risks of incoherence and distortion in the interpretation of the withdrawal agreement, and we need to see respect for the fact that the situation of Northern Ireland is unique and deserves to be treated in a unique way.

We all want to reach that deep and special partnership that Ms May has called for and which is in the interest of all European citizens, but lack of progress now would delay the whole process of the negotiations. That is why achieving confidence now, and a shared understanding on the essential issues of the first phase, is of such importance.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anzitutto voglio dire che apprezzo la chiara indicazione del presidente Juncker che l'Unione europea deve andare avanti con il dibattito e le concrete proposte e iniziative per il futuro dell'Unione europea. E voglio dire ai colleghi inglesi: non è vero che vogliamo trattenerci; vogliamo semplicemente che ogni tanto oltre ad ascoltare voi stessi, ascoltiate anche gli altri, perché qui praticamente non avete fatto che ascoltarvi. Credo che il nostro negoziatore sia stato chiaro e apprezzo il lavoro che sta facendo.

Vorrei focalizzare il mio intervento su due punti: anzitutto, la questione dei diritti dei cittadini europei e britannici, compresi quelli dei figli nati dopo la Brexit o di eventuali nuovi matrimoni. L'accordo, anche se farà parte di quello generale di ritiro, com'è ovvio, prima saremo in grado di spiegarlo a questi cittadini e meglio sarà. Sono in attesa di capire meglio.

Il secondo punto è quello del *Good Friday Agreement*, che deve certamente essere rispettato per l'Irlanda: dobbiamo garantire la libertà dei cittadini irlandesi ma dobbiamo anche garantire l'integrità del mercato unico e in questo momento appare evidente che si tratta di due esigenze che sono contraddittorie, che a noi sembrano conciliabili solo se tutto il Regno Unito, almeno l'Irlanda del Nord, restano nell'Unione doganale e nel mercato unico.

Se esistono proposte diverse tocca al Premier britannico darne la dimostrazione, facendo proposte concrete. Su questi temi ci deve essere un accordo chiaro e preciso. Concludo, dicendo che periodo di transizione non può voler dire posticipare la soluzione dei problemi.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przemówienie pani premier Theresy May we Florencji obudziło nadzieję, że negocjacje z Wielką Brytanią wreszcie przyspieszą, a tego oczekują obywatele Unii. Propozycję okresu przejściowego oraz deklarację, że rząd brytyjski będzie nadal wnosił swój wkład do wspólnego budżetu na lata 2014-2020 należy ocenić pozytywnie.

Wydaje się, że także kwestia ochrony praw obywateli UE mieszkających w Wielkiej Brytanii znajdzie odpowiednie rozwiązanie. Teraz Unia powinna zrobić krok naprzód. Być może pan przewodniczący Juncker powinien wygłosić podobne przemówienie jak pani premier.

Zresztą my w Polsce ostatnio martwimy się bardziej o prawa naszych pracowników we Francji niż prawa Polaków zamieszkających w Wielkiej Brytanii. W ogóle paradoks tych negocjacji polega na tym, że rozmowa z Brytyjczykami o wolnym rynku i przepływie osób i ich praw toczy się w sytuacji, gdy w ramach Unii pod hasłem walki z dumpingiem socjalnym coraz wyraźniejsze staje się dążenie do protekcjonizmu wewnątrz UE.

Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE). – Hr. formand! I denne uge var der besøg fra København i London. Den danske erhvervs- og økonomiminister var af sted sammen med den danske nationalbankdirektør og med ham 20 CEOs fra de største danske finanshuse og pensionskasser. Hvad skulle de så i London? Ja, de skulle være med i kampen om at tiltrække nogle af de 30 000 finansarbejdspladser, som i øjeblikket er på vej ud af London til andre steder i Europa. Fra hele Europa – Tyskland, Frankrig, Holland, Sverige og alle andre steder – er finansbosserne nu i London for at finde ud af, hvordan de skal tiltrække alle disse mennesker.

Det lader til, at man nogle steder i Storbritannien har fundet ud af, at det er den gale kurs, man er på, og at man er ved at betale prisen for konsekvenserne af det, der foregår. I det halvandet år, der er gået siden brexit, er jeg blevet rystet over den forudsigelighed, hvormed man bevæger sig ud i sumpen fra britisk side. Jeg mangler stadig at høre, hvad den britiske regering vil stille op med de 759 aftaler med 168 lande uden for EU, som skal genforhandles. Hvordan i alverden har man forestillet sig, det skulle foregå og hvornår? Hvad regner man med, at der skal ske? Alle vi, der elsker Storbritannien, og som følger godt med, kan undre os over, at der er så meget kaos, og at man ikke snart finder ud af, hvad man skal stille op. Jeg håber på, at der snart indsniger sig en eller anden form for realisme i disse brexitforhandlinger, og jeg håber, at Storbritannien finder ud af det, så man kan komme i gang med noget realistisk og på den måde også kan få gang i de forhandlinger om fremtiden, som er så virkelig nødvendige for, at det britiske erhvervsliv og det britiske samfund ikke skvatter sammen.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o respeito pela decisão soberana e legítima do povo britânico de sair da União Europeia não é compatível com chantagens, ameaças ou punições. Os impasses e bloqueios das negociações resultantes de contradições do grande capital britânico e europeu não são alheios a uma agenda que visa perverter, contornar e, eventualmente, reverter a decisão do povo britânico.

O caráter neoliberal das forças em presença, a natureza da classe do poder em ambos os lados das negociações fica patente na intenção anunciada de manter e aprofundar políticas comuns, nomeadamente na vertente securitária, militarista e de resposta à crise dos refugiados.

Neste quadro é imprescindível afirmar a exigência de que os direitos dos imigrantes sejam assegurados nas negociações, incluindo os emigrantes portugueses no Reino Unido, os seus direitos laborais e outros direitos sociais, como o de residência, a igualdade de tratamento ou o acesso a serviços públicos, à portabilidade das prestações de segurança social, ao reagrupamento familiar ou ao reconhecimento mútuo de diplomas académicos e de qualificações profissionais.

Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I have to say that at some points this morning this debate has taken me back to my teaching days, where you used to get the occasional pupil who would behave so badly, as if they wanted to be thrown out of your lesson because they felt that way they were going to have an easy time and not have to do any work. I see some have bunked off early today.

So let's say here that this is a serious setup. It is a serious negotiation, and we do want an ongoing relationship. Some of us would like the same one, but that is not on the table. So we have to ask whether walking away actually makes this a serious relationship. And no, it does not. Aiming and continuing to say that no deal is better than a bad deal, or no deal is okay, is not a serious outcome. And does all of that show to other countries that you want to be a trusted partner in future negotiations? No, it does not.

Let's also be clear that paying what you promised to pay is not a punishment: it is also about keeping your word.

(Applause from the centre)

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Ik zou onze Britse vrienden willen waarschuwen voor wat er nu gaande is. Ze mogen niet onderschatten welke tegenstander ze tegenover zich hebben. Dat is een Europese elite die uit is op revanche, op weerwraak, op een soort van strafexpeditie; in ieder geval een strategie die tijd wint en die zorgt dat de *remain*-strategie wind onder de vleugels kan krijgen.

Dat is wat er gaande is en dat is de reden waarom deze hele procedure op dit ogenblik langzaam maar zeker in een soort van chaos wordt omgebouwd. De parlementaire procedure die hier wat mij betreft eigenlijk niks mee te maken zou mogen hebben – want het zou gewoon een afhandeling tussen twee executieve niveaus moeten zijn – maakt daar deel van uit.

Ik ken Verhofstadt al 35 jaar. Hij is de geknipte man om van die brexitprocedure een chaos te maken, met allerlei nevenpaadjes zoals het bedreigen van de burgers, het praten over geld en het praten over Noord-Ierland. Laat dat niet gebeuren. Zorg dat je een goed plan B hebt, zeg ik aan onze Britse vrienden: een goed plan B voor de onafhankelijkheid van uw land.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A brexit-tárgyalások során az Európai Unió elsődleges feladata a 27 tagállam érdekeinek képviselete. Mindenekelőtt az Egyesült Királyságban élő állampolgárok jogainak biztosítása a kölcsönösség alapján, valamint előnyös szabadkereskedelmi megállapodás megkötése.

A cél a rendezett megállapodással történő távozás. Ehhez azonban figyelembe kell vennünk az Egyesült Királyság méltányos érdekeit. Méltányosak vagyunk-e akkor, amikor elvárjuk, hogy a kilépés után is elfogadják az Európai Unió Bíróságának joghatóságát? Vajon méltányosak vagyunk-e akkor, amikor meg akarjuk tiltani minden előzetes kereskedelmi tárgyalás folytatását harmadik országokkal?

Mindezzel én az EU huszonhetek érdekeit képviselem, ugyanis, ha mi büntetni akarjuk a kilépésért a briteket, azért mert egyesek álmát szertefoszlatta az Európai Egyesült Államokról, akkor veszélyes útra tévedünk, mert nem lesz szervezett kilépés, nem lesz megállapodás, ennek pedig mindkét oldal vesztese lesz.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, this resolution merely states the obvious, that insufficient progress has been made on the three key issues before us. But I want to accentuate the positive, and I think Michel Barnier, Mr Verhofstadt and others have said that there are welcome developments in the British Prime Minister's speech.

Let me be very clear: on citizens' rights, we can make progress because we have to. We cannot let people down. Some of the banter in this debate will frighten citizens who are listening to it. So on that issue, let us make progress. On the issue of the financial settlement, there is a solution and that the UK will meet and honour its commitments. They are an honourable nation and I believe they will do that.

But let me be very frank. I am the first Member of the European Parliament from the Republic of Ireland to speak. I listened with great respect to my colleagues from Northern Ireland who spoke here. Nobody owns the peace process, but let us salute those who lost their lives for the peace process, those politicians and civil society actors on all sides who won peace so that my children do not see the violence of the past. Nobody, including this Parliament, wants to see that. But I would like to make this observation: we want things to remain the same as they are today on the island of Ireland after Brexit. That is why I say that we do need the United Kingdom to stay in the single market and the Customs Union. If that is not to be, then please tell me what will replace that. I want a solution. I am afraid I hear nothing from the UK side that will leave things as they are today, but we will welcome a proposal with open arms. Michel Barnier wants that too. In the negotiations, we will have to make progress on this issue. I cannot go back home to my constituents in Donegal, in Cavan, in Monaghan, in Louth, in Meath, in all of that constituency, and say that we are going to return to the borders of the past. I will not let that happen.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Es ist für uns alle von Interesse, dass die Brexit-Verhandlungen mit Konsequenz und Realitätssinn abgeschlossen werden. Viel zu lange ist eigentlich nichts substantziell weitergegangen, und das liegt vor allem an der britischen Seite. Jetzt scheint etwas Bewegung in die Sache zu kommen. Gut so! Die Menschen haben es satt, nur Reden zu hören – Ergebnisse sind notwendig. Bei aller Bereitschaft, Kompromisse zu machen, dürfen diese Kompromisse aber nicht zulasten von gewissen Problembereichen gehen.

Da sind zwei Eckpunkte zu nennen: Das ist einmal Irland. Wir brauchen keine neue Grenzen und kein Wiederaufleben der alten Konflikte. Vor allem aber geht es um die Millionen Unionsbürger im Vereinigten Königreich und Briten in der EU. Hier geht es um Menschen, die ihre Lebensplanung auf ganz anderen Grundlagen gemacht haben und die jetzt deswegen nicht benachteiligt oder gar diskriminiert werden dürfen. Vor allem darauf müssen wir uns konzentrieren.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik denk dat het heel belangrijk is dat we vooruitgaan met de brexitonderhandelingen. Onduidelijkheid creëert onzekerheid en dat is voor niemand goed: niet voor het Verenigd Koninkrijk, maar ook niet voor Europa.

Het is inderdaad belangrijk om duidelijkheid te hebben over de rechten van EU-burgers in het Verenigd Koninkrijk, over de financiële verplichtingen van het Verenigd Koninkrijk, over de grens tussen Noord-Ierland en de Republiek Ierland. Maar het is nog veel belangrijker om op het einde van de rit een goede brexitovereenkomst te hebben.

Daarom een warme oproep om de twee fasen niet te allen tijde op een kunstmatige wijze gescheiden te willen houden. Op het einde van de rit zal er één deal op tafel liggen en die zal ook niet uit twee delen bestaan.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, research has shown that in the event of a hard Brexit, the UK would lose half a million jobs whilst the EU would lose 1.2 million. Crucially, they say that these losses will not be evenly distributed, with Ireland being worst hit, suffering a relatively greater loss in both jobs and GDP than even the UK itself. This must be factored into any final outcome of the negotiations.

Largely, today's debate was positive, and just like the negotiations it must be about establishing a cooperative future – not about settling old scores, or, heaven forbid, opening new wounds. Today's resolution offers hope in the context of Northern Ireland, where it speaks of Northern Ireland staying in some form in the internal market and Customs Union. I believe the majority of people in Northern Ireland who voted to remain would support today's proposal, and it would fit in with Theresa May's proposal to exclude any physical infrastructure at the border.

Those who represent Northern Ireland must be clear: do they want a hardening of the border, will they accept a harder border, or do they support a unique solution for Northern Ireland that will avoid a hardening of the border, maintain the travel area and uphold the Good Friday Agreement?

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, od samého začátku jsme věděli, že jednání o odchodu Velké Británie z Evropské unie nebudou vůbec jednoduchá. Hlavním problémem však je, že EU nemá na druhé straně jednacího stolu rovnocenného partnera. Britská vláda se utápí ve vnitřních konfliktech a situace na britské politické scéně je velmi nepřehledná. Premiérka Mayová žádá po EU kreativní řešení, ale nepřináší nic na jednací stůl. Boris Johnson znovu opakuje lži o bájných 350 milionech a občané EU v Británii a Britové v EU se stále utápí v nejistotě, jak to bude po brexitu s jejich právy. Občané jsou zase jednou nuceni sledovat mocenské a stranické hry, které mohou mít zásadní dopady na jejich životy a budoucnost. Souhlasím, že je nutné se dohodnout, ale už je opravdu nejvyšší čas pro to to udělat. Občané nesmí být rukojmí a my nesmíme dopustit, aby se tak stalo.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, as a politician I understand that political negotiations take time, that legal studies need to be conducted, that there are political games being played, and maybe I even understand that one side of the House wants to make a circus out of this. But, as a citizen, I must admit I am still completely lost as to what the British Government actually wants out of these negotiations. And I think this is deeply worrying.

That is why I have two points to make to Theresa May, and I think she can clarify them tomorrow in her speech at the party congress: Finally, Madam Prime Minister, let us, and the millions of citizens who are waiting for this, know what the British Government actually wants out of these negotiations. And secondly – and this is also an important signal to send here from this European Parliament – never forget that there is still a way out of this mess. The strength of a leader is demonstrated not by stubbornness but by insight. You can still turn this around, Ms May. It is high time to do so!

Auke Zijlstra (ENF). – Het siert meneer Juncker niet dat hij nu net weggelopen is bij het debat, maar oké.

Voorzitter, ik ben vorige week in Engeland geweest en de EU heeft zich daar zó onmogelijk gemaakt dat niemand nog sympathie voelt voor Brussel. Premier May doet een keurig voorstel voor een permanente verblijfsvergunning voor iedereen die zich daar nu legaal bevindt en de EU wijst dat direct af. Ze stelde dat een redelijk bedrag betaald kan worden en de EU wil meer, meer, meer. Iedere vorm van onderhandeling over een toekomstig vrijhandelsverdrag wordt afgewezen totdat Londen zich onderwerpt aan deze afpersing.

Voorzitter, waar is onze eeuwige dankbaarheid voor het land dat de Duitse spijkerlaars heeft verslagen? Brussel wil het de Britse burgers ineperen dat ze iedereen hier diep hebben beledigd door te stemmen vóór het verlaten van de EU, alsof dat hoogverraad is. Brussel vindt het oké om een Brits referendum te frustreren. Morgen gaan we horen waarom Brussel het ook oké vindt om Catalaanse stemmers in elkaar te knuppelen. Voorzitter, het totale morele failliet van de EU kan deze week niet duidelijker zijn.

David McAllister (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Als jemand, der neben der deutschen auch die britische Staatsbürgerschaft besitzt, bedaure ich nach wie vor unendlich die Entwicklungen seit dem Mai 2016. Ich halte den Brexit für einen historischen Fehler mit schwerwiegenden Konsequenzen für das Vereinigte Königreich. Am Brexit ist nichts, aber auch gar nichts gut.

Aber der britische Weg – so irrational er auch erscheinen mag – ist natürlich zu akzeptieren. Und deshalb sollten wir nun – und dafür machen wir uns als Parlament heute einmal mehr stark – eine ordentliche und vernünftige Trennung und anschließend eine wegweisende Vereinbarung über unsere künftigen Beziehungen anstreben. Viele Vorredner haben bereits darauf hingewiesen: Ein ausreichender Fortschritt mit Blick auf die Scheidungsbedingungen ist bislang nicht festgestellt worden. Hier muss die britische Seite konkret liefern. Und auch, wenn durch die Rede in Florenz mancher Fortschritt erzielt worden ist, bleibt es Frau Mays Aufgabe, morgen auf dem Parteitag der britischen Konservativen etwas mehr Klarheit zu schaffen. Und dann müssen wir sehen, was in der nächsten Verhandlungsrunde beginnt. Ansonsten wird das im Oktober nichts werden, wie es bereits mehrfach angesprochen wurde.

Es liegt aber auch in unserem eigenen Interesse, dass wir die künftigen Beziehungen zum Vereinigten Königreich vernünftig organisieren und dass wir nach wie vor eine intensive wirtschaftliche und politische Partnerschaft pflegen werden.

Ich möchte abschließend ausdrücklich einen Dank an Michel Barnier und an sein gesamtes Team aussprechen. Ich glaube, viele von uns hier in diesem Hause haben das Gefühl, dass unsere europäischen Anliegen bei Ihnen, lieber Michel Barnier, in besten Händen sind.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Nach der Trennung der Beatles schrieb Paul McCartney den Song *Too many people*: „*That was your first mistake, you took your lucky break and you broke it in two.*“ Das passt zum Brexit. Die britische Regierung scheint es langsam zu begreifen: Ihr Referendum war ihr *first mistake*, und die Euphorie der Brexit-Anhänger – endlich *lucky break!* – ist längst verfliegen. *You broke it in two* – Konsequenzen folgen.

Die Unteilbarkeit von Binnenmarkt und Zollunion, bestehende finanzielle Verpflichtungen, volle Anerkennung des EuGH sind nicht verhandelbar. Es fehlt nach wie vor eine Garantie für Reziprozität, für Gleichheit und Nichtdiskriminierung der Rechte von EU-Bürgern in Großbritannien und von Briten in der EU. Und dies auch für die Kinder, die nach dem Brexit geboren werden, denn es darf keine Familienmitglieder erster und zweiter Klasse geben.

Frau May, Sie könnten sich verzoeken. Auch dazu ein Beatles-Song: *We can work it out* –vor der Trennung geschrieben: „*Think of what you're saying. You can get it wrong and still you think that it's alright. Think what I am saying, we can work it out and get it straight, or say good night.*“ Es ist Ihre Entscheidung.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Collega Verhofstadt heeft met anderen een resolutie over de brexit opgesteld en aan het begin van die tekst worden mooie woorden gezegd over de gezamenlijkheid van de EU en het Verenigd Koninkrijk. Bijvoorbeeld dat EU-burgers ook Britse burgers zijn en dat het Europees Parlement ook de Britse burgers vertegenwoordigt.

Vervolgens legt de tekst echter alle verantwoordelijkheid geheel eenzijdig bij de Britten. Zij moeten de rechten van de burgers volledig garanderen. De Britten dragen volledige verantwoordelijkheid voor de relatie tussen Noord-Ierland en Ierland, en de Britten moeten de betaling eerst volledig regelen.

Gebeurt dat niet, dan worden de onderhandelingen opgeschort. Geen woord dus over andere wederzijds gemeenschappelijke belangrijke onderwerpen, zoals handel en visserij. Slechts eenzijdige Brusselse eisen en die kunnen maar één doel hebben, Voorzitter: never nooit moeten de burgers van welke lidstaat dan ook het in de kop krijgen en er zelfs maar aan denken om uit de EU te willen stappen. Verhofstadt en de zijnen willen een vechtscheiding. Dat levert aan beide kanten slechts verliezers op.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, Ireland needs these negotiations to work out more than any other country. Diplomacy is a bit like dating. If you want it to succeed, you need to be careful what you say. One thing you don't say to your future partner if you want your relationship to work is that they would be a dwarf without you. That is what you said, Mr Verhofstadt, if you could come off your phone for a second.

Another thing you don't do is run down their family, no matter how bad their brother or sister might be, even if they have a lower of opinion of them, you don't run them down! Today, Manfred Weber did just that by demanding that Boris Johnson resign. I agree. I don't like him, but it is the British people's choice. You have made it harder today, Manfred!

Another thing you don't do with your date is tell them you are in a hurry. Jean-Claude Juncker, you said you would not have much time to spend on this. Another thing you don't do is make public what happens in the bedroom! You brought out what happened in private discussions.

We need this to work! We have been bitten by Europe on Lisbon and Nice and on bank debt. It is time to put your egos away, time to make this work, and time to stop insulting people that you ultimately want to work with you.

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, dans cette résolution, vous exigez des Britanniques le respect de la libre circulation des individus et le respect des décisions de la Cour de justice européenne. Nous l'avons compris, l'Union européenne veut faire payer ainsi au peuple britannique son désir légitime de liberté et de retour de sa souveraineté. Car, souvenons-nous de ce qui s'est passé: à peine l'article 50 du traité déclenché, nous avons assisté à une avalanche de sommations et de menaces de la part d'une Union européenne aux abois. En réalité, l'Union européenne a peur, peur de voir le Royaume-Uni mieux s'en sortir à l'extérieur de l'Union qu'à l'intérieur, ce qui, évidemment, pourrait inciter d'autres États membres à suivre cette voie vers la souveraineté nationale.

Les négociations sont un véritable chantage, un chantage insupportable, mais le Brexit aura eu au moins ce mérite: celui de montrer le vrai visage d'une Union européenne antidémocratique et incapable de respecter la volonté des peuples car on ne peut pas négocier avec un revolver sur la tempe.

György Schöpflin (PPE). – Madam President, anyone following the relationship between the European Union and the United Kingdom since the Brexit vote will be struck by a number of factors. First of all, why is everything in slow motion? The Brexit referendum took place well over a year ago, yet the pace of discussions has been glacial.

Second, the United Kingdom never seems to have believed that the EU 27 would preserve its unity. Indeed, the UK made a serious diplomatic effort to split that unity. This failed.

Third, the EU's position was made very clear indeed in the Council mandate and in the various statements by Michel Barnier. Despite the clarity, the message never seems to get through. The UK side, when it responds, does so in vague all too often unfocused language or makes complaints of inflexibility or punishment. Fourth, the discussion in the UK itself seems to be entirely unaware of what the EU is saying. It is as if the UK has become another planet.

From the outset, in the 1970s – and I was there – the UK never sought to understand what the EU was for. The attitude was entirely transactional. Equally England – and I mean England, and not the UK as a whole – has become intensely focused on itself, thereby making it very hard to see the EU as it is, a body of values.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, nous étions contre le Brexit, mais le peuple britannique a voté pour. Alors, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, jusqu'au 29 mars 2019, les Britanniques restent membres de l'Union européenne, et il est de votre devoir, en votre qualité de président de la Commission, de veiller à ce que la législation soit entièrement appliquée.

Tout d'abord concernant les droits des citoyens, qui, avant même la sortie du Royaume-Uni, sont trop souvent victimes de discriminations; concernant également la lutte contre la fraude à la TVA car, manifestement, le Royaume-Uni est devenu la plaque tournante d'une fraude générée par des importations en provenance de Chine; concernant enfin la situation à Gibraltar, qui semble être devenu une passoire pour les licences bancaires et les captives d'assurance.

Et puis, un nouvel élément est apparu récemment: la «phase de transition». Pour une fois, je vais vous surprendre, je suis d'accord avec M. Weber. Il ne faudrait pas que l'on ramène tout à cette phase de transition avant même qu'elle soit effective. La transition, nous y serons quand nous serons parvenu à un accord: 1) sur les conditions du divorce, et 2) sur les conditions de la relation future.

C'est le bon séquençage. Nous devons nous y tenir.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Юнкер, г-н Барние, колеги, хубаво е, че най-накрая виждаме известен прогрес в преговорите с Обединеното Кралство относно Брексит. В своята реч г-жа Мей показа готовността на Великобритания да продължи преговорите в духа на компромиса. Ако искаме да запазим близките си отношения с Обединеното Кралство след напускането на Европейския съюз, то е нужно възможно най-бързо да преминем към установяване пряко на споразумение, което да влезе в сила след Брексит. Това ще успокои хората, работодателите, икономиката и пазарите.

Вярвам, че никой не иска в Европа отново да се повторят икономическите трусове от последните години. Те са неминуеми, ако Европейският съюз не постигне добро, приятелско и разумно споразумение с Великобритания. Нека да спрем да говорим за това как Великобритания трябва да бъде наказана. Това отношение е неконструктивно и бих казал глупаво.

Очевидно Обединеното Кралство има добра воля да реши трите важни въпроса: правата на гражданите, ирландския въпрос и плащането на дължимото по договори с Европейския съюз. Не може да очакваме това плащане, ако няма добра сделка.

Искам да призова за рационалност, разум, запазване на добрите отношения. Великобритания трябва да остане най-добрият съюзник на Европейския съюз след Брексит.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, durante estos meses de negociaciones hemos visto diferentes posiciones, más o menos duras, pero lo que no hemos visto ha sido ningún avance. Se habla de unidad de Europa, de las empresas, de los derechos de los ciudadanos, pero, en todo este periodo, no se ha dicho nada, absolutamente nada, de los trabajadores, los grandes olvidados del *brex*it.

Pondré el ejemplo de los más de 12 000 trabajadores fronterizos españoles, que suponen el 27 % de la mano de obra de Gibraltar y cuyos puestos de trabajo están en peligro por la falta de concreción de su estatus futuro. En la zona existe una interdependencia social y económica que va a ser alterada, alterada, por supuesto, a peor, porque nada se dice en las negociaciones de cómo proteger el empleo y las condiciones de los trabajadores.

Todos los intentos por tener el *brexit* más beneficioso atienden a los intereses económicos de las empresas y los mercados y, una vez más, son los trabajadores los que se ven amenazados y desamparados, al ser la última prioridad en la mesa de negociación.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rok temu wydawało się, że referendum brytyjskie i jego następstwa to będzie problem egzystencjalny całej Unii Europejskiej. Zgłaszali się naśladowcy w innych krajach. Dzisiaj już widzimy, że szok brexitu zamienił się w swoistą terapię szokową dla Europy, bo odnowił wiarę Unii Europejskiej we własną przyszłość. Natomiast ujawnia się w całości problem, jaki mieszkańcy Wysp Brytyjskich zgotowali sami sobie. Można współczuć, ale nas interesuje przede wszystkim zabezpieczenie interesów Irlandii, naszych obywateli na Wyspach oraz projektowanie finansów przy niepewności, jaką stwarza brexit. Dlatego strategia realizowana przez Michela Barnier zgodnie z wytycznymi Rady i rezolucją Parlamentu ma sens – najpierw postęp w tych sprawach, a potem rozmowy o przyszłym modelu relacji między Unią Europejską i Wielką Brytanią. Ale nie ma tej przesłanki, jest chaos po drugiej stronie.

Chciałbym wyrazić swoje osobiste rozczarowanie. Mam prawo do tego wyrazu osobistego rozczarowania dlatego, że w komunistycznej Polsce w podziemiu, co rodziło pewne ryzyko osobiste, wskazywałem Wielką Brytanię jako wzór dojrzałej demokracji. Dojrzałej, czyli takiej, która jest odporna na demagogię i populizm. Niestety referendum brytyjskie było świadectwem nieprawdy (*fake news*) i stąd moje rozczarowanie, ale też cieszę się, że Unia Europejska jako całość odzyskała wiarę we własną przyszłość.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente Juncker, è stato evocato stamattina da più parti l'intervento che la Premier May ha tenuto nella mia città, Firenze, qualche giorno fa: mi lasci dire che nel discorso di Theresa May, a Firenze, di bello c'era solo Firenze e nessuna rassicurazione, almeno su alcuni punti importanti.

Primo: abbiamo sempre affermato che al rispetto degli accordi del Venerdì Santo debba corrispondere l'integrità del mercato unico e l'Unione doganale, evitando che si creino varchi, dai quali possano arrivare in Europa merci prive di alcun controllo, capaci di eludere i dazi doganali all'entrata; in secondo luogo, credo inoltre, che davanti alla richiesta, da parte del governo inglese di un periodo transitorio, l'Unione europea debba, sicuramente dimostrarsi disponibile. Ma un periodo di transizione non è un periodo senza regole e dovrà basarsi sull'insieme delle attuali norme dell'Unione europea, incluso il rispetto delle quattro libertà fondamentali.

Duemila anni fa, Seneca scrisse che «non esiste vento favorevole per il marinaio che non sa dove andare». Il tempo scorre e noi – e penso con noi anche i cittadini inglesi – vorremmo sapere qual è la rotta che la signora May vuole seguire.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Madam President, we have heard the usual ranting from UKIP and far-right colleagues fuelled by their diminishing testosterone levels. They state the obvious. They say they want a cliff edge, no deal and a complete withdrawal – what Kenneth Clarke called a calamitous act of national self-harm. Well, there is no surprise there: that's what they want. Be clear about that, colleagues. That's what they want.

But I don't want that, and let me assure you that that's not what a lot of British Conservatives want. We want to make progress. Ms May has signalled in Florence that she wants to move. Let's speed this process up. This Parliament can play an important role in moving the deal forward. We are experienced in negotiating; we are experienced in reaching consensus and compromise. I would like to make one point about this resolution, which is the one point I do not agree with. It is really important that this Parliament urges Mr Barnier, the Commission and the Council to move forward with a parallel negotiation on some of the issues that the UK is signalling are important, on the principle that no deal is agreed until everything is agreed. That would open up channels of communication that would show goodwill and the willingness to go forward without digging our heels in and being just as stubborn and just as awkward as those gentlemen that I mentioned earlier. I'm not with them; I'm with this parliament, and I think that we could play a useful role here. Let's get on and do so.

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, dans à peine 420 jours, la convention de divorce, négociée de main de maître par Michel Barnier, devrait être adoptée par les Vingt-Sept et votée par notre Parlement, qui aura le dernier mot.

Or, à 420 jours de cette échéance cruciale, que constatons-nous? Qu'une fois de plus, une classe politique britannique, qui n'est décidément pas plus à la hauteur des enjeux qu'elle ne l'est de son propre peuple, n'a pour seule préoccupation que son propre nombril. Son problème n'est pas l'avenir de la Grande-Bretagne, sinon celle-ci serait restée dans l'Europe. Son problème n'est pas non plus l'Union européenne, ni une supposée technocratie supranationale qui n'existe que dans leurs fantasmes. Non, la seule obsession de cette classe politique nombriliste et cynique est d'échafauder des plans pour conserver ou conquérir des majorités de circonstance au sein même de ses propres partis politiques. Peu importe si pour cela elle doit mentir, se renier et se trahir elle-même en excitant au besoin quelques dangereux populistes. Nous devons lui dire «stop»!

Ceux qui pensent, en Grande-Bretagne comme ailleurs, que l'avenir consiste à rejeter l'autre parce que l'on est trop riche pour être solidaire et trop fier pour être fraternel, trompent leur peuple. Car ce n'est pas plus de richesse ou d'indépendance qu'ils trouveront au bout du chemin, mais plus de pauvreté et d'isolement.

Chers collègues britanniques, il vous reste encore quelques jours pour avoir du courage et arrêter ce processus qui n'a aucun sens. Si vous n'avez pas ce courage, trouvez alors au moins celui de la clarté et cessez vos atermoiements dont vous êtes et serez les seules victimes.

In c'est in, et out c'est out.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Barnier, Herr Verhofstadt! Ich habe nun über 40 Verhandlungen mit dem Rat über Gesetzgebungen geführt und viele Handelsverträge begleitet, aber solche Zustände, wie wir sie in den Brexit-Verhandlungen erleben, habe ich noch nie gesehen. So unklare Positionen des Verhandlungspartners habe ich noch nie erlebt. Wenn ich mir den Parteitag jetzt in Manchester angucke – wem solch ich da zuhören? May, Johnson, Davidson, Mogg oder Hammond? Völlige Unklarheit, und das kann doch keine seriöse Grundlage für Verhandlungen sein! Wir brauchen Klarheit – intern für die Verhandlungen zwischen EU und Großbritannien, aber auch darüber hinaus!

Ich war letzte Woche in Genf die WTO-Partner gucken: Wir wollen wissen, wie es mit Großbritannien und der EU weitergeht. Wir brauchen auch hier Klarheit in einer Situation, wo das Welthandelssystem eh in einer destabilisierten Situation ist. Und wir brauchen auch für unsere Handelsverträge in Zukunft z. B. mit Australien Klarheit.

Also die dringende Bitte an die britische Regierung: Klarheit schaffen, damit wir auch weiter vorankommen können! Ich glaube, wir können wirklich Herrn Barnier, Herrn Verhofstadt für die gute Zusammenarbeit Danke sagen. Kooperativ und transparent – so arbeiten wir weiter!

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I too would like to thank Mr Verhofstadt and his team for his good work and for the resolution before us today, and also to thank him for coming to Ireland two weeks ago, where he was well received as was Mr Barnier when he came to the PPE Bureau meeting in May and went to the North to see the position of the border. Thankfully – and I appreciate this very much – there is a determination to maintain the provisions of the Good Friday Agreement, the special circumstances of Northern Ireland, and a seamless border.

Some progress has been made was in relation to a transition period. This has now been recognised, and I appreciate that. However, one thing I would say is that a transition period needs to be open-ended, with a target minimum length of maybe two years, without setting a maximum, because it is during that transition period that people will realise what Mr Barnier has said today and what has not been realised up till now: that the consequences, like the extraordinary complexity of the issue, have been underestimated. Given enough time, people will realise that, and then come to an arrangement that would be in the best interests of the EU and the best interests of the United Kingdom and of Ireland.

The other point I would like to make is that an awful lot of speeches, even here today, have to be taken with a pinch of salt, because they are aimed at constituents back home. This is grandstanding. We need less of the public speeches and more engagement where it matters most – around the negotiating table. I think that, over a period of time, around the negotiating table, trust can be built and we can come to conclusions that are satisfactory to everybody.

(Applause)

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señora presidenta, esta mañana hemos oído aquí un apoyo encendido por parte de Mister Farage al nacionalismo catalán, y creo que es un torpedo mortal a la causa independentista de Cataluña, porque no puede haber peor amigo, no puede haber peor apoyo en Europa y en el mundo al nacionalismo que el de Mister Farage, que el de la ultraderecha.

Señorías, Europa se construyó para superar las guerras entre nuestros países; Europa se construyó para superar los nacionalismos, y el *brexít*, como estamos viendo hoy en esta negociación, es la expresión de un nacionalismo viejo, es la pretensión de una independencia anacrónica. Hoy lo estamos viendo en una negociación que va a requerir de una transición muy larga —como ha pedido la señora May—, una transición que tenemos que negociar de nuevo.

Señorías, los referéndums de independencia los carga el diablo: son un barco lleno de problemas ciudadanos; son un barco que navega hacia ninguna parte, la mayoría de las veces.

La bandera del nacionalismo es la independencia, es la soberanía. Pero la soberanía, hoy, es Europa: una Europa más fuerte, más unida y más democrática, como dicen Juncker y Macron.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, I must say I deeply regret the decision of the UK to leave the EU. The UK in this way abandons a community of more than 500 million people, a community that has an essential role in the future of our continent and the world. The economic impact of that is just one small part of the problem, but it is an important one. Let me illustrate that in numbers: the UK, by leaving the single market, will make it complicated for its businesses to join and use the market of 450 million people, while the opposite way around this is just 65 million people.

In today's interconnected and highly effective world, any uncertainty means job losses, lower wages and budget and investment problems. Unfortunately, for the time being, it seems to me that we are not on the way to reducing this uncertainty. The reason is that while the EU 27 has quite a clear negotiating position, it seems to me that the UK side of the negotiation table is trying to square a circle. We know that squaring a circle is not possible, and we have known that for more than 100 years.

It is time to act. It is important that we can move forward, and the recent speeches by the UK Prime Minister show the possibility to get improvement, but they must understand that there are some limits and some conditions that must be fulfilled. This is the only way to reach progress and reduce the cost and uncertainty of Brexit. The cost will be there, but it depends on whether it is high or low. I hope it will be low!

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, (*fuori microfono*) almeno una parte di esso sembra capire o cominciare a capire che non si può avere accesso al mercato unico e insieme costruire muri contro i lavoratori comunitari; come dicono gli inglesi, non si può avere la torta e poi mangiarla.

Gli alfieri della Brexit, qui tutti scomparsi, fanno i conti con la realtà che sarà inevitabilmente dura per la Gran Bretagna e cambiano tono ma noi continuiamo sulla nostra strada: chiediamo a Theresa May concretezza e certezza sulle condizioni di recesso. Apprezzo completamente la posizione esposta stamattina dalla Commissario Barnier.

Il Parlamento lo deve dire chiaro: nessuna tattica dilatoria, nessuna transizione senza certezze. Non si gioca con la vita delle persone. Io penso che la vita dei cittadini non possa essere messa tra parentesi, per un certo periodo di tempo, in attesa magari di rimandare il momento in cui i politici conservatori britannici, che hanno spesso giocato per le loro reciproche posizioni di partito, saranno chiamati a rendere conto dei propri errori.

Il nostro non è un atteggiamento punitivo bensì è la voglia di arrivare a un risultato. Ma vedo invece oggi e sento dalle parole dei colleghi molta paura di rispondere delle conseguenze delle proprie scelte.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Madam President, I would first like to say one thing about a mistake we must not make here in this Chamber: Mr Farage and his friends might be British, but they are not the representatives of Great Britain.

(Applause)

Great Britain is much greater than that. They are loving the conflict and the tensions, and they are, for me, contradictory to what the United Kingdom is, and has been, for Europe. I think Brexit is a sad thing. It is not win-win; it is lose-lose. In the negotiations we need to be counterparts, but in the future we need to be partners. That means that this is time for negotiation more than agitation. We need the British Government to get its act together, and we need to secure the rights of citizens, secure a way to deal with the bill and proceed with the Irish issue. But in day-to-day life, regarding prosperity and our big challenges, we need to be serious about how we manage this divorce and create a new partnership.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Juncker, Herr Barnier! Im Frühjahr dieses Jahres hat OLAF, das Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung der Europäischen Union, einen Zollbetrug in Großbritannien aufgedeckt, der durch systematische Unterbewertung zustande gekommen ist. Der Schaden für unseren Haushalt – für den Haushalt der EU – beläuft sich auf knapp zwei Milliarden Euro, eine Summe, von der ich nicht weiß, ob sie in den Rechnungen der EU-Kommission über die Abschlusskosten des Brexits auftaucht, und einen zusätzlichen Schaden von 3,2 Mrd. EUR an entgangener Mehrwertsteuer für die Mitgliedstaaten. Der britische Zoll weiß das, und er tut nichts dagegen, denn er ist nicht in der Lage dazu. Er hat zu wenig Personal, und er hat die Anweisung seiner Regierung, den Fokus der Aufgaben auf eine andere Stelle zu richten., Ob den administrativen Empfehlungen, die OLAF ausgesprochen hat, nachgegangen worden ist, ist mir unbekannt; eine juristische Aufarbeitung findet nicht statt.

Vor diesem Hintergrund glaube ich, dass wir sehr hohe Aufmerksamkeit darauf richten müssen, wie die Kontrollen an der irischen Grenze organisiert sind. Wir können nicht hinnehmen, dass die Integrität der Europäischen Union und der Zollunion durch schlampiges Verhalten des britischen Zolls beeinträchtigt werden. Ich bitte Sie, an dieser Stelle hohe Aufmerksamkeit zu haben und Garantien einzufordern, damit uns nicht weiter passiert, was uns zurzeit passiert, denn der Skandal dauert an.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, it has been six months since Article 50: six months in which substantial progress could have been made on citizens' rights, on the financial settlement, and on the Irish border issue; six months that could have paved the way for a meaningful conversation about our common future; six months in which bridges could have been built between those who voted to leave and those who would have preferred to remain.

But all we have seen in the past six months is chaos: a Prime Minister who is so preoccupied with her own position that she cannot focus on these negotiations; a Foreign Secretary who is the main cause of the Prime Minister's preoccupations; a House of Commons leader who said yesterday that the UK will take back control of its borders, its money and its laws in 2019, denying the idea of a transition period; David Davis, who first agreed to the sequencing of negotiations, but now cannot stop complaining about it; Michael Gove, who is too busy selling pigs' ears to China to make any meaningful contribution to the process; and then Nigel Farage stands here in this House and demands a meaningful, intelligent conversation while even he himself has said that, if he does not Brexit his way, he will be forced to pick up a rifle. Well, good luck having an intelligent conversation with someone like that.

So please, our friends in London, be serious. Get your act together. Stop your party political games and come to the table as a serious, united and credible negotiating partner. All our citizens deserve that.

(Applause)

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, por razões que, em larga medida, se ficaram a dever a erros sucessivos na política económica e na gestão da crise dos refugiados da União Europeia, uma maioria dos eleitores do Reino Unido decidiu deixar esta União. A concretização dessa decisão legítima tem que ser conduzida com toda a transparência. Proteger os direitos dos cidadãos europeus e o futuro do projeto europeu no quadro dos Tratados é a prioridade absoluta.

Portugal tem uma longa tradição de cooperação bilateral com o Reino Unido. Essa cooperação sempre se pôde desenvolver no quadro da pertença comum à União Europeia. Autonomia, identidade e cooperação são pilares que não se anulam, mas antes se valorizam entre si. Uso o meu país como exemplo para tornar mais clara a mensagem que devemos deixar clara na resolução do Parlamento Europeu.

Queremos continuar a cooperar com o Reino Unido. Nada nos move contra o seu povo. Mas devemos fazê-lo no quadro da integridade das instituições europeias e dos seus valores e princípios. Com calendários transparentes e claros. Com garantias de total respeito pelos direitos dos cidadãos europeus que vivem no Reino Unido. Assegurando a indivisibilidade e a proteção da coerência e da integridade do projeto europeu. Queremos, em síntese, um projeto europeu que continue forte e aprenda com a experiência do BREXIT para não voltarem a ser cometidos os erros que a ele nos conduziram.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, έφτασε η ώρα να αναπτύξουμε πρωτοβουλίες για να είναι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μετά το Brexit ισχυρότερη και ελκυστικότερη. Χρειαζόμαστε μια σοβαρή συζήτηση για την αύξηση των ιδίων πόρων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και για τη χρηματοδότηση νέων πολιτικών. Και μη μου πείτε ότι οι φορολογούμενοι των χωρών σας δεν θέλουν να χρηματοδοτήσουν ευρωπαϊκές πολιτικές, γιατί θα σας απαντήσω ότι τα ίδια έλεγε ο David Cameron και είδατε τι έπαθε! Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι το City του Λονδίνου θα παραμείνει και μετά το Brexit ένα ισχυρό χρηματοπιστωτικό και ναυτιλιακό κέντρο. Έχουμε υποχρέωση όμως να ενισχύσουμε τη συγκριτική μας θέση στη Φρανκφούρτη, στο Δουβλίνο, στο Παρίσι και στον Πειραιά, ειδικά σε ό, τι αφορά την εμπορική ναυτιλία. Να συνδυάσουμε, λοιπόν, την πολύ καλή διαπραγμάτευση από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που βρίσκεται σε πλήρη εξέλιξη, με την οργάνωση ενός καλύτερου μέλλοντος για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση των 27.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hace ya dieciséis meses que los británicos decidieron salirse de la Unión. Quienes gestionaban a esa salida soñaban con una estrategia *cherry picking*: escoger las cerezas que les gustaran. Soñaban con que, al otro lado, en la Unión Europea, habría división e intereses contrapuestos, pero la realidad, hoy, es que donde hay confusión y división es en la parte británica y aquí hemos sido capaces de mantener la unión en torno al proceso de negociación.

La Resolución de este Parlamento subraya el apoyo de esta Cámara a la estrategia negociadora del señor Barnier. Me sumo a quienes han visto esta mañana con sorpresa como el líder del UKIP y el líder del grupo del Frente Nacional apoyaban con entusiasmo la estrategia independentista de Cataluña. Solo quiero recordar que tomen nota de que se trata de dos partidos, dos movimientos supremacistas, entre cuyos objetivos fundamentales está sacar a sus países de la Unión Europea, esa unión que los otros veintisiete queremos mantener y reforzar.

Christofer Fjellner (PPE). – Fru talman! Ingen borde förvånas över att de här förhandlingarna om en skilsmässa mellan EU och Storbritannien går uselt. För det är en konstig skilsmässa. Ingen kommer ju att flytta. Det kommer att förbli 32 kilometer mellan Dover och Calais. Vår framtid och vårt öde är och förblir sammanflätat. Storbritannien kommer fortfarande att bo kvar, men har liksom sagt att man vill flytta ner i källaren, kanske bo på soffan.

Jag har här i parlamentet under 13 år följt handelsförhandlingar. Det här är egentligen precis samma sak, men tvärtom. För i handelsförhandlingar är alla vinnare. Man avskaffar handelshinder och gränser som alla tjänar på, oavsett vem som ger med sig. Men här gör vi motsatsen. Här förhandlar vi om vilka handelshinder och gränser vi ska resa – en förhandling där alla blir förlorare. Frågan är bara hur mycket. Och det vet vi inte, för Storbritannien har ju faktiskt ingen aning om vilka handelshinder eller gränser man vill införa.

Men för att lyckas måste vi alltid ha samma sak: ett tydligt mandat och en bred politisk uppslutning. Där är EU ett föredöme. Vi har ett solklart mandat och den bredaste totala uppslutningen, men Storbritannien måste ta sig samman. För man är inte ens överens i regeringen om vad man vill åstadkomma, och än mindre verkar det tydligt att man har parlamentet eller folket med sig. Ta sig samman!

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, le droit des citoyens et la question irlandaise sont parmi les deux préoccupations essentielles.

Il faut souligner ici, et c'est une surprise, la faiblesse du gouvernement britannique qui ne semble ni savoir ce qu'il veut, ni assumer le résultat d'un référendum qu'il a pourtant voulu. C'est la faiblesse d'un gouvernement désuni, au sein duquel Boris Johnson, irresponsable enfant gâté, continue de sévir.

L'attitude de M. Farage tout à l'heure, qui parle de l'Espagne pour éviter le débat, est inqualifiable. Son succès électoral, il ne sait pas l'assumer, parce qu'il a plongé son peuple dans le désarroi et l'inconnu. Le peuple britannique mérite mieux.

Quant à vous, Monsieur Barnier, Monsieur le négociateur en chef, je vous félicite de préserver l'unité de l'Union européenne et de privilégier l'intérêt des citoyens, ce qui devrait être la préoccupation principale de tout responsable politique.

Continuez dans cette voie, car vous êtes vraiment, comme on dit à Londres «*the right man in the right place*».

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, sobre o Brexit, três notas breves sobre a clareza, sobre as pessoas e sobre a celeridade.

Clareza: estamos atrasados. O artigo 50.º foi acionado há mais de seis meses e não há verdadeiros progressos nas negociações. Este impasse não aproveita a ninguém. Há mais tempo para discursos mediáticos do que para apresentar propostas concretas. Ouvimos Theresa May em Florença, mas continuamos a ignorar propostas concretas consequentes.

Sobre as pessoas: há cinco milhões de cidadãos com o futuro hipotecado. Europeus que vivem no Reino Unido e britânicos que escolheram outro dos 27 países. 400 mil portugueses vivem num limbo inaceitável. É urgente que o Reino Unido se comprometa com a salvaguarda dos direitos dos cidadãos europeus residentes. Violar o direito da União de forma mais ou menos camuflada e retirar direitos seria intolerável.

E sobre a celeridade: por isso é tão importante decidir e decidir agora. Para preservar os direitos de todos os cidadãos europeus e trabalhar para uma transição tranquila. Isso implica a aplicação do acervo comunitário assente nas quatro indissociáveis liberdades de circulação. Precisamos de um bom acordo e o relógio está a contar.

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Fru talman! Som många påpekat idag är det olyckligt att den fjärde förhandlingsrundan inte har resulterat i tillräckliga framsteg vad gäller medborgarnas rättigheter, situationen i Irland och Nordirland och Storbritanniens ekonomiska förpliktelser inom EU. Därför är det bra att vi kräver konkreta framsteg på dessa områden. Men samtidigt: Varför talar vi om britterna som ett enigt kollektiv som har gjort ett välinformerat val när de röstade ja till Brexit? Vi vet ju att det inte är så.

Själv känner jag i likhet med exempelvis kollegan Lavrilleux stor sorg över att britterna sannolikt lämnar. Jag minns också vad Michel Barnier sa när ni inledde ert arbete: "Se upp med hatet", sa ni. "Det kommer att dyka upp efter ett tag." Så låt oss alltså hålla en anständig ton, samtidigt som vi kräver resultat i förhandlingarna.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Barnier, έξι μήνες μετά την ενεργοποίηση του άρθρου 50 της Συνθήκης για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η πρόοδος είναι ισχνή, αλλά η σύγχυση γύρω από την πορεία του Brexit μεγάλη. Η ασάφεια στη σχέση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου υπονομεύει την προοπτική της και, κυρίως, δεν εξασφαλίζει τα συμφέροντα των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. 3,2 εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες ζουν σήμερα στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, εκ των οποίων 63.000 είναι Έλληνες. Είναι υποχρέωσή μας να τους παράσχουμε ασφάλεια άμεσα, ενσωματώνοντας όλα τα δικαιώματα που απολαμβάνουν, χωρίς να υπάρξει ουσιαστική μεταβολή στη θέση τους για εκείνους και τα παιδιά τους.

Στο πεδίο του οικονομικού διακανονισμού είναι απαραίτητο να επιτύχουμε συμβιβασμό το ταχύτερο δυνατόν. Υπάρχουν χώρες όπως η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, που εξαρτούν σε ένα μεγάλο βαθμό την οικονομική τους ανάπτυξη από τη χρηματοδότηση από τον κοινοτικό προϋπολογισμό. Υποχρεώσεις που ανελήφθησαν από 28 κράτη μέλη δεν μπορούν να εκπληρωθούν από τα 27 και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο πρέπει να τηρήσει στο ακέραιο τις δημοσιονομικές υποχρεώσεις που έχει αναλάβει. Αλλιώς, τον λογαριασμό θα τον πληρώσουν οι πιο αδύναμοι και ανάμεσα σε αυτούς είναι και οι Έλληνες.

Τέλος, ενόψει της απόφασης του Συμβουλίου τον Νοέμβριο του 2017 για τον προσδιορισμό των εδρών των ευρωπαϊκών οργανισμών που εδρεύουν στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, θα ήθελα να επαναφέρω εδώ ενώπιον της Ολομέλειας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, ενώπιον των αντιπροσώπων όλων των κρατών μελών, το αίτημα της Ελλάδας για τη φιλοξενία της έδρας των Ευρωπαϊκού Οργανισμού Φαρμάκων στην Αθήνα. Διαθέτουμε τις υποδομές, μπορούμε να εξασφαλίσουμε στις οικογένειες των 900 εργαζομένων πρόσβαση σε πολύγλωσση εκπαίδευση, μπορούμε να συνεισφέρουμε σε τεχνονομία. Σας καλώ να δώσουμε αυτή την ευκαιρία στην Ελλάδα, στέλνοντας ένα ηχηρό μήνυμα ίσων ευκαιριών στην Ευρώπη μετά το Brexit.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, in Florence, Prime Minister May gave the best Remain speech never held. Ms May touched on a range of extremely important issues – terrorism, climate change, the refugee and migrant crisis, global free trade, organised crime and territorial aggression – issues so challenging, so dangerous and so complex that we can only solve them together. To put it bluntly, one could paraphrase Ms May’s speech like this: ‘you need now, more than ever, to work together – so I am leaving!’

Ms May was very concrete on what she does not want. She does not want a Norway model and she does not want a Canada model, but what does the British Government want? Nobody knows! All we get from Ms May is a desire, and I quote from the speech, for ‘a bold, new strategic, comprehensive framework that is unprecedented in breadth’. That sounds like something out of ‘Yes, Prime Minister’. Did Sir Humphrey write the Florence speech, one could ask?

How can we negotiate a workable Brexit agreement if the UK Government cannot state clearly what they want? Please, Prime Minister May: wake up, speak up! You owe it to your citizens.

(Applause)

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte am Ende der Debatte noch einmal klarstellen, dass dieses Parlament heute mit breiter Mehrheit eine EntschlieÙung beschließen wird, die eine logische Folge des Beschlusses über die Verhandlungsposition des Parlaments vom April dieses Jahres ist. Wir beschließen diese EntschlieÙung deshalb mit großer Einigkeit, weil wir Verhandlungen wollen, weil wir berechenbar und entschlossen sind, eine klare Position haben. Diese EntschlieÙung ergreift Partei – Partei für die Bürger, Partei für den Friedensprozess in Irland, Partei für die Steuerzahler, Partei für unsere rechtlichen, politischen und moralischen Verpflichtungen. Das muss die Grundlage von Verhandlungen sein, weil wir uns unseren gemeinsamen Werten, dem gemeinsamen Recht und den gemeinsamen Zielen verpflichtet fühlen.

Alle jene schreien heute, die das nicht wollen, sondern die sich immer auf die Seite der Verletzung des Rechts, des Nationalismus, des Extremismus und der Verlogenheit als politisches Instrument von Taktik und Strategie gestellt haben. Die Mehrheit dieses Parlaments steht auf klaren Grundlagen. Man weiß, woran man ist, wenn man mit uns verhandelt.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Muszę przyznać, że w pełni solidaryzuję się z tym, co usłyszałem i w jakiej formie usłyszałem – powiedziane tym spokojnym tonem – od pana Michela Barnier, i również od Guy Verhofstadta. Przyznam się, że dawno nie słyszałem Guy Verhofstadta bez teatralnych gestów, i to jest właśnie bardzo dobre. Dwie zasady, o których Panowie powiedzieli, a które mnie szczególnie przekonują: po pierwsze, byłe państwo członkowskie Unii Europejskiej nie jest państwem członkowskim Unii Europejskiej, po drugie, ludzie są najważniejsi, czyli my chcemy traktować bardzo życzliwie i normalnie obywateli Zjednoczonego Królestwa w Unii Europejskiej, pod warunkiem że będzie wzajemność – i to podejście również bardzo mi odpowiada.

Chciałbym też zwrócić Państwa uwagę na sprawę studentów wyższych uczelni. Otóż dotychczasowe zapisy przewidują, że po brexicie nie będziemy uznawać dyplomów w sposób automatyczny. Namawiam, abyśmy uznawali dyplomy brytyjskie, a także aby dyplomy wyższych uczelni, stopnie i tytuły uzyskane w Unii Europejskiej były uznawane w Wielkiej Brytanii.

Derek Vaughan (S&D). – Madam President, some in the UK Government want to blame the EU for the lack of progress in negotiations, but of course it was the UK Government who, knowing the consequences, triggered Article 50 – and now, six months after triggering Article 50, the UK Government still doesn’t know what it wants. It is spending all its time negotiating, or rather fighting, with itself; it is an embarrassment to watch. It can’t agree amongst itself what it wants from the divorce settlement, from transitional arrangements or from a future relationship with the European Union. And as they squabble, companies in the UK go bust or look to relocate elsewhere, and people are losing their jobs. Day after day now, we hear bad economic news, and as they squabble things get worse and worse. It really is about time the UK Government pulled itself together: they should be clarifying their position and negotiating properly. They should be accepting the view of the Scottish and Welsh Governments that the UK needs to be in the single market and the customs union for the transitional period, and indeed permanently. For once, the British Government should put the country first, before the party.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pan Michel Barnier stwierdził, że oprócz uregulowań finansowych, kwestii irlandzkiej, to tak naprawdę prawa kilku milionów obywateli są tutaj najważniejsze, i one są głównym aspektem prowadzonych negocjacji. Za chwilę przyjmujemy rezolucję, która, niektórzy mówią, że jest twardą rezolucją, ale im więcej informacji dociera do tych wielu milionów obywateli, tym więcej jest pytań o ich przyszłość. Dotyczy to również moich rodaków, Polaków, których wielu mieszka w Wielkiej Brytanii. To jest kwestia prawa do pobytu, warunków, które winni spełnić, kwestia uprawnień socjalnych, również emerytalnych, zasad, które dotyczą przemieszczania się osób po brexicie – te pytania są związane z troską, czy będzie równe traktowanie obywateli, wielu pyta również o kwestię łączenia rodzin.

Ostatnie deklaracje pani premier May są obiecujące. Z drugiej strony Wielka Brytania jest ważnym partnerem i chcemy to tak widzieć również po brexicie, bowiem jest partnerem w NATO, sąsiadem w Europie, zatem konieczny jest w tych negocjacjach również wzajemny szacunek, ale ważna jest też treść tych negocjacji, ostateczny wynik korzystny dla Unii Europejskiej.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, ni este Parlamento Europeo ni los ciudadanos de los 27 - Estados miembros votaron el *brexit*: lo hizo una exigua mayoría de ciudadanos británicos; y solo entonces se pone en marcha el equipo negociador —dirigido por el señor Barnier, con el apoyo de este Parlamento Europeo— para velar por los derechos de los ciudadanos europeos, por la integridad de las cuatro libertades —tal y como están interpretadas por la jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia— y por la justicia en el reparto de los costes. Esta es la posición de la Unión Europea.

Pero del lado británico solo vemos confusión; y hemos visto deportaciones; y hemos visto la división social, generacional y territorial, la fractura de la propia sociedad británica. Ese es el resultado de un referéndum en el que se han salido con la suya el nacionalismo reaccionario y la demagogia populista azuzada por la extrema derecha, cuyos discursos infames hemos soportado, una vez más, en esta Cámara.

Y esos son los fantasmas contra los que nació la Unión Europea; esos son los enemigos a los que se enfrenta la Unión Europea y a los que tenemos el deber de derrotar. Y nos vamos a asegurar de que lo haremos.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dovoľte mi na začiatok povedať, že práve teraz je čas na spoluprácu a hľadanie prienikov. Spojené kráľovstvo a Európska únia musia nájsť vhodnú cestu pre odchod z Európskej únie. Žiaľ, tento návrh uznesenia diktuje Spojenému kráľovstvu, ako má napredovať. Napríklad pán Verhofstadt odmietol ďalší dialóg, kým pani premiérka nepríde s finančnou ponukou. Ale nevie pán Verhofstadt, že pri akomkoľvek vyjednávaní prehráva ten, kto prvý udáva cenu? Všetci vieme, že živobytie mnohých Britov v Európe a tiež občanov EÚ v Spojenom kráľovstve je ohrozené. Aj pre viac ako deväťdesiat tisíc Slovákov v Spojenom kráľovstve, ktorí tam žijú, je potrebné zabezpečiť dodržanie ich sociálnych práv vrátane možnosti bývať na britskom území s celými rodinami. Slováci popri iných Východoeurópanoch prispeli k životnej úrovni Britov a nesmú byť len tak odložený nabok. Som presvedčený, že moji britskí kolegovia budú vo svojich rozhodnutiach prezieraví a múdri, pretože akýkoľvek rozvod je drahý, bolestivý a zanecháva jazvy. Napriek odchodu by sme sa mali naučiť spolu vychádzať ako bratské národy a príkladom by mohlo byť rozdelenie Československa v roku 1993.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, estas negociaciones certifican que ni los defensores del *brexit* ni el Gobierno del Reino Unido creyeron nunca que los británicos decidiesen abandonar la Unión Europea. Ahora hay que asumir lo decidido y aparecen la improvisación y la melancolía. Por eso, antes que nada, hay que persistir en negociar rápidamente las condiciones del divorcio, incluido el coste de la factura, priorizar el debate sobre los derechos de la ciudadanía y blindar el trabajo por la paz realizado por la Unión Europea en Irlanda del Norte. Mostrar, en definitiva, lo mejor de la Unión; asentar la mejor convivencia posible por separado en el futuro; y, quién sabe, ofrecer argumentos para regresar a la vida en común.

Toda una lección sobre lo que aporta a la Unión y sus valores el derecho a decidir. Aclara a quienes se van el alcance real de su decisión; obliga a quienes nos quedamos a insistir en lo que nos une: un espacio de derechos, libertades y prosperidad; una unión voluntaria, construida desde abajo, suma real de toda nuestra diversidad, capaz de representarnos como agente global, que nunca se nos ocurriría imponer a porrazos, porque convence. Y, en un escenario así, nuestro futuro —como ha dicho Juncker— es la unión, no el *brexít*.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I have been listening to this debate with extreme attention. I am not a specialist in divorce issues, as I have been living with my spouse almost as long as the UK has been in the EU and we do not have any thoughts of breaking up. However, the key to a harmonised and hateless divorce lies on the basis that both sides recognise their mistakes and do not blame it all on the other side. In my opinion, there is space for improvement in that respect on both sides of the British Channel. Finally, I would ask the British Conservatives: please do not hire Boris Johnson as your defence lawyer, because he is so untypical of the British people: a man with no good manners.

(Applause)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διαδικασία της αποχωρήσεως του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να γίνει με τρόπο πολιτισμένο, ανάλογο του κύρους των δύο μερών. Από την πλευρά της, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν πρέπει να επιδεικνύει εκδικητική διάθεση, διότι οι πολίτες της Μεγάλης Βρετανίας αποφάσισαν να αποχωρήσει η χώρα τους από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αλλά και η κυβέρνηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου δεν πρέπει να χρησιμοποιεί ως ομήρους τους υπηκόους των υπολοίπων χωρών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως που ζουν και εργάζονται εκεί, απειλώντας να καταστρέψει τη ζωή των ιδίων και των οικογενειών τους.

Θα συμφωνήσω με τη θέση του κυρίου Verhofstadt ότι πρέπει στο Μπέλφαστ να γκρεμιστούν οι φράκτες που χωρίζουν κάποιες συνοικίες της πόλεως. Αυτό πρέπει να γίνει, διότι η κατάσταση αυτή είναι απαράδεκτη. Είναι όμως, εξίσου, απαράδεκτο να διατηρείται η πράσινη γραμμή στη Λευκωσία, την πρωτεύουσα της Κύπρου, τμήμα της οποίας κατέχεται παράνομα από την Τουρκία. Πρέπει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση –γιατί και αυτή ευθύνεται για αυτή την απαράδεκτη κατάσταση–, να λάβει τα μέτρα της ούτως ώστε να πιεστεί η Τουρκία και να λήξει αυτή η απαράδεκτη κατάσταση, η οποία μειώνει το κύρος της πολιτισμένης Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se domnívám, že Evropský parlament dnes musí vyslat jasný signál jako odpověď těm občanům, kteří žijí v nejistotě. Ať už je to 3,2 milionu občanů z členských zemí, kteří žijí na území Spojeného království, nebo naopak občanů Spojeného království, kteří žijí na území členských států, kterých je 1,2 milionu.

Říkáme, že přechodné období je možné, ale musí mu předcházet dohoda o všech zásadních otázkách a po tuto přechodnou dobu budou platit *acquis communautaire*. Tedy Evropská unie dokazuje svoji akceschopnost a reakci na zásadní problémy, zatímco Spojené království nemá jasno. Myslím, že to je také jasný signál populistickým a separatistickým snahám v jiných členských státech. Na závěr chci říci, že brexit je pro mne zklamáním, o to více se musíme snažit, aby naše vztahy do budoucna byly co nejlepší, abychom dokázali spolupracovat, je to závazek vůči těm, kteří hlasovali proti brexitu.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, doresc de la bun început să subliniez că susțin rezoluția și felicit grupurile politice care și-au asumat o asemenea revoluție. Vin dintr-o țară care are îngrijorări privind situația cetățenilor săi care trăiesc în Marea Britanie. Problematika eventualei introduceri de către Marea Britanie a vizelor pentru cetățenii din țara mea ulterior datei retragerii Marii Britanii din UE, constituie un subiect major pentru mine și țara mea.

Discriminarea unor cetățeni europeni, oricare ar fi naționalitatea lor, este de neacceptat. De aceea, felicit că în rezoluție avem acest cuvânt magic: „reciprocitate”. Trebuie să asigurăm un tratament egal, de reciprocitate. Aceasta trebuie să fie condiția de bază alături de plata în 28 a tot ce s-a cheltuit din bugetul Uniunii Europene și nu în 27. Felicit raportorii – decizia de a părăsi Uniunea Europeană are un cost și acest cost trebuie suportat și de cel care și-a asumat decizia, nu numai de cei cărora, oricum, le-a creat probleme de reorganizare.

Este păcat însă că suportă acest cost și cetățenii care nu au votat Brexitul. Ar fi foarte interesant ca Marea Britanie să aibă un referendum în cunoștință de cauză după ce se negociază în Brexitul.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση για το Brexit αναδεικνύει τα θεμελιώδη στοιχεία λειτουργίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το δικαίωμα αποχώρησης ενός κράτους μέλους από την Ένωση είναι αδιαπραγμάτευτο. Είναι κυρίαρχο δικαίωμα ενός κράτους μέλους να φύγει. Οι διετείς διαπραγματεύσεις έχουν ως στόχο να διευκολύνουν την ενάσκηση αυτού του δικαιώματος και όχι να παρακωλύσουν το δικαίωμα εξόδου. Εδώ γίνεται μια προσπάθεια, από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, να τεθεί σε ομηρία ένα κράτος μέλος το οποίο επιθυμεί να αποχωρήσει. Γίνεται ουσιαστικά προσπάθεια διάσπασης αυτού του κράτους μέλους, καθώς δίνονται δικαιώματα στη Βόρειο Ιρλανδία να παραμείνει μέλος της Τελωνειακής Ένωσης. Επίσης, δίνεται δικαίωμα στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αποφασίζει και για το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο μετά την αποχώρησή του. Νομίζω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να επικεντρωθεί στη διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των πολιτών της Ένωσης που βρίσκονται στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, μεταξύ των οποίων πάνω από 63.000 Έλληνες συμπολίτες μας.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Michel Barnier, négociateur en chef pour le Brexit. – Monsieur le Président, au terme de ce débat dense, vif et long, mes premiers mots seront pour remercier le Parlement européen de ses nombreux témoignages de soutien au travail que j'ai l'honneur de conduire avec la confiance du président Juncker, des services de la Commission, et en confiance avec votre propre équipe, celle de Guy Verhofstadt et tous les membres du *Brexit Steering Group* du Parlement européen et des présidents de groupe.

Nous avons besoin de ce soutien et de cette confiance, et aussi de cette unité dont fait preuve le Parlement, dans sa très grande majorité. Au terme de ce débat durant lequel je vous ai tous écoutés avec attention et en m'excusant de ne pas répondre, comme je le fais habituellement, à chacune et à chacun d'entre vous, je voudrais dire brièvement quelques mots.

D'abord, je voudrais dire clairement à beaucoup de ceux qui se sont exprimés, qu'il y a deux mots que je ne peux pas accepter, car ils ne correspondent nullement, ni à mon état d'esprit, ni à mon attitude. Ce sont les mots de revanche et de punition.

J'ai pour le Royaume-Uni, depuis très longtemps, une très grande admiration. Je rappelle même souvent qu'en 1972, pour mon premier vote en tant que jeune citoyen français, j'avais alors 21 ans, j'ai fait campagne en faveur du référendum organisé dans mon pays pour l'adhésion du Royaume-Uni, de l'Irlande, du Danemark et de la Norvège. Cela n'a pas été facile pour le jeune membre du parti gaulliste que j'étais à l'époque, et je n'ai jamais regretté ce vote. J'ai pour votre pays, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés du Royaume-Uni, une très grande admiration et jamais, au grand jamais, vous ne trouverez dans mon attitude le moindre esprit de revanche et la moindre intention de punition. Jamais!

(Applaudissements)

Monsieur Farage, il y a un autre mot que je n'accepte pas et que vous avez prononcé à nouveau, qui est celui de rançon. Il n'y a pas de rançon, il n'y a pas de facture de sortie. Il y a simplement le fait qu'au moment où vous décidez de partir, nous vous demandons de solder les comptes. Ni plus, ni moins! De payer ce à quoi vous vous êtes engagés!

(Vifs applaudissements)

J'ajoute que ce point est important si nous voulons, comme vous l'avez vous-même souhaité, bâtir dans l'avenir une relation différente, mais solide et durable, en matière de commerce, en matière de protection de la sécurité, de lutte contre le terrorisme et de défense. Nous avons besoin de confiance entre nous pour une relation durable dans l'avenir. La clé de cette confiance est aussi que vous acceptiez objectivement de solder les comptes.

Il y a quelque chose que vous avez dit, les uns et les autres, que je ne comprends pas. C'est l'idée que le négociateur européen que je suis ou l'Union européenne voudrait faire traîner les choses ou voudrait vous retenir, qu'elle jouerait la montre. Mais, Mesdames et Messieurs, le référendum au Royaume-Uni a eu lieu le 23 juin 2016. Nous avons reçu la lettre de Theresa May notifiant cette volonté de retrait le 30 mars 2017. Nous avons, en raison des élections au Royaume-Uni, attendu la fin juin 2017 pour commencer cette négociation. Nous ne jouons pas la montre. Vous avez pris le temps. Nous respectons ce temps, mais franchement je ne peux pas accepter ce reproche.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Nous sommes même prêts, et je suis prêt, à accélérer et à intensifier le rythme des négociations autant que nous le pourrons.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, il y a quelques points que je voudrais télégraphiquement qu'on comprenne bien ou qu'on comprenne mieux.

Le Royaume-Uni a décidé de quitter l'Union européenne. C'est son choix souverain. Il quitte en même temps, selon ce que dit le gouvernement britannique, «le marché unique et l'union douanière», après 44 ans d'intégration. Je recommande que personne, vraiment personne, ne sous-estime la complexité, les difficultés juridiques, humaines, sociales, économiques et financières de cette décision. Je recommande également que chacun de ceux qui ont pris cette décision accepte d'en assumer les conséquences.

(Applaudissements)

Deuxième point, nous respectons le choix souverain des citoyens britanniques. Nous mettons en œuvre le retrait que vous avez choisi. Nous voulons que ce retrait soit ordonné, et pour beaucoup de raisons je pense qu'il vaut mieux que vous quittiez l'Union européenne le 30 mars avec un accord plutôt que sans accord. Il en va de l'intérêt commun. Nous respectons ce choix, mais nous vous demandons de respecter l'Union européenne. Nous vous demandons de respecter le fait que nous serons intransigeants sur l'intégrité du marché unique, le respect des règles de fonctionnement et l'autonomie de décision de l'Union européenne. Le Brexit ne peut pas avoir des conséquences payées par les contribuables de l'Union européenne. Le Brexit ne peut pas avoir pour conséquence de fragiliser le marché unique et les quatre libertés qui en font intrinsèquement partie.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Enfin, nous aurons les uns et les autres, et vous-mêmes Mesdames et Messieurs les députés comme élus des peuples, des comptes à rendre aux citoyens, qui sont notre priorité, s'agissant de leurs droits. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aux contribuables. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aux entreprises. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aussi à ceux qui ont construit depuis 60 ans cette Union européenne et dont nous sommes les cogarants et les coresponsables.

Je veux simplement que les comptes que nous allons rendre au terme de cette négociation, Mesdames et Messieurs, soient des comptes justes et vrais.

Je ne reviendrai pas sur les différents points de la négociation qui sont en suspens. Nous avons accompli des progrès, clarifié beaucoup de points. Je dis que l'intérêt général requiert d'avancer par étapes. Nous avons peu de temps entre aujourd'hui et octobre ou novembre 2018 pour aboutir à ce traité sur le Brexit, c'est-à-dire sur le divorce ou le retrait ordonné, et le cas échéant, puisque cela a été demandé par le gouvernement britannique, sur une éventuelle période de transition dont les conditions ont été clairement encadrées par votre résolution d'avril dernier et par les lignes directrices du Conseil. Ce sera une période courte, encadrée, pendant laquelle nous maintiendrons, parce que c'est notre raison d'être, la totalité de l'architecture de régulation des conditions budgétaires, juridiques et le rôle de la Cour de justice. C'est votre demande que d'avoir cette période de transition courte, c'est notre droit de dire qu'elle se fera dans les conditions qui sont celles du marché unique.

Nous ne sommes pas surpris par cette demande de transition, nous l'avions prévue, nous en discuterons le moment venu, et j'aurai besoin d'un mandat pour le faire.

Je précise aussi simplement à l'intention de M. Farage un point juridique. L'accord commercial que vous souhaitez ne peut pas être signé avec un État membre de l'Union. Il faut que vous soyez juridiquement sortis, que vous soyez en dehors, pour que nous signions cet accord.

Mesdames et Messieurs, nous garderons tout au long de cette négociation qui continue, l'espoir que le ton constructif, adopté par Theresa May dans son discours de Florence, sera maintenu et consolidé, et que nous pourrons dès la semaine prochaine accomplir de nouveaux progrès.

Pour ce qui me concerne, dans la responsabilité qui m'a été confiée, avec votre confiance et votre soutien, tout au long des mois à venir, je ferai en sorte que les négociations restent dignes, calmes et fermement attachées aux principes de l'Union européenne.

(Applaudissements vifs et prolongés)

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi.

Angelo Ciocca (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chiedo davvero un attimo di attenzione, è un intervento importante. In Tunisia, esattamente nel porto di Sfax, si sta consumando il rapimento di due cittadini europei, di due cittadini italiani che si chiamano Giacomo e Salvatore, due cittadini che sono detenuti sul loro peschereccio sequestrato dal governo tunisino da ben 18 giorni: 18 giorni senza cibo, senza energia elettrica e a Salvatore mancano ormai i medicinali.

Chiedo davvero, in nome del rispetto dei pescatori, del lavoro, della libertà, di aiutare Salvatore e Giacomo a rientrare in Europa, a rientrare in Italia.

Presidente. – Avvertirò immediatamente il Servizio esterno perché si possano intraprendere tutte le iniziative utili quanto meno in relazione alla fornitura di medicinali a uno dei due cittadini europei che sono detenuti dalla Tunisia.

Mi auguro che si possa arrivare quanto prima alla loro liberazione. Appena uscito dall'Aula chiamerò il Servizio esterno in modo che si possa avviare immediatamente un'iniziativa da parte europea.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE), in writing. – Negotiation efforts between the EU and the UK seem to be stagnating. It has become apparent, now more than ever, that there is a great need for clear political direction from the UK and for a sense of partnership between the two parties. To my mind, the most important aspect of the negotiations is the status of European citizens living in the UK – especially that of Romanian nationals – which must be clearly defined so as to avoid the risk of confusion with non-EU migrants. Moreover, the UK must honour its promise to continue its financial contributions to the EU budget until the end of this financial year (following rule n+3). I am delighted to see that, given the circumstances, the EU is speaking with one voice, highlighting the coordination and collaboration among all the leading EU players.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los negociadores de la UE y el Reino Unido no han logrado progresos suficientes en las áreas clave, condición necesaria para comenzar las discusiones sobre la futura relación bilateral. Valoramos positivamente las clarificaciones de la primera ministra británica, Theresa May, en su reciente discurso en Florencia, pero seguimos pidiendo propuestas concretas para: garantizar en su totalidad los derechos que disfrutaban actualmente los 4,5 millones de ciudadanos de la UE y el Reino Unido, respetar los compromisos financieros asumidos por el Reino Unido con la UE, y resolver la cuestión fronteriza entre Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, en línea con el acuerdo de Viernes Santo. Además, para dar por concluida la primera fase de negociación es necesario que se garantice el respeto a la legislación comunitaria hasta el momento de la salida oficial del Reino Unido de la Unión. La votación de esta sesión plenaria confirma la unidad del Parlamento junto a las otras instituciones comunitarias.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D), *írásban*. – Több mint hat hónapja tartanak a Brexit tárgyalások, de még mindig nem látszik tényleges előrelépés. A brit miniszterelnök firenzei beszéde adott némi lendületet a tárgyalásoknak, de még mindig jelentősek a nézetkülönbségek. Különösen igaz ez a mintegy 3 millió, az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU állampolgárok ügyében.

Szaporodnak azok a jelek, amelyek arról tanúskodnak, hogy a brit hatóságok már jelenleg is hátrányosan megkülönböztetik az EU-s állampolgárokat. Éppen ezért támogatom az Uniónak azt a javaslatát, amely szerint az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU-s állampolgárok, illetve az EU-ban élő brit állampolgárok kollektíve kapjanak azonos jogokat. Vonatkozik ez a családegyesítés, valamint a már korábban megszerzett jogok fenntartására is. Ez a megoldás jelentős mértékben javítaná az Egyesült Királyságban élő, az ott dolgozó magyarok helyzetét is.

Hiszen az Orbán kormány semmit nem tesz ezeknek az embereknek az érdekében, magukra hagyta őket. Nemcsak szavazati jogaik gyakorlásában korlátozza őket, hanem szociális biztonságukkal sem törődik. Számunkra azonban az Egyesült Királyságban élő honfitársaink ügye fontos, meghatározó európai kérdés. Csak akkor fogjuk megszavazni a brexit-tárgyalások eredményeit, ha azok egyértelműen megvédik az állampolgári jogokat, s biztosítják honfitársaink már megszerzett jogait.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los negociadores de la UE y el Reino Unido no han logrado progresos suficientes en las áreas clave, condición necesaria para comenzar las discusiones sobre la futura relación bilateral. Valoramos positivamente las clarificaciones de la primera ministra británica, Theresa May, en su reciente discurso en Florencia, pero seguimos pidiendo propuestas concretas para: garantizar en su totalidad los derechos que disfrutaban actualmente los 4,5 millones de ciudadanos de la UE y el Reino Unido, respetar los compromisos financieros asumidos por el Reino Unido con la UE, y resolver la cuestión fronteriza entre Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, en línea con el acuerdo de Viernes Santo. Además, para dar por concluida la primera fase de negociación es necesario que se garantice el respeto a la legislación comunitaria hasta el momento de la salida oficial del Reino Unido de la Unión. La votación de esta sesión plenaria confirma la unidad del Parlamento junto a las otras instituciones comunitarias.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Brexit-neuvottelut ovat edenneet ristiriitaisten viestien saattamana ja moni asia on edelleen auki. Tosiasia on, että Britannia voi lähteä unionista ilman varsinaista erosopimusta, sillä sopimuksen Euroopan unionista (SEUT-sopimus) 50 artiklan mukaisesti pelkkä ilmoitus riittää. On näin ollen kaikkien EU-maiden ja kansalaisten intressissä, että erosopimus syntyy.

Britannian pääministeri May on todennut, että on parempi lähteä ilman sopimusta kuin huonon sopimuksen kanssa. EU:n tulisi pyrkiä välttämään sopimukseton tila, sillä se vaikeuttaisi mm. ulkomaankauppaa ja kansalaisten asemaa. On selvää, että Britannia edellyttää erosopimuksen lisäksi kattavaa vapaakauppasopimusta. Parasta olisikin pyrkiä neuvotteiluissa nopeasti eteenpäin ja varmistaa, että kaikkia osapuolia hyödyttävä vapaakauppasopimus voi syntyä. Näin on mahdollista saavuttaa erosopimus, jonka pohjalta Britannia vastannee taloudellisista velvoitteistaan pidemmän aikaa. Mikäli kustannuksia tulisi lisää siksi, että Britannia ei vastaisi velvoitteistaan maaliskuun 2019 jälkeen, olisivat seuraukset kaikkien jäljelle jääneiden EU-maiden veronmaksajille kohtuuttomia. Olennaista on varmistaa, että brexitin jälkeen EU:n budjetti myös pienenee samassa suhteessa kuin brittien osuus on ollut maksuista. Lisäkustannuksia EU:n nettomaksajille kuten Suomelle ei saa syntyä.

Monika Smolková (S&D), písomne. – Pri rokovaniach EÚ s Veľkou Britániou má rozhodujúce slovo aj EP, ktorý je aj priebežne informovaný o stave rokovaní. To dáva záruku transparentnosti a v konečnom dôsledku aj schválenia zmluvy, ktorá bude po vystúpení Veľkej Británie z EÚ dávať záruky všetkým 3,2 milióna občanom EÚ, ktorí žijú alebo pracujú vo Veľkej Británii, všetky práva a povinnosti také, aké mali pred brexitom. Týka sa to aj 1,2 milióna občanov Veľkej Británie, ktorí žijú alebo pracujú v niektorom členskom štáte EÚ. Oceňujem prácu komisára p. Barniera, ktorý sa veľmi dôsledne zhostil úlohy hlavného vyjednávača. Vyjednávanie zmluvných podmienok, za akých Veľká Británia vystúpi z EÚ, nie je jednoduché, pretože brexit má vážne dôsledky ľudské, sociálne, hospodárske a finančné. Medzi hlavné témy pri vyjednávaní sa tiež musí dostať aj otázka Írska a Severného Írska, kde osobitné okolnosti je potrebné zahrnúť do zmluvy o vystúpení, aby sa nezaviedli pevné hranice, aby bol zachovaný mierový proces a aby platila Veľkopiatočková dohoda. Ako najťažší bod v rokovaniach sa javí finančné vyrovnanie, pri ktorom EÚ chce, aby Veľká Británia splatila všetky svoje záväzky, ku ktorým sa zaviazala pri schvaľovaní viacročného finančného rámca na roky 2014-2020. V konečnom dôsledku nemôže 27 členských štátov doplatiť na rozhodnutie jedného členského štátu, ktorým bol brexit.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), na písme. – Kolejná runda negocijci medzi Komisją Europejską a Wielką Brytanią zakończyła się 28 września. Pomimo iż po wystąpieniu premier Wielkiej Brytanii Theresy May we Florencji dało się odczuć nową dynamikę rozmów i przebiegały one w konstruktywnej atmosferze, postęp nadal nie został uznany za wystarczający. Wielka Brytania zgodziła się nadać „bezpośredni skutek” umowie o wyjściu z UE. Daje to więcej pewności i stabilności obywatelom UE w Wielkiej Brytanii. Jednak nadal pozostają rozbieżności w zakresie jurysdykcji Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości. Konieczne jest także przedstawienie klarownego stanowiska Wielkiej Brytanii w zakresie pełnego wywiązania się ze zobowiązań finansowych wobec UE.

Nierozwiązana pozostaje także m.in. kwestia uznawalności wykształcenia. A jest to szczególnie ważne, ponieważ dotyczy tysięcy młodych osób, zarówno obywateli Wielkiej Brytanii, jak i UE. Studenci, którzy rozpoczynają naukę przed dniem wyjścia Wielkiej Brytanii, muszą mieć pewność, że mogą ukończyć kurs na tych samych warunkach, na jakich go rozpoczęli, oraz że nadal będą mieli dostęp do pożyczek studenckich i innych form wsparcia finansowego na takich samych warunkach. Dodatkowo studenci, którzy rozpoczynają naukę muszą mieć pewność, że uzyskane kwalifikacje zostaną uznane zarówno w UE, jak i w Wielkiej Brytanii, a po ukończeniu kursu zachowają takie same prawa pobytu w Wielkiej Brytanii, jakie przysługiwały im przed dniem wyjścia.

4. Stemmingen

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

4.1. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017) (stemming)

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK

Vizepräsidentin

President. – Dear colleagues, before proceeding to the votes, allow me to make a short personal statement. Some of you know that I am the leading candidate for the Austrian Greens in the snap elections on 15 October. This means that I will be leaving this Parliament. It also means that this is the last time I will chair the votes with you as your Vice-President.

(Loud applause)

I would like to thank you for these eight years in which I have been working with many of you in this Parliament, sharing this spirit of cooperation rather than confrontation that unites us, or at least the majority of us here, and also for the three years as one of your Vice-Presidents. They have been very good years for me, and I promise you I am taking this European spirit that I have experienced here with me to our national debates and to the Austrian parliament.

I am also looking forward to working with you in the future in a different function, because we need strong national parliaments as well as a strong European Parliament. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

4.2. Beperking van het gebruik van bepaalde gevaarlijke stoffen in elektrische en elektronische apparatuur (A8-0205/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (stemming)

4.3. In het verdragsgebied van de ICCAT geldende beheers-, instandhoudings- en controlemaatregelen (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (stemming)

4.4. De economische empowerment van vrouwen in de particuliere en openbare sector in de EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh) (stemming)

— *After the vote:*

James Carver (EFDD). – Madam President, I apologise to my colleagues, but my voting system seems to be breaking down. It is not often, as my colleagues can appreciate, that I vote in favour of something in this place, but it would be quite nice to be able to do so on occasion when I wish to. Could one of the technicians look at it in the break? It is very sticky and static, and it needs sorting out.

4.5. Het aanpakken van de steeds beperktere ruimte voor het maatschappelijk middenveld in ontwikkelingslanden (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (stemming)

4.6. De strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi) (stemming)

4.7. De politieke betrekkingen tussen de EU en ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer) (stemming)

President. – That concludes the vote.

5. Stemverklaringen

5.1. Stand van de onderhandelingen met het Verenigd Koninkrijk (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, although we saw some openings in the Prime Minister's speech in Florence, many key issues remain to be solved. The most important among them is the question of the Irish border. I am from the Western Balkans myself and I know perfectly well that a hardening of the border will lead to tensions and nationalist sentiments. We cannot pretend that the whole solution to the problem is to promise not to have a physical border. In Bosnia there are no physical borders, but nationalism and tensions certainly do exist.

In order to prevent it, you need to make sure that no new mental, cultural and religious borders are established, and that demands much clearer thinking than has been the case so far. Therefore, the message that we send here is very clear: the time for political games should be over. It is crucial for Prime Minister May to translate her commitments into tangible actions. We need to move forward before the tensions and conflicts arise. The citizens of Northern Ireland need clarity, action and responsible leaders.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, 'we do not know' I said in answer after answer at an event I spoke at about Brexit recently. It didn't make for a very interesting or illuminating evening, but the crippling uncertainty is playing havoc with the British economy. Every sector that I speak to has their own Brexit problem: ground-breaking research that relies on cross-border data flows, imports and exports at our ports, or the freedom of movement of Newmarket's race horses. Today's debate shows what everyone knows. The talks are not going well, and that is hardly surprising when we have a cornered Prime Minister more worried about negotiating with her own cabinet than engaging constructively in the Brexit process.

As a remainer, I have no doubt that Britain will emerge from all of this weaker, poorer and more isolated. Today, this Parliament has sent another warning siren. So I say to the British government: with a bumpy landing ahead why, oh why, do you choose to deliberately fly through turbulence?

(Applause)

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az Egyesült Királyságban körülbelül félmillió magyar ember él, többnyire gazdasági kényszerből. Az ő segítségüket szeretném kérni a jelentés hatodik paragrafusával kapcsolatban, amelyet megszavaztam egyébként, és amelynek tartalma az, hogy az Egyesült Királyságnak tartózkodnia kell mindennemű adminisztratív, vagy más gyakorlatról, amely többek között a munkahelyükön akadályozza, vagy hátrányosan megkülönbözteti az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU-27 tagállamok polgárait.

Kérdezem a magyar honfitársainktól, természetesen mindannyian azt szeretnék leginkább, hogy minél előbb jöjjenek haza, de ameddig ez nem történhet meg, tájékoztassanak e-mailben, levélben arról, hogy melyek ezek a gyakorlatok, hátrányosan megkülönböztető gyakorlatok, milyen problémáik, milyen nehézségeik akadnak a munkahelyen, vagy más-
hol, a közigazgatásban vagy egyéb helyen a brexit-folyamat óta.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, may I just thank you for your service to Parliament and wish you well as you go to fresher pastures.

Briefly on Brexit: 557 Members supported this resolution. I think what it says very clearly is that this Parliament wants to see progress. I hope that the vote and the strength of the resolution will urge the UK side, in particular, to come forward with a much stronger and clear negotiating position, because every day there are new nuances to the Brexit story. There are problems and concerns about child protection laws around the border, about the supply of medicines to citizens, about health care and about all sectors of society. Therefore, we need progress on the withdrawal agreement before we can move forward to the next phase and I hope today's vote will nudge those at the negotiating table to make that progress.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, Ujedinjena Kraljevina bila je važan motor u ekonomskoj liberalizaciji Europe i stvaranju pretpostavki za uspostavu jedinstvenog tržišta u punom smislu riječi. Njezino vodstvo u uklanjanju suvišne regulative, micanju barijera i otvaranju naših tržišta te jasan zagovor nacionalnog suvereniteta i načela supsidijarnosti nedostajat će ovoj Zajednici.

No, Britanci su jasno izrazili svoju volju da napuste Europsku uniju i na nama je sada da taj proces prođe uz što manje problema za građane i tvrtke s obje strane Kanala.

Гласооала сам против ове Резолуције јер непотребно препоруџује додатно комплицирање овог ионако комплицираног развода. Парламент се не би требао превише мијешати у преговоре о Brexitу, него то препустити Комисији и Вијећу.

У противном ће преговори постати још сложенји с наше стране јер се ближе европски избори, а наши будући блиски односи с Уједињеном Краљевином не смiju бити жртва популизма и политиканства.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το Brexit είναι ένα χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα για το πού μπορούν να οδηγήσουν οι εθνολαϊκιστές μια χώρα, όσο ισχυρή και αν είναι. Η Μεγάλη Βρετανία προχωράει τώρα σε αχαρτογράφητα νερά. Δυστυχώς, έξι μήνες μετά την έναρξη των διαπραγματεύσεων δεν έχει σημειωθεί επαρκής πρόοδος. Τη θέση αυτή εξέφρασαν τόσο το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο όσο και η Επιτροπή. Η Μεγάλη Βρετανία δεν έχει αποδεχθεί τη διατήρηση των δικαιωμάτων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών που κατοικούν εκεί. Πάνω από τρία εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίοι, εκ των οποίων πολλές χιλιάδες Έλληνες, ζουν, σπουδάζουν και εργάζονται στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο. Δεν μπορεί αυτοί να πληρώσουν τους τακτικισμούς του κυρίου Cameron. Πολλοί από αυτούς έχουν εγκατασταθεί εκεί, έχουν κάνει οικογένειες, είναι πλέον το σπίτι τους. Δεν μπορούμε να αλλάξουμε τη ζωή τους. Δεν μπορεί να τους χρησιμοποιεί η βρετανική κυβέρνηση ως μοχλό πίεσης στις διαπραγματεύσεις. Δεν μπορεί να τους εκφοβίζει στέλνοντάς τους, κατά λάθος, χαρτιά απέλασης. Οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες που κατοικούν στην Αγγλία θα πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να απολαμβάνουν τα ίδια δικαιώματα που τους εξασφαλίζει σήμερα η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία. Τίποτα λιγότερο δεν μπορεί να γίνει αποδεκτό από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, на референдум, на който голяма част от британското общество беше подведено с едностранни и недоказани твърдения с гласовете на малко над един милион граждани, започна период на несигурност и на политически сътресения във Великобритания. За съжаление това се пренася към Европейския съюз.

Близо 5 милиона граждани ще бъдат директно повлияни от решението на Великобритания да напусне Европейския съюз. Тук говорим за близо 3,6 милиона европейски граждани, от които 200 хиляди български граждани във Великобритания и над 1,2 милиона британци в Европейския съюз.

Смятам за фрапантно липсата на резултат, вече над шест месеца след обявяването на напускането на Великобритания на Съюза, относно правата на всички тези граждани. Смятам за безотговорни спекулациите на някои британски политици, че Великобритания маже да напусне Съюза без да уважи финансови задължения, направени години преди референдума.

Несигурността, която произлиза от решението за напускане, не трябва да бъде транспонирана върху европейските производители и земеделци. Затова подкрепих тази резолюция.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ho votato a favore della risoluzione perché ritengo che il Parlamento debba con forza proseguire nei negoziati, per far sì che il Regno Unito rispetti i termini e le condizioni per uscire dall'Unione, a ormai un anno e mezzo dal referendum. Ritengo, infatti, che allo stato attuale i progressi risultino davvero poco evidenti.

Credo che l'Unione europea non possa invece permettersi né incertezze, né insicurezze. L'Europa deve continuare ad agire e a garantire la salvaguardia dei cittadini europei che oggi vivono oltre Manica: sono più di 600.000.

Ritengo, infine, di dover sottolineare che la Gran Bretagna debba mantenere fede agli impegni finanziari, laddove invece essa presenta un notevole deficit commerciale con l'Unione europea. Su questo e su altri punti chiave dell'accordo restano divergenze e incoerenze, che vanno al più presto affrontate.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se domnívám, že je důležité, že Evropský parlament přijal toto usnesení, dokonce s velkou podporou, když pro něj hlasovalo 558 poslanců a poslankyň. Je to důležité, protože EP se nakonec bude vyjadřovat k výsledné dohodě mezi Evropskou unií a Spojeným královstvím. Je to tedy důležitá informace o politické shodě na dalším postupu při vyjednávání.

Usnesení velmi správně akcentuje práva občanů EU ve Spojeném království a jejich zajištění je jedním z hlavních úkolů, které jako Unie máme před sebou. Do těchto úkolů bezesporu patří také zachování britské účasti v programech, jako je Erasmus+ a Horizont 2020. Je to v zájmu občanů jak EU, tak Spojeného království. Také zcela souhlasím s přístupem, který ve zprávě je zvolen, co se týká Severního Irsku. Je nutné, aby hranice na irském ostrově zůstala i po brexitu otevřená, a pokud to tak má být, rýsuje se možnost, že by Severní Irsko samotné bylo součástí celní unie a vnitřního trhu.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D). – Madam President, there are more than 3 million EU citizens residing in the United Kingdom and more than one million citizens of the United Kingdom residing in the EU. They are all asking the same question: what will happen to me, to my family, to my job, to my business, to my studies? People are right to be worried about the future, because they do not really know what will happen come Brexit day.

Moving to another country is a major decision, usually based on the rights that they would have in that country. That is why maintaining the whole set of EU rules on citizens' rights, with the full application of the four freedoms and without imposing unnecessary hardship on the citizens of the EU living in the United Kingdom and vice versa, is the main prerequisite for the success of these negotiations.

The work of this Chamber determines the fate of over 4 million citizens, and that is why we first need to defend people's interests, and that is why I voted in favour of this resolution.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, I echo the sentiments of colleagues wishing you the best in your future endeavours: you have always tried to chair with impartiality, and for that I thank you.

Article 8 of the Lisbon Treaty is all about neighbourliness and cooperation. That is the spirit in which the Brexit negotiations should be conducted, and a bit of give-and-take would be great, but it seems it is all give from Theresa May and all take from Michel Barnier.

This resolution is a shopping list: the EU's goals on the Northern Ireland border but nothing on Gibraltar's. No one wants a hard border, but effectively this place are the ones raising the possibility. Do we want reciprocal rights for EU citizens in the UK and vice versa? Of course we do, but please do not gold-plate it to your children and children's children.

This sufficient progress test is nothing more than an unnecessary hurdle designed to throw a spanner in the works. This intransigence will not help Britain, it is true – but it will not help the EU either. Theresa May should fight fire with fire and act with boldness, not cowardice.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałem przeciwko i chciałem zwrócić uwagę, że Brytyjczycy dlatego wyszli z Unii Europejskiej, że nie lubili praw rządzących Unią Europejską. W związku z tym jeżeli będziemy się domagali, żeby pewnych ludzi, którzy są pod władzą brytyjską, obowiązywało prawo europejskie, to efekt będzie dokładnie odwrotny. Przypominam, że nawet taki zbrodniarz jak Lenin mieszkał spokojnie w Londynie, mimo że nikt: ani Rosja, ani Europa, ani Niemcy, ani Francja nie domagały się, żeby Wielka Brytania traktowała go uczciwie. Dlatego też moim zdaniem trzeba zostawić tę sprawę Brytyjczykom, bo każde mieszanie się w to spowoduje niechęć Brytyjczyków w stosunku do obywateli Unii Europejskiej.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Debatten i dag gav et rystende indtryk af den manglende forståelse for folkeafstemninger som et demokratisk instrument, der findes i dette hus. Måske fordi man i EU generelt igennem hele sin historie har gjort, hvad man kunne, for at undgå folkeafstemninger, ja ofte betragtet dem som en decideret ondskab, som kun ville forhindre projektet. Men dermed har man også bragt sig selv i et modsætningsforhold til den europæiske befolkning. Det er det modsætningsforhold, der gør, at vi i dag står i en situation, hvor briterne ikke længere føler, at de kan være medlem af denne Union.

Årsagen til, at briterne forlader EU, skal ikke findes i London, men skal findes i Bruxelles, i Frankfurt, i Strasbourg og i alle de andre europæiske hovedstæder, hvor man i årevis har ført en linje væk fra den europæiske befolkning, som rettelig har et krav om at blive hørt og spurgt. Vi skylder ikke briterne spot og nedgørelse, men respekt for at holde folkeafstemninger, således at befolkningen bliver spurgt.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, bhí áthas orm gur glacadh leis an moladh seo inniu, 557 ina fhábhar, 92 ina choinne agus 29 ag staonadh. Ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a chur in iúl do Guy Verhofstadt, Michel Barnier agus gach duine a chabhraigh linn cás na hÉireann a chur chun tosaigh sna pointí seo: go háirithe ag iarraidh na moltaí agus na socruithe a ghabhann le comhaontuithe Aoine an Chéasta a choimeád agus teorainn bhog a bheith againn in ionad teorainn chrua. Bíodh sin ráite, tá sé soiléir go bhfuil bac mór ann, is é sin mar a thug Michel Barnier air: “An Bille Imeachta”: Iarraim ar údarás na Ríochta Aontaithe teacht le moladh cinnte chun an bille seo a réiteach. Má éiríonn linn é sin a réiteach, níl aon dabht in aon chor ach gur féidir linn an spriocdháta a bhaint amach agus idirbheartaíocht a chríochnú in am.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovolu mi, abych se vyjádřil k mému dnešnímu hlasování, kdy jsem hlasoval pro tuto zprávu, ale s jedním důležitým aspektem, že mi v ní chybí stále konkrétní vyjádření toho, jak bude dále financován rozpočet EU. My nemáme stále dohodnuté parametry, jakými budeme spolupracovat s Velkou Británií, a jak se tedy bude Velká Británie a na čem konkrétně v rámci evropské politiky podílet. A to si myslím, že je důležité nejenom pro sestavování rozpočtu pro příští rok, ale především pro sestavování rozpočtu po odchodu Velké Británie. A proto bych chtěl vyzvat především vyjednavače i Velkou Británii, aby tento aspekt zohlednili a co nejdříve se snažili na něm domluvit.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the European Parliament has recognised that Theresa May’s Brexit has the potential to be devastating for the island of Ireland. The prospect that is envisaged by the Tories, and unfortunately endorsed by Unionist representatives in this House today, of a small island of 6.5 million people operating with one part inside the EU and another part outside would be catastrophic for the Irish economy north and south, for Irish agriculture north and south and, of course, for the Irish peace process.

I welcome the fact that Parliament understands that all of Ireland needs to remain in the single market and the Customs Union. Of course, the easiest way for this to happen is for Britain to do so also, but if they do not do this they need to know that they have no mandate to drag the North of Ireland into economic, political and social upheaval. The Irish Government must now seize upon this report and lead the demand for special status for the North of Ireland in the EU in order to protect our entire island.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, Michael Gove has promised that, as a result of Brexit, the UK will be able to export more pig’s ears to China. The Tory Government has certainly made a pig’s ear of these negotiations and what is quite clear is that they have run out of ideas completely. The Tories continue, distracted by a power tug-of-war, to steer us towards a cliff edge, promising three decades of damage to the UK economy. Yet many persist in the deluded belief that we can cherry-pick.

Parliament’s resolution is a much needed reality check. That is why I supported it. What is clear in my region, the West Midlands, is that no-deal means costs going up by 30% to 40% in dairy and meat and 10% in cars. That is why Labour is saying ‘no deal is no way’ – whereas we will deliver one that retains jobs and protects rights.

David Davis, as you know, having not even delivered on his own job at the moment, is talking about his retirement whilst millions of people living in the EU and the UK have no idea what their future may be.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, I would like to add my appreciation to those who have already thanked you for your service in the chair.

This resolution and, even more, the speeches that we have heard today bear very little relation to the progress in the talks. Britain has already said that it will not put up any physical border in Ireland. We have already said that we will look at the financial settlement in the spirit of wanting advantageous outcomes for our European allies, as well as for us. We have already said that all of the social, working, residence and healthcare rights of EU nationals in the UK will be guaranteed. These things have been formally stated. I understand that there are some colleagues here who love to have a go at us – this is not new, it is not a post-Brexit thing; it is an occasional occurrence in this House.

What I think is strange – and will strike people in the UK as strange – is to have British MEPs, particularly in the S&D Group, lining up to say that everything is going to be catastrophic and that the economy is tanking when that bears no relation to people's actual experience. I hope that after we have left we will remove the main cause of contention and will be able to enjoy a better relation than we have now.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, a poco più di un anno dal referendum sulla Brexit, la consapevolezza del ruolo dell'Unione europea è notevolmente cresciuta. L'Unione ha davanti a sé una finestra di tempo per cogliere anche le opportunità offerte da questo inciampo, a patto però che lo stato di incertezza generato da una coabitazione non voluta, non si proroghi oltre misura.

L'accettazione della richiesta del Primo ministro britannico di un periodo transitorio di durata limitata va dunque subordinata alla certezza della durata di tale periodo, alla prosecuzione di tutto l'acquis comunitario, alla piena giurisdizione della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione e alla conclusione di un vero e proprio accordo di recesso, che contempli soprattutto le questioni relative ai diritti dei cittadini europei nel Regno Unito e dei britannici in Europa, al destino dell'Irlanda e agli obblighi di liquidazione finanziari vantati dall'Unione europea.

Alle belle parole dello scorso settembre, Theresa May deve far seguire i fatti. Senza un recesso ordinato dal Regno Unito dell'Unione, nessun negoziato dovrà essere avviato sul quadro delle future relazioni, né alcuna fase di transizione potrà e dovrà essere concessa.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałabym przyłączyć się do podziękowań moich kolegów za współpracę z Panią.

Obywatele Unii Europejskiej osiedlają się w innym państwie członkowskim, korzystając z możliwości stworzonych im przez prawo wspólnotowe i zakładając, że przez całe życie będą mogli z tego prawa korzystać. Dlatego też wszelkie negocjacje o postbrexitowym statusie obywateli Unii w Zjednoczonym Królestwie czy Brytyjczyków w Unii powinny opierać się na tym prawie. Nie może być więc zgody na jakiegokolwiek zmiany w ich położeniu prawnym czy faktycznym. Nowe propozycje Londynu nie są zgodne z tym prawem, dopuszczają bowiem ograniczenia na przykład w prawie do łączenia rodzin, a także wprowadzają nową nie do końca zdefiniowaną kategorię osoby osiedlonej. Negocjacyjny postęp osiągnięty w tym zakresie jest więc dalece niewystarczający. Przeciągające się rozmowy potęgują niepewność wśród ludzi zwykłych, ani obywatele Unii mieszkający w Wielkiej Brytanii, ani Brytyjczycy w Unii nie wiedzą jaka przyszłość ich czeka. Ta niepewność uniemożliwia im zabezpieczenie swoich praw i interesów, dlatego też negocjatorzy powinni jak najszybciej dojść do porozumienia mieszczącego się w ramach regulacji traktatowych i gwarantującego poszanowanie praw nabytych. Nie możemy się zgodzić na żadne ich ograniczanie. Z tych powodów poparłam dzisiaj z pełną odpowiedzialnością rezolucję Parlamentu Europejskiego.

5.2. In het verdragsgebied van de ICCAT geldende beheers-, instandhoudings- en controlemaatregelen (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato)

Oral explanations of vote

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa importante relazione doveva recepire al meglio, nel diritto dell'Unione europea, le misure adottate addirittura dieci anni fa dalla commissione ICCAT: servono per la conservazione e gestione dei tonnidi. Non solo lo facciamo in ritardo, ma lo facciamo anche male. Era l'occasione buona per tutelare le specie ittiche ma anche il reddito dei nostri pescatori, penso soprattutto a quelli della pesca artigianale e tradizionale.

Andava, prima di tutto, aumentata la trasparenza allo scopo di contrastare la pesca irregolare e illegale. L'allocazione delle quote di tonno e pesce spada doveva seguire criteri trasparenti e oggettivi, inclusi quelli di natura ambientale, prestando attenzione altresì all'aspetto sociale e all'economicità. La distribuzione dei totali ammissibili di cattura (TAC) doveva venire prestando particolare attenzione alla pesca tradizionale e artigianale e incentivare i pescherecci dell'Unione che utilizzano dispositivi di pesca selettivi o tecniche di pesca con ridotto impatto ambientale.

Anche per questo ci sarebbe dovuta essere una particolare attenzione alla disciplina delle catture accessorie o accidentali, per venire incontro alle richieste della pesca artigianale, che cerca di sfruttare una risorsa non più in crisi da alcuni anni, ma la cui abbondanza sta mettendo in ginocchio decine e decine di imprese.

Per queste ragioni non ho potuto sostenere la relazione che, così emendata, rappresenta addirittura un passo indietro rispetto allo status quo.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quienes más han perdido con la ineficacia de la Comisión y de los Estados miembros en la aplicación del Convenio de la CICA son los pescadores artesanales que, tradicionalmente, han sido el principal motor económico de las localidades costeras. En España no se cumple el artículo 17 de la política pesquera común porque el Partido Popular utiliza la cuota como arma política para enfrentar a los pescadores, a los territorios y, además, quitarles su derecho a la mar.

El Partido Popular deja la mayor parte de la cuota de atún rojo a grandes factorías pertenecientes al grupo Balfegó y Ricardo Fuentes y, después, se llenan la boca de patria. Patria es defender el pan de los pescadores artesanales. Lo hemos dicho en reiteradas ocasiones: vamos a apoyar todo aquello que tenga que ver con la mejora de la vida de las personas que cada día se baten el cobre en la pelea contra las olas para mantener a su familia. Esperamos que este informe no se quede en papel mojado y que la Comisión castigue y persiga a quienes legislan favoreciendo a las grandes corporaciones mientras empobrecen a nuestro pueblo y destruyen nuestro bien común.

5.3. De economische empowerment van vrouwen in de particuliere en openbare sector in de EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałem przeciwko dokumentowi nie dlatego, że jestem przeciwna wyrównaniu płac za taką samą pracę czy przeciwko poprawie statusu materialnego kobiet albo podniesieniu świadczeń emerytalno-rentowych, które można osiągnąć, niekoniecznie realizując cele barcelońskie. Głosowałam przeciw, gdyż prezentowane zapisy i tendencje w rzeczywistości skierowane są przeciwko kobiecości i kobietom, redukując ich rolę do jednego z elementów napędzającego machine ekonomiczną i PKB. Propozycje, poza osłabieniem więzi rodzinnych, dyskredytacją macierzyństwa uprzedmiotawiają kobiety. Ponadto istnieje wiele innych kontrowersyjnych zapisów, chociażby określenie zdrowia reprodukcyjnego zamiast szanującego godność określenia prokreacji. Najlepszą opiekę nad dzieckiem sprawuje kochająca matka i nikt i nic jej nie zastąpi. Pamiętam dokładnie z czasów komunizmu, kiedy nie zważając na różnice psychofizyczne mężczyzn i kobiet oraz ich szczególnie powołanie, namawiano Polki do wsiadania na traktory.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dzisiaj w Polsce obchodzimy rocznicę tak zwanego czarnego protestu, czyli protestu kobiet przeciwko propozycjom rządowym, które godziły w ich autonomię i samodzielność. Z tego powodu także i dzisiaj będzie protest rocznicowy. Korzystając z okazji, przesyłam wszystkim organizatorkom słowa solidarności z ich ideami i dążeniami, ale wracając do dokumentu, o którym rozmawiamy, prezentuje on wiele aspektów nierówności. Chciałbym ze względu na brak czasu wskazać na jeden, moim zdaniem, bardzo kluczowy, a mianowicie w wielu krajach, także w Polsce, obowiązuje różnica wieku przechodzenia na emeryturę. To jest rzecz, która absolutnie dyskryminuje kobiety, powoduje, że otrzymają mniejsze świadczenia emerytalne na emeryturze, a jest fałszywie prezentowana jako przywilej. To jest skandal.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, celebro que este informe aborde cuestiones clave para el feminismo, como la economía de los cuidados y la educación sexual. Lamento que no se concrete en sanciones decididas contra la cultura de la violación, que se expande peligrosamente a través de los medios de comunicación y que tiene relación con la cosificación de los cuerpos de las mujeres y, por tanto, con la mercantilización de la vida.

La economía de los cuidados, no es una frase decorativa: trata de una nueva forma de producir, de entendernos, de establecer las reglas que rigen nuestras sociedades, donde no solo el beneficio cuenta.

Hoy en día, desgraciadamente, hasta nuestros vientres se convierten en mercancía. Por eso, la solidaridad entre nosotras, mujeres del mundo, es más necesaria que nunca; también con nuestras hermanas musulmanas, a las que, por desgracia, este informe ha dejado olvidadas, a pesar de que viven con nosotras, puerta con puerta, en Europa y que merecen todo el respeto y el reconocimiento del mundo.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovoluňte mi zdůvodnit, proč jsem nehlasovala pro tuto zprávu, přestože dlouhodobě se zasazují o odstranění diskriminace žen a za ocenění žen jako matek a jejich rodičovské péče. Jsem přesvědčena o tom, že ekonomické postavení žen podpoříme tím, když uznáme hodnotu mateřství a jejich rodičovské péče, když umožníme volbu mezi rodičovskou a profesní kariérou. Tato zpráva ale bohužel nejde tímto směrem. Bohužel jde za hranu toho, co je možné diktovat členským státům a firmám. Například v tom, že navrhuje opatření pro firmy, kterým by se závazně muselo sledovat rozdíly v platech. Rovněž jsem nemohla souhlasit s požadavkem na zavedení životopisů bez uvedení pohlaví nebo např. s tím, aby všechny ekonomické modely a daňové politiky zohledňovaly genderové hledisko. Tato zpráva je stereotypní i v tom, že i do ekonomického posílení žen zavádí sexuální a reprodukční zdraví.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Én egyetértettem ennek a jelentésnek az alapvetésével, ami végighúzódik rajta, mégpedig hogy sajnálatos, hogy mind a mai napig a nőket tekintjük majdnem hogy a kizárólagos felelősének mindannak, ami a családban, a családi otthonban, a háztartásban történik.

Valamiféle hamis biológia különbségre hivatkozva azt mondom, hogy a nők képesek, alkalmasak és kötelesek kizárólagosan a gyermekek gondozására, nevelésére, az idős hozzátartozók gondozására, a betegápolásra, az esetleges fogyatékos családtagnak az ápolására, és ez elviselhetetlen és folyamatos fizikai, lelki és lelkiismereti terheket okoz a nőknek.

Alapvető lenne ennek a szemléletnek a megváltoztatása, abban ugyan egyetértek, hogy nem kötelezheti az Unió a tagállamokat, de oktatásban, médiában és EU-s ajánlásokban jó lenne valahogy odahatni, hogy társként, férfi és nő, valamint a társadalom együtt vállalja fel ezeket a fontos feladatokat.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W sprawozdaniu o wzmocnieniu pozycji gospodarczej kobiet wbrew deklarowanym intencjom znalazły się narzędzia społecznej degradacji kobiet. Uzależnianie pozycji gospodarczej kobiet od tzw. prawa do aborcji – jakkolwiek by nie było nazywane jako prawa reprodukcyjne czy seksualne – przyjmuje za rzecz naturalną nakłanianie kobiet przez pracodawców do wyboru między macierzyństwem a pracą zawodową. Oczywiście takie podejście wpisuje się w kulturową presję na kobiety, żeby rezygnując – częściowo albo wręcz całkowicie – z macierzyństwa, konkurowały z mężczyznami. Traktowanie macierzyństwa i roli kobiet w rodzinie jako obojętnych albo zbędnych społecznie prywatnych opcji jest najwyższą krzywdą, którą liberalny konsumpcjonizm wyrządza kobietom, dzieciom, rodzinom i całemu społeczeństwu.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, timing is everything. I wanted to make a very brief comment on this report. I think in this House we talk a great deal about the invisibility of women on boards or in politics and how we want to empower young women as they go through the education process to become more visible, but I think very often we forget that there are a great deal of women in very invisible positions in low-paid work. I think we do not spend enough time talking about their empowerment and looking after their rights because they are invisible to many of us. So I think there is a challenge to women, when we are addressing this issue, to talk about all women across all sectors and not just the more visible parts of our society and our economy. That is why I think this is an important report. I supported it, but I think we need to widen the debate and be more inclusive.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quería expresar, como ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, mi satisfacción por algunos elementos de este informe, como el hecho de reconocer que las barreras estructurales que frenan el empoderamiento económico de las mujeres tienen su origen en múltiples formas de desigualdad y discriminación.

Para superar estas barreras, las respuestas tienen que ser integrales. Es necesario combatir la segregación en el mercado laboral, pero también en la educación, la formación y las tareas de cuidados. Debemos reducir la precariedad de las trabajadoras en los llamados sectores feminizados, como el trabajo doméstico y de cuidados. Y necesitamos, asimismo, escuelas infantiles y servicios de asistencia para personas dependientes, que sean públicas, accesibles, suficientes y de calidad.

Debemos luchar contra la discriminación directa e indirecta que existe en el mercado laboral, garantizar que haya igual retribución para un mismo trabajo, combatir las formas atípicas y precarias de los contratos laborales, que afectan sobre todo a las mujeres, y garantizar una redistribución de los cuidados con, por ejemplo, permisos de paternidad y maternidad iguales e intransferibles.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Jeg kommer fra et land, hvor vores statsoverhoved, Hendes Majestæt Dronningen, er en kvinde, hvor formanden for parlamentet, Folketinget, den absolut højeste civile position, man kan opnå, er en kvinde, min tidligere partiformand Pia Kjaersgaard, hvor det absolutte flertal af partier i Folketinget har eller har haft kvindelige formænd, og hvor man derfor i hele det politiske spil kan se, at det ikke er kvoter og reguleringer og politiske beslutninger, der gør, at kvinder vinder frem, men deres egenskaber, deres evner, deres gåpåmod, deres arbejde. Det er dét, vi skal fremme. Ikke et særligt pussenusse-system, hvor vi laver kvoter ud fra særlige politiske bestemmelser. Slet ikke når vi kan se, hvordan det eksempelvis i Norge, hvor man for 10 år siden lavede et sådant system, er slået fejl. Det har ikke dér ført til topposter i erhvervslivet, men det kan vi til gengæld i Danmark se, at det har inden for det politiske uden kvoter. Derfor er det vejen at gå. Frivillighedens vej og respekten for den enkelte. Ikke kvoter.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I supported this report, which promotes the crucial protection of women's rights in the private and public sectors. Economic empowerment of women is not only important in a human rights context, but also for the EU's prosperity at large and for its fair and economic growth.

When discriminatory practices have a negative impact on women due to their gender, they are hindered from reaching their full potential and from engaging with society in a meaningful way. Important tools for empowering women in the workplace include ensuring the work-life balance, wage mapping, gender quotas, gender equality plans, equal pay for equal work of equal value, collective agreements and social partners.

Eurostat findings show that the proportions of working women compared to working men in the EU in full-time work amounts to a full-time employment rate gap of 25.5%. Irish society has much to thank the EU for in terms of gender equality legislation, but there are still many improvements to be made in Ireland and across the EU.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, v tomto parlamente som tri a pol roka a za tú dobu sa snažím častokrát poukazať na to, že EÚ sa potrebuje prinavrátiť ku rešpektovaniu judeo-kresťanských hodnôt a k pochopeniu o Bohu a prirodzených úlohách a rolách mužov a žien v živote. Na jednej strane je schválenie tejto správy pre mňa Pyrrhovo víťazstvo, prešli obidva moje pozmeňujúce návrhy a som presvedčený, že si musíme začať poriadne vážiť neplatenú prácu mužov a žien, ktorí sa starajú o starších príbuzných alebo postihnutých v rodine a ich obeta zostáva nepovšimnutá. Na druhej strane, napriek tomu, že tieto návrhy môžu pomôcť veľa ľuďom a prešli, som veľmi nespokojný s touto správou, lebo je tá z najhorších, aké sme tu kedy za posledné obdobie mali. Znovu presadzujú a prinášajú LGBTI agendu, tlačia nás do schvaľovaní kvót pre firmy, ktoré sú kótované na burze, aby tam bolo viac žien, alebo jednoducho presadzujú veci, ako je napríklad Istanbulský dohovor, s ktorým mnohé štáty nesúhlasia. Takže som musel hlasovať proti.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Niepokojące są dla nas informacje, iż w ostatnich latach w zasadzie nie udało się osiągnąć postępu w kwestii dyskryminacji kobiet. Powinniśmy postawić sobie pytanie, czy instrumenty, które wykorzystujemy, są rzeczywiście efektywne, jeżeli nadal wynagrodzenia kobiet są średnio o 16% niższe w porównaniu do tych, które dostają mężczyźni, a emerytury i renty otrzymywane przez kobiety średnio o 40% niższe w porównaniu do tych, które dostają mężczyźni. Silna dyskryminacja w okresie aktywności zawodowej prowadzi do realnej głębokiej pauperyzacji kobiet na starość.

Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawczynią, że zachodząca właśnie rewolucja cyfrowa może być szansą na wzmocnienie pozycji gospodarczej kobiet. Konieczne jest jednak podjęcie działań zachęcających kobiety nie tylko do zdobywania formalnego wykształcenia w tym obszarze, ale przede wszystkim do przekwalifikowywania się i podnoszenia swoich umiejętności. Powinniśmy też wypracować instrumenty ukierunkowane na wspieranie kobiet chcących założyć przedsiębiorstwa w obszarze cyfrowej gospodarki. Stoimy przed wyjątkową szansą wzmocnienia pozycji gospodarczej kobiet. Dlatego też poparłam sprawozdanie w głosowaniu końcowym, szczególnie jednocząc się z Polkami walczącymi dzisiaj na polskich ulicach o swoje prawa podstawowe.

5.4. Het aanpakken van de steeds beperktere ruimte voor het maatschappelijk middenveld in ontwikkelingslanden (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)

Oral explanations of vote

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, în Rusia, societatea civilă este eliminată prin lege. *Transparency International*, de exemplu, sau organizația *Memorial* fondată de Andrei Saharov și alte peste o sută de organizații neguvernamentale au fost forțate de Kremlin să își încheie activitatea. În Turcia, judecători, profesori, oameni de afaceri, familiile lor, jurnaliști, au fost arestați pe motivul că sunt guleniști. Landromatul azer a arătat cum zeci de politicieni europeni sunt corupți de Azerbaidjan. Propaganda mincinoasă cu George Soros a început să-și facă loc și în țări europene și se îndreaptă spre dictatură, evident, pentru că efectul este împotriva societății civile.

Ca să nu fim ipocriți, respectăm valorile Uniunii Europene sau nu? Da sau nu? E simplă întrebarea. Dacă da, atunci să impunem aceste valori tuturor țărilor din UE și din afara UE și să le sancționăm drastic, inclusiv financiar, pe cele care nu le respectă.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, en cuanto a la votación de este tipo de informes, la verdad es que cada vez están más vacíos de contenido, pero repletos de una hipocresía política, y es lo que hace que una se sienta un poco absurda en este Parlamento.

Cuando promovamos un comercio internacional entre iguales, que anteponga las personas y el medio ambiente al lucro de las transnacionales, y cuando existan cláusulas vinculantes al respecto, entonces sí estaremos haciendo algo por la sociedad civil de los países en vías de desarrollo.

Mientras tanto, me gustaría emplazar a mi homóloga española Jiménez Becerril, ponente de este informe, a preocuparse por la sociedad civil española, una sociedad civil a la que su partido, el Partido Popular, está reprimiendo y enfrentando.

El día 1 fue Cataluña y hoy es Murcia. Es la sociedad civil española en su conjunto la que es reprimida y la que sufre una violencia digna de tiempos pasados. Están convirtiendo al Gobierno de España en una enorme vergüenza a ojos del mundo entero y de toda la gente que en España seguimos del lado de la democracia y de la libertad.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, antes de mais felicidades na sua nova contenda no seu país. Espero que tenha boa sorte e desejo-lhe grandes felicidades.

Senhora Presidente, votei a favor desta resolução porque entendo que a sociedade civil desempenha um papel central na construção e no reforço da democracia e na promoção da boa governação e as organizações da sociedade civil são agentes importantes na ajuda ao desenvolvimento. Realizam relevantes atividades no domínio social e ambiental, salvaguardam os interesses das pessoas com deficiência, vulneráveis e marginalizáveis, movimentos sociais e aos povos indígenas.

A União Europeia é o maior doador para as organizações locais da sociedade civil nos países em desenvolvimento e tem sido um ator de primeiro plano na proteção dos agentes da sociedade civil e dos defensores dos direitos humanos através do Instrumento Europeu para a Democracia e os Direitos Humanos e do Fundo Europeu para a Democracia.

Por tudo isto, Senhora Presidente, entendo que esta resolução é, na minha opinião, de facto, um instrumento fundamental na defesa dos direitos individuais e no reforço da democracia. Muito obrigado. Por isso votei a favor.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, in my role as Vice-President, I look after dialogue with religious communities and non-confessional organisations and we talk a great deal about freedom of religion and belief. In the developing world, a vibrant civil society is very important in terms of protecting that freedom. It is something that we work on with the UN and we need to deepen the involvement of civil society in the developing world on this issue because it is a matter of life or death in many developing countries.

The problem – and it has been addressed by this report – is that we are seeing, in some developing countries, a shrinking space, with little room for civil society to have its place. Therefore, as part of our development policy, we need to help these countries to respect the full range of human rights. We need to empower communities and individuals and we need to make this a priority.

5.5. De strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi)

Oral explanations of vote

Philippe Juvin (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, ce que je voulais dire est assez simple.

Quand on tape certains mots-clés dans Google, je ne vais pas les citer car ce sont des mots très simples, parmi les premiers résultats de recherche apparaissent les journaux d'Al-Qaida, du Front al-Nosra ou de l'État islamique.

Que trouve-t-on dans ces journaux? On y trouve des appels au meurtre et des informations sur la manière d'assassiner quelqu'un, de fabriquer une bombe et de crypter ses communications.

Si un seul journal papier était publié et mis en vente chez un libraire avec de tels contenus, le libraire et l'éditeur seraient évidemment condamnés, et le journal serait interdit.

Sur le plan numérique, en revanche, rien ne se passe. Il y a une totale impunité des diffuseurs numériques. Ce que nous voulons est très simple. Si l'on entend lutter contre le crime, il faut que tous ceux qui diffusent des contenus incitant au meurtre soient incriminés, poursuivis et punis. Car ces publications sont identiques, sous leur forme papier ou en version numérique. C'est là une question de bon sens, et si nous ne faisons pas cela, ne venons pas nous plaindre lorsque le prochain attentat se produira!

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl říct, že evropské instituce v posledních letech zažily několik kybernetických útoků. A myslím si, že z tohoto důvodu by neměly podceňovat kybernetickou bezpečnost. V řadě států vznikly speciální úřady, ale myslím si, že pořád chybí kooperace mezi jednotlivými úřady členských států a snaha, abychom opravdu jako celá EU čelili těmto hrozbám.

Dále je tady obrovský problém kybernetické šikany. Je to problém, kterému se nevěnuje příliš velikánská pozornost a kterému jsou vystaveni jak žáci, tak velmi často učitelé nebo ředitelé různých škol. A vedle represe bych chtěl říct, že v této zprávě oceňuji, že je zmíněná i prevence, protože si myslím, že prevence především v rodině, kdy vysvětlujeme, že některé věci se na internetu třeba nepublikují nebo se na něj nepíší, je velmi důležitá.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Bezpieczeństwo w cyberprzestrzeni urasta dzisiaj do problemu numer jeden. Ono dotyczy bezpieczeństwa narodowego, bezpieczeństwa państwowego, bezpieczeństwa gospodarczego, ale dotyka powoli już także bezpieczeństwa politycznego. Mamy coraz więcej uzasadnionych podejrzeń, że niektóre państwa ingerują w demokratyczne procesy wyborcze innych państw. To jest absolutnie niedopuszczalne, w związku z czym rodzina demokratycznych państw świata powinna się przeciwstawić tym wszystkim zagrożeniom zwłaszcza, że przecież technologie, o których mówimy, są technologiami przyszłości. Potrzebne są więc działania na rzecz ustanowienia międzynarodowego prawa dotyczącego bezpieczeństwa w cyberprzestrzeni oraz międzynarodowej współpracy na rzecz skutecznego wprowadzenia nowych norm prawnych w życie.

Stefano Maullu (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la lotta contro la criminalità informatica, credo, debba rappresentare una delle priorità dell'Unione europea per il valore che rappresenta e soprattutto per i settori che coinvolge: dalla lotta alla pedopornografia, ai reati informatici che colpiscono le aziende, alle truffe che sono in costante e continuo aumento, un vero grande pericolo! E l'uso che noi facciamo della tecnologia per tutte le nostre attività e per la vita quotidiana, rende il settore ancora più vulnerabile.

Credo che questo provvedimento non possa che tener conto della necessità per i paesi dell'Unione di fare un lavoro assolutamente corale, per poter utilizzare la lotta contro i crimini informatici soprattutto sul fronte su cui siamo più esposti: il terrorismo. Un terrorismo che è sempre più tecnologico, che mira a raccogliere il consenso attraverso il web, in una maniera assolutamente invasiva, che credo debba essere combattuto in maniera assolutamente dura e profonda.

E solo grazie a un lavoro che deve essere di squadra, di rete e di coesione attraverso i paesi è possibile ottenere questo risultato.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Madam President, thank you very much for your collegiality, and I wish you all the best in your future to come.

We have to strike a balance in enjoying the benefits of modern technologies without compromising on our security or privacy. Therefore, I fully agree with this report calling for the update of the European Union's cybersecurity strategy. It is important to enhance cooperation at EU level in order to fight the current and newly emerging cybercrime trends. Member States should combine their efforts for a better information exchange through Eurojust, Europol or the European Union's Agency for Network and Information Security.

Lastly, let's not forget that every single one of us can make small steps to avoid becoming a victim of cybercrimes. We therefore urge the Commission to launch information and awareness-raising campaigns for citizens so that they know the risks and can develop a good digital hygiene.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovoluji mi pár vět k samotnému hlasování. Já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože považuji za důležité, aby u těch forem trestné činnosti, které mají přeshraniční charakter, státy EU mnohem více spolupracovaly. Kyberkriminalita k tomuto objektivně patří. Žádný stát na národní úrovni není schopen tyto problémy vyřešit samostatně. Tady ten princip spolupráce 28 zemí je jednoznačně na místě a já jej podporuji. Takže zprávu jsem podpořil.

Ve zprávě je celá řada pozitivních, konkrétních věcí, které do budoucna bude třeba řešit. Je dobře, že vzniklo Evropské centrum pro boj proti kyberkriminalitě v rámci Europolu, ale bude třeba se také zabývat tím, jak toto centrum bude aktivní. Jestli to bude pouze úřad pro úřad nebo bude přinášet své výsledky. Důležité jsou ty části zprávy, které přinášejí preventivní opatření. Ty zvláště považuji za důležité a doufám, že se ta zpráva naplní.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Det, som bekymrer mig ved denne betænkning, er, når talen falder på »fake news« og »hate speech regulation«. Vi er alle sammen imod, at falske nyheder spredes. Vi er også alle sammen imod hadefulde udtalelser. Det er imidlertid en enorm magt at lægge i hænderne på få at afgøre, hvad der er falsk og sandt, at afgøre, hvad der er had og ikke had. Ved at lave den opdeling, hvor vi kriminaliserer den ene gruppe, men ikke den anden gruppe, er vi på vej ned mod en totalitær tilstand, hvor vi grundlæggende vil sætte nogle få mennesker til at være dommere over en af de mest vitale demokratiske rettigheder, nemlig retten til at ytre sig. Jeg tror ikke på et sådant stats- eller europæisk censursystem. Jeg tror, at borgerne – oplyste, kloge og dygtige til at navigere imellem nyheder – selv kan sondre imellem det sande og det usande, det gode og det dårlige.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report, which outlines the challenges and the legal gaps related to the threats posed by cybercrime. Cybercrime is one of the most pressing issues we face today. Across the EU it is increasing in intensity and is causing ever greater economic and social damage.

Europol's assessment of the threat posed by cybercrime is that it has affected the fundamental rights of individuals and that 80% of companies in Europe have experienced at least one cybersecurity incident. Children who are using the internet at an early age are particularly vulnerable to cybercrime. The proposals outlined by this report aim to address these challenges. They include improved responsibility and liability of service providers, and enhanced cooperation among police and judicial authorities, etcetera. To combat child exploitation online, an action plan has been proposed for the protection of children's rights online and offline in cyberspace. I agree with this.

To conclude, Madam President, may I wish you all the best for the future. I have always found you to be a very fine, honest and pleasant MEP.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože skutečně kybernetický prostor představuje velmi vážné nebezpečí do budoucna. Jsem velmi rád, že se mu zpravodajka ve své rozsáhlé zprávě věnuje a že získala takhle průřezovou podporu napříč všemi politickými frakcemi. Také jsem rád, že EU toto téma vnímá jako vážné a zásadní v okamžiku, kdy v Estonsku se k tomu konala speciální konference.

Já bych si vybral dvě okolnosti, které si myslím, že jsou velmi podstatné na té zprávě. Za prvé EU musí být lídrem, musí být na špici odbornosti, protože právě odbornost je předpokladem pro vyrovnávání se s hrozbami spojovanými s kybernetickými útoky. A za druhé je důležité, aby systémy, které budujeme, byly co nejvíce odolné, aby byly integrální. No a za třetí je důležité občany samozřejmě informovat o těchto hrozbách, aby byli připraveni na případné útoky.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamna președintă, în 2016, la Varșovia, NATO a recunoscut spațiului cibernetic drept una dintre amenințările în care alianța trebuie să se apere, la fel cum o face acum în spațiul aerian, maritim sau terestru.

Atacul WannaCry din mai anul acesta a lăsat în urmă peste 200 de victime din 150 de țări. Spațiul cibernetic nu are reguli și de aceea trebuie să dăm instrumentele necesare, inclusiv financiare, inclusiv accesul la toate bazele de date celor care luptă împotriva infracțiunii cibernetic.

În acest moment, lupta este total inegală; situația de astăzi arată că sunt insuficiente și inegale mijloacele de luptă. Dacă nu le dăm aceste instrumente și nu le creștem, repet, finanțarea și nu le dăm tot ce au nevoie, atunci vom avea și mai mulți morți pentru că știm foarte bine că infracțiunile cibernetică finanțează și terorismul și ajută la spălarea banilor.

Putem fi și noi cu un pas înaintea criminalității, înaintea infraționalității, pentru că altfel nu o să rezolvăm niciodată nimic.

5.6. De politieke betrekkingen tussen de EU en ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer)

Oral explanations of vote

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report because

EU-ASEAN relations are comprehensive and cover a wide range of sectors, including trade and investment, development, economics and political affairs. I believe that this report comes at the right time, as this year we celebrate the 40th anniversary of our formal relations and the 50th anniversary of ASEAN.

ASEAN is one of the world's most dynamic and fastest growing regions and the potential for the EU to deepen its relations with the region should not be neglected. A good example is that the EU granted the Philippines GSP+ status, and I think that we should advocate the launching of negotiations for a regional EU-ASEAN FTA. Of course we have to address not only the successes, but also the challenges faced by the EU-ASEAN relationship. The EU will continue to place human rights at the centre of its relations with third countries, and ASEAN countries need to comply with human rights standards and promote gender equality and women's empowerment.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Region Stowarzyszenia Narodów Azji Południowo-Wschodniej (ASEAN) to dzisiaj jeden z najbardziej dynamicznie rozwijających się regionów świata, także w czymś, co jest bardzo ważne, a więc nowych technologiach. Ten region jest też dla nas bardzo ważny, jeżeli chodzi o utrzymywanie światowego bezpieczeństwa, dlatego stosunki Unii Europejskiej z krajami ASEAN powinny być dla nas kluczowe i tak samo ważne jak stosunki na przykład z innymi krajami Azji jak Chiny, Indie czy Japonia. Natomiast musimy pamiętać, że w ramach tych stosunków powinniśmy rozwijać nie tylko współpracę ekonomiczno-gospodarczą, ale także działalność na rzecz demokracji i praw człowieka, kwestii klimatu i ochrony środowiska. Powinny to być sprawy równie ważne jak ekonomiczno-gospodarcze.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, Uniunea este al doilea partener comercial al ASEAN și primul furnizor de investiții directe. Până în anul 2020, Uniunea și statele membre s-au angajat să aloce peste trei miliarde de euro pentru a reduce sărăcia și a stimula dezvoltarea țărilor cu venituri mici. Dar acest ajutor financiar trebuie condiționat de respectarea drepturilor omului și de finanțarea societății civile, de eliminarea arestărilor abuzive și a dictaturilor.

De exemplu, *Amnesty* numește legile adoptate în diverse țări, cum ar fi Malaysia, Thailanda și altele, drept legi draconice. În Malaysia, în noiembrie 2016, 15 activiști au fost arestați pentru că au cerut reforma electorală. Sau, în Thailanda, în august 2017, studentul Pai a fost condamnat la cinci ani de închisoare pentru că a distribuit pe Facebook imaginea președintelui. Mulți alți activiști au fost arestați și anchemtați pentru că s-au opus torturii și sistemului dictatorial. Adică o țară în care oamenii nu sunt liberi nu se va dezvolta niciodată și degeaba punem bani în ea.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl říct, že rozvoj vztahů se sdružením ASEAN je krok správným směrem. Je nutno ale při této příležitosti říct, že ten rozvoj vztahů není pouze ekonomický, ale musí být i politický. Musíme s řadou států sdružení ASEAN vést poměrně velmi otevřený dialog o lidských právech. Nemyslím teď jenom situaci Rohingyů, ale musíme třeba se státy, jako je Vietnam nebo Laos, hovořit otevřeně o tom, co se v těchto státech děje a jak jsou zde potlačována lidská práva. Já osobně vidím ve sdružení ASEAN obrovskou příležitost. Poté, co se z této části začaly víceméně stahovat Spojené státy, si myslím, že Evropa zde může poměrně dobře investovat. A má zde velmi dobré jméno, takže věřím, že nadále budou vztahy s těmito státy posilovány.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, ke zprávě pana Bütikofera bych si dovolil říci, že mne velmi těší, že nás upozornil na to, jakým způsobem jsou země sdružení ASEAN pro nás strategické. Skutečně se jedná o třetí nejvýznamnější ekonomickou destinaci pro naše investování a to si myslím, že je velmi důležité zde podtrhnout. I z tohoto důvodu já jsem tuto zprávu podpořil. Chci zdůraznit roli tohoto prostoru, tzn. zemí sdružení ASEAN v boji proti terorismu. Myslím si, že to je důležité, abychom zmínili. A také chci závěrem podtrhnout fakt, že Amerika vyklízí tento prostor, já to pokládám za chybu, jedná se o diplomatickou příležitost pro evropskou diplomatickou službu i pro nás.

President. – Before adjourning the sitting I would like, on a personal note, to thank the interpreters for the great work they have been doing and continue to do in this Parliament, and also to thank all the departments of the Administration with whom I have really enjoyed working.

6. Rectificaties stemgedrag/Voorgenomen stemgedrag: zie notulen

(The sitting was suspended at 13.55)

Președintele: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

7. Hervatting van de vergadering

(Ședința a fost reluată la 15.02)

8. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen

9. De situatie in Moldavië

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind Declarația Vicepreședintelui Comisiei/Înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate referitoare la situația din Moldova (2017/2848(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the last few years have been particularly intense for our relationship with Moldova. There are several reasons for this, including geography and the close ties between our people. But there is one reason in particular I would like to focus on, and that is the kind of relationship that we have proposed to Moldova.

A partnership with the European Union is not about spheres of influence and geopolitics. We do not ask our partners to pick sides. They do not have to choose between us and other global powers – this is not how our partnership works. Our partnership is always about improving the life of our citizens, inside the European Union, and of course inside Moldova. It is a partnership for, not against. It is about the economy and trade. It is about democracy, human rights, the rule of law and the fight against corruption. It is with this attitude that we are heading towards our Eastern Partnership Summit next month.

This is the spirit that led to the new association agenda that we adopted with Moldova last August, setting out the priorities for the implementation of the association agreement in the coming two years. And this is also the spirit that leads us to speak out when we see new challenges emerge for democracy in Moldova. This is what we did last July when a new electoral law was adopted.

Commissioner Hahn and the Vice-President/High Representative said very clearly many times that the new legislation contradicts the recommendations of the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe, and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Both these institutions had pointed towards the importance of broad political consensus on the reform, and of avoiding a system that would expose candidates to the influence of business interests. These suggestions have not been addressed by the new electoral law.

Since then, the law has not yet been implemented. The effects of this law on multi-party democracy will depend on how it is implemented. From our side, I can assure you that we will continue to closely monitor developments, particularly on the definition of single-mandate constituencies.

I know that you have discussed the electoral law within the framework of the decision on a macro-financial assistance programme for Moldova. This decision has been adopted in agreement with the European Parliament, and entered into force on 23 September 2017. Any payment, though, will depend on the respect by Moldova of political preconditions and by the implementation of a Memorandum of Understanding that we will sign with Moldova. These conditions will include reforms that are necessary to guarantee macro-financial stabilisation, together with the implementation of our Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement.

Turning now to reform for business, a healthy economy requires transparency in the financial and public sector; it requires a strong fight against corruption and money laundering; it requires a positive business climate. These are the reforms we will be asking for, because these are the reforms that the people of Moldova expect.

As you know, a massive banking fraud was recently unveiled in the country: a comprehensive investigation and the recovery of the diverted funds are also essential to the credibility of Moldova's economic system. Last year, in 2016, we saw important reform in the energy sector, including on the use of renewable sources: it is now crucial to complete this reform process, with the swift adoption of the energy law.

But a strong economy also needs to be supported by a strong and functioning democracy. For this reason, we will continue to monitor how Moldova implements recommendations of international partners regarding the new electoral law. A healthy democracy does not only depend on a good electoral law: it also needs a strong judicial system, a serious fight against corruption, and of course a free and open space for civil society organisations.

These are the issues that matter to the people of Moldova, and so these are the issues we care about. Our budget support aims precisely at supporting good reform in these fields. For instance, we have a budget support programme to support reforms in the justice sector, and for the moment we will not transfer any funds related to this programme since there has not been sufficient progress to justify these payments. There are also other pending budget support payments that are linked to democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

Turning to assistance now, this is how our partnership works. If you look at our package of assistance for 2017 to 2020, it has a strong focus on projects directly benefiting citizens, for instance on rural development, infrastructure and women's empowerment. Our assistance aims at supporting the reforms that will move Moldova forward, particularly towards the goal of political association and economic integration with the European Union. The more Moldova does to address its citizens' needs, the stronger our assistance and support.

When we discuss budget lines and reforms, it may sound like we are talking technicalities. But everything we do has a very concrete impact on the lives of many – in the European Union and in Moldova. It is a partnership for our people, with very practical benefits for both sides. Take the visa liberalisation that allows our citizens to travel freely between the European Union and Moldova, or the reforms that were adopted last year after our Council Conclusions on the Republic of Moldova of February 2016. The European Parliament has been very active in shaping our partnership and making sure that we always focus on what truly matters: helping Moldova become a stronger country with stronger democratic institutions and a stronger economy: a country that can truly address its citizens' needs.

Cristian Dan Preda, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule președinte, în sesiunea dinaintea vacanței am discutat în acest Parlament despre ajutorul macrofinanciar acordat Moldovei. Am decis prin vot să condiționăm trimiterea acestor fonduri de respectarea recomandărilor Comisiei de la Veneția de către autoritățile de la Chișinău. Reamintesc că această prestigioasă comisie declarase în mod foarte clar că trecerea la un sistem electoral mixt nu este de recomandat în prezent pentru Moldova.

Ce s-a întâmplat la două săptămâni după discuția și votul nostru din Parlament, cu care Comisia și Consiliul au fost, de altfel, de acord, la Chișinău, disprețuind toate aceste referințe, Parlamentul a votat modificarea legii electorale. De ce s-a întâmplat așa? Avem o explicație la îndemână pentru că, în mod public, președintele Dodon, un apropiat al lui Putin, și șeful Partidului Democrat, un apropiat al colegilor noștri socialiști europeni, au considerat că problema numărul unu a Moldovei este eliminarea tuturor partidelor cu excepția celor pe care ei înșiși le conduc.

În aceste condiții, cred că e rațional să solicităm Comisiei să aplice strict condiția fixată și să suspende transferul ajutorului macrofinanciar. Mai mult decât atât, cred că e necesară o monitorizare strictă a implementării legii electorale și a evoluției politice din Moldova din partea Comisiei, a Serviciului European de Acțiune Externă și a Parlamentului European. Consider că ar fi bine ca cinci membri acestui Parlament să se alăture acestui grup de monitorizare.

Victor Boștinaru, în numele grupului S&D. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, recunosc, aproape că înțeleg frustrările PPE, și totuși mă voi adresa în special domnului McAllister, domnului Brok, care au o solidă înțelegere a complexității situației din Republica Moldova.

Am auzit astăzi în discursul colegului meu român aceeași teză, o presupusă complicitate între Partidul Democrat și președintele pro-rus Dodon, și vă invit să discutăm faptele. Nu voi discuta de partea economică, știți mai bine ca mine, situația economică e în favoarea Republicii Moldova și acest lucru a fost confirmat și de Fondul Monetar Internațional și de Comisia Europeană. În primul rând, Guvernul Republicii Moldova a participat cu efective militare la manevrele organizate de NATO în Ucraina în această vară ca răspuns la manevrele Zapad 2017. Acest lucru s-a făcut cu opoziția președintelui Dodon. Președintele Republicii Moldova, pro-rusul Dodon, s-a opus sistematic nominalizării, în două rânduri, a ministrului apărării. Guvernul Republicii Moldova a cerut trupelor rusești să părăsească Transnistria și a făcut-o inclusiv de la tribuna Organizației Națiunilor Unite de la New York. Ce este și mai important, în aceste zile, în Republica Moldova, se discută de amendarea Constituției pentru a introduce un articol special referitor la integrarea europeană, pentru ca un viitor Dodon să nu poată să deturneze cursul acestei țări. Sunt aceste fapte complicități cu Rusia sau sunt exact opusul?

Discutând despre reforma electorală, domnule comisar, să fim clari: cei care manipulează subiectul reforma electorală uită sau nu vor să țină cont de faptul că această lege este 100 % *copy/paste* după legea electorală din Germania, este o lege democratică sau nu? Uită că au fost încorporate peste 80 % din recomandările Comisiei de la Veneția, acest lucru este democratic sau nu? Uită că noi nu putem judeca oportunitatea adoptării legislației? Într-un cuvânt, dacă nu sprijinim Moldova astăzi, o dăm pe gratis Rusiei și atunci vom spune la final „*Do svidaniya, Moldova!*”, dar pe mâna PPE-ului.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Od czasu aneksji Krymu wybór opcji zachodniej lub opcji rosyjskiej przez społeczeństwo i ewentualnie władze Mołdowy oznacza wybór zupełnie innych zasad bezpieczeństwa, zupełnie innych wartości, zupełnie innych zasad demokracji. Cieszę się, że dostrzegają to zarówno NATO, jak i Unia Europejska. Mołdowa stała się terenem priorytetowego projektu współdziałania obydwu organizacji w dziedzinie cyberbezpieczeństwa. Pochwalam politykę bezpieczeństwa rządu Mołdowy. Monitoruję postęp w tej dziedzinie i uważam, że jest ciekawy, interesujący i godny pochwały. Niestety również dostrzegam w tym kraju pewne niepokojące oznaki, do takich należy ciągle monopol medialny i wpływy oligarchów.

Petras Auštrevičius, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, this is the third time in the last five months that we are discussing Moldova in this Chamber. As a standing rapporteur, it is not the kind of attention I would like to see for Moldova so repeatedly.

Let me start by addressing the Moldovan authorities very frankly: the main thing that I miss in Moldovan politics is a critical lack of a real consensus in the national political field. Do not expect Brussels to do it for you. Consensus must be built on a daily basis in Chișinău, Bălți and Comrat. The newly adopted election law was clearly a bulldozer-type move – not what we expect from an EU-associated partner. As a result, respectable international bodies – the Venice Commission and the OSCE – are ignored and bypassed. At home, smaller political parties feel unfairly pressed and even eliminated.

Moldovan citizens are waiting for a different type of politics. People, including us in this House, want to see the unimpeded publication of the Kroll 2 investigation report. We all expect no further delay in the identification and bringing to justice of those persons or politicians who are hiding behind this unprecedented bank fraud scandal. At the same time, we continue to be concerned to see biased legal proceedings, such as in the case of Chişinău Mayor, Dorin Chirtoacă. We stress that only an independent and depoliticised judiciary can deliver justice and trust.

I will keep repeating that I see today many missed opportunities for Moldova. As a true friend, I am critical of idea of the European future of Moldova. However, the country will continue losing until the moment when its authorities finally come to the conclusion that building a national consensus in a European way is exactly what makes Moldova's statehood stronger and consolidates its society.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, jako dlouhodobý člen delegace pro spolupráci – podtrhuji slovo „spolupráci“ – EU-Moldavsko bych mohl jedině přivítat, že EU systematicky, a to nejen finančně, přispívá na pomoc a rozvoj Moldavska. Moldavsko je členem Východního partnerství již od jeho vzniku, tedy od roku 2009. A rád slyším slova, že je to partnerství ne proti někomu, ale pro spolupráci.

Bohužel jsem nucen konstatovat, že doposud nedošlo k naplnění očekávání ani ze strany EU, ani samotných Moldavanů. Moldavsko stále zůstává nejchudší zemí v Evropě, korupce je na vzestupu, stát je veden fakticky oligarchy a občanská společnost zůstává nevyslyšena. Od všech dosavadních vlád jsme očekávali potřebné změny v justici, boji s korupcí a organizovaným zločinem. Vnitřní uspořádání státu je jistě věcí každého státu, ale racionálně uvažující člověk se musí ptát, zda je v pořádku plánovaná koncentrace moci v rukou jediného člověka. Domnívám se, že bychom měli vyhodnotit účinnost a prospěšnost projektu Východního partnerství pro všechny zúčastněné. Chci zdůraznit, že brána na Balkán – Moldavsko – by se neměla stát místem doutnajícího konfliktu či druhou Ukrajinou.

Igor Šoltes, v imenu skupine Verts/ALE. – Res je, kar so rekli kolegi o Moldaviji.

V tem zadnjem obdobju govorimo kar velikokrat, vendar situacija zaradi tega ni nič boljša, in upravičeno se sprašujem tudi sam, ali je smiselno pošiljati finančna sredstva v Moldavijo za njen razvoj in pomoč, ko pa ta sredstva izginjajo, ko pravzaprav tudi sredstva iz banke, ki pomenijo kar velik škandal, še vedno po tolikem času ne dobijo ustreznega epiloga.

Problem se v Moldaviji samo krepi in korupcija se povečuje, tudi situacija na področju svobode medijev in svobode govora ni idealna in se slabša.

Nevladni sektorji, nevladne organizacije govorijo tudi o množičnem kršenju človekovih pravic in pravzaprav o politiki izključevanja, o aretacijah, ki seveda nimajo nič skupnega z demokracijo in pa seveda tudi s pravičnim sojenjem. In to so signali, na katere mora tudi Evropski parlament ukrepati.

Tudi zaradi te situacije sem prepričan, da mora Parlament odigrati tudi svojo vlogo, in se strinjam s kolegom Predo, ki tudi predlaga, da se tudi predstavniki Evropskega parlamenta vključijo v ta monitoring situacije v Moldaviji ali pa s posebno misijo pregledamo vse te navedbe.

James Carver, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the international community should support this country on a basis of maintaining strict neutrality on their democratic process. The EUR 100 million euros in grants and loans to Moldova recently approved by the European Union have, of course, the usual strings attached, not least when you consider Parliament's recent reports underlining your support, given their forthcoming parliamentary elections.

With respect to your comments, Commissioner, this naked ambition to attempt to influence Eastern European nations is just another part of the EU's neo-colonialism or, as you prefer to call it, foreign policy. Surely the time has come, colleagues, for a different approach. Why not recognise the geographic and cultural dilemmas affecting such countries and, instead of the usual tug-of-war with Russia, use Moldova's position as a conduit to attempt to build bridges.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je savais déjà que l'Europe, cela pouvait être la guerre économique, du fait du principe de concurrence, qui implique la guerre.

Je sais maintenant, et je constate tous les jours, que l'Europe, c'est aussi la guerre politique menée au nom des droits de l'homme, de l'état de droit ou de la démocratie, à usage très ambivalent et, selon les pays, évolutif.

Cela ne renforce ni l'intégration ni la paix, mais entraîne une division à géométrie variable, notamment vis-à-vis de l'ennemi unilatéralement désigné que serait la Russie.

Faut-il établir des contrôles aux frontières moldaves entre l'Ukraine et la Transnistrie? Faut-il mettre en place un bureau d'information de l'Otan? Faut-il des ONG pilotées par des financements étrangers pour remettre en question, à tout moment, la démocratie moldave?

Et puis parlons de la corruption: jamais un système n'a été aussi corrompu que celui-ci. Donc, quelle est votre politique, Monsieur le Commissaire? Expliquez-moi!

David McAllister (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Das Assoziierungsabkommen der Europäischen Union mit der Republik Moldau legt aus meiner Sicht besonderen Wert auf drei Punkte: erstens auf die Einhaltung demokratischer und rechtsstaatlicher Prinzipien, zweitens auf eine verantwortungsvolle Staatsführung sowie drittens auf die Wahrung von Grund- und Menschenrechten. Vorredner haben es bereits betont: In diesem Land muss insbesondere die Korruption bis auf die höchste Ebene bekämpft und die Justiz des Landes reformiert werden. Diese dringenden Reformen gilt es voranzutreiben. Die Verantwortlichen in Chişinău rufe ich eindringlich dazu auf, allen Empfehlungen der Venedig-Kommission im Rahmen der Wahlrechtsreform zu folgen.

Herr Kommissar, ich will an dieser Stelle deutlich werden: Die Europäische Union ist der größte Geldgeber der Republik Moldau. Mit dieser Entschließung machen wir als Parlament deutlich: Der Ball liegt im moldauischen Spielfeld, und wenn die Fortschritte in den genannten Bereichen ausbleiben, muss das auch Konsequenzen für die finanzielle Unterstützung von unserer Seite haben.

Die europäische Nachbarschaftspolitik fußt auf dem Grundsatz „*more for more*“. Das kann aber konsequenterweise im Gegensatz auch bedeuten „*less for less*“, und dessen müssen sich alle Verantwortlichen in Chişinău bewusst sein.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Skepsis ist angebracht, da gebe ich Ihnen Recht. Unter sogenannten proeuropäischen Regierungen ist das Land systematisch von einem Skandal in den nächsten gerutscht, und die Menschen in Moldau wissen nicht wirklich, ob das nun der Weg der Europäischen Union ist. Nein, er ist es nicht! Wir selbst haben uns ein bisschen mitschuldig gemacht, weil wir zu nett waren und ab und zu auch weggeguckt haben.

Ich glaube, die Situation ist heute besser geworden. Die Wirtschaft fängt an, sich zu erholen, wenn Sie beim Internationalen Währungsfonds nachsehen, wenn Sie bei der Weltbank nachsehen, kann man das auch nachlesen. Reformen werden angegangen. Gut so, aber nicht genug und nicht schnell genug – einverstanden mit dieser Kritik. Insbesondere die Reform der Justiz und auch der Kampf gegen organisierte Kriminalität, Korruption müssen deutliche Früchte zeigen. Dennoch: Die Politik gegenüber NGOs und die Medienfreiheit – diese Rechte wollen wir nicht vergessen.

Die Wahlrechtsreform ist ein sensibles Thema in jedem Land. Niemand kann der Regierung in Chişinău vorschreiben, was für ein Wahlrechtssystem sie haben will. Aber sie sollte bei der Einführung und bei der Art der Ausführung des Gesetzes deutlich auf die Venedig-Kommission hören. Ich glaube, das ist wirklich in ihrem Interesse, auch nach dem, was Herr McAllister gesagt hat.

Letzter Satz: Ich traue der Kommission und dem Auswärtigen Dienst eine Menge zu. Wir wollen nicht anfangen, dass wir das infrage stellen, indem wir immer lieber selbst reisen und die Behörde dann auflösen. Wir haben in unserer Fraktion noch nicht darüber geredet, ob wir das, was Sie vorgeschlagen haben, gut finden. Diesen speziellen Punkt halte ich selbst für überzogen und auch nicht für notwendig. Ich traue Frau Mogherini und ihren Mitarbeitern.

Bas Belder (ECR). – De nieuwe Moldavische kieswet van 20 juli impliceert een verdere ondergraving van exact een democratische rechtsstaat. Deze politiek doorzichtige wetgeving beoogt immers elke potentiële oppositie uit te bannen of te marginaliseren. Dat voorspelt weinig goeds voor de parlementsverkiezingen van herfst volgend jaar.

Dat brengt mij bij een vraag: moet de Europese Unie in deze zorgelijke situatie toch gewoon overgaan tot de verstrekking in termijnen van 100 miljoen euro macrofinanciële hulp aan Moldavië? Commissie, hoe verhoudt zich dat tot de gezamenlijke verklaring van de Raad, de Commissie en het Parlement die precies om een rechtsstatelijke afweging vraagt voor juist deze hulpverlening?

Ik vraag dit niet zonder haast, want in Nederland zijn er tal van particuliere stichtingen – ik heb er zelf ook deel van uitgemaakt, ik ben bij Moldavië betrokken geweest – die het hart in de hand willen hebben voor Moldavië, maar dat moet kunnen op grond van een democratische rechtsstaat die functioneert en dat is niet het geval.

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). – Domnule președinte, acordul de asociere cu Republica Moldova vizează cetățenii Republicii Moldova și cred că, în preocupările fiecărui om politic european, aceasta trebuie să fie o prioritate, nu jocurile politice care vizează întărirea unui partid sau altul.

Salut, domnule comisar, abordarea dumneavoastră cu privire la asistența financiară. Proiectele care vizează direct bunăstarea cetățenilor trebuie să continue, pentru că, numai așa, Uniunea Europeană poate să fie relevantă și poate aduce bunăstarea și în această parte de lume atât de controversată, atât de săracă și atât de dificil poziționată într-o strategie de securitate în această zonă. Altfel, ar însemna ca cele 100 de milioane să vină probabil peste câțiva ani direct de la Moscova, iar Bruxelles-ul va fi irrelevant și este păcat pentru ceea ce am investit noi în sprijinul cetățenilor moldoveni, care sunt cetățeni europeni.

Reformele continuă. Creșterea economică este de 4 %. Sunt, sigur, chestiuni care urmează să fie rezolvate, dar acestea cu sprijinul Uniunii Europene, și nu altfel, vor aduce prosperitate Republicii Moldova.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Ein Wort zur Wahlrechtsreform als Erstes: Also ich denke, dass man diese Reform, so wie die Gesellschaft dazu polarisiert ist, nicht ein Jahr vor der nächsten Wahl machen sollte. Das ist auch die wichtigste Kritik der Venedig-Kommission an dieser ganzen Vorbereitung derjenigen, die jetzt Moldau regieren. Ich glaube, dass diese Wahlreform nicht dazu führen wird, dass Politiker zuverlässiger werden und weniger Korruption in den politischen Eliten stattfindet. Das würde besser erreicht werden – und auch das hat die Venedig-Kommission gesagt –, wenn man die Parteienfinanzierung transparent machen würde und wenn es endlich mehr und unabhängige Medien in Moldau gäbe.

Trotz dieser Kritik glaube ich, dass es sehr wichtig ist, dass die Europäische Union gegenüber Moldau zuverlässig ist. Wir haben eine Möglichkeit, durch die Implementierung des Assoziierungsabkommens etwas zu erreichen. Wir sollten unsere makrofinanzielle Unterstützung allerdings nicht bedingungslos geben. Gerade die Bürger von Moldau wollen, dass wir unser Geld an Erfolge bei der Korruptionsbekämpfung binden.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Die Republik Moldau ist nach wie vor eines der ärmsten europäischen Länder und wird von der Korruption einiger weniger Oligarchen in Geiselhaft genommen. Zwischen 2007 und 2015 überwies die Union 782 Mio. EUR an Finanzhilfe, und laut dem amtierenden Präsidenten, Igor Dodon, ist mindestens die Hälfte dieses Betrags verschwunden. Jetzt kann man sagen: Ja und, der Herr ist ja Moskau-orientiert und daher auch so politisch motiviert. Allerdings ist unter der proeuropäischen Regierungskoalition der Allianz für europäische Integration auch eine halbe Milliarde versickert, im Korruptionssumpf verschwunden.

Eine weitere Annäherung ist daher zu überlegen. Weitere finanzielle Unterstützung Moldaus sollte in Anbetracht dieser wüsten Korruption durchaus rational überdacht werden und nicht dem politischen Wunsch entspringen, Russland hier offensichtlich wieder einmal zu provozieren.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în sesiunea trecută, aici, la Strasbourg, Președintele Comisiei a prezentat în discursul său propunerea ca, în această toamnă, Comisia să vină cu o foaie de parcurs pentru integrarea Serbiei și Muntenegrului.

Îmi exprim regretul că Moldova nu este în acest pachet. Acum câțiva ani făcea eforturi și progrese foarte mari. Din păcate, în ultima perioadă, lucrurile au decurs altfel. Sunt foarte multe lucruri care nu sunt în ordine în Moldova: vorbim despre statul de drept, despre corupție, despre foarte multe lucruri care nu fac din Moldova un stat care să poată să fie stat candidat.

Însă, în același timp, Uniunea Europeană are o politică de vecinătate care dorește să aducă liniște la granițele Europei. Toate aceste acorduri de parteneriat sau acorduri de asociere sunt făcute în acest în scop. De aceea, eu cred că trebuie să continuăm această politică. E adevărat, în cazul unor astfel de state, după părerea mea, există o singură posibilitate: condiții, apoi îndeplinirea acestor condiții și apoi banii. Cred că aceasta este calea pe care ar trebui să o urmăm.

Andi Cristea (S&D). – Mr President, today's debate demonstrates that, notwithstanding the many challenges the EU is confronted with, the Republic of Moldova is and remains a top priority for the Union and for this House. While many domestic and external challenges are still present, my feeling is that finally Moldova is back on track.

Let me be very clear, the Filip government is delivering results. The state of crisis of 2015 has been replaced by steady progress on important reforms. The economic situation has stabilised with many indicators showing solid improvement. It is a fact! Political association and economic integration with the EU through the provisions of the Association Agreement and the DCFTA are proceeding at a stable pace.

The next months will be crucial to confirming this positive trend. This is why all political forces must overcome the polarised political climate ahead of the electoral period and engage in constructive dialogue, taking into account the real needs and expectations of the citizens.

The EU and the European Parliament are looking forward to working with both the majority and the opposition to this end. As always, we stand ready to assist the Republic of Moldova through all the means at our disposal.

Let me be very clear, and I have this advice from my colleagues from the EPP Group: we should work together, not bash ourselves!

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, Moldova a primit în ultimii trei ani de la Uniunea Europeană peste 300 000 000 EUR pentru reformele în justiție, pentru administrație și pentru infrastructură. De ce? Pentru că vrem ca Moldova să intre în familia europeană. Dar Dodon și Plahotniuc își continuă proiectul de a scoate Moldova de pe drumul european.

Ne-am opus votului uninominal în Moldova, de exemplu, așa cum a recomandat și Comisia de la Veneția, pentru că folosea numai oligarhilor și prietenilor lui Putin și nu folosea populației, al cărei vot ar fi fost corectat și numărat incorect. Ei l-au ignorat, ne-au ignorat și pe noi în decizia noastră și Comisia de la Veneția și au votat votul uninominal. Moldova trăiește din bani europeni, nu din banii lui Plahotniuc, nu din banii lui Dodon și nu din banii Rusiei.

Moldova trebuie să înceteze cu ipocrizia, clasa politică din Moldova trebuie să înceteze cu ipocrizia și trebuie sancționată prin condiționarea sprijinului financiar de respectarea principiilor democratice și de a nu fura din banii de la Uniunea Europeană.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Noriu atkreipti Jūsų dėmesį į svarbą, kuri išorės politikoje tenka Moldovai. Moldova – ES išorės santykių mechanizmo lakmuso popierėlis. Ji yra skurdi ir ne itin gerai valdoma šalis, kuriai reikia pagalbos tiek užtikrinant darnią plėtrą, tiek ir gerą valdymą. Ji yra išaldytų konfliktų šalis – Padniestrės problema yra tokia pat skausminga kaip ir Šiaurės Kipro problema. Moldovoje susikerta šalies piliečių noras suartėti su Europa ir Rusijos nenoras paleisti iš savo kontrolės. O padėti dar labiau komplikuoja silpna ir į vidinius konfliktus įsivėlusį vietinį valdžią, kurios veikla pastaruoju metu kelia abejonių dėl suderinamumo su demokratijos principais. Europa turėtų pasiūsti aiškų žinią, kad suartėjimas su Europa ir rinkų atvėrimas bei parama yra įmanoma tik mainais į demokratines, teisėtvarkos ir rinkos reformas.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, oui à une Moldavie européenne, oui à une Moldavie dans l'Europe des nations, en partenariat avec la Russie.

Aujourd'hui, vous voulez faire de la Moldavie l'Ukraine. C'est là un beau scénario dont personne ne veut. La Moldavie est un pays indépendant et souverain, et ce ne sont pas les Roumains que vous êtes qui allez ignorer ce fait d'histoire.

La Moldavie est une grande nation, même si sa population compte seulement trois millions d'habitants. Aujourd'hui, l'Union européenne veut engager des réformes pour la Moldavie, à la place de la Roumanie. Elle a ainsi prévu de consacrer 2,8 millions d'euros à une réforme de l'administration et à une réforme territoriale.

Moi, je crois qu'il faut respecter la souveraineté des nations. La Moldavie est un État indépendant, un État situé entre l'Est et l'Ouest, un État auquel il faut, bien évidemment, demander l'accord en vue de sa participation.

Aujourd'hui, il est vrai que la Moldavie a refusé, avec son président M. Dodon, de participer aux engagements de l'OTAN. Je crois personnellement qu'il faut respecter la souveraineté de cet État.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die moldauische Bevölkerung hat sich in vielen Wahlen für eine westliche europäische Politik entschieden. Zweitens: Sie haben dafür auf eigenen Wunsch einen Assoziierungs- und Freihandelsvertrag bekommen, den sie ratifiziert haben, und darin steht, dass dies entwickelt werden muss, einschließlich der inneren Entwicklung zur Rechtsstaatlichkeit gegen Korruption. Was wichtig ist, ist, dass das Land selbst Fortschritte für die Bürger hat, weil Rechtsstaatlichkeit, und Antikorruption eine Bedingung für weitere Investitionen und Arbeitsplätze sind.

Ich weiß nicht, Herr Kollege, was daran falsch sein sollte. Das ist eine Vereinbarung, die da sein soll. Wir müssen feststellen, dass wir Moldau unterstützen müssen, damit es seine Unabhängigkeit gegen den Nachbarn, der diese Unabhängigkeit zerstören will, verteidigen kann! Da liegt doch die Aggression, wenn man beispielsweise auf die Transnistrien-Frage hinweist.

Und eine letzte Bemerkung: Das sollte man aber nicht mit einem Wahlrecht, das manipulationsträchtig ist, machen. Wenn man Wahlkreise gewinnen kann und das nicht auf das Gesamtergebnis angerechnet wird und dann noch mal bei den Listen Mandate kriegen kann, dann kann man mit 50 % der Stimmen 80 % der Mandate bekommen und das so weiter rechnen. Das ist eine Wahlmethode, die nicht korrekt ist, und aus diesem Grunde ist das ein falscher Einsatz.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Trzysta trzydzieści pięć milionów euro w ciągu trzech lat Unia przekazała Mołdowie. Wydaje się, że to spore pieniądze. Oczywiście wymagamy, aby te pieniądze były dobrze użytkowane. Z drugiej strony w Mołdowie w tej chwili toczy się pewien mecz geopolityczny między nami, Zachodem, Unią, a Rosją. To też trzeba wziąć pod uwagę, że jest proeuropejski rząd i prorosyjski prezydent. Trzeba szczególnej dyplomacji i mądrości, aby wspierać siły proeuropejskie w tym kraju i aby pokazywać również społeczeństwu tego kraju to, w jakim stopniu ten kraj może stać się częścią rosyjskiej strefy wpływów ze wszystkimi tego konsekwencjami geopolitycznymi. Jestem za tym, żeby ta pomoc ze strony Unii była jak największa i żeby ona przesuwała Mołdawię w kierunku Europy, tylko Europy politycznej, bo w Europie Mołdawia jest.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, I would say to the Commissioner that Moldova has certainly reached a crossroads. This is a warning, but it could yet become an incentive for hope and progress. Political and social stability have been seriously undermined and, as has been pointed out, the lack of national consensus about the European road is a warning signal.

We have been critical of the latest electoral law which, as the Venice Commission has warned, could favour the influence of oligarchs and disadvantage minorities and women. But, to be fair, this is not about the laws as such: it is about the possible misuse of a law in the short-term interests of political and economic groups. The truth is that Moldova represents a warning of the long-term, devastating impact of foreign-imposed frozen conflict that the international community has not been willing or able to address. Therefore, we should support the request for the Moldovan Government to include the withdrawal of Russian troops on the General Assembly's agenda, because this promise, which should have been fulfilled 15 years ago, in 2002, is still unfulfilled.

We certainly remain committed to supporting Moldova, but we have to remind the Moldovan authorities that granting micro-financial assistance has to be conditional on their meeting European and democratic standards for civil society.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nic nie przemawia za tym, by Unia Europejska odstąpiła od przyjętej strategii wyraźnego wsparcia dla wolnościowych i europejskich aspiracji Mołdawii. Jeden z posłów UKIP mówił tutaj o nadużyciu ze strony Unii Europejskiej, o neokolonializmie, o neutralności politycznej. Otóż w tym świecie nie ma neutralności politycznej: albo Mołdawia będzie częścią rodziny europejskiej, albo znajdzie się w strefie wpływów rosyjskich. Jednak pomoc nie może być naiwna i bezwarunkowa, więc ten realistyczny głos jest jak najbardziej godny wsparcia. Musimy oczekiwać walki z korupcją, uzdrowienia sądownictwa, autentycznej wolności politycznej i pluralizmu mediów, nie tylko ze względu na europejskie oczekiwania, ale i interesy Mołdawii. Mołdawia, która nie uzdrowi siebie sama, skaze się na obecność w rosyjskiej strefie wpływów. Jeśli się uzdrowi, będzie mogła dzielić wspólny los z narodami Europy.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Fulvio Martusciello (PPE), Domanda «cartellino blu». – Soltanto per chiedere se nella legge elettorale vi siano disposizioni per aiutare i tanti moldavi che vivono all'estero – in Italia ce ne sono 135 000 – mettendoli nella condizione di poter partecipare al voto. Chiedo, quindi, se questo può essere un ulteriore elemento di discussione.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Jak najbardziej, to znaczy tego typu oczekiwania powinny być rozważone. Jeszcze w większym stopniu powinny być rozważone oczekiwania dotyczące prawdziwej wolności, konkurencyjności i swobody wyborów, więc jak najbardziej tego typu oczekiwania są godne wsparcia. Natomiast ważny jest kierunek strategiczny – czy z dobrą wolą wspieramy aspiracje europejskie Mołdawii, czy też nie. Ja opowiadałam się za tym pierwszym rozwiązaniem.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Tuż przed szczytem Partnerstwa Wschodniego chcielibyśmy widzieć zupełnie inną debatę na temat Mołdawii i to jest niespełna rok po wejściu w życie układu stowarzyszeniowego wraz ze strefą wolnego handlu. Wiemy też, że dobre skutki odnosi ruch wizowy, no ale trudno jest nie podnosić tego tematu, bowiem umowy to wzajemne zobowiązania. Kiedy mamy problemy ze zwalczaniem korupcji, zawłaszczaniem środków publicznych, kiedy mamy problemy z wymiarem sprawiedliwości, również te sygnały dotyczące zmian, jeżeli chodzi o system demokratyczny w samej Mołdawii.

Chciałbym przypomnieć, że 22 maja parlamentarny komitet stowarzyszenia z zadowoleniem przyjął między innymi narodowy plan działania do roku 2019, który został przyjęty przez Mołdawię. Teraz należałoby go wypełnić treścią, w szczególności jeżeli chodzi o postępowanie w legislacji. Problem stały to oczywiście Naddniestrze, które ogromnie wpływa na sytuację wewnętrzną w Mołdawii, tego nie możemy pominąć i to być może jest jeden z elementów, który usprawiedliwia nieco to, co się dzieje w Mołdawii, ale z drugiej strony trudno inne sprawy akceptować. Myślę, że to stwierdzenie Pana Komisarza, że należy wspierać społeczeństwo obywatelskie, to dobry kierunek, Panie Komisarzu. Zawsze jest tak, że gdy próbujemy państwo i jego władzę trochę naprostować, to nie powinniśmy karać społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i wydaje mi się, że to jest niezmiernie istotne.

Również z zadowoleniem chcę powiedzieć, że przyjmujemy tę wspólną deklarację przewodniczących parlamentów Mołdawii, Gruzji, Ukrainy, która odnosi się do szczytu Partnerstwa Wschodniego. To też jest dobry sygnał, w końcu pochodzący z parlamentów narodowych.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziś rano odbyła się burzliwa debata na temat stanu negocjacji w sprawie brexitu. Wielka Brytania opuszcza Unię. Z drugiej strony, co niedawno triumfalnie zapowiedział szef Komisji Juncker, Unia liczy na przyjęcie innych krajów. W przedśionku unijnym czeka także Mołdawia. Kraj ten podpisał z Unią Europejską układ o partnerstwie i współpracy już 23 lata temu. Przed trzema laty podpisał umowę stowarzyszeniową. Wciąż jednak daleki jest od spełnienia unijnych kryteriów. Unia Europejska przeciwstawia się zmianom w ordynacji wyborczej Mołdawii. Domaga się skutecznej walki z korupcją, a także straszy Komisją Wenecką. W twardym dążeniu do ideologicznych standardów niektórzy zdają się nie dostrzegać, że trzyipółmilionowa Mołdawia należy do najbardziej biedniejszych państw europejskich, a jej wewnętrzne problemy wykorzystuje Rosja. Jeśli zasklepimy się w unijnej retoryce, za chwilę może się okazać, że kraj ten wypowie umowę stowarzyszeniową i znajdzie się w unii, ale euroazjatyckiej.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to repeat that we have been standing behind Moldova's pro-European ambitions and have had high hopes for its involvement in our joint projects. Yet now I am very concerned about the deterioration of the rule of law and democratic standards in the Republic of Moldova. We have seen the intimidation and harassment of pro-European political opposition and the disregarding of the recommendations of the Venice Commission to change the electoral system. It is clear that the changes in the electoral law directly undermine democratic standards in the country. The recent internal political developments in Moldova are nowhere near the positive momentum we witnessed three years ago. The implementation of the Association Agenda is lagging behind and it is clear that it needs to become a priority of the political leadership.

I would like to appeal to the High Representative and the Commission to make use of our external policy instruments in order to bring the country back to democratic standards. We in the European Parliament stand ready to support Moldova on its European path and its reform process. This can happen, however, only once we see real commitment to a pro-European path and respect for democratic values from the leaders of the country.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi. Adevăratele mize ale relației noastre cu Republica Moldova sunt următoarele: unu – reformele pe care le așteaptă cetățenii Republicii Moldova, și doi – creșterea sprijinului cetățenilor Republicii Moldova pentru parcursul european al Republicii Moldova.

Republica Moldova are nevoie de reforme profunde în justiție, combaterea corupției, administrația publică și multe alte domenii. Oamenii așteaptă aceste reforme, iar noi trebuie să utilizăm toate instrumentele pe care le avem la dispoziție pentru a accelera ritmul reformelor. Nu trebuie să ne fie teamă să aplicăm condiționalități pentru sprijinul financiar pe care îl aplicăm Republicii Moldova. Dimpotrivă, condiționalitatea este ceea ce cetățenii Republicii Moldova așteaptă. Cetățenii Republicii Moldova nu mai vor să acordăm cecuri în alb. Doar fiind fermi în sprijinirea acestor reforme vom avea sprijinul cetățenilor.

Trebuie să fim cinstiți. Majoritatea parlamentară de la Chișinău a modificat legislația electorală în ciuda avizului Comisiei de la Veneția și a semnalelor de alarmă trase de către Comisia Europeană și a pierdut, ca atare, încrederea noastră. A ne mulțumi cu mimarea procesului de reformă înseamnă a fi naivi și a pierde susținerea cetățenilor Republicii Moldova pentru procesul de integrare europeană.

Ca raportor general pentru bugetul Uniunii Europene, am propus de la începutul anului mai multe fonduri pentru vecinătatea estică, inclusiv pentru Republica Moldova, dar acești bani să fie folosiți acolo unde e nevoie de ei.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tu debatu velmi pozorně poslouchal a osobně se domnívám, že – alespoň pro mne – z toho plynou dva závěry, i pro zástupce Komise. Za prvé je třeba, podle mého názoru, jasně říkat moldavským státním orgánům, že reforma volebního práva, která byla přijata, je pro nás nepřijatelná. Myslím si, že je třeba v tomto být jednoznačný, mít jasný postoj a orgány státu jasně kritizovat.

Na druhou stranu bychom v žádném případě neměli omezovat finanční pomoc Moldavsku. Pokud vyklidíme prostor a stáhneme se z Moldavska, ten prostor geopoliticky obsadí Rusko. Rusko čeká na to, až naše pomoc bývalým sovětským satelitům bude omezena, bude snížena a Rusko samo tento prostor mocensky vyplní. Takže já moc prosím, pane komisaři, podporujme finančně občanský sektor v Moldavsku, pomáhejme Moldavanům dále, mějme na paměti, že boj s Ruskem o toto území stále probíhá.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Domnule președinte, cred că cei care solicită suspendarea acordului financiar și a ajutorului financiar acordat Republicii Moldova vor să vadă această țară dusă spre Uniunea Euroasiatică, acolo unde vrea să o ducă domnul Dodon – domnul Dodon, care face orice e posibil să fie inclus în partea negativă, întunecată a scurtei istorii a Republicii Moldova.

Cetățenii Republicii Moldova vor un parcurs european și trebuie să ne gândim că anul viitor, în 2018, vor fi alegeri parlamentare. Acum este momentul să susținem parcursul european al Republicii Moldova mai mult ca oricând. Doamnelor și domnilor, este un moment important acesta și nu trebuie să îl pierdem.

În același timp, vă solicit, domnule comisar, solicit Comisiei Europene, Parlamentului European și altor instituții, atunci când vorbesc de Moldova, să folosească termenul corect de Republica Moldova, pentru că Moldova este și o parte a României.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Mr President, it is absolutely right that the citizens of Moldova want European integration. Unfortunately, the political situation in Moldova is getting very complicated and embarrassing. We are witnessing continuing confrontation and, indeed, political deadlock between pro-Western and pro-Eastern forces in the country. In this context, I urge all political leaders and parties in Moldova to engage in constructive dialogue in order to ensure democracy, the rule of law and political stability there.

I strongly believe that politicians in Moldova should focus their efforts on important issues for the future of the country and implement crucial political and economic reforms in order to provide better living standards for all Moldovans.

The EU has the capacity to play the essential role of facilitator, on the one hand for political dialogue among the country's political factions and, on the other, for the implementation of sorely needed reforms.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Unione europea e Moldavia: siamo un *player* o solo un *payer*? Mentre il Parlamento moldavo adottava una riforma del sistema elettorale, passando a un sistema fortemente criticato anche dalla Commissione di Venezia, per gli enormi vantaggi per il partito di governo, era infatti ancora fresco l'inchiestro sulla nostra decisione di concedere l'assistenza macrofinanziaria. E questa è solo la punta dell'iceberg.

I recenti emendamenti alla nuova legge sulle ONG, se adottati, comprometterebbero gravemente l'attività della società civile, spesso unico baluardo nel paese contro la corruzione dilagante. Mentre sulla colossale frode bancaria da un miliardo di dollari, dopo tre anni tutto ancora tace.

Da ex osservatore elettorale nel paese, l'auspicio mio e di molti è di vedere un giorno la Moldavia, insieme a noi nella famiglia dell'Unione europea. Ma la nostra benevolenza non deve essere scambiata per stupidità. Ritengo che sia opportuno, se il governo moldavo non ritornerà prontamente sui suoi passi, rivalutare la concessione dell'assistenza macrofinanziaria per indirizzarla invece su progetti e programmi a pieno sostegno della società civile.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η περίπτωση της Μολδαβίας είναι ένα ακόμη δείγμα της εσφαλμένης εξωτερικής πολιτικής που ακολούθησε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Παρά το γεγονός ότι, από το 2005 και μετά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χορήγησε τεράστια χρηματικά ποσά στη Μολδαβία, τα χρήματα αυτά δεν χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για να αναπτυχθούν τομείς, οι οποίοι θα έδιναν και θέσεις εργασίας, όπως παραδειγματός χάρη η βιομηχανία και ο αγροτικός τομέας, αλλά για να διανοιγούν κάποιες αγορές που ενδιέφεραν την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αυτό είχε σαν συνέπεια να δοθεί η δυνατότητα στις δυνάμεις του εσωτερικού κατεστημένου και της διαφθοράς της χώρας να εκμεταλλευθούν τα χρήματα αυτά, να τα καταχραστούν, να δημιουργήσουν ένα οικονομικό κενό της τάξεως του ενός δισεκατομμυρίου δολαρίων σε τρεις τράπεζες της χώρας και γενικά να καταρρακωθεί η οικονομία της χώρας. Η καταστροφή της χώρας έλαβε τη χαριστική βολή από τα μέτρα τα οποία εφάρμοσαν εναντίον της Ρωσίας οι χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, διότι η Ρωσία αποτελεί τον βασικό προμηθευτή αερίου στη Μολδαβία και τον μεγαλύτερο εισαγωγέα προϊόντων της χώρας. Με βάση αυτά πιστεύω ότι, εάν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν αναθεωρήσει τη στάση της, θα χάσει αυτή τη μικρή σύμμαχο χώρα.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Domnule președinte, această dezbatere pe Republica Moldova este binevenită. Dintre toate țările Parteneriatului estic, Republica Moldova este poate cel mai de succes exemplu. Direcția europeană a fost menținută, în ciuda multor presiuni dinspre est și mă refer, evident, la Rusia.

Sunt însă informații și dovezi îngrijorătoare legate de starea democrației, de ademeniri, amenințări și presiuni la adresa unor parlamentari sau aleși locali să își schimbe opțiunea politică în legătură cu schimbarea legislației electorale. Comisia Europeană trebuie să facă toate demersurile, cât mai ferme și mai hotărâte, ca angajamentele asumate de Republica Moldova să fie respectate și democrația și statul de drept să funcționeze, poate chiar să reflecteze la înființarea unei structuri în interiorul Comisiei Europene care să monitorizeze implementarea angajamentelor, mai ales în domeniul judiciar.

Și, sigur, dacă toate aceste demersuri nu dau roade, putem vorbi și de sancțiuni financiare, deși mă tem că ele vor afecta mai mult cetățenii obișnuiți și mai puțin pe cei care conduc astăzi Republica Moldova.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, comme l'Ukraine, la Moldavie est tiraillée entre l'Union européenne et la Russie. Notre devoir est de tout faire pour qu'elle se reconnaisse dans les valeurs européennes, et l'aide que nous lui apportons doit y contribuer.

La loi électorale, la démocratie et l'indépendance de la justice font, à l'évidence, partie de ces valeurs. Le parti unique n'entre pas dans notre conception de la démocratie, mais nous devons aussi favoriser le développement économique de la Moldavie, qui possède des ressources minières intéressantes, et lutter contre la pauvreté.

Selon moi, c'est à partir de ces progrès qu'il y aura une prise de conscience du peuple moldave. Si nous ne devons pas nous ingérer directement dans la gouvernance de la Moldavie, nous devons porter ces valeurs auprès du peuple et nous serions bien inspirés, me semble-t-il, de faire en sorte qu'une partie de cette aide soit consacrée au pluralisme des médias.

Dans tous les cas de figure, la Moldavie ne peut en aucun cas devenir une nouvelle Crimée.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν τρία χρόνια η Ένωση και η Μολδαβία υπέγραψαν Συμφωνία Σύνδεσης, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Συμφωνίας Ελεύθερων Συναλλαγών, ενώ η Μολδαβία έγινε η πρώτη χώρα εταίρος που επωφελήθηκε από το καθεστώς απαλλαγής θεώρησης. Στόχος ήταν να υποστηριχθεί η χώρα για πολιτική, κοινωνική και οικονομική μεταρρύθμιση, προκειμένου να ενισχυθούν ο εκδημοκρατισμός και η χρηστή διακυβέρνηση, η ενεργειακή ασφάλεια και η οικονομική και κοινωνική ανάπτυξη. Αντ' αυτών ένα δισεκατομμύριο δολάρια εξαφανίστηκαν από τα τρία μεγαλύτερα τραπεζικά ιδρύματα μέσα σε δύο ημέρες. Ο πληθυσμός της χώρας μειώθηκε κατά 10% σε μια χώρα με 2,9 εκατομμύρια εναπομεινάντες πολίτες, όπου 600.000 ζουν μόνιμα στο εξωτερικό και 350.000 πηγαίνουν σε γειτονικές χώρες για να επιζήσουν. Η χώρα οδηγήθηκε σε ενεργειακή και αγροτική κρίση λόγω των συνεπειών των κυρώσεων της Ένωσης προς τη Ρωσία. Είναι, επομένως, λογικό οι Μολδαβοί πολίτες να στρέφονται προς τη Ρωσία. Η Ένωση θα έπρεπε να έχει αντιληφθεί ότι τα χρήματα δεν εξαγοράζουν το εθνικό φρόνημα. Τέτοιες πολιτικές είναι καταδικασμένες να αποτύχουν.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, o să am o altă abordare. Eu cred că trebuie să plecăm de la scopul principal. Scopul nostru principal este ca Republica Moldova să continue drumul spre Uniunea Europeană. Evident că trebuie să avem două asistențe din partea Uniunii Europene: una, cea financiară – și nu sunt de acord cu ce au spus colegii din PPE, nu putem să pedepsim un popor -, și cealaltă este să ne concentrăm pe cum putem să le asigurăm o consiliere forțelor pro-europene pentru a putea să răspundă și pentru a avea rezultate bune în anul viitor.

Nu ne putem bloca în faptul că Parlamentul Republicii Moldova a votat modificarea legii. Discursul public al președintelui Dodon, critic față de Uniunea Europeană și NATO, arată că el deja se pregătește pentru alegerile viitoare. Ce facem noi? Noi trebuie să vorbim cu forțele pro-europene să se unească, să aibă un discurs, să aibă o strategie astfel încât să evităm încă un mandat pentru Dodon. Aceasta cred că trebuie să fie strategia, domnule comisar, nu să suspendăm pur și simplu finanțarea și asistența față de Republica Moldova pentru că e strategic: Republica Moldova este importantă pentru toată regiunea, nu doar pentru cetățenii din Republica Moldova.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the speakers for their contributions. From this debate I conclude that we share the opinion that it is important to continue supporting the Republic of Moldova with its reform agenda. Secondly, I understand your concerns in relation to the rule of law and democracy.

Let me assure you that the European Union will consider thoroughly any decision on future assistance and that these decisions will be consistent with messages transmitted as part of our political dialogue. At the same time, I would like to repeat our position about the partnership. The partnership with the European Union is not about spheres of influence and geopolitics. We do not ask our partners to pick sides – they do not have to choose between us and other global powers. This is not how our partnership works. Our partnership is about improving the lives of our citizens inside the European Union, and of citizens in Moldova. It is a partnership for, not against. It is about the economy and trade. It is about democracy, human rights, the rule of law and, of course, the fight against corruption.

It is with this attitude that we are heading towards our Eastern Partnership Summit next month. Thank you for your attention and for this fruitful discussion.

Președintele. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc în cadrul unei viitoare perioade de sesiune.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Dominique Martin (ENF), par écrit. – Nous étions surpris du montant du budget alloué à la Moldavie (1 milliard d'euros sur 10 ans, soit 100 millions par an), dans un pays comptant 3 millions d'habitants... Nous étions surpris d'un tel montant alors même que nos États membres ont grandement besoin de ce budget, et alors même que l'UE impose, ici et là, une politique d'austérité...

La réponse de la Commission à notre question écrite, donnée par M. Hahn le 6 septembre 2017 constituait une première piste de réflexion: «préalablement à l'octroi de l'aide, il sera tenu compte du respect satisfaisant d'un vaste ensemble de conditions politiques (...)», c'est à dire, permettez-moi une traduction politique: «si vous souhaitez cet argent, acceptez notre intrusion dans votre souveraineté!»

Par exemple, Christos Stylianides insiste, lors de cette session, sur la réforme de la justice, un secteur tout particulièrement régalien. Par ailleurs, certaines interventions de mes confrères constituent une deuxième piste: celle d'une lutte toujours plus irrationnelle contre la Russie. Nous sommes favorables à une Moldavie dans une Europe des nations sans immixtion dans sa souveraineté, comme nous l'avions expliqué lors du vote en juillet.

10. De uitbanning van kindhuwelijken (debat)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns oral referitoare la eradicarea practicii de căsătorie a copiilor, adresată Comisiei de Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, în numele Comisiei pentru drepturile femeii și egalitatea de gen (O-000064/2017 – B8-0328/2017) (2017/2663(RSP)).

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Autorė. – Besivystančiose šalyse viena iš trijų mergaičių ištekinama dar nesulaukus 18 metų, o viena iš devynių – net 15 nesulaukus. Nuo vaikų santuokų kenčia ir berniukai, ir mergaitės, bet mergaitėms, kurios sudaro 82 proc. susituokusių vaikų, kyla didžiausia rizika. Ir ši problema aktuali ne tik trečiojoje šalyse, bet ir Europoje.

Pagal Europos Sąjungos sutarties 3 straipsnį ES skatina vaiko teisių apsaugą, tačiau vaikų ankstyvos ir priverstinės santuokos yra šių teisių pažeidimas. Vienas iš Jungtinių Tautų darnaus vystymosi tikslų yra panaikinti visą žalingą praktiką, įskaitant vaikų ankstyvą ir priverstinę santuokas. Be to, vaikų ankstyvų ir priverstinių santuokų panaikinimas kaip vienas iš veiklos ES prioritetų yra įtrauktas į bendrą tarnybų darbinį dokumentą „Lyčių lygybė ir moterų įgalėjimas: keisti mergaičių ir moterų gyvenimą plėtojant ES išorės santykius (2016-2020 m.)“, į 2015-2019 m. ES veiksmų planą žmogaus teisių srityje ir į lyčių lygybės veiksmų planą, kuriame pabrėžiamas poreikis užtikrinti, kad moterys ir mergaitės galėtų visapusiškai naudotis visomis žmogaus teisėmis ir pagrindinėmis laisvėmis.

ES neseniai nusprendė pasirašyti Stambulo konvenciją, kurioje priverstinė santuoka laikoma smurto prieš moteris forma ir kurioje raginama joje nurodytas priemonės taip pat taikyti berniukams ir vyrams, kadangi jie irgi gali tapti priverstinės santuokos aukomis. Konvencijoje reikalaujama vaiko privertimo tuoktis veika ir vaiko išviliojimą į kitą šalį siekiant priversti jį susituokti laikyti nusikaltimu. Ankstyvos ir priverstinės santuokos labai kenkia bendram mergaičių ir moterų teisių įgyvendinimui ir galimybei jomis naudotis, taip pat mergaičių sveikatai, įskaitant didelę nėštumo komplikacijų, neretai besibaigiančių mirtimi, ir ŽIV infekcijų riziką. Dėl per ankstyvų santuokų mergaitėms kyla pavojus tapti seksualinės prievartos, smurto šeimoje ir netgi nužudymo dėl garbės aukomis.

Turime įvertinti ir tai, kad labai skiriasi oficialiai užregistruotų atvejų ir galimų aukų, prašančių pagalbos, skaičius, o tai parodo, kad daug vaikų santuokų gali būti sudaromos nepastebėjus valdžios atsakingoms institucijoms. Todėl labai svarbu, kad socialiniams darbuotojams, mokytojams ir kitiems darbuotojams, tiesiogiai bendraujantiems su galimomis aukomis, būtų suteiktas specialus mokymas ir parengti vadovai, kuriuose būtų paaiškinta, kaip nustatyti aukas ir pradėti pagalbos jiems procedūras.

Taip pat noriu priminti, kad Parlamentas smerkia nėštumo nutraukimą remiančių organizacijų nefinansavimo taisyklės atnaujinimą ir taikymo srities išplėtimą ir jos poveikį pasaulinei moterų ir mergaičių sveikatos priežiūrai ir jų teisėms. Ir čia noriu dar kartą paraginti ES ir valstybes narės užpildyti jau atvertą finansavimo spragą seksualinės ir reprodukcinės sveikatos srityje, panaudojant nacionalines ir ES vystymuisi skirtas lėšas.

Taigi klausimai gerbiamai Komisarai: kaip Komisija įvertina projektų ir kampanijų, skirtų kovoti su vaikų santuokomis, poveikį ir tai, kiek finansavimo skiriama šiam tikslui vykdant visus Europos Sąjungos išorės veiksmus? Ar Komisija atsižvelgia į vaikų santuokų rodiklius savo bendradarbiavimo susitarimuose ir ar nustato konkrečius lyginamuosius standartus, kad šitas reiškinys būtų panaikintas? Kokių veiksmų imamasi siekiant užtikrinti visų vaikų Europos Sąjungos valstybėse narėse teisių ir sveikatos, įskaitant lytinę ir reprodukcinę sveikatą ir teises, apsaugą vaikų santuokų atvejais ir siekiant taikyti suvienodintus teisinius standartus, be kita ko atsižvelgiant į tai, kad Europos Sąjunga ketina ratifikuoti Stambulo konvenciją? Ir pagaliau, kaip Komisija ir valstybės narės sprendžia vaikų santuokos problemą, ypač, kai tai susiję su nepilnamečiais pabėgėliais ir prieglobsčio prašytojais? Ačiū ir laukiam atsakymo iš gerbiamos Komisarės.

Věra Jourová, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, the Commission's position is absolutely clear. We cannot accept or tolerate any kind of violence, including forced marriage. But it is a complex problem which cannot be solved at one stroke.

As for question 1, we are participating in comprehensive programmes to put an end to harmful practices such as child marriage. Their impact can only be measured in the long term over generations. For example, in 2016 the EU contributed EUR 6 million to the UNICEF United Nations Population Fund Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage. This programme works at local, national and regional level and targets the communities of 12 countries. The objective is to improve access to services, strengthen enforcement mechanisms, increase girls' empowerment and challenge social norms, so that girls can fully enjoy their childhood and grow up to control their own destiny. In 2019, when this programme comes to an end, we shall evaluate its quantitative impact using the quantitative indicators. The same applies to other ongoing projects to address child marriage which we are supporting in Tanzania, Niger, Mali, Malawi, Lesotho and Sudan. Beyond this targeted support, the EU also contributes to programmes dedicated to social protection, access to education, violence against children, and access to justice and health, including sexual and reproductive health and rights. They also contribute to a reduction in child marriage.

As for question 2, accession to the Istanbul Convention is a priority for the Commission. The criminalisation of forced marriage based on the definition of the Istanbul Convention will remain a matter of Member State competence. However, many victims of forced marriage, especially underaged, may fall victim to other serious forms of gender-based crime, such as rape. This offence is criminalised in all EU Member States. The Victims' Rights Directive provides for targeted and integrated support for victims with specific needs, such as victims of sexual violence, victims of gender-based violence and victims of violence in close relationships, including trauma support and counselling or shelter for victims in need of a safe place. The EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention would further strengthen the Union's framework on protection of and support to victims of forced marriage and other crimes covered by the Convention. For instance, the Istanbul Convention will require the EU to ensure that resident status is granted to victims of gender-based violence, which could be independent from that of the spouse, and that victims may obtain the suspension of expulsion. The Convention requires that gender-based violence against women be recognised as a form of persecution under the Geneva Convention and that the obligation of non-refoulement is applied to women victims in need of protection where they might be subject to torture or inhuman treatment or punishment.

As regards sexual and reproductive health, the Istanbul Convention provides for a prohibition of forced abortion and sterilisation, for instance, abortion without full and informed consent. It does, however, not contain provisions regarding rights to safe abortion or as to whether abortion in unsafe conditions constitutes violence against women. On 25 November 2016 the Commission launched a year of focused actions to combat violence against women. The focused actions, which involve local, national and EU-level initiatives, aim to mobilise, connect and support all relevant stakeholders in combating the problem and to ensure the dissemination of good practices across the EU.

Let me now answer question 3. Married minors are also considered vulnerable under the EU asylum acquis and therefore benefit from special rights and procedural guarantees. It will often be the case that the law or practice of the responsible Member State does not recognise an adult spouse as being responsible for a minor spouse. Therefore, if the minor spouse travels only with the adult spouse and is not accompanied by her parents or tutor, the married minor would often be considered unaccompanied and thus in need of special guarantees. Moreover, non-consensual child marriages are prohibited by international law. The authorities of the Member State of arrival have an obligation to verify if the minor has consented to the marriage. If this is not the case, the child must be offered protection. This issue is to be distinguished from the separate matter of whether the legal effects of the marriage undertaken in the country of origin or prior to arrival in the EU can or cannot be recognised according to the national law of the Member State responsible.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, today we give a voice to the 750 million girls forced to marry around the world. Let's say together: enough is enough! Child marriage is child abuse. Girls are exposed to rape, domestic and even honour violence. It can be devastating for their health, with serious risks concerning pregnancy and infections.

Child marriage is a crime recognised under the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women. Once again, I call on all Member States to ratify and enforce the Convention, to combat impunity and protect girls. Many girls seeking asylum arrive in Europe married – in Sweden alone there are 132. Authorities must consider the best interests of the child. A child is first of all a child, and we cannot have parallel communities in Europe where child marriage is tolerated. There is no tradition and no culture that can justify child abuse.

Girls forced to marry are forced out of school. Desperate parents give away daughters to older men to save them from poverty. But on the contrary, early marriage condemns girls to poverty and discrimination. Education is the best chance for girls to be empowered. No child should be deprived of their childhood.

Civil society plays a key role. The Girls not Brides global partnership, UNICEF, ombudsmen and many others in civil society deserve more support. President Trump's global gag rules will affect projects for thousands and of girls who are victims of child marriage. Europe should step in and provide resources.

I call on the High Representative on the Commission to do more in all EU external action to eliminate child marriage by helping countries to adopt and to enforce legislation. We need to combat stereotypes, change mentalities, work with family and community leaders and break the vicious circle of submission and violence.

Mr President, in conclusion, as author of the European People's Party Group resolution and co-Chair of the Intergroup on Children's Rights, I call for your support. This Parliament should join forces and send a clear message – we are committed to a zero-tolerance policy on child marriage. It is time to act.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, hemos utilizado en muchas ocasiones esta Cámara, este Parlamento Europeo, para debatir y para poner encima de la mesa todas las cuestiones referidas a la igualdad de género, a los derechos de las mujeres y también a los derechos de los niños y las niñas. Por eso, creo que traer hoy aquí este debate es algo importante y esencial.

Tengo una sobrina de ocho años: juega, va al colegio, es una niña feliz, independiente y es una niña que está viviendo la edad que le corresponde. Y no debería decir esto, pero es una niña afortunada por nacer donde ha nacido, porque ha nacido en un país, en el seno de una familia donde la igualdad de género es una cuestión esencial.

No podemos permitir desde este lado de la historia que haya niñas que no tienen esa oportunidad de disfrutar de su niñez porque se ven obligadas a casarse, a contraer estos matrimonios de los que hoy estamos hablando. Hay datos que nos ponen encima de la mesa como una cruda realidad: en los países en desarrollo, una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de cumplir los quince años.

La política de cooperación y desarrollo de la Unión Europea relativa a estos países en desarrollo tiene que tener la perspectiva de género dentro de su esencia y ser capaz de posibilitar que las niñas que han nacido en otros países tengan las mismas oportunidades y los mismos derechos que las niñas europeas.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! „Sind Sie hierher gekommen, um nach reiflicher Überlegung und aus freiem Entschluss mit Ihrer Braut den Bund der Ehe zu schließen?“ Diese Frage steht am Anfang jeder christlichen Trauung in Europa. Es ist eine wichtige Frage: aus freiem Entschluss? Leider ist das weltweit keine Selbstverständlichkeit. 700 Millionen Frauen weltweit sind zwangsverheiratet, mehr als 250 Millionen von ihnen waren zum Zeitpunkt der sogenannten Eheschließung unter 15 Jahre alt. Jährlich werden weltweit 15 Millionen Mädchen verheiratet, bevor sie volljährig sind – das entspricht einer Kinderehe alle zwei Sekunden. Und das ist keine kulturelle Besonderheit, das ist kein Kavaliersdelikt. Nein, wer Kinder zwangsverheiratet, missbraucht sie. Wer Kinder missbraucht, begeht ein Verbrechen.

Europa ist entschlossen, Kinderehen weltweit zu bekämpfen – so steht es geschrieben. Weit unklarer wird es, wenn wir auf die nationale Ebene gehen. Zwar haben die meisten Mitgliedstaaten Kinderehen inzwischen untersagt, aber kaum einer geht effektiv gegen im Ausland bereits geschlossene Ehen vor. Diese haben mit der aktuellen Flüchtlingskrise deutlich zugenommen. Mein leidenschaftlicher Appell lautet: Null Toleranz gegen Kinderehen, auch dann, wenn sie im Ausland geschlossen wurden! Das Wohl der Mädchen muss unser Ziel sein, ihrer Zukunft muss all unsere Hilfe gelten. Da, wo wir sie den Händen ihrer Ehepeiniger entreißen, müssen wir sie sanft in behutsamen Händen auffangen. Das – und nur das – sollte heute unser gemeinsames Ziel sein: Nein zur Kinderehe! Es sind Mädchen, keine Bräute.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, comisaria Jourová, el matrimonio infantil es un problema global que se produce en diferentes países, culturas, religiones y etnias. Niega a las niñas su derecho a la salud, a la educación, a vivir con seguridad y a elegir con quién casarse y, si es el caso, cuándo y cómo.

Sin independencia económica, las niñas abandonan la educación y quedan atrapadas, junto a sus familias y comunidades, en un ciclo de pobreza. En más de 20 países en todo el mundo, es más probable que una niña cruce el umbral del dormitorio conyugal que el de su clase de secundaria.

Para combatir el fenómeno de las niñas-novias necesitamos un enfoque holístico y comprensivo, que se ajuste a los contextos locales y las particularidades de cada comunidad. Necesitamos verdadera coordinación de varios sectores, incluyendo educación, sanidad, justicia y desarrollo económico.

Terminar con el matrimonio infantil requiere destinar a los países más afectados inversiones significativas y bien orientadas, tanto de donantes internacionales como de los gobiernos.

También debemos cortar la ayuda al desarrollo a aquellos países que rehúsan limitar la edad mínima de matrimonio a los 18 años. Aunque no conviene olvidar lo que ocurre en Europa por la falta de armonización legal: en España, en mi país, la edad mínima para casarse todavía son los 16 años.

Pero lo más importante es dar poder a las niñas. Debemos trabajar directamente con ellas para que puedan adquirir habilidades y conocimiento, para que vean las posibilidades que tienen de elegir con casos reales, para que comprendan y ejerciten sus derechos y creen sus auténticas redes de apoyo.

Estas reformas serían sencillas y eficaces y demostrarían que la Unión Europea no solo habla de valores, sino que los refuerza, de verdad, en todo el mundo.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εξελίσσεται μπροστά μας ένα σύγχρονο δουλοπάζαρο. Τα θύματα όμως δεν φορούν σκισμένα και βρώμικα ρούχα, αλλά νυφικά και κοστούμια. Τι μας λέει η μελέτη; Αν συνεχιστούν οι σημερινές τάσεις μέχρι το 2030, υπολογίζεται ότι 150 εκατομμύρια παιδιά-νύφες θα έχουν παντρευτεί πριν γίνουν 18 ετών. Για αυτό απαιτούμε αμέσως την εφαρμογή της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης, που καταδικάζει τους αναγκαστικούς γάμους. Και καλώ την Επιτροπή, πρώτον, να ρυθμίσει πανευρωπαϊκά την ποινικοποίηση του εξαναγκασμού παιδιών σε γάμο καθώς και της σκόπιμης μεταφοράς τους σε άλλη χώρα για τον γάμο αυτό. Δεύτερον, να φροντίζει ώστε κάθε ασυνόδευτο προσφυγόπουλο να έχει νομικό εκπρόσωπο, που θα εγγυάται τον σεβασμό του και τα δικαιώματά του.

Linnéa Engström, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Barn- och tvångsäktenskap är ett övergrepp och ett symptom på sjuka normer som existerar i våra samhällen. Det kan inte accepteras. Barn har en okränkbar rätt att få vara just barn. Flickor och pojkar världen över måste få utvecklas i sin egen takt till trygga och starka individer. Bara så säkrar vi en hållbar utveckling och livsutrymme för alla.

Det är nedslående att titta på siffrorna: 37 000 minderåriga flickor blir bortgifta varje dag. Det blir 14 miljoner barn- och tvångsäktenskap varje år. Om vi ska klara de enorma utmaningar som världen står inför så måste vi stärka kvinnors rättigheter. Kvinnor måste ges ekonomiskt självbestämmande och rätten till den egna kroppen. För varje förhindrat barnäktenskap så minskar risken att barn dör i barnsäng och att svåra förlossningar leder till sjukdomar och spädbarnsdöd.

Det är EU:s skyldighet att på alla fronter bekämpa fenomenet med barn- och tvångsäktenskap. Medlemsstaterna måste se till att myndigheterna har kunskap nog att känna igen fenomenet och resurser och lagstöd att hantera situationen. Budskapet är klart: Vi accepterar inte barn- och tvångsäktenskap.

Daniela Aiuto, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissaria, grazie anche al supporto di diverse associazioni presenti sul territorio, abbiamo sollevato in commissione FEMM la problematica dei matrimoni precoci all'interno dell'Unione europea, proponendo la presentazione di un'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale con relativa risoluzione.

Ecco, perché questa urgenza? Perché ogni anno milioni di bambine affrontano viaggi dagli Stati membri verso le terre d'origine dei loro genitori per contrarre un matrimonio non voluto e non sognato, accordato dagli stessi genitori con uomini adulti.

Milioni di bambine che ogni anno vedono svanire il loro sogno di vivere libere e di realizzarsi professionalmente. Proprio il mese scorso un'inchiesta giornalistica italiana, denunciava la sparizione annuale di migliaia di ragazzine tra i tredici e i diciassette anni di età, fatte partire per il Bangladesh, il Pakistan e altri paesi, per sposare un lontano parente molto più grande di loro.

Ma queste ragazzine sono nate e cresciute in Europa, hanno frequentato le scuole e la cultura europea, sono a tutti gli effetti europee. Mancano purtroppo dei dati certi ed è per questo motivo che oggi chiediamo con forza alla Commissione di prendere coscienza della gravità del problema, invitando allo stesso tempo gli Stati membri a monitorare sulle situazioni a rischio presenti al loro interno e inasprire le pene contro questi veri e propri stupri perpetrati sulle minorenni.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Mylène Troszczynski, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Madame le Commissaire, les enfants sont notre avenir et, à ce titre, doivent être protégés. Le mariage des enfants est une violation de leurs droits.

La Convention des Nations unies relative aux droits de l'enfant énonce à son article 3 que «dans toutes les décisions que prend une autorité, l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant doit être une considération primordiale». Marier un enfant va donc clairement à l'encontre de son intérêt supérieur, qui est de se construire et de bénéficier, dans la mesure du possible, de la protection d'un cadre familial jusqu'à sa majorité.

À la violation de ce droit élémentaire, à la vie future gâchée de ces enfants, viennent s'ajouter environ 70 000 décès par an dus à la grossesse ou à l'accouchement et un taux de mortalité faramineux des enfants de ces enfants.

Il est primordial de rappeler que le mariage des enfants fonctionne comme une norme sociale et ancestrale dans ces pays, souvent en voie de développement.

Mais que faire après ce constat? Comme vous le précisez dans votre texte, c'est une bonne chose de lutter contre ce phénomène en collaboration avec les pays tiers, sous réserve que l'on ne dépasse pas le cadre de la coopération et que l'on ne verse pas dans l'interventionnisme.

Vous admettez qu'avec la crise migratoire, le nombre d'enfants déjà mariés en Europe augmente, et pourtant vous persistez dans votre folle politique d'immigration et d'accueil.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία πως οι γάμοι ανηλίκων, ειδικά δε παιδιών σε προεφηβική ηλικία ή στην έναρξη της εφηβείας, είναι για τα δεδομένα του δυτικού πολιτισμού απορριπτέοι και καταδικαστέοι. Ο δε εξαναγκασμός σε γάμο είναι απεχθής σε οποιαδήποτε ηλικία, πόσω μάλλον όταν αφορά ανηλίκους. Ευτυχώς, εξ' όσων γνωρίζω, το νομικό πλαίσιο σε όλες τις χώρες της Ένωσης είναι σε μεγάλο βαθμό επαρκές, ενώ και οι κοινωνίες μας, με ελάχιστες εξαιρέσεις συγκεκριμένων κοινωνικών ομάδων, δεν αποδέχονται τέτοιου είδους πρακτικές.

Δυστυχώς, όμως, με τη δραματική αύξηση της λαθρομετανάστευσης και την εισροή στην Ευρώπη πληθυσμιακών ομάδων από χώρες με τελείως διαφορετικό πολιτισμό και ήθη, το φαινόμενο αυτό τείνει να λάβει ανησυχητικές διαστάσεις. Για να αντιμετωπίσουμε τέτοιες πρακτικές θα πρέπει να λάβουμε συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Το νομικό πλαίσιο θα πρέπει να συμπληρωθεί όπου υπάρχουν κενά και οι ποινές να γίνουν πιο αυστηρές για τους παραβάτες. Όμως πραγματική λύση θα υπάρξει μόνο αν καταστήσουμε σαφές σε όσους έρχονται νόμιμα στην Ευρώπη με σκοπό να εγκατασταθούν σε όσες χώρες επιθυμούν να τους δεχτούν πως, ασχέτως με τις παραδόσεις και τα «έθιμα» που έχουν στις χώρες προέλευσής τους, θα πρέπει να συμμορφώνονται με τις αξίες και τις αρχές του ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού, αλλιώς δεν μπορούν να παραμείνουν στην ήπειρό μας.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mówimy dzisiaj tutaj o małżeństwach dzieci, ale tak naprawdę powinniśmy mówić o małżeństwach z dziećmi: dorosłych mężczyzn, czasami dojrzałych mężczyzn z dziewczętami poniżej 15 roku życia. W europejskich kodeksach karnych współżycie dorosłej osoby z dzieckiem poniżej 15 roku życia klasyfikowane jest jako pedofilia. Zważywszy na fakt, że w krajach, gdzie występują, małżeństwa te są społecznie akceptowane, bo taki jest zwyczaj, tradycja, oraz na fakt, że występują one także w Europie, mamy do czynienia z potężnym konfliktem prawnym i kulturowym, a ofiarami braku reakcji i decyzji w tej sprawie są dziewczynki i młode kobiety.

Naprzeciw tym problemom wychodzi konwencja stambulska, która jasno przesądza, że przymusowe małżeństwa i małżeństwa z dziećmi są formą przemocy, i wymaga od sygnatariuszy konwencji, ażeby uznać zmuszanie dzieci do małżeństwa za czyn przestępczy. Konwencja stanowi też, że przemoc nie może być usprawiedliwiana tradycją ani religią. W przypadku konfliktu tych wartości zwyczaj, które oparte są na idei niższości kobiet i które usprawiedliwiają przemoc, powinny być wykorzenione. Tak stanowi art. 12 konwencji i dziś, gdy mówimy o małżeństwach z dziećmi, warto przypomnieć to przesłanie konwencji, gdyż na tej sali są posłowie, którzy sprzeciwiają się tej konwencji i sprzeciwiają się właśnie treści art. 12.

(Mówczyni zgodziła się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Marek Jurek (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Bardzo liczne na przykład w Niemczech przymusowe małżeństwa dziewcząt to jest bardzo poważny problem. Cały czas o tym słyszymy. Tylko co z tym właściwie ma wspólnego konwencja stambulska? A nasz kraj – no i to dzięki tobie Agnieszka niestety – ją ratyfikował. Ja byłem przeciwny. Ale, no wiesz dobrze, że Węgry, Słowacja, Czechy, Litwa, Łotwa – kraje, które nie ratyfikowały konwencji stambulskiej – to nie są kraje, gdzie ten problem występuje. Wiele z tych dziewcząt byśmy ocalili, gdyby ich rodziny nie znajdowały się pod taką presją muzułmańskiego otoczenia.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – To nie jest pytanie, to jest, jak rozumiem, komentarz. Jak to, co ma z tym wspólnego konwencja stambulska? Konwencja stambulska to jest międzynarodowy dokument, a dla państw sygnatariuszy tego dokumentu treść konwencji staje się prawem krajowym. Nawet jeżeli na poziomie prawa krajowego była niepewność co do tego, jak rozwiązywać konflikty wartości w prawie, to konwencja te konflikty rozstrzyga.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, estava aqui a pensar se é mesmo verdade que estamos a ter um debate sobre o casamento infantil em pleno século XXI. Alguma coisa, de facto, está muito errada neste mundo. A infância deveria ser um tempo de alegria e de tranquilidade.

Já aqui foi dito que o casamento infantil destrói milhões de vidas de meninas e raparigas. Nega-lhes o direito a tomar decisões sobre o seu bem-estar e a sua saúde sexual, na altura devida. Rouba-lhes o direito à educação. Condena-as a uma vida sem perspectivas.

Estas meninas e raparigas ficam expostas à violência, aos abusos, às doenças e à morte precoce. Ficam grávidas ainda meninas. Muitas morrem do parto. Outras são mães quando deveriam estar a aprender ou a brincar. São esposas quando deviam ser crianças. São marcadas pela violação de alguém com idade para ser o seu pai.

Não há uma solução isolada. Há a necessidade de um esforço coletivo. Acabar com o casamento infantil exige um trabalho a todos os níveis. Neste aspeto, cabe à União Europeia uma responsabilidade acrescida no que diz respeito à sua política externa. Implica da nossa parte uma ação que resolva e mate este problema na sua origem. Acabar com o casamento infantil impõe um maior investimento que esteja claramente direcionado, educação, intervenção comunitária, legislação mais dura e quem não cumprir não pode receber financiamento europeu.

O combate ao casamento infantil não tem ideologia. Tem um rosto, ou melhor, milhões de rostos.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Małżeństwa dzieci to jedna z najbardziej haniebnych form seksualnego niewolnictwa, którego ofiarą padają kilkuletnie dziewczynki. Niestety w związku z nasileniem się kryzysu migracyjnego ta pedofiliska praktyka rozlała się po krajach Unii Europejskiej. Niestety w tym przypadku, jak i w innych, poprawność polityczna bierze górę nad fundamentalnymi chrześcijańskimi wartościami, które ukształtowały Europę i które przecież nie dają przyzwolenia na haniebne traktowanie dziewcząt. Powiedzmy to sobie otwarcie: praktyki te mają źródło w imigranckich środowiskach Unii Europejskiej. To twardo pokazują statystyki. Nie możemy pozwolić sobie na relatywizowanie i przemykanie oczu. Tak więc chciałabym zapytać panią komisarz: czy komisja zamierza wszcząć procedurę naruszenia praworządności w stosunku do państw, w których te pedofilskie praktyki są tolerowane?

Charles Goerens (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, quand on parle aux représentants des pays qui, hélas, tolèrent encore le mariage forcé des jeunes filles, on a souvent droit à la réponse suivante: «cette pratique est fortement ancrée dans notre culture et dans nos traditions».

La présente discussion et le vote de votre résolution devraient contribuer à mettre fin à cette situation exécrable qui, malheureusement, méprise encore les droits humains les plus élémentaires des jeunes filles.

Nous ne pouvons, bien entendu, pas faire la loi dans les pays qui tolèrent encore ces pratiques, mais nous pouvons mobiliser des moyens susceptibles d'influer sur leur politique: dans nos contacts avec leurs responsables, dans le cadre du dialogue politique avec ces pays, dans le renforcement du système multilatéral, et notamment au niveau des Nations unies, et dans le cadre des accords entre l'Union européenne et les pays tiers.

Il ne sert à rien d'inscrire une mention dans le préambule d'un traité si l'on n'arrive pas à mettre les bouchées doubles. En clair, je voudrais que nous profitions du futur accord avec les pays ACP, par exemple, pour faire de l'abolition du mariage des enfants et des jeunes filles un élément de conditionnalité. Vous ne respectez pas ce principe inscrit dans la convention d'Istanbul, alors vous n'obtiendrez plus d'aide.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, los matrimonios forzados de mujeres menores, fuera y dentro de la Unión, son una de las expresiones más lacerantes de las sociedades patriarcales, y los debemos atajar con estrategias globales y coordinadas donde la política de género esté incluida transversalmente.

Para ello, la Unión Europea debe incluir en sus acuerdos de cooperación medidas específicas para la lucha contra esas prácticas. Pero, al mismo tiempo, no podemos caer en la simplicidad: no se puede hablar de empoderamiento de las mujeres, cuando alimentamos conflictos a través de una política exterior marcada por intereses económicos propios. Si, por ejemplo, se desestabilizan países en el tercer mundo para obtener materias primas baratas, es difícil que se pueda garantizar la paz y un desarrollo social y económico que ayuden a derribar las barreras de la igualdad.

Por ello, insistimos en que la política de desarrollo tiene que ser coherente y contar con una financiación adecuada, al mismo tiempo que debemos promover una política exterior de paz.

Margot Parker (EFDD). – Mr President, the luring and forcing of a child into a marriage is a disgusting crime, and one that UKIP deplors. Helpless and vulnerable children are often exploited in this way during school holidays. Such criminal activity is a threat to our society and its values and is a hindrance to integration, wherever it is perpetrated. It is an absolute violation of the human rights of many of our young girls and boys.

Today, more than 250 million women worldwide are believed to have entered into a marriage before the age of 15. We strongly believe that those involved in such a dreadful crime must be prosecuted. In addition, there should be a refusal of permanent leave to remain, or the withdrawal of British citizenship, for any adult who has procured such a marriage for themselves or for children.

It is shocking, in the 21st century, to recognise that forced marriage became a criminal act in the United Kingdom as recently as 2014. This monstrous crime needs to be tackled immediately and by all parties, and the law should apply equally irrespective of race, faith or ethnic origin.

André Elissen (ENF). – We spreken vandaag over kindhuwelijken, een fenomeen dat helaas nog steeds bestaat, en zelfs in ons beschaafd Europa voorkomt. Niet zelden vinden deze huwelijken plaats in Afghaanse, Somalische, Iraanse, Syrische en Pakistaanse gemeenschappen. Dit is niet zo vreemd wanneer men kijkt naar de legitimatie van veel van deze huwelijken. Deze legitimatie komt voort uit de islam.

In bepaalde Europese landen is het nog steeds mogelijk om een in het buitenland gesloten huwelijk met een minderjarige te laten erkennen. Dit is te gek voor woorden. Het is aan de natiestaten om erkenning van dit soort barbaarse praktijken onmogelijk te maken. Het is puur kindermisbruik. Het is de plicht van eenieder om dit krachtig te veroordelen.

We hebben geen behoefte aan duur betaalde onderzoeken, geen Commissie waarin open deuren worden ingetrapt en waar overbetaalde bobo's zich laven aan snoepreisesjes. We hebben behoefte aan krachtig beleid vanuit de natiestaten. We willen minder islam en een halt op immigratie vanuit islamitische landen.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Dámy a pánové, Alexandr Solženicyn kdysi napsal, že žádný tvor na světě netrpí tolik jako ruská žena. Stále mám před očima ruské ženy ve vatovaných kabátech podbíjející pražce železničních kolejí. Solženicyn nedohlédl dále než k Solovkám a Magadanu. Neviděl miliony žen Afriky a Asie, které trpí primitivním maskulinním násilím, hladoví, jsou uráženy a ponižovány. Jsou v dětském věku obřezávány a vdávány. To jsou ti živí tvorové, kteří trpí nejvíce.

Kdysi jsem v Afghánistánu natočil film o ženách. Jedna z hrdinek byla žena, která měla 13 dětí. Po 13. dítěti řekl lékař manželovi: „Další těhotenství vaše žena nepřežije“. Znovu otěhotněla a zemřela. Její muž jí urodil k smrti. Poprvé byla těhotná, když jí bylo 15 let.

Dnes žije na světě přes 700 milionů žen, které byly vdány v dětském věku. Každý rok je k sňatku přinuceno 15 milionů dívek před 18. rokem. 60 % dětských nevěst v rozvojových zemích je negramotných, protože jim je upíráno právo na vzdělání. Islamofobie táhnoucí se Evropou zdůrazňuje, že dětské sňatky jsou vlastní islámské víře. Dovolují si říci, že to není pravda. Obrovské počty dětských sňatků jsou v nemuslimských zemích, v Indii, Brazílii či Etiopii. Násilí na dětských nevěstách je problém nadkonfesní.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, sono sessanta milioni le spose bambine nel mondo ed è stato calcolato che nei paesi in via di sviluppo una bambina ogni tre si sposa prima dei diciott'anni; una su nove, addirittura prima dei quindici anni e le bambine prive di istruzione hanno il triplo delle probabilità di sposarsi ancora prima.

Risulta elevatissima – lo hanno ricordato anche i colleghi – la probabilità di morte a causa di rapporti sessuali che avvengono prima della pubertà ed è elevata naturalmente anche la mortalità durante i parti. Si tratta di numeri che parlano di una vera e propria emergenza, Presidente e Commissaria. Un'emergenza rispetto alla quale noi non possiamo davvero voltarci dall'altra parte, ed è bene dirci con chiarezza che questi matrimoni infantili precoci forzati sono la legalizzazione e la copertura per chi continua a praticare la pedofilia, per chi continua a macchiarsi di un reato particolarmente aberrante, particolarmente odioso e rispetto al quale io credo noi non dobbiamo avere assolutamente tolleranza.

E questo significa fare cose concrete, significa certamente andare nella direzione che noi abbiamo voluto attraverso questa risoluzione che è una cosa importante, perché combattere queste pratiche significa difendere semplicemente i diritti umani fondamentali.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, nútenie mladistvých dievčat k tomu, aby sa vydávali, považujem za absolútne neakceptovateľný prejav v európskej kultúre v roku 2017. Ale je tiež morálne hanebné, že tvorcovia predloženej rezolúcie a otázky nám podsúvajú tak krutú udalosť, akou je detské manželstvo, na presadzovanie ďalšej krutosti, a tou je zabíjanie nevinných detí v ženských materniciach. Riešenie jednej traumy pomocou nepotrebných a brutálnych tzv. „liečby“ je jednoducho návodom na vyvolávanie ďalších mentálnych chorôb a nie je vhodné, aby to zaznievalo v tejto sále. Názov témy rokovania – Ukončenie manželstiev maloletých – je zavádzajúci. Očakával by som totiž, že sa budeme baviť o tom, ako pomôcť deťom narodeným z týchto manželstiev a zlepšiť tak život ďalšej generácie, ale žiadne ponúkané riešenie som tam nenašiel. Tento názov je falošnou reklamou. Nútené sobáše vznikajú v uzavretých komunitách, kde sa nerešpektuje európske právo. Ja sa potom pýtam, kde sú sudcovia, polícia a štátna správa? Tieto dievčatá treba vedieť ochrániť. Ale jednu krivdu chceme nahradiť inou, a to tým, že zoberieme nenarodený život. Toto im nepomôže, naopak, poškodí ich to ešte viac.

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

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), blue-card question. – Mr President, I see that the members of the European Conservatives and Reformists Group and my colleague Mr Škripek are saying that there is nothing to do and that it is behind closed doors, but there is a legal instrument. It is called the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women, which also criminalises child and early marriage. Why did you all vote against it? This is the instrument – or do you only care if this practice is done in your Member State or not? (Applause) It is a global phenomenon affecting millions of girls, and with access to the Istanbul Convention we have more legal tools and more comprehensive means to deal with it in the world.

Branislav Škripek (ECR), blue-card answer. – There are many errors being used as an answer to this problem. We say that this is something which is being pushed forward. It is not a real solution to suggest so-called sexual and reproductive rights and yet more money for abortions. This is not a solution. You mention the Istanbul Convention, but this is again a legally flawed document which is not yet accepted by many countries, so we cannot rely on it.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che oggi si tratti di collocarsi, come recita il titolo di un bellissimo libro di Elena Gianini Belotti, «dalla parte delle bambine». Penso che la discussione che abbiamo fatto nella scorsa plenaria, chiedendo con forza la ratifica della Convenzione di Istanbul in tutta l'Unione europea, da parte di tutti gli Stati membri, ci dia uno strumento e un'indicazione importante proprio perché riconosce la violenza sulle donne in molteplici declinazioni, compresa la violenza contro le bambine.

Bambine a cui questi matrimoni precoci impediscono di svolgere appieno un percorso di autodeterminazione, un percorso di autoconsapevolezza e la cui salute viene minata – come è stato già detto benissimo dalle colleghe che mi hanno preceduta – da rapporti sessuali costretti, forzati e non scelti e da gravidanze, appunto, non scelte.

Penso che questo sia un'urgenza per quest'Aula e mi auguro che la Commissione intenda agire con forza nella direzione di salvaguardare i diritti delle bambine.

President. – Ms Forenza, I do apologise to you but I would take this opportunity to remind the Members that we are behind schedule, the time has been allocated and has to be respected. I will follow that up but let us also pay some respect to those who have asked for catch-the-eye time and possibly for blue cards. We want to have a debate, so from now on I will be even stricter than I have been up to now.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). – Herr talman! Barn ska inte föda barn. Och barn ska inte gifta sig. Samtidigt lever vi i en värld där 27 flickor i minuten blir bortgifta, oftast mot sin vilja. Barnäktenskap medför en extrem allvarlig risk för dödlighet för flickor framförallt när det gäller komplikationer i samband med graviditet och att dessa barn föder barn.

FN har som mål att utplåna barnäktenskap i världen innan 2030, detta när antalet bara ökar, här har vi som en välfärdsstat ett ansvar att kraftfullt se till att göra vårt bästa för att stoppa och förhindra att barn blir bortgifta. Vi får inte blunda för detta förtryck, vi måste stå upp för barnens rättigheter och sätta hårt mot hårt. I Sverige hör vi rapporter som säger att så många som 70 000 unga riskerar att bli bortgifta.

Vi vet också att i och med den stora invandringen som skett till Europa har orsakat att många av de barn som kommer är gifta med äldre män, många gånger har giftermålen skett strax innan man kommit till Europa för att man trott att det ska leda till större chanser för att få asyl, min fråga är då här hur gör man i dessa fall för att säkerställa barnens bästa, vågar vi verkligen utreda barnens situation eller blundar vi för att vi är fega och tror oss kränka någons kultur eller tradition. Men låt mig då påminna er om att detta är inget annat en ett fruktansvärt förtryck.

(Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 162.8 i arbetsordningen.)

Marek Jurek (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Chciałem zapytać, czy Szwecja potrzebuje konwencji stambulskiej po to, żeby walczyć z plagą przymusowych małżeństw dziewcząt.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD), svar ("blått kort"). – Ja, vi har ju ratificerat Istanbulkonventionen i Sverige och jag tycker att det faktiskt är viktigt att alla medlemsstater gör det. Som sagt: Det är kanske inte bara är upp till Istanbulkonventionen att bekämpa det här. Vi måste på nationell nivå våga säga ifrån, för vi blundar ofta och ser mellan fingrarna för att vi är så rädda för att kränka någon. Så vi måste nog jobba från många håll när det gäller det här.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Wir schreiben das Jahr 2017 Anno Domini in Europa, geschätzte Kollegen, und worüber müssen wir uns in diesem Haus unterhalten? Wir müssen uns darüber unterhalten, dass Kinder zur Ehe mit erwachsenen Männern gezwungen werden.

Wo liegt denn die Wurzel dieses Übels? Man sieht ja, wie sich die linke Seite winden muss, um ja nicht die Wurzel anzusprechen. Die Wurzel dieser grausamen Praxis liegt bei der ungezügelter Zuwanderung, die Sie befürworten, bei einer ungezügelter Zuwanderung aus muslimischen Staaten, wo in der Scharia ja erlaubt ist, Mädchen bereits mit neun Jahren zu verheiraten. Diese Rechtspraxis widerspricht jedem geltenden europäischen Recht seit der Erfindung durch die Römer, als sie das Recht mehr oder weniger erfunden haben.

Also die Problematik liegt an der unkontrollierten Zuwanderung. Und dieses Haus beschäftigt sich immer wieder exzessiv mit Gender-Maßnahmen, die völlig an der Problematik vorbeigehen. Auf der anderen Seite wird hier eine Kinderehe toleriert. Also, so kann es mit uns nicht gehen.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, permita-me subscrever e partilhar a perplexidade de que deu nota a Deputada Liliana Rodrigues, mas a verdade é que todos os anos, a cada minuto, 28 meninas são obrigadas a casar. Isto significa 15 milhões por ano e, se nada fizermos, 150 milhões na próxima década. Estima-se que existam já no mundo 700 milhões de mulheres e 150 milhões de homens que foram obrigados a casar antes da sua maioridade. Números como estes reforçam o sentido de urgência no combate a esta realidade, um combate que passa, necessariamente, pela política externa da União.

Países como a Nigéria, Moçambique ou a Índia são exemplos onde esta realidade ainda persiste, mas também no nosso território necessitamos de agir. É urgente garantir que temos os meios mais adequados para erradicar este fenómeno dentro de portas. É ainda mais intolerável que existam casamentos forçados dentro da União Europeia. Ainda recentemente, este Parlamento aprovou a adesão da União à Convenção do Conselho da Europa para a prevenção e o combate à violência contra as mulheres e urgiu os Estados-Membros em falta para o fazerem, como recordou Anna Maria Corazza Bildt.

Em suma, Senhor Presidente, temos de fazer deste combate uma prioridade, para resgatar estas crianças dos casamentos forçados e garantir que, no futuro, muitas mais não sejam agrilhoadas. Uma prioridade para todos, nos Estados-Membros e no resto do mundo.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, cette résolution ne suffira pas sans un signal politique fort. Les chiffres, nous les connaissons, les instruments juridiques de protection des enfants existent, alors pourquoi toujours faire face à cette terrible réalité?

Les mariages d'enfants sont toujours forcés. Toujours! C'est sur la notion de consentement que je voudrais insister car c'est le grand perdant de nos débats. À partir de quel moment peut-on dire qu'un mariage est librement consenti par une fillette terrorisée? À partir de quel moment la première relation sexuelle est consentie lorsque cette même fillette doit prouver sa fertilité et sa virginité?

Ces circonstances inégalitaires ne démontrent-elles pas la contrainte sidérante? Le silence ne peut valoir consentement.

Par conséquent, Madame la Commissaire, je vous demande d'engager une initiative européenne sur la notion de consentement des filles et des femmes en général, afin de mettre fin aux disparités nationales et au défaut de protection des législations européennes.

Enfin, je tiens à dire à mes collègues d'en face qu'un mariage d'enfants mineurs sur trois se produit dans les pays développés.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Zwischen 2011 und 2020 werden weltweit voraussichtlich 140 Millionen Kinderehen geschlossen. In diesen Ehen verlieren Jugendliche ihr Selbstbestimmungsrecht, manchmal werden ihnen die Freiheit und die Zukunft genommen. Sie landen in Abhängigkeit, was dazu führt, dass sie oftmals sehr früh schwanger werden, dies führt zu Schulabbrüchen und erst recht auch zu Ausbildungsabbrüchen. Das heißt, sie landen in Abhängigkeit – Abhängigkeit gegenüber ihren Ehemännern und in der Konsequenz vielleicht auch gegenüber dem Staat.

Kulturen, in denen so etwas vorkommt – darüber müssen wir uns doch im Klaren sein –, passen – wenn sie das in Europa leben wollen – nicht zu uns. Deshalb müssen wir dafür sorgen, dass solche Ehen in Europa nicht anerkannt werden und dass Menschen, die hierher kommen und eine Kinderehe praktizieren wollen, hier nichts verloren haben. Das sollten wir in aller Klarheit sagen.

Marco Zullo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio anche i colleghi che hanno portato in Aula questo importante tema del matrimonio dei bambini. Ringrazio anche le associazioni che ogni giorno lavorano sul territorio per fermare questo fenomeno. L'abbiamo detto: sono milioni le bambine costrette a sposarsi forzatamente, quindi in piena violazione dei diritti umani.

Noi possiamo agire come Europa, come Parlamento, prendendo in considerazione negli accordi di cooperazione questo fenomeno, perché non è etico che si facciano affari con i paesi che non rispettano i diritti umani.

Però non dobbiamo dimenticare che il tema delle spose bambine riguarda sempre di più anche noi dell'Unione europea e non solo i paesi in via di sviluppo. Lo abbiamo già citato: mi riferisco per esempio ai casi di abbandono scolastico, dove bambine europee improvvisamente spariscono e, se va bene, rimangono in Italia o addirittura vanno al di fuori dei confini europei.

Noi dobbiamo interrompere questo flusso: serve una forte iniziativa normativa a livello europeo e nazionale per fermare questo fenomeno.

Dominique Bilde (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il est impératif de lutter contre les mariages d'enfants, mais encore faut-il être logique.

Cette proposition rappelle que ces enfants abandonnent souvent leur scolarité. Étonnamment, elle propose de mettre l'accent sur l'éducation. Mais si ces enfants ont été contraints de quitter l'école, ce n'est pas par des moyens éducatifs que nous ferons cesser le phénomène.

La proposition indique que le mariage des enfants n'est pas l'apanage des pays tiers. Nous voilà affectés! Mais elle fait elle-même le lien avec l'immigration, liant crise migratoire et mariages d'enfants contractés à l'étranger. Comme quoi la mobilité n'est pas toujours libératrice!

À aucun moment elle n'évoque la question de l'intégration. C'est pourtant ce que l'on demande aux populations qui ont de telles pratiques. Qu'elles assimilent nos mœurs. Cette intégration ne peut réussir avec le flux actuel.

Incapable de remettre en cause l'accueil inconditionnel et illimité des migrants, la proposition va jusqu'à encourager l'évolution des mœurs des pays tiers via l'éducation.

Comment faire pour soigner le mal à la racine? Peut-être faudrait-il commencer par ne pas importer ce mal sur notre sol.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní komisařko, ta debata jasně ukazuje, že ten problém má dvě polohy. Dětské sňatky ve třetích státech a dětské sňatky na úrovni Evropské unie. U té první polohy, tzn. dětské sňatky ve třetích státech, je třeba, abychom výrazně tlačili na naše partnery, aby přijali Istanbulskou úmluvu. Ale téma dětských sňatků jako princip porušování lidských práv by měl být mnohem více obsažen v naší evropské diplomacii. Při jednání s našimi partnery bychom neměli řešit jenom otázku svobody projevu, trestu smrti nebo jiné formy porušování lidských práv. Ale měli bychom také řešit i toto právo, tzn. právo ženy na sebeurčení a právo ženy v dospělém věku se svobodně rozhodnout, jestli vstoupí či nevstoupí do sňatku. Je to o naší diplomacii při jednání s našimi partnery, při poskytování finanční pomoci třetím státům jako jednu z podmínek pro to, abychom těmto státům nějakou ekonomickou pomoc poskytovali.

Druhá věc jsou pak dětské sňatky na území EU. Už to zde bylo řečeno, jejich počet narůstá s příchodem dalších migrantů na území EU. A tady mě osobně mrzí, že usnesení, o kterém zítra hlasujeme, v bodu 14 pouze hovoří, že je třeba řádným způsobem monitorovat dětské sňatky na území EU. Čekal bych mnohem tvrdší odsouzení, čekal bych, že důsledkem bude už zde zmiňovaná evropská iniciativa, která jasně zakáže jakékoliv tolerování dětských sňatků na území EU a dětské sňatky na území Evropy bude kriminalizovat. V Evropě to můžeme řešit.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, beaucoup de choses ont été dites, c'est pourquoi je limiterai mon propos à la différence dans le traitement juridique, en prenant quelques exemples.

En 2016, un tribunal de Bavière a approuvé le mariage d'un Syrien de 21 ans avec sa cousine de 14 ans. Le tribunal a estimé que ce mariage était valide parce qu'il avait été conclu en accord avec la loi syrienne. Fin 2015, selon le même principe, les Pays-Bas reconnaissaient les mariages de mineurs lorsqu'ils avaient été enregistrés dans le pays d'origine. En Allemagne aussi, le gouvernement fédéral a présenté, il y a quelques mois, en Conseil des ministres, un projet de loi qui interdit le mariage des mineurs, l'âge légal minimum passant de 16 à 18 ans. En France, les deux époux doivent avoir 18 ans, mais un mariage avec un mineur peut être autorisé pour des motifs sérieux comme, par exemple, une grossesse.

L'important est d'essayer d'aller vers une harmonisation. Par le vote de cette résolution, nous essaierons d'appliquer des normes juridiques uniformes sur le territoire européen en ce qui concerne le mariage des enfants et, si possible, son interdiction, comme le rappelle le rapporteur spécial des Nations unies en la matière.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kannatan täydestä sydämestäni lapsiavioliittojen lopettamista. Euroopassa ei voida enää sulkea silmiä lapsiavioliitoilta monikulttuurisiin arvoihin vedoten. Eurooppaan saapuvilta on edellytettävä samanlaista ihmisoikeuksien kunnioitusta kuin eurooppalaisilta itseltään.

Lapsiavioliittojen estäminen ei ole pelkästään humanitaarista. Se on vaikuttava keino edistää pitkällä aikavälillä kehitysmaiden kehitystä ja padota pakolaistulvaa kestävästi. Tyttöjen koulutus on niitä harvoja tekijöitä, jotka on tutkimuksissa havaittu yli sukupolvien vaikuttavaksi investoinniksi köyhyyden vastaisessa taistelussa. Lapsiavioliitot, vähäinen koulutus ja nopea väestönkasvu ovat sidoksissa toisiinsa. EU:lla on tässä tilaisuus osoittaa suurta johtajuutta, eikä tätä tilaisuutta tule jättää käyttämättä.

President. – Colleagues, we now come to catch the eye. Even if I am very generous I will not be able to provide speaking time to more than half of those colleagues who have applied to speak because the list is very long.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Többször beszéltünk már a gyermekházasságok riasztóan magas számáról, mégsem lehet elégszer elmondani, hogy a jelenség megfékezése nem csak emberi jogi szempontok miatt fontos. Hiszen hozzá kell tennünk azt, hogy főleg a fejlődő országokban, szegénységben élő családok gyermekeiről van szó, akik így iskolai tanulmányaikat is félbehagyják, ezzel saját és családjuk társadalmi felemelkedését és a szegénység csökkentését teszik még nehezebbé.

Óriási lakosságszámmal rendelkező államokban, Indiában, Bangladesben vagy éppen Afrika középső részén nagyon elterjedtek a gyermekházasságok, ahol a népszaporulat is magas, és ezek az államok sok esetben Európába irányuló migrációs forrásországoknak is számítanak. Elképesztő adat, hogy 2030-ra 950 millió főt fog érinteni a gyermekházasság, ami az Unió lakosságának kétszeresét teszi ki. Nem lehet a hagyományokkal és a szokásokkal magyarázni a jelenség fenntartását. Ha a világ kezelni szeretné a túlnépesedésből, a globális felmelegedésből és a migrációból eredő problémákat, akkor a gyermekházasságok gyakorlatát meg kell szüntetnie.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, i matrimoni precoci e forzati, e in particolare il fenomeno delle spose bambine, rappresentano una piaga mondiale, forse ancora sottostimata e quindi non adeguatamente contrastata sul piano giuridico e socioculturale.

Sono milioni nel mondo le giovani donne che hanno contratto matrimonio addirittura prima del compimento dei 14 anni e tali matrimoni, precoci e forzati, costituiscono un fenomeno estremamente pregiudizievole, che comporta una grave violazione dei diritti delle bambine, spesso sottoposte a violenze ed abusi, in ogni caso private del diritto all'infanzia ma anche della dignità, della speranza e della possibilità di scegliere il proprio futuro.

Come Unione europea, abbiamo la responsabilità di intervenire: dobbiamo far sì, che il rispetto della dignità e dei diritti dei minori, oltre ad essere sempre affermati sul territorio europeo, siano le necessarie premesse per avviare accordi di cooperazione con quei paesi in via di sviluppo nei quali persiste tale pratica, per sollecitare e avviare un percorso di riforme, nel segno del rispetto dei diritti delle giovani donne e delle bambine.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il fenomeno delle spose bambine è in costante aumento e, secondo *Save the Children*, è tra le principali barriere che impediscono alle ragazze di accedere a servizi e opportunità.

Ogni sette secondi nel mondo, una ragazza con meno di 15 anni si sposa, spesso con un uomo molto più grande. Tutte queste bambine non sono pronte né fisicamente, né psicologicamente, non possono affrontare un matrimonio, né tantomeno una gravidanza.

Purtroppo, l'impegno legale volto a proteggerlo attraverso la penalizzazione del matrimonio infantile incontra notevoli ostacoli dovuti alla cultura politica prevalente, all'accondiscendenza di estremisti religiosi e al perdurare di pregiudizi di genere.

La comunità internazionale si è impegnata a mettere fine alla pratica dei matrimoni precoci entro il 2030: ma se il numero di spose bambine nel mondo continuerà a crescere ai ritmi attuali, entro quella data avremo 950 milioni di giovani donne sposate. Il lavoro da fare è sulla diffusione di legislazioni che impediscano la possibilità di contrarre un matrimonio con delle minori e l'Europa deve fare la sua parte.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, child marriages are a violation of the human rights of children, of young girls, and are a form of gender-based violence. This debate provides an opportunity for elected representatives to hear from the Commission about the effectiveness of EU measures, whether it is in Europe or in developing countries. For example, the right-wing ruling party in Turkey recently considered a proposal to free convicted rapists provided that they marry their victims. To truly confront the reality, we must take a holistic view, empowering women and girls through education, ensuring that systems that subject girls to child marriages are eroded through women's leadership from the grassroots community upwards and that girls themselves are enabled and empowered to speak up in every way they can.

I am proud to be part of a European Union that takes action to advance the rights of women and girls around the world and I look forward to hearing from the Commission about their work on this.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, I am glad that we are having this debate because it gives us the opportunity to reiterate, loud and clear, that child marriage is a violation of human rights and should be criminalised as such. Girls are the most targeted group in this vile practice. This scourge only furthers gender discrimination and, in practical terms, it means legalising domestic sexual violence. The EU stands with women and girls and is committed to eradicating child marriage, with initiatives such as the Daphne programme, but we can do more.

We need to push all countries to introduce a minimum age for marriage and to ensure better access to sexual and reproductive health services. Ending child marriage would be a major milestone on the path towards the empowerment of women, and thus it should remain a priority of the European Union.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, dječji brakovi nespojivi su s onim što Europa danas jest – jedna napredna civilizacija koja se oslanja na vladavinu prava. Naš pravni sustav ovakav oblik nasilja nad najranjivijim članovima društva stavlja izvan okvira dozvoljenog i to bi svi žitelji država članica Unije, neovisno o vlastitom kulturnom ili vjerskom nasljeđu, trebali poštovati.

Problem nastaje kad se pripadnike raznih manjina automatski svrstava u ranjive skupine pa im se neke stvari, koje nikome drugome nisu dozvoljene, ipak dozvoljavaju. Jedna od tih stvari su i dječji brakovi koji su u Europi dominantno praksa manjinskih zajednica.

Ovo je još jedno pitanje koje pokazuje kolika je potreba za boljom integracijskom politikom i dosljednim provođenjem zakona u Europi. Zakon mora biti isti za sve jer ćemo se u protivnom vratiti u neka ružna vremena kojih se europski narodi ne sjećaju s osobitom nostalgijom.

President. – Colleagues, just by way of explanation, I have seen some colleagues asking for catch-the-eye after the catch-the-eye debate has started. I am not in a position to take those requests.

By the way, this does not concern you, Ms Vautmans. I am just saying it as a general remark: looking at you does not mean it is about you! But seriously, I cannot take those requests, not least because we are behind schedule and the list is very long. So, my apologies, but the moment catch-the-eye starts we cannot even put your name on the list to give you the floor.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – 750 miljoen meisjes wereldwijd, kindhuwelijken. Jaarlijks 15 miljoen meisjes. Dat aantal is toch wel verschrikkelijk. Het gebeurt in ontwikkelingslanden en, collega's, ik heb ze bezocht. Zwanger zijnde in een kraambed, baby's die sterven, jonge meisjes die lijden aan fistels en nadien verstoten worden. Ik heb ze ook weggedragen zien worden. Kindbruiden, zwanger geworden, stervend in het kraambed.

Dat is wat vandaag de dag nog altijd gebeurt en daar moeten we op inzetten in de ontwikkelingslanden. Zoals collega Goerens zei: met educatie, met opleiding, met politieke druk op de politieke verantwoordelijken aldaar. Maar we moeten ook in eigen hart durven kijken. We moeten, zoals de heer Tarabella zei, ook kijken naar wat hier in Europa gebeurt. Waar herkennen we die kindhuwelijken? Hoe kunnen we hier kinderen beschermen zodat ze niet worden uitgehuwelijkt? Laten we samen gaan voor nultolerantie.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, v rozvojových zemích se kařda třetı dıvka vda před dovršenım 18. roku a kařda devata před dovršenım 15 let. Problem detskeho manřelstvı se dotyka jak dıvek, tak chlapcu, ale dıvky, ktere představujı 82 % sezdanych detı, jsou ohrořeny nejvıce. Problem se netyka vsak pouze třetıch zemı, ale take Evropy. Omlouvam se, ře pouřıvam silna slova, ale detske snatky povařuji za naprosto neakceptovatelnou zvratenost. Napřıkklad ıřady v Nemecku v lonskem roce evidovaly jıř 1 500 vdanych řı ženatych detı. To je zcela nepřijatelne, nenı přece mořzne, abychom v EU akceptovali detska manřelstvı, ktera jdou zcela proti evropskemu pravu. Detı patřı do řkol a ne k plotnam a to je princip, od ktereho se na ızemı EU nenı mořzne odklonit. Tato praxe musı skonřit, pokud se stale chceme povařovat za mısto s jıstym moralnım a civilizačním rozmerem. A tato debata by

měla zcela konkrétní opatření, která jí zabrání uvnitř EU, připravit do budoucna a já pevně věřím, že tomu tak bude, paní komisařko.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι το πρόβλημα έχει περιγραφεί πάρα πολύ καλά από πολλούς συναδέλφους και δεν θα επαναλάβω τίποτα. Πρέπει όμως, κυρία Επίτροπε, να λάβουμε μέτρα, οικονομικά, πολιτικά και νομικά. Νομίζω ότι έχετε ακόμα δρόμο να διανύσετε και πρέπει να αναλάβετε την προσπάθεια αυτή. Θέλω να κλείσω με το εξής για να μην τρώω πολύ χρόνο: είναι λανθασμένη η προσέγγιση που ακούσαμε από τα απέναντι έδρανα για την αύξηση των γάμων αυτών και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Είναι ένα υπαρκτό πρόβλημα, αλλά εμείς το κοιτάζουμε παγκόσμια. Δεν μπορεί να έχουμε διαφορετική ματιά για αυτό που συμβαίνει στην Αφρική, στην Ασία και διαφορετική για αυτό που συμβαίνει ίσως και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Το πρόβλημα πρέπει να το αντιμετωπίσουμε με τους ίδιους τρόπους. Να λάβουμε πιο επιτακτικά μέτρα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αλλά να μην ρίχνουμε το βάρος στο ότι υπάρχει μετανάστευση. Υπάρχει μετανάστευση, αλλά έχουμε καλύτερους τρόπους για να αντιμετωπίσουμε το πρόβλημα μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for this very interesting and very alarming debate. On 30 June this year a great step was taken as the Convention, the Istanbul Convention which has been mentioned here many times in the discussion, was signed on behalf of the EU. The decision on the conclusion is currently being negotiated in the Council, and I can assure you that the Commission is working very closely with the Estonian Presidency to achieve progress towards ratification.

I can assure you that I will use every possible moment and opportunity to discuss with those States which have not yet ratified, to do so. On behalf of the Commission I can say that we are very grateful for the considerable support for accession expressed by Parliament on many occasions.

President. – I have received one motion for a resolution tabled in accordance with Rule 128(5) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Wednesday, 4 October 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve, antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), *în scris*. – Pe lângă toate aspectele legate de acest subiect sensibil, menționate în întrebarea orală, vreau să vă atrag atenția în primul rând că, odată cu recenta criză a migrației, au apărut noi cazuri de căsătorii de copii încheiate în străinătate, care implică uneori copii cu vârsta mai mică de 14 ani, ceea ce este absolut revoltător.

În al doilea rând, vreau să subliniez faptul că, atât la nivel național și la nivelul Uniunii, cât și la nivel internațional, sunt disponibile foarte puține statistici care să demonstreze magnitudinea problemei reprezentate de căsătoriile copiilor, căsătoriile timpurii și căsătoriile forțate (CEFM). Având în vedere că această practică este prezentă nu doar în țările terțe, ci și în unele state membre ale Uniunii Europene, consider că este necesară o monitorizare adecvată și armonizată a tuturor acestor cazuri de căsătorii pe teritoriul UE, dar și o colectare de date defalcate în funcție de gen, pentru a putea evalua mai bine amploarea acestei probleme.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), *por escrito*. – Quisiera dar la bienvenida a esta pregunta parlamentaria en la medida en que impulsa las iniciativas europeas encaminadas a erradicar los matrimonios infantiles y asegurar los derechos universales de los niños. Al mismo tiempo, quisiera recordar que esta complicada cuestión no podrá ser tratada de forma eficaz sin tener en cuenta diversos condicionantes culturales, económicos y políticos. Por ejemplo, según la asociación no gubernamental *Child not brides*, siete de cada diez países con mayores tasas de matrimonio infantil son considerados Estados frágiles. Simultáneamente, se sabe que las crisis humanitarias, los conflictos y las catástrofes ambientales exacerban las condiciones de pobreza e inseguridad que favorecen los matrimonios infantiles, lo que también se refleja en las crisis migratorias, incluyendo la que afecta a Europa en los últimos años. Todos estos factores deben tomarse en consideración a la hora de abordar una estrategia eficaz que vaya más allá de las declaraciones tranquilizadoras. Por último, quisiera saludar la decisión de mencionar explícitamente a los niños (no sólo a las niñas) en la pregunta, lo que muestra un genuino compromiso con la igualdad de género.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Fakt, że na publicznej arenie w krajach rozwijających się istnieje takie zjawisko, jak małżeństwa nieletnich, pokazuje, że nie idziemy do przodu, ale cofamy się, w przepaść ignorancji umysłowej. Nieletnie dziewczynki i potomstwo (takich małżeństw) płacą cenę za tę ohydę umysłową, która skłania ludzi do wydawania za mąż dziewczynek, które nie osiągnęły dojrzałości płciowej lub zaledwie ją osiągnęły. Jest to umysłowe ześlizgiwanie się do tyłu, które ma bardzo poważne konsekwencje. Mała dziewczynka nie może znieść wymagań życia małżeńskiego ani psychicznie, ani fizycznie. Jest to zatem przestępstwo, które może powstrzymać tylko prawo.

Ze względu na migrację z krajów dotkniętych klęską i dużą liczbę uchodźców powyższy problem dotyczy również Europy. Traktaty wymagają, by UE promowała prawa dziecka. Samoistnie nasuwa mi się więc pytanie: jak Komisja zajmuje się tą kwestią?

Pragnę jednocześnie zaznaczyć, że nie zgadzam się na ustępstwa pochwalające aborcję (ukrytą pod hasłem praw seksualnych i reprodukcyjnych). Moje poparcie dla rezolucji nie ma więc nic wspólnego z tymi ustępami, którym stanowczo się sprzeciwiam.

Livia Járóka (PPE), *írásban*. – Minden évben 15 millió 18 év alatti kislány köt kényszerházasságot, tehát úgy is mondhatnánk, hogy perenként 28 lány, másodperenként pedig 1 lány esik a nők elleni erőszak eme formájának áldozatául. A roma nők Európa-szerte nem csak nemük, hanem etnikai hovatartozásuk miatt is hátrányos, összetett, többszörös megkülönböztetés áldozatai a széles körben elterjedt cigányellenesség következtében. Ezért is különösen fontos, hogy az EU Roma 2020-2030 stratégiában kiemelten foglalkozzunk a kérdéssel. Magyarország kormányja 2012-ben indított „Nő az esély” programja keretében 1,5 milliárd forintot szakképzési támogatást nyújt, hogy minél több roma nő tudjon elhelyezkedni a munkaerőpiacon. Hasonló célzott intézkedéseket javasolunk a többi kormány számára is.

Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Mit dieser Entschloßung setzen wir ein klares Zeichen gegen die Verhehlung von Kindern. Die Bekämpfung von Kinderehe unterstütze ich vollumfänglich. Allerdings möchte ich davor warnen, verschiedene Themen zu vermischen. Daher lehne ich den Antrag betreffend die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und die damit verbundenen Rechte und Dienstleistungen, einschließlich des sicheren und legalen Schwangerschaftsabbruchs, ab. Außerdem lehne ich es ab, dass die Europäische Union Gelder für die Finanzierungslücke der „Global Gag Rule“ im Bereich der reproduktiven und sexuellen Rechte zur Verfügung stellen soll.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *por escrito*. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D), *in writing*. – In recent years child marriage has gained increasing prominence on international and national development agendas. Each year, 15 million girls are married before the age of 18. Child marriage is a crime recognised under the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women, which we must end in order to achieve a fairer future for all.

Child brides face enormous challenges as a result of being married as children. Child marriage is a complex issue: poverty, lack of education or different cultural practices. Ending child marriage requires work across all sectors and at all levels. We must take a holistic approach to empower young girls through education, to ensure that systems that subject girls to child marriages are eroded through women's leadership from the grassroots community upwards and that girls themselves are enabled and empowered to speak up in every way they can. Today, we have a unique opportunity to act on this momentum and accelerate our efforts to help change the lives of girls and young women all over the world.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), *kirjalikult*. – Laste varajased ja sundabielud on lapse õiguse rikkumine ning naiste- ja tütarlaste vastane vägivald. Arenguriikides abiellub iga kolmas tütarlaps enne 18-aastaseks saamist ja iga üheksas enne 15-aastaseks saamist. Väikeste või keskmiste tuludega riikides on rasedus- ja sünnitusaegsed tüsistused 15-19-aastaste tütarlaste seas peamine surmapõhjus. Varajased ja sundabielud on seotud emasuremuse kõrge määraga ning tavaliselt tähendab see ka tütarlapse hariduse omandamise lõppu. Selline praktika tuleb peatada ja see peab olema ELi välistegevuse prioriteet naiste õiguste ja inimõiguste edendamise valdkonnas. Oluline on ka märkida, et probleem ei esine mitte ainult kolmandates riikides, vaid ka ELis. Eelarves tuleb leida vahendid laste abielude ennetamise programmidele, tuleb toetada kolmandaid riike selliste praktikate kaotamisel ning suurendada teadlikkust erinevate kampaaniate raames. Veel on erilised murekohad laste kaitse tagamine pagulaste ja varjupaigataotlejate seas – vastuvõtavad riigid peavad tagama lapspagulaste täieliku juurdepääsu haridusele ning abistama laps- või sundabielude ohvreid. Samuti leian, et ELil on kohustus leida rahastus USA poolt tekitatud tühimikule nn üldise vaikumise seaduse uuesti kehtestamisega seksuaal- ja reproduktiivtervise valdkonnas.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), *por escrito*. – Todos los niños y todas las niñas tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños y las niñas reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños y las niñas.

11. Prioriteiten van het partnerschap EU-Egypte voor de periode 2017-2020 (debat)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the EU-Egypt partnership priorities for 2017-2020 (2017/2874(RSP)).

Miguel Arias Cañete, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, last July, High Representative Mogherini and the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Sameh Shoukry, chaired the European Union-Egypt Association Council, in the presence of Commissioner Hahn. It was on that occasion that our new Partnership Priorities were adopted.

This was the first Association Council with Egypt in seven years, so the first since the beginning of the revolts in the Arab world. It is precisely in these times of transition that our cooperation becomes more important. It is important for the people of Egypt and their aspiration to security, democracy and economic growth. It is essential for the region – from Libya to Syria – and it is essential for Europe, because we are neighbours and we share many of the same challenges.

So we are glad that we have managed to reopen such an important channel for dialogue with Egypt. This does not mean that the European Union and Egypt agree on all files. But precisely when you disagree on something, engagement becomes essential. There is no other way to address any outstanding issue, in the interest of the Egyptian people and of the whole region.

Our partnership with Egypt will be structured around four main tracks. Firstly, support to the Egyptian government's socio-economic reform agenda. In this field, there has been much concrete progress in the last year: the Egyptian authorities adopted an economic reform plan supported by the International Monetary Fund, aimed at bringing back macroeconomic stability and inclusive growth. This is an important step, and we are eager to support the plan, including through our bilateral assistance programme. We are also keen to support Egypt's efforts to address the social and economic impact of these reforms, particularly on the most vulnerable parts of the population.

The second track of our partnership is building stronger cooperation on common challenges, such as counterterrorism and migration. Terrorism poses a fundamental threat to Egypt's stability and security. Time and again, we have stood on the side of the Egyptian people when they were hit by a new attack. It is not just 'moral' solidarity; we are ready for more concrete cooperation in this field, and the Partnership Priorities are giving us the opportunity to explore new forms of common engagement.

Let me add that, whenever we discuss counterterrorism with our Egyptian counterparts, we always insist that repressive measures are never enough to address this issue. Terrorism needs to be tackled in full respect of international human rights standards and fundamental freedoms.

On migration, Egypt has made an important contribution in hosting refugees, not least Syrian refugees. It has also significantly reduced irregular migration flows, through the implementation of the Valletta Action Plan and the Khartoum process. A better and more humane management of migration flows is in the interest first and foremost of migrants, but also of countries of origin, transit and destination. So we are currently working with our Egyptian counterparts to launch a high-level migration dialogue.

The third track relates to closer dialogue and cooperation on foreign policy and regional issues. Egypt currently seats on both the UN Security Council and the African Union Political and Security Council. Beyond that, it is an essential partner to address other crises in our region, starting with the conflict between Israel and Palestine. We share an interest in working together more, including on the conflicts in Libya and Syria, as well as to address tensions in the Gulf.

Last, but definitely not least, there is a strong political track in our partnership, which includes governance, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. The European Union's position on this is very clear and we reiterate it constantly in our dialogue with our Egyptian counterparts: sustainable security and stability can only be achieved when human rights – those guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution and flowing from Egypt's international commitments – are fully implemented.

If we want to help improve the situation of human rights in Egypt or to preserve the space for civil society, we have no alternative to engaging with them. It is in this spirit that the European Union Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, visited Egypt in February, to enhance dialogue on human rights with the Egyptian authorities.

We continue to pass this message both in public and in private, in all our contacts both at bilateral level and in multi-lateral fora. This is what we did, for instance, on the possible consequences of the new NGO law.

On NGOs, in particular, there is something we should not forget. The European Union is the biggest donor in Egypt. Total ongoing European Union financial assistance commitments to Egypt amount to over EUR 1.3 billion in grants. If Member State and European Financial Institutions' grants, loans and debt-swaps are included, the figure rises to EUR 11 billion. A relevant part of this bilateral assistance relies on civil society organisations as implementing partners. Our partnership needs a strong and lively civil society, and this is something our Egyptian friends should also keep in mind.

The four tracks of our partnership are closely linked to one another. Sustainable security is linked to sustainable development, which is linked to human rights and to regional stability. This is the approach we have adopted with our Partnership Priorities, and this is the proof that only through engagement can we address our common interests for the people of Egypt, for Europe and for our entire region.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, le partenariat entre l'Union et l'Égypte est important pour la stabilité et la prospérité des deux rives de la Méditerranée. Nous avons des intérêts communs, nous devons également affronter des défis communs comme la lutte contre le terrorisme, le trafic des êtres humains, les migrations et l'instabilité dans notre voisinage Sud.

Sur tous ces fronts, nous avons besoin d'une action conjointe plus poussée. C'est pour cela que notre groupe salue la tenue, le 25 juillet dernier, du septième Conseil d'association UE-Égypte. Une impulsion supplémentaire a été ainsi donnée à ce partenariat, et nous partageons l'orientation générale des priorités qui ont été convenues.

Je me réjouis en particulier de voir que la section consacrée aux principes de la coopération évoque l'approfondissement du dialogue politique sur la démocratie et les droits de l'homme et la nécessité d'une collaboration avec les organisations de la société civile pour la mise en œuvre de ce partenariat.

Les deux dimensions sont très importantes, puisqu'on sait qu'il reste beaucoup à faire en matière de respect des droits de l'homme et de participation de la société civile en Égypte.

D'ailleurs, lorsqu'on discute avec nos interlocuteurs égyptiens, ils sont les premiers à le reconnaître. Et je trouve qu'il est essentiel de continuer à travailler avec eux pour promouvoir les droits de l'homme et privilégier une approche constructive qui nous permettra d'obtenir de meilleurs résultats sur le terrain.

Ainsi, une mission d'information du groupe PPE, à laquelle ont participé nos collègues Elmar Brok et Mariya Gabriel, a été dépêchée en Égypte en novembre 2016, et l'un des principaux messages communiqués à nos partenaires est que l'Union soutiendra toutes les mesures visant à l'adoption de normes internationales en matière des droits de l'homme en Égypte.

C'est un travail, certes de longue haleine, qu'il faudra soutenir avec constance afin de promouvoir une véritable transition démocratique en Égypte.

À cet égard, le mécanisme de suivi et d'évaluation qui sera mis en place dans le cadre du partenariat jouera un rôle essentiel, et il conviendra de s'assurer qu'il est suffisamment doté pour nous permettre d'atteindre ces objectifs.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Egypt is a key partner for the EU and we welcome the first EU-Egypt Association Council after the revolution and the adoption of the partnership priorities for the period 2017-2020. Egypt is undergoing a difficult period, but its path towards stability and sustainability is so important. Egypt is confronted with a challenging internal situation following the revolution and faces terrorism that continues to strike the country, with all its consequences on people, on tourism and on the economy.

We know there are many shortcomings, and yet we know and acknowledge the progress already made in certain areas, including the new parliament; but equally, we have to take note of the many areas where EU-Egypt cooperation is of fundamental importance. I mentioned terrorism. There is no doubt that to defeat terrorism we need a close cooperation with all partners, including Egypt. In this regard, I welcome the efforts of the President el-Sisi to reform Islam and to prevent radicalisation, as well as the strong effort to protect Christians, which has recently prevented attacks being launched against the Christian communities. But let me also add the importance of cooperating with Egypt on migration and for regional stability. We praise in particular the efforts of Egypt to play its very important broker's role in Palestinian reconciliation. Just today we have taken note of the successful talks between the two sides and the fact that the two sides have decided to build up the national consensus government of Palestine. It's an example of what Europe can do.

(The President cut off the speaker.)

President. – Thank you, colleague. My apologies on behalf of those of us who are sitting here. You really had two minutes but there was a mistake in the papers. I give you our apologies.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie.* – Vanuit Europees perspectief loont het zeker de moeite kennis te nemen van de sociale media in Egypte. In deze sociale media woedt immers al maandenlang een verhit debat over de resultaten van het bewind van president Sisi en diens vooruitzichten op herverkiezing in april 2018.

Dit debat valt grosso modo positief uit voor het Egyptische staatshoofd: een ruime herverkiezing in april 2018 ligt in het verschiet. Echter, ook onder de sympathisanten van president Sisi heerst onmiskenbaar grote teleurstelling over 's lands ronduit dramatische sociaal-economische situatie (broodrellen bijvoorbeeld).

Dat brengt mij bij de grote rol die het Egyptische leger in de nationale economie speelt. Graag wil ik van de Raad en de Commissie weten, desnoods schriftelijk, hoe zij met dit militaire “*business empire*” omgaan binnen het kader van de partnerschapsprioriteiten tussen de EU en Egypte 2017-2020, die duidelijk spreken over “versterking van de rol van de private sector”. Ik hoop dat de Commissie er nota van neemt en dat ik hierop een schriftelijk antwoord krijg: de rol van het militaire apparaat in de Egyptische economie. Zie dat eens te rijmen met versterking van de private sector.

In het officiële document over de gezamenlijke partnerschapsprioriteiten lees ik op pagina 7 dat de EU en Egypte samen blijven werken in de strijd tegen extremisme, discriminatie, inclusief islamofobie en xenofobie. Op grond van de Egyptische realiteit mogen hier twee woorden niet ontbreken: contra christofobie en contra antisemitisme.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group.* – Mr President, I hope these words are conveyed to the High Representative, Commissioner. The circumstances that Egyptians live under and the EU's relation to this crucial country merit a serious and critical assessment. Considering the increased focus on security, managing migration and now the EU-Egypt partnership, it is shocking and disappointing that the EPP and S&D Groups have blocked this debate for three years and, even now, colleagues have ensured that this House does not express itself in a resolution this month. I consider this to be a cop-out.

The human rights situation in Egypt cannot only be relevant for us when it hits home, however terrible the brutal murder of Giulio Regeni might be, and I too echo the ongoing calls for justice in that case. But countless Egyptians face grave injustices and violations of their rights, and we must address their fate too. They face systematic torture, enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings, and all of this is happening with impunity. Civilians are still tried by military courts and we have now seen 22 cases of death sentences. Very restrictive NGO laws make the work of civil society, including EU-based organisations, nearly impossible. Journalists and bloggers are harassed – and I want to highlight particularly the ongoing imprisonment of Alaa Abd El-Fattah – and they cannot work freely, and that is unacceptable. Add to that the recent wave of arrests of gay people and the intimidation of LGBT people. That is also unacceptable.

No short-term cooperation in the field of anti-terrorism or ‘migration management’ can compensate for these gross violations, nor can they justify the EU's ongoing silence. Egyptians deserve better and need better. We know what a boiling point can be reached if the needs of young people are not addressed. There cannot be a partnership without respect for human rights.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, é verdade tudo o que foi dito relativamente à estratégia que é preciso estabelecer entre a União Europeia e o Egito enquanto parceiro histórico: as relações culturais e as relações de vizinhança.

É verdade também o papel fundamental do Egito relativamente à questão da Síria, da Líbia ou até mesmo da Palestina. Mas gostaria de retomar o que foi dito pela colega agora mesmo. É que entre parceiros não pode haver assuntos tabu, nomeadamente a questão dos direitos humanos nos dois sentidos: seja no que diz respeito à violação de direitos humanos no Egito, seja no que diz respeito à violação de direitos humanos na União Europeia.

Por isso, queria aqui afirmar, com muita veemência, que não pode haver cláusulas neste acordo que fiquem apenas no papel. É nossa responsabilidade que tudo o que está escrito no acordo seja cumprido e a questão dos direitos humanos não pode ser uma questão menor. Tem que estar ao nível das questões do comércio, tem que estar ao nível da questão dos interesses económicos, ou melhor, tem que estar acima delas, porque senão será sempre uma vítima pobre.

Peço, por isso, à Senhora Comissária que tenha em conta que, para haver parceria e para sermos amigos, temos que falar de direitos humanos e, volto a dizer, nos dois sentidos.

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Das Partnerschaftsübereinkommen verpflichtet die EU und Ägypten, Menschenrechte auf der Basis von internationalen Standards zu achten und zu fördern. Die Realität in Ägypten sieht anders aus: Aktivisten der Zivilgesellschaft werden bespitzelt, bedroht und eingesperrt, Menschenrechtsorganisationen berichten von Folter, willkürlichen Verhaftungen, dem Verschwindenlassen von Inhaftierten, unfairen Gerichtsverfahren, Diskriminierung von Minderheiten und Frauen. Wir haben im letzten Jahr aufgrund der Ermordung von Giulio Regeni hier eine Entschließung verabschiedet, die die katastrophale Menschenrechtssituation in Ägypten klar verurteilt.

Sie, Herr Kommissar Cañete, haben erwähnt, dass Sie sich für dieses NGO-Gesetz eingesetzt haben. Aber mit welchem Ergebnis? Das jüngste Partnerschaftsabkommen ist eine vertane Gelegenheit. Die EU hätte entschiedener auf konkrete Verbesserungen der Menschenrechtssituation drängen müssen. Beispielsweise hätte sie sich eben deutlich gegen dieses inzwischen verabschiedete NGO-Gesetz positionieren müssen. Dieses restriktive Gesetz bedroht direkt die Arbeit von Menschenrechtsorganisationen.

Die EU hat es versäumt, Ägypten gegenüber Klartext zu sprechen. Offenkundig haben Wirtschaftsinteressen Vorrang. Das zeigt sich auch darin, dass zahlreiche EU-Mitgliedstaaten sogar Waffen nach Ägypten exportieren, und dies im Widerspruch zum Beschluss des EU-Außenministerrats vom August 2013. Ich denke, mit dieser Ägypten-Politik machen sich die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten an der dortigen Menschenrechtspolitik mitschuldig.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Egitto e l'Unione europea si impegnano a promuovere la democrazia, le libertà fondamentali, i diritti umani come diritti costituzionali di tutti i loro cittadini. Parole scritte del partenariato UE-Egitto 2017-2020, parole che risultano paradossali, amaramente surreali, pensando che nel territorio del nostro partner, chiunque voglia indagare sui circa 378 casi di sparizioni forzate, viene zittito brutalmente, come dimostra il recente caso dell'avvocato della famiglia Regeni, Ibrahim Metwaly Hegazy, rinchiuso nel carcere di massima sicurezza di Tora.

Gli sono stati tolti tutti i vestiti e il suo corpo è stato sottoposto a scosse elettriche; è in isolamento senza energia elettrica e la cella è piena di spazzatura. Lo dice la Commissione egiziana per i diritti e la libertà, alla cui sede oggi l'autorità egiziana probabilmente metterà anche i sigilli. Rafforzare la cooperazione con l'Egitto è un'aspirazione che condividiamo ma non possiamo chiudere gli occhi, né far tacere la nostra voce davanti al vergognoso silenzio sul sequestro, sulle torture e sulla morte di Giulio Regeni, un ragazzo italiano, un cittadino europeo.

Non siamo e non saremo complici di una utilitaristica ipocrisia e oggi, come sempre, chiediamo a gran voce, verità e giustizia per Giulio Regeni.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sicuramente l'importanza di questo accordo di partenariato non può essere ignorata da chi ha a cuore, come noi, il problema della sicurezza del Mediterraneo, il problema dell'immigrazione, ma anche e forse soprattutto, il grave problema del terrorismo. È più che mai necessaria la collaborazione del Cairo per la sicurezza ora che, dopo la sconfitta in Iraq e in Siria, l'ISIS sta spostando l'asse operativo del Califfato verso il Nord Africa e il Sahel, cioè molto vicino all'Europa e in particolare al mio paese, l'Italia: ma non è che non veda anche la gravità della situazione dei diritti umani.

Se noi, come Unione europea, vogliamo essere amici e partner affidabili e credibili di questo paese che io continuo a ritenere amico, dobbiamo parlare con molta chiarezza su alcuni fatti di una gravità eccezionale, come quelli, più volte e giustamente, ricordati dai colleghi, come il caso veramente emblematico di Giulio Regeni, un ragazzo inviato da una università europea – ed è anche strano che l'Unione europea non abbia voluto approfondire il ruolo di questa università e di questi insegnanti, quali veri incarichi avessero dato a questo giovane ricercatore, sicuramente in buona fede.

Io vorrei sapere quali azioni concrete l'Alto rappresentante Mogherini ha posto in atto per difendere la memoria, l'onore e soprattutto le richieste, anche da un punto di vista morale, di due genitori italiani che ancora adesso hanno diritto di sapere la fine che ha fatto il loro figlio.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η εταιρική σχέση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με την Αίγυπτο κινείται στα πλαίσια της αναθεωρημένης Πολιτικής Ευρωπαϊκής Γειτονίας και συνοψίζεται στην αντιμετώπιση των κοινών προκλήσεων, στην προώθηση κοινών συμφερόντων και στην εξασφάλιση μακροχρόνιας σταθερότητας και στις δύο περιοχές της Μεσογείου. Η Αίγυπτος είναι στρατηγικός εταίρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως και για τον λόγο αυτό συνεργάζεται μαζί της και σε άλλα σοβαρά θέματα, όπως είναι η εξασφάλιση σταθερότητας στην περιοχή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, η προώθηση θεμάτων κοινού ενδιαφέροντος, η αντιμετώπιση της τρομοκρατίας, η αντιμετώπιση της μεταναστεύσεως και τέλος η προώθηση της δημοκρατίας.

Η Αίγυπτος έχει δεσμευθεί να κατοχυρώσει συνταγματικά τις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των πολιτών της και προστατεύει τα δικαιώματα των μεταναστών και των περιθωριοποιημένων ατόμων. Συνεργάζεται επίσης και σε θέματα ενεργείας. Μάλιστα η ανακάλυψη του υπεργίγαντιου κοιτάσματος ZOP στην ΑΟΖ της Αιγύπτου θα συμβάλει στην προώθηση της συνεργασίας των δύο αυτών μερών. Τέλος, επισημαίνω ότι η τριμερής συνεργασία της Αιγύπτου με την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο θα συμβάλει στη σταθερότητα στην περιοχή και στην προώθηση των κοινών σκοπών της εξωτερικής πολιτικής.

President. – Colleagues, from now on and in future, the moment you exceed the time and continue speaking I shall see that as a mark of disrespect to your colleagues, so next time I will cut you off exactly to the second, regardless of the colleague concerned or the political group.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, Egipto, por su dimensión, por su situación estratégica, por su influencia en la región y en el mundo árabe, por ser miembro del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas, está llamado a ser un socio destacado de la Unión Europea, tanto en su agenda bilateral como ante los problemas globales.

Se ha celebrado en julio la reunión del Consejo de Asociación, y creemos que es una noticia positiva. Estuvo siete años suspendido. Entendemos que en siete años han pasado muchas cosas en Oriente Medio, en Europa y en el mundo. Por eso tenemos que adaptar nuestra agenda de cooperación a la nueva configuración de las amenazas, contribuir a la estabilización de la región —evidentemente, no se podrá conseguir hasta que no haya un avance en el problema de Siria—, superar las diferencias en el Consejo de Cooperación del Golfo y, evidentemente, luchar contra el terrorismo.

Es evidente que la cooperación en el ámbito de la seguridad y la eficiencia energética y de la lucha contra el cambio climático, ambas competencias del comisario Arias Cañete, son también muy importantes. Aquí se ha subrayado la importancia que tiene la nueva cooperación, la ayuda de la Unión Europea, que tiene que situarse en el ámbito de la política de vecindad revisada, y tenemos que avanzar también en los ámbitos que nos propone el Servicio Europeo Acción Exterior: desarrollo y modernización económica y social, comercio e inversión y, desde luego, no por último y por ello menos importante, en el ámbito del respeto de los derechos humanos.

Quiero recordar lo que pasó cuando los Hermanos Musulmanes llegaron al poder por la vía democrática y quiero recordar, señor presidente, ante algunas insinuaciones, que yo renuncié a la jefatura de la misión de observación de las últimas elecciones presidenciales en Egipto.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente, la alta representante, señora Mogherini, ha definido a Egipto como un socio clave para nuestra política exterior común, y mi Grupo también piensa lo mismo: son tantos y tan graves los escenarios que están abiertos en la región, que la colaboración, la cooperación con Egipto aparece como una necesidad imperiosa para la causa de la paz y de la estabilidad.

Es verdad que esta asociación no puede establecerse a cualquier precio. Comparto muchos de los objetivos que marca este Acuerdo de Asociación y, enunciándolos en sentido inverso, empezaré por los derechos humanos.

Egipto tiene que cambiar ese rumbo: no puede seguir adelante con las cárceles llenas de opositores, reprimiendo duramente a la sociedad civil. La Unión Europea no puede consentirlo.

En cuanto a la seguridad, Egipto tiene que seguir echando la llave con mayor eficacia al apoyo al terror, al apoyo financiero al terror.

En política exterior, Egipto debe estar en condiciones de volver a tener el liderazgo en la solución al conflicto entre Israel y Palestina. Su papel en esta cuestión es clave, y Egipto debe caminar y debe definirse como una democracia sin matices, pero está lejos de ello.

Por eso, aunque celebro de nuevo la reanudación de las conversaciones, me parece muy importante que la Unión Europea deje claro que, si va en contra los derechos de los ciudadanos egipcios, no vamos a callarnos.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Egypten er overordnet set en kerneallieret for Europa, ikke bare en kerneallieret i regionen, men også en venligtsindet og konstruktiv magt, der normalvis arbejder med os i Europa for vores fælles interesser.

Det gælder, når det handler om at modstå terrorisme, om vores fælles sikkerhed, om at skabe stabilitet i en region, der har en direkte indvirkning på vores fred, sikkerhed og stabilitet her i Europa.

Det gælder også, når der er tale om den bredere politik i forhold til Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, senest eksemplificeret ved de egyptiske bestræbelser på at få de palæstinensiske selvstyreområder til at tale bedre sammen og til måske igen at forme en fælles regering, som på sigt vil være den eneste måde, hvorpå en realistisk fredsftale kan nås mellem Israel og Palæstina.

Vi ved ikke, hvad det vil bringe med sig endnu, men vi ved, at uden Egypten og de arabiske allierede kommer vi ingen vegne.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, l'Égypte est un pôle de stabilité sur une Méditerranée au bord de l'effondrement. La Tunisie est convalescente par rapport au prétendu Printemps arabe, la Libye est un État fantôme, l'Algérie se prépare à une transition lourde de menaces.

Monsieur le Commissaire, vous parlez de sécurité et de développement, et vous rajoutez les droits de l'homme. Méfiez-vous des droits de l'homme qui vont contre la sécurité et le développement parce qu'à la fin, vous n'aurez ni la sécurité, ni le développement, ni les droits de l'homme.

Aussi, il est irresponsable de vouloir déstabiliser l'Égypte, au nom des droits de l'homme, alors que son gouvernement lutte comme il le peut contre le fondamentalisme des Frères musulmans.

Nous sommes, comme beaucoup de pays musulmans, en guerre contre le totalitarisme islamiste. Cela doit être clair pour nous. Dans cette guerre, des hommes comme le maréchal Al-Sissi, le général Haftar ou Bachar El-Assad sont des remparts pour les pays européens, et ceux qui voudront les déstabiliser sont les complices du terrorisme et les ennemis de l'Europe.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io sono convinto dell'importanza strategica del ruolo dell'Egitto nello scacchiere mediterraneo e ritengo fondamentale che alla base del dialogo ci sia un impegno comune anche sui valori della democrazia e rispetto dei diritti umani, così come sottoscritto nel preambolo del documento del Consiglio di associazione.

Per questo mi chiedo come sia possibile oggi parlare di cooperazione, commercio, investimenti, immigrazione e terrorismo in costanza di pesanti violazioni di tale preambolo da parte dell'Egitto, attraverso politiche repressive in materia di diritti umani. I casi come quelli di Ibrahim Metwaly, avvocato impegnato sul fronte dei diritti e impegnato nella triste vicenda di Giulio Regeni, per la quale si è fortemente battuto per ottenere verità, detenuto in condizioni disumane o come quello dei suoi colleghi Ahmad Amasha Hanan e Badr el-Din. Sono casi questi, come tanti altri, che sono lì a dimostrare che noi abbiamo il dovere di intervenire, utilizzando anche gli strumenti che il partenariato offre perché vengano rilasciati e l'Egitto cambia registro sui diritti umani.

Signor Commissario, capisco il realismo politico ma quando esso fa tabula rasa dei principi morali, il problema si pone e con forza. Dobbiamo essere consapevoli che la coerenza e la credibilità della politica estera europea si misurano anche da come affrontiamo questi problemi.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, this House has shown extraordinary patience with Egypt, which is considered a key partner by many in the House. But I believe it is time we made up our mind. Can we stand by a partner where nearly 400 activists and dissidents have disappeared off the radar since August 2016? Where students like Giulio Regeni are murdered in cold blood? Where 22 people are arrested for waving rainbow flags, and where rockets are bought from North Korea?

I share the concerns outlined by the High Representative over the economy and the ticking time bomb of youth unemployment, but we cannot let Egypt be the sole decider in our partnership, excluding any cooperation on the rule of law and fundamental rights. I have two questions to the Commissioner. Firstly, our total ongoing assistance to Egypt is worth EUR 11 billion. What are we doing to leverage this? Secondly, what measures have been taken to follow up on the resolution adopted last year following Regeni's murder to stop companies from exploiting technology that contributes to human rights violations in Egypt?

Catch-the-eye procedure

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parliamo di partnership tra UE ed Egitto: ma quale partnership può esserci con un paese che calpesta quotidianamente i diritti fondamentali e senza verità sulla tortura e la barbara uccisione di un giovane ricercatore europeo, Giulio Regeni: oggi sono 20 mesi che chiediamo verità senza ottenerla.

Le autorità egiziane non hanno mai collaborato efficacemente nelle indagini. E questa è sì una battaglia per Giulio ma anche per tanti altri ed altre che in Egitto trovano la stessa sorte. Continuano le sparizioni forzate, le gravi intimidazioni ai danni dei legali che assistono la famiglia di Giulio in Egitto, non ultimo l'arresto di Ibrahim Metwaly, e il tentativo di chiudere gli uffici della Commissione egiziana per i diritti umani e le libertà.

I genitori di Giulio sono stati in questo Parlamento un anno fa e hanno chiesto cose precise, rimanendo inascoltati: interrompere l'invio di armi e di materiale per lo spionaggio, non considerare l'Egitto un paese sicuro, interrompere i rimpatri.

Ecco, è scandalosa la mancanza di solidarietà da parte degli altri paesi europei che hanno continuato tranquillamente a commerciare, anche armi, con l'Egitto e Tusk, quando incontra al-Sisi a New York, parla solo di collaborare per fermare i migranti.

Se l'UE chiude un occhio sul rispetto dei diritti umani, ha finito di esistere.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, οι προτεραιότητες και οι φιλοδοξίες μας στην εταιρική μας σχέση με την Αίγυπτο πρέπει να εξυπηρετούν και τους λαούς μας στις δύο πλευρές της Μεσογείου. Ανάπτυξη αφενός, αλλά και ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και αξιοπρεπή διαβίωση. Οικονομική ανάπτυξη και τεχνική βοήθεια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αλλά, ταυτοχρόνως, και απαιτήσεις για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και το κράτος δικαίου. Αυτά συμβαδίζουν με ισορροπημένο τρόπο. Όντως η Αίγυπτος έχει να επιδείξει ουσιαστική πρόοδο σε πολλούς τομείς, περιλαμβανομένων και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, αλλά, ταυτοχρόνως, υπάρχουν και αναπάντητα ερωτήματα στα οποία πρέπει να απαντήσει.

Δύο προκλήσεις όμως είναι κυρίαρχες στην ατζέντα μας: τρομοκρατία και ενεργειακή ασφάλεια. Κλείνω, λοιπόν, με μία πρόταση: η σταθερότητα της κυβέρνησης el-Sisi είναι θεμέλιο για τα κοινά μας συμφέροντα.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συμφωνούμε χωρίς καμιά αμφιβολία στο άνοιγμα διαύλων επικοινωνίας με την Αίγυπτο και το ίδιο αναμένουμε να γίνει και με άλλες χώρες της περιοχής. Κυρίως, όμως, νομίζουμε πως οιαδήποτε οικονομική ή άλλη σχέση πρέπει να προσφέρει στον ίδιο τον αιγυπτιακό λαό, με περισσότερο βάρος στις ευάλωτες ομάδες. Ιδιαίτερα στεκόμαστε απέναντι στα αιτήματα των νέων της Αιγύπτου για πραγματική δημοκρατία και ελευθερία. Χρειάζεται, ως εκ τούτου, ενδελεχής έρευνα σε σχέση με τα βασικά ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Να καταπολεμηθεί στη χώρα κάθε βίαιη συμπεριφορά απέναντι σε ευάλωτες ομάδες.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come hanno già detto alcuni colleghi precedentemente, penso che sia assurdo discutere in quest’Aula di Egitto e di cooperazione con l’Egitto senza mettere al centro il tema della costante violazione dei diritti umani. La famiglia di Regeni, i genitori di Giulio Reggiani, proprio un anno fa, come ricordava la collega Schlein, hanno chiesto qui al Parlamento europeo di prendere una posizione sull’Egitto, sul suo continuo silenzio sull’omicidio di Giulio Regni e sulle torture che ha subito in Egitto.

Continuare a considerare l’Egitto un paese sicuro, continuare a far finta di niente, al solo fine di garantire che l’Egitto continui a impedire ai migranti di arrivare in Europa è un crimine, un crimine che la storia non perdonerà all’Unione europea, così come non le perdonerà il silenzio sulla violazione dei diritti umani in Libia e su quello che continua a fare Israele.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, like my colleagues, I am very worried about the situation for human rights defenders and human rights activists. I have met numerous women’s rights activists who are subject to extreme persecution at the moment.

But today I want to raise the specific situation of LGBTI persons being persecuted. I am sure you have seen the reports of this increasing persecution: of 33 or more youths being detained, of sexual assault in detention and of violence. It is also a question of when the authorities perpetrate this kind of violence. Public violence and hate speech against LGBTI people in Egypt are rampant and increasing, and we have reports on that. The EU must act against these human rights abuses. To say that we are passing on the message, Mr Commissioner, is just not enough: you don’t pass on the message about human rights – you demand that human rights be respected! We need a different kind of partnership.

President. – Before I give the floor to the Commissioner I would like to express my appreciation for one thing across the political spectrum today, namely the emphasis on respect for human rights and on the clause in international agreements. I would appreciate it if we remembered this debate, because sometimes some of us deviate from that central principal. I note this with much appreciation, but we need to apply it across the board, with all international agreements.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Miguel Arias Cañete, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I think this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the honourable Members for their contributions.

Many of you have addressed the different problems relating to human rights. Human rights are an integral part of our partnership priorities and we address the situation not only through bilateral dialogue, silent diplomacy and formal demands, but also through public statements, including in multilateral forums such as the Human Rights Council in Geneva.

The European Union, in its position for the EU-Egypt Association Council, has raised clear concerns regarding the blocking of websites and the ongoing pressure on human rights organisations and defenders. It calls on Egypt to comply with its commitments to promote freedom of expression, association and assembly, as well as the freedom of the press, as guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution and according to its international obligations. This position was also expressed in the recent European Union statement at the Human Rights Council, under item 4.

Some of you referred to the case of the Egyptian lawyer Ibrahim Metwaly. This is a case that the European Union is following very closely, and one we have raised with our Egyptian counterparts at a high level both in Cairo and in Brussels. We have stressed the need to allow human rights defenders to carry on their work, including cooperation with the United Nations human rights agencies and mechanisms, without intimidation or harassment, in line with Egypt’s international obligations and with the guarantees enshrined in the Egyptian Constitution for democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms. This message, as well as the need to shed light on the circumstances of the death of Giulio Regeni, was clearly expressed in our statement to the Association Council, and in the recent European Union statement at the Human Rights Council in Geneva.

You can count on us to continue to insist on this in our contacts with our Egyptian counterparts at all levels.

Some of you also referred to the LGBTI situation. The present position is that the arrest of an increasing number of people after the concert of rock band Mashrou' Leila in Cairo and sentences of one to six years in prison for so-called 'practices of debauchery' are not in line with Egypt's commitments to promote freedom of expression as guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution, nor with Egypt's international obligations.

Freedom of expression is essential in a democratic society, and we call on Egypt to take active measures to promote it and to abide by its national and international commitments in that regard. The European Union wishes to reaffirm its commitment to freedom of expression, and to the quality and dignity of all human beings, irrespective of their sexual orientation and gender identity.

Finally, regarding the situation of Ibrahim Halawa, his acquittal is welcome news and a relief for his family, for Ireland and for the European Union. The Commission was particularly pleased to hear that Ibrahim was finally acquitted after four years in pre-trial detention. This is a case that the European Union has been following very closely and one we have actively raised with the Egyptian authorities, in coordination with and support of the Irish Government's efforts. Nonetheless we remain concerned about the use of a mass trial in which 442 defendants received heavy prison sentences: this is not in line with Egypt's human rights obligations. The European Union looks forward to the appeals and expects Egypt to uphold its national and international commitments to due process and fair trials.

To conclude this debate, I think that we all agree on the importance of our partnership with Egypt, even if there are different views on how to take it forward. As I have stressed before, we now need to approach it in a coherent and comprehensive way in order to make the best out of it in the interests of Egyptians and Europeans. We will continue to look at how best to achieve progress on the four tracks of our partnership, and to use all the instruments available to us to foster a system of stability, growth and social and economic development in the country. We count, too, on Parliament's support to contribute to the success of this partnership and its concrete impact on our people.

President. – The debate is closed.

12. Rectificatie (artikel 231 van het Reglement): zie notulen

13. VN-Klimaatconferentie 2017 in Bonn, Duitsland (COP23) (debat)

President. – The next item is the debate on

— the oral question to the Council on the 2017 UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn, Germany (COP23) by Adina-Ioana Vălean, Peter Liese, Gilles Pargneaux, Julie Girling, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Estefanía Torres Martínez, Marco Affronte, Mireille D'Ornano and Piernicola Pedicini, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000068/2017 – B8-0329/2017) (2017/2620(RSP)), and

— the oral question to the Commission on the 2017 UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn, Germany (COP23) by Adina-Ioana Vălean, Peter Liese, Gilles Pargneaux, Julie Girling, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Estefanía Torres Martínez, Marco Affronte and Piernicola Pedicini, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000069/2017 – B8-0330/2017) (2017/2620(RSP)).

Adina-Ioana Vălean, author. – Mr President, it has been almost two years since the birth of the Paris Agreement and almost exactly one year since its entry into force on 4 November 2016. 195 parties have signed up to the Agreement to date and 166 of these have already deposited with the UN their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to what one might qualify as the most significant multilateral international agreement of the decade.

Undoubtedly, climate change is one of the most important challenges for humankind. Those of us who believe in the science explaining climate change keep on stressing this fact and the associated disastrous consequences for both our present and our future. But we should also act on our beliefs. The Paris Agreement was a major step, but a lot more needs to be done to ensure that this agreement will deliver on its intentions. We all know in this House from our work on European legislation that if it is hard to agree on a common set of policy design and the numbers, it is even harder to implement them in a meaningful way. And this is where we are with the Paris Agreement. For the past year, preparatory work has started that will go on well into 2018 laying down the foundation for the implementation of the accord. We are one month away from the start of the 23rd climate conference in Bonn, which will be a milestone in the technical work on the implementing rules for the agreement. We expect quite importantly that there will be some clarification on the structure of the 2018 facilitative dialogue. This will be a key opportunity to take stock of progress made towards the agreement's mitigation goals and to inform the preparation and revision, by 2020, of the parties' 2030 nationally determined contributions.

The regrettable decision by the President of the United States to withdraw his country from the Paris Agreement will have numerous implications but, most worryingly, it has an immediate impact on climate financing, which is one of the cornerstones for international climate action. The suspension of US contributions to the Green Climate Fund will open up substantially a hole which we have all been working hard to fill. These are very pertinent issues that we look forward to discussing today with both the Council and the Commission, who will both be sitting at the negotiation table in Bonn in 4 weeks' time. As every year, in line with our commitment to the international climate process, the European Parliament will attend the Bonn conference and follow the discussion and decisions made there, and through its privileged contacts with parliamentarians from around the world will support the EU position.

Tomorrow we will be adopting our resolution on the topic, which sets out the vision, concerns, expectations and aspirations of our institution. This will also constitute our mandate for the Bonn conference. I am looking forward to a fruitful exchange with all of you this afternoon, as well as much cooperation between our institutions in the run-up to and during the climate negotiations in November.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me highlight at the outset that by the United Nations Climate Change Conference taking place in November this year in Bonn, known as COP 23, all Member States should have finalised their ratification procedures for the Paris Agreement.

By this step we confirm our credibility and our responsibility. The EU and its Member States have reaffirmed clearly their commitment to continued climate action in line with the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

Despite the political changeover in the US, we are encouraged by good news from other countries moving forward on climate action. The international community, including non-state actors, remains committed to implementation of the Paris Agreement. This was also demonstrated during the Hamburg G20 summit held on 7 and 8 July and the recent Montreal Ministerial Meeting on climate action that took place in September.

The upcoming conference in Bonn will be an important occasion to demonstrate the collective determination of the international community on climate action. The EU and its Member States have expectations for broad-ranging progress at COP 23 and we are working closely with our international partners to ensure it is a success.

Firstly, COP 23 must establish a solid foundation for the completion of the Paris work programme by COP 24 next year in Katowice, Poland. This should include making substantial progress on the work programme with a view to finalising it next year and to preparing for the implementation of all provisions of the Paris Agreement, comprising mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation, support and the transparency framework. It is important that we achieve clarity on the process for next year, so that all parties and external stakeholders are reassured that we will deliver on our task.

We expect an agreement on the 2018 facilitative dialogue at COP 23. The dialogue will be the key political moment at COP 24 and the first opportunity after Paris to take stock of our collective efforts towards achieving the objectives of the Paris Agreement. It will help inform the preparation of subsequent nationally determined contributions or NDCs. Therefore the EU considers that COP 23 should result in a clear proposal on how the 2018 facilitative dialogue should be prepared, outlining the work for next year.

In this respect non-party stakeholder contributions will be key in terms of presenting policy options, approaches and technologies with high potential, experiences and lessons learned. They also bring concrete opportunities to overcome barriers in NDC implementation and international cooperation, such as partnerships through the Global Climate Action agenda.

With regard to the transparency framework, it is important to have comparable and robust methodologies to track progress and make sure that the chosen policy instruments have the desired impact in terms of reducing emissions or increasing resilience. COP 23 should result in significant progress on the details of the modalities, procedures and guidelines of the framework.

Further action by all parties, individually and collectively, will be required to reorient and make finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate resilient development. The EU and its Member States are the world's biggest climate finance donor. In 2015 it provided, together with the European Investment Bank, EUR 17.6 billion for climate finance to third countries.

The EU will continue to support climate action in partner countries and is fully committed to the implementation of the 2020 climate finance roadmap. We remain committed to scaling the mobilisation of climate finance as part of a global effort to assist developing countries to implement their low-carbon sustainable development, and in particular their NDCs. Domestic implementation, climate policies and measures to achieve intended nationally determined contributions and their full integration into national policies are of crucial importance.

At this stage the Council and Parliament are the key actors currently working on completion of the EU's own legislative and regulatory package that is necessary to deliver our Paris target of reducing economy-wide emissions by at least 40% by 2030. That remains the most ambitious pledge under the Agreement. This is an important sign of leadership as the success of Paris will ultimately depend on concrete action on the ground.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, President Juncker stressed in his recent State of the Union address that he wants Europe to be the leader when it comes to the fight against climate change. He added that, set against the collapse of ambition in the United States, Europe must ensure we make our planet great again because it is the shared heritage of all humanity.

Recently, the European Union, Canada and China convened a Ministerial Meeting on Climate Action. This was the first ministerial meeting of its kind, bringing together three major economies in a leadership role and gathering ministers from more than 30 countries, including both major economies and also some of the most vulnerable countries, to discuss how to advance global action on climate change.

For the UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn (COP23) the European Union envisages three broad areas of deliverables. Firstly, there should be substantial progress on developing the detailed modalities, procedures and guidelines of the Paris Agreement with a view to concluding them by 2018. Secondly, we need to find political agreement on the design of the 'Facilitative Dialogue' that will take place in 2018. This is a clear deliverable expected by COP23 from the Moroccan and Fijian Presidencies, as was mandated by the decision in Marrakech. Thirdly, the European Union attaches great importance to the Global Climate Action Agenda to expand multi-stakeholder action and further build momentum.

Let me elaborate further on the first deliverable. The Paris Agreement achieved comprehensive coverage of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation by treating these and other issues in a balanced and tailored way. The delicate balance set in Paris now needs to be made operational through detailed modalities, procedures and guidelines.

Priority areas to advance are the work programme that includes the Paris transparency framework and the five-yearly global stocktake. The transparency framework will make it possible to track progress made on all parties' commitments, for both adaptation and mitigation as well as support, according to common agreed rules and methodology, and to compare and aggregate results in terms of emission reductions and assess progress towards the global goal on adaptation.

The global stocktake is one of the fundamental features of the Paris Agreement and it is the key element of a wider ambition cycle that will inform and incentivise processes progressively to enhance ambitious action, both domestically and collectively. At European Union level, the proposal for the 2030 legislative framework provides for a review in 2024, and every five years thereafter, of the overall functioning of the legislation, in order to take account of evolving national circumstances and to be informed by the results of the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement.

Coming back to the second deliverable, the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue is intended to take stock of the collective efforts of parties in relation to progress towards the long-term emissions reduction goal and inform the preparation of further or updated nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The European Union sees the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue as an important milestone in promoting subsequent discussions about ambition. Parties will have to consider and explain what the outcomes of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue imply for them individually in terms of their domestic processes.

In the context of the insufficient global ambition currently on the table, the Commission supports the European Union's active participation in the dialogue as a first important opportunity to take stock of the collective efforts of parties and to demonstrate how we have been preparing for the implementation of our NDC.

Looking ahead, and to facilitate the preparation of long-term strategies, the Commission is preparing an in-depth analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of pathways coherent with the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement in order to stimulate the political debate in the European Parliament and the Council and with stakeholders.

Let me give you some further comments on climate finance. The Commission participated closely with many Member States in the development of the donors' 2020 USD 100 billion road map. We remain committed to the collective goal of mobilising, from a variety of sources, USD 100 billion a year in climate finance by 2020 for climate action in developing countries, and continuing significantly to increase adaptation finance. However, neither the European Union nor any other party acting alone can be expected to fill the gap left by the United States. We need to work collectively and look for innovative solutions and scalability. In that respect the COP21+2 Climate Summit convened by the French Government, the United Nations and the World Bank in Paris on 12 December will usefully complement the COP23 Conference and should help us work better together to redirect public and private investments towards the clean energy transition.

Lastly, looking beyond the amount of finance mobilised, we must also consider the important role of technical cooperation for the implementation of the Paris Agreement and of NDCs. In that respect, we are mobilising technical support from across Europe to share our experience and help partner countries develop and implement climate policies and measures.

Presidente. – Ascoltiamo ora le dichiarazioni dei gruppi politici. In questa fase non sono ammesse le domande «cartellino blu».

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Ratspräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich denke, das wichtigste Signal, das von der Konferenz in Bonn ausgehen muss, ist, dass wir den Prozess weiter vorantreiben – auch nach der Ankündigung von Donald Trump. Der Rest der Welt hält zusammen, Klimaschutz bleibt eine wichtige Aufgabe, und wir sind sehr froh darüber, dass das auch viele in den USA erkannt haben. Es ist schon traurig, dass angesichts der Überschwemmungen und Wirbelstürme bei dem Präsidenten und seinen Beratern noch kein Nachdenken eingesetzt hat. Natürlich kann man nie ein einzelnes extremes Wetterereignis auf den Klimawandel zurückführen, aber es ist vonseiten der Wissenschaft klar, dass solche Ereignisse zunehmen, wenn wir so handeln würden wie Trump und nicht so wie der Rest der Welt. Deswegen, glaube ich, ist es gut, dass wir das in unserer Entscheidung auch ganz klar sagen: Der Prozess muss weitergehen, und wir freuen uns, dass sich Bundesstaaten und andere in den USA auch weiterhin beteiligen.

Die EVP hat der Entscheidung im Ausschuss zugestimmt, weil in ihr viele sehr wichtige Punkte enthalten sind. Uns war vor allem wichtig, dass die Änderungsanträge des Industrieausschuss es berücksichtigt wurden, dass wir dabei auch an die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Industrie denken und dass extreme Anträge abgelehnt wurden, und die sind zum Glück auch gar nicht wieder im Plenum vorgelegt worden. Ich glaube, wir haben eine insgesamt ausgewogene Entscheidung. Wir möchten sie mit unseren beiden Änderungsanträgen noch mal ein bisschen verbessern, aber ich glaube, wir werden in jedem Fall morgen zustimmen. Ich bedanke mich bei unserer Vorsitzenden Adina Văleano, bei allen, die geholfen haben dieses Ergebnis herbeizuführen, und freue mich auf ein starkes Signal in die USA und in den Rest der Welt bei der Abstimmung morgen im Plenum.

Gilles Pargneaux, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, l'accord de Paris est irréversible et non négociable. C'est le message que nous adressons au Président des États-Unis dans notre résolution commune sur la COP 23.

L'annonce de ce retrait des États-Unis de l'accord de Paris a finalement galvanisé les 194 autres signataires de la COP 21 et, depuis le 1^{er} juin, les chefs d'État et de gouvernement du monde entier ne cessent de réaffirmer leur engagement à maintenir la hausse de la température mondiale entre 2,4 degrés et 6,6 degrés d'ici à 2050.

Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Union européenne est, selon nous, le nouveau leader dont le monde a besoin pour lutter efficacement contre le changement climatique. C'est pourquoi nous vous encourageons à aborder à la COP 23 à Bonn les sept priorités suivantes:

La création de financements innovants pour lutter contre le changements climatique, avec la fixation d'un prix plancher pour la tonne de carbone et la réforme du système européen d'échange de quotas de carbone;

L'instauration d'une véritable économie circulaire et la dynamisation des énergies renouvelables;

La suppression des subventions allouées au secteur des énergies fossiles, qui mènera, à terme, à l'abandon des combustibles fossiles;

L'intensification des efforts de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre produites par les secteurs des transports et de l'agriculture pour atteindre les objectifs fixés pour 2020 et 2030;

La concrétisation de l'engagement financier des pays développés à fournir 100 milliards de dollars par an aux pays en développement d'ici à 2020;

La promotion de l'accès universel à l'énergie durable dans les pays en développement, en particulier en Afrique, qui dispose d'un potentiel incroyable en énergies renouvelables, pour l'instant inexploité;

L'impact des changements climatiques sur les migrations et la reconnaissance au niveau international du statut de réfugié climatique.

Si, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous abordez, nous abordons à Bonn, ces sept priorités, la COP23 sera un succès.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Porozumienie paryskie było przełomowym dokumentem opartym na dwóch kluczowych elementach: elastycznym formułowaniu własnych zobowiązań dostosowanych do możliwości gospodarczych i rezygnacji z postulatu dekarbonizacji. Niestety w dzisiejszej rezolucji ten kompromis już nie jest postrzegany jako element niezbędny do zachowania równowagi między wolą ambitnego działania a realnymi możliwościami. Konferencja w Bonn oraz szczyt klimatyczny w Katowicach to doskonała okazja do wypracowania rozwiązań, które pozwolą stronom porozumienia paryskiego zachować poczucie, że razem i w rozsądnym tempie idziemy do wspólnego celu. Najważniejsza jest faktyczna poprawa komfortu naszego życia i kolejnych pokoleń i niezławienie europejskiego przemysłu. Mam nadzieję, że pan komisarz był uprzejmy słuchać mojego wystąpienia.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and the Council for their statements. It is two years, and unfortunately a record number of hurricanes, floods and heat waves, since Paris, and while Marrakech last year was a sort of post-Paris party (though unfortunately under some dark clouds due to the newly elected US President, Donald Trump), the real work will start now again in Bonn, because it is really very important that we clarify the structure of the facilitative dialogue in 2018. This facilitative dialogue should provide us with a clear picture of where we stand, because Paris was a huge success, but we knew even while we were still applauding there that it was not enough; that it was not enough to stay within the 1.5 degrees or even the 2 degrees.

The facilitative dialogue can therefore lead only to one conclusion: that we have to do more, that we are falling short at the moment. That is why we should not allow the US to renegotiate the commitments that it made in Paris. That is crucial, absolutely. But it also means how crucially important it is that we do our work on both the emission trading system, on the effort sharing, and on the energy package. We seriously have to deliver on Paris, and not only that: we also have to work on proper implementation. It is wonderful news that our economy is growing again, really good news, but at the same time we see that even in our Member States CO₂ emissions are growing again. They are growing instead of decreasing – and that is something that we should really work on. It is great that we applauded Paris, but we cannot applaud without delivering on the promises that we made there.

Estefanía Torres Martínez, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, como ustedes saben, la COP21 fue la conferencia de las decisiones. De ella nació el acuerdo de París. La COP22 se dijo que sería la de las soluciones, pero más bien fue la de las paradojas. Ahora les diré qué debe ser la COP23: o es la de los compromisos económicos, o habremos llegado definitivamente tarde.

Instamos hoy a este Parlamento a apoyar los esfuerzos de los países en desarrollo en la transición hacia sociedades de bajas emisiones de carbono, para que así sean más sostenibles y más seguras. Pero también debemos instarnos a nosotros mismos a dejar de hacer políticas al servicio de los mercados y empezar a hacerlas al servicio de las personas. Porque, ¿de verdad creemos que es compatible la transición energética y la política comercial de la Unión Europea, sobre todo, con la lucha contra el cambio climático? No lo es. Lo hemos dicho muchas veces: mientras no haya un cambio de modelo de crecimiento económico, no habrá forma de paliar el deterioro medioambiental del planeta.

Necesitamos un cambio profundo en nuestro sistema productivo. Transición energética, sí, pero también necesitamos cambios en el sistema agroalimentario mundial. La batalla por el clima es política y enfrenta dos visiones distintas del mundo. En esta COP23 esperemos que gane protagonismo la visión del mundo de las mujeres, especialmente de las agricultoras y de las indígenas, y que pierda todo el poder la visión de los lobbies energéticos y de las multinacionales, que hablan, muchas veces, a través de nuestros gobiernos.

Marco Affronte, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la verità è che siamo persino un po' stanchi di parlare dei cambiamenti climatici in quest'Aula. La COP 23 è importante, la nostra risoluzione è fatta bene ed è altrettanto importante per tutti i motivi che hanno già detto i colleghi.

E poi leggiamo però proprio in questi giorni le cifre che nel 2016, così come negli anni precedenti, gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea hanno regalato alle fonti fossili: 112 miliardi di euro di finanziamento. 112 miliardi che si inchiodano un po' al passato e non ci consentono di andare avanti verso il cambiamento.

Non sappiamo neanche se questa cifra è corretta perché non c'è trasparenza su questi finanziamenti o sussidi; quindi, potrebbe essere addirittura una cifra parziale e l'importo potrebbe essere anche maggiore. Ma sappiamo che il 44% di questi fondi vanno per esempio al settore dei trasporti.

Questo ha consentito e consente a Sergio Marchionne della FCA di dire che le auto elettriche sono le armi a doppio taglio e che è preferibile migliorare i motori a benzina, invece. Ovviamente, le auto elettriche non sono l'unica soluzione, lo sappiamo bene anche noi, ma se Marchionne può permettersi di dire questo è proprio perché il mercato è alterato dai sussidi che vengono dati attraverso i soldi pubblici.

Quattro miliardi ce li mette direttamente l'Unione europea, cui si aggiungono quelli che ci mettono la Banca europea per gli investimenti e la Banca internazionale per la ricostruzione e lo sviluppo: se vi sembrano pochi, sappiate che, in un solo anno, sono cinque volte quello che noi diamo, nel periodo dal 2014 al 2020, per l'accoglienza ai migranti.

Quindi, di cosa parliamo esattamente quando parliamo di lotta al cambiamento climatico?

Julia Reid, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the climate and energy package was imposed by the EU with the objective of achieving by 2020 a 20% reduction in CO₂ emissions compared to 1990 levels. Since then, climate-obsessive politicians have set various objectives towards establishing targets that would involve the final deindustrialisation of Europe. We in UKIP disagree with the climate change alarmism which is the cause of the EU's current damaging and counterproductive energy policy. However, the Commission continues to impose never-ending objectives for emissions reductions which invest vast amounts of money into activities that will have little or no effect on climate. Realistically, we can expect global CO₂ emissions to keep rising for several decades. The massive exit of EU industry and investment is not only damaging our economies, but by its relocation to countries with lower environmental standards it actually increases CO₂ emissions.

After Brexit the EU will be in charge of its own destiny and we in Britain will be able to formulate our own energy policy. The British people are looking forward to cheaper, reliable and affordable energy.

Marcus Pretzell, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren Kollegen! Ich möchte Ihre Wohlfühlatmosfera ganz kurz mit einigen Zahlen stören: China ist für etwas mehr als 28 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf dieser Welt verantwortlich. Die USA sind für rund 16 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf dieser Welt verantwortlich. Indien steht für über 6 %, Russland für rund 4,5 %. Zusammen stehen diese vier Länder für 55 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf der Welt.

China hat angekündigt, bis 2030 keine Reduktion des CO₂-Ausstoßes vorzunehmen. Die USA – wie Sie es hier alle beklagen – haben bereits angekündigt, aus dem Klimaabkommen auszusteigen. Indien hat gerade laufende Planungen für 370 neue Kohlekraftwerke. 370 neue Kohlekraftwerke, meine Damen und Herren, so viel CO₂ können Sie in den kommenden Jahrzehnten in der ganzen Europäischen Union nicht einsparen! Russland hat bislang noch gar nicht ratifiziert und hat das für 2020 angekündigt. Schauen wir mal.

Was ich Ihnen damit sagen möchte? Wenn Herr Juncker sagt, die EU soll federführend sein, dann meint er vermutlich eher, dass die EU ein Federgewicht beim Klimaschutz ist. Es handelt sich hier um Zwerge, die gemeinsam etwas erreichen wollen.

Meine Damen und Herren, liebe Klima-Alarmisten, orientieren Sie sich an dem Machbaren! Das Klima der Welt wird nicht in der Europäischen Union gerettet, es wird nicht durch die Europäische Union gerettet, und Sie machen sich mit Ihren Forderungen auch in Bonn vor den Augen der Welt lächerlich.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! 2015 decemberében ez a Parlament úgy ünnepelte a párizsi találkozó eredményeit, hogy új időszámítás kezdődött a klímavédelem területén. Miért? Mert állítólag jogilag számon kérhető elkötelezettségek születtek. Én a Bizottsághoz fordultam. Megkérdeztem, hogy hogyan lehet majd számon kérni Obama elnök vállalását az USA vezetésén a jövőben?

Cañete úr teljes mértékben megnyugtató, hogy kötelezően végre kell hajtani az USA-nak ezt. Új időszámítás kezdődött amikor Trump elnök kivonta a világ második legnagyobb szennyezőjét a Párizsi Megállapodás alól. Természetesen az Európai Unió teljesítsa a kötelezettségét, járjon élen, de az teljesen abszurd, amit Juncker elnök mond, hogy az Európai Unió fog majd az USA helyére lépni, és helyette vállalásokat tenni, miközben csak tíz százalék kibocsátásért vagyunk felelősek. Ez teljes mértékben az európai ipar tönkretételét eredményezné.

Presidente. – Abbiamo ascoltato tutti i gruppi politici. Da questo momento in poi è possibile usare le domande «cartellino blu».

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący, celem konferencji COP23 w Bonn jest zaawansowanie rozmów na temat wytycznych dotyczących wdrożenia porozumienia paryskiego. Mamy dobre wieści z wielu krajów, 166 krajów złożyło dokumenty ratyfikacyjne, a porozumienie jest w naszej ocenie dużym sukcesem konferencji paryskiej, w szczególności ze względu na te dobrowolne zobowiązania wielu państw.

Jesteśmy jednak przed wieloma wyzwaniem, które niekoniecznie mają odzwierciedlenie w negocjacjach. Ważne jest stanowisko Stanów Zjednoczonych, słyszeliśmy już deklaracje o wyjściu z porozumienia, pozostaniu, renegocjacji. Dla całego porozumienia byłoby dobrze, aby Stany Zjednoczone pozostały w porozumieniu i wypełniły jego zapisy, a zatem najgorszą sytuacją jest taki stan niepewności.

Również w wielu krajach, na tej sali również o tym mówiono, podejmuje się decyzje, które są w sprzeczności z porozumieniem paryskim. Cieszą natomiast dane dotyczące emisji gazów cieplarnianych za ubiegły rok, według których światowa emisja tylko nieznacznie wzrosła, co może wskazywać, że być może znajdujemy się gdzieś blisko szczytu emisji, niedługo zaczną te emisje spadać. Jako Parlament będziemy uczestniczyć w konferencji w Bonn wsparci przez udzielony mandat, który Parlament przyjmie w dniu jutrzejszym w postaci rezolucji. Ważnym elementem będą też wspomniane pięcioletnie plany działania i okresowe oceny postępów w ograniczeniu emisji.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Għalija, il-konferenza tat-tibdil fil-klima f'Bonn hija pass importanti favur progress fuq tibdil fil-klima. Il-Gvernijiet, iva, huma importanti, imma nemmen li dan huwa ż-żmien għall-ibliet, għan-negozji u għaċ-ċittadini tagħna, biex ikunu huma li jmxexxu t-triq 'il quddiem. Ma nistgħux u m'għandniex ninzammu ostaġġi tal-impuls politiku ta' pajjiż wiehed, kbir kemm hu kbir dak il-pajjiż.

Ejja nbiddlu l-approach tagħna ta' kif nindirizzaw it-tibdil fil-klima, mill-metodu tas-soltu fejn min hu fuq jiddetta x'għandu jagħmel minn hu taħt, għal sistema fejn ikunu ta' taħt li jcaqilqu l-policies, fejn flok nibqgħu nitkellmu dwar spejjeż biss, ejja nibdew nitkellmu dwar benefiċċji, u benefiċċji hemm hafna. Fejn flok noqogħdu niffukaw fuq x'jista' jiġri għada, ejja nibdew niffukaw fuq x'inhu jiġri llum madwarna.

U dan kollu huwa dwar il-htieġa li nagħmlu l-hajja taċ-ċittadini tagħna ferm ahjar. Li nagixxu fuq it-tibdil fil-klima jfisser li pereżempju nibdew innaqqsu l-attakki ta' azzma li jsofru minnhom it-tfal, li nsalvaw membri tal-familji tagħna minn mard respiratorju, li nżidu l-ammonti ta' snin li nistgħu nghixu ahna stess, li nnaqqsu, iva, il-kontijiet tal-enerġija tagħna, li ntejbu l-kwalità tal-hajja tagħna u nżidu n-numru ta' impjegji fil-komunitajiet tagħna.

COP23, nemmen, li se toffrilna opportunità, li jekk irridu, immexxu d-diskussjoni dwar il-klima fejn wahda li ssolvi l-problemi u tidentifika l-opportunitajiet. Aktar ma naddottaw din it-tip ta' attitudni, aktar huma ċ-chances li nindirizzaw b'mod effettiv din l-isfida li għandna quddiemna.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αδράνεια που επιδείχθηκε μέχρι σήμερα έχει ως αποτέλεσμα τους καταστροφικούς τυφώνες, την όξυνση της ενεργειακής φτώχειας, την περαιτέρω αποψίλωση των δασών, την ανεπανόρθωτη μόλυνση των θαλασσών, τη συνέχιση της καταστροφής του πλανήτη μας. Επίσης, επειδή δεν βάλαμε φραγμό στην ανεξέλεγκτη δράση των πολυεθνικών, οδηγηθήκαμε, μεταξύ άλλων, και στο μεγάλο σκάνδαλο με τους ρύπους στην αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία. Δεν γίνεται να παραμείνουμε και άλλο στις εξαγγελίες, χωρίς να ληφθούν δεσμευτικές αποφάσεις για ουσιαστική δράση.

Με τη Συμφωνία του Παρισιού επιτεύχθηκε ένα σημαντικό πλαίσιο για την αντιμετώπιση των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Ωστόσο, δυστυχώς, στην 22η Διάσκεψη για το Κλίμα στο Μαρακές δεν υπήρξε η πρόοδος που αναμέναμε για άμεση δράση. Η 23η Διάσκεψη στη Βόννη δεν πρέπει να είναι ακόμα μια ανούσια επανάληψη διακηρύξεων και κροκοδειλιών δακρύων για την κατάσταση του περιβάλλοντος και την όξυνση των περιβαλλοντικών προβλημάτων. Ενόψει αυτής της Διάσκεψης ζητάμε από την Επιτροπή, ανεξάρτητα από την πρόθεση της διοίκησης Trump να αποσυρθούν οι ΗΠΑ, να συνεργαστεί με την Κίνα και τα άλλα κράτη, να στηρίξει τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και να αναπτύξει ένα ολοκληρωμένο σχέδιο δράσης για τον τερματισμό της αλόγιστης χρήσης των φυσικών πόρων, τη μείωση των εκπομπών του θερμοκηπίου και την προώθηση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, it is great that we are again talking here about climate action, and I want to stress that word ‘action’, because the Commission also said that Europe wants to be the leader in climate action, did it not? So then, maybe it is time to act as well, and that is going to be the key.

Up to now Europe has just had plans on the table there are insufficient to meet the Paris goals. We all know that. We have to do more. So, Commission, when you are reading Parliament’s resolution, please also note that we are demanding for next year a low emission strategy for 2050, because we need this long-term planning. After the facilitative dialogue next year, we need new NDCs in Europe where we are increasing our action. Only then will we be the leading continent on climate action which we claim to be.

But it is not only about numbers and targets. This is about our future economy, and I say this to our nationalist friends on the right who are always very proud of what we can achieve as a country but then suddenly when it is about climate action, suddenly they say we are little, we are small, it does not matter what we do. Come on, stay on and be consistent! This is about our future economy. If we take the lead, the jobs will be here. If we do not take the lead, we will suffer from climate change and will have to import the technologies from all those regions that you so much fear. So be clever and take action now!

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Mr President, having listened to the last speaker I can say I disagree with every single word he says. This ludicrous myth of man-made global warming is going to impact on agriculture. Farmers apparently are going to have to improve the world weather by emitting fewer greenhouse gases. There are two of them that we emit where we find ourselves in total contradiction to EU dogma.

The first is CO₂. We emit CO₂ by tractor use, exhausts and engines running. If we are seriously going to reduce that on farms, we’re going to have to reduce our tractor usage and that means we must go to no-till agriculture, which means using glyphosate and adopting GM crops. You hate those two things more than you actually hate CO₂.

Then of course we’ve got the other juxtaposition on nitrous oxide. We produce nitrous oxide by growing leguminous crops. Yet we are told by the EU ‘you must grow more leguminous crops’ because they will substitute for all the GM soya beans coming in from South America.

I could go on, Mr President, but I’m out of time.

(Applause)

Olaf Stuger (ENF). – Prachtig betoog van mijn voorganger. Ik wil deze debatten altijd beginnen door te zeggen dat het nog maar helemaal de vraag is of de mens iets met die klimaatverandering te maken heeft. De wetenschappers zijn het hier in ieder geval niet over eens. Wat mij erg stoort, is dat er in het maatschappelijk debat heel weinig ruimte is om daar überhaupt over te discussiëren.

Er is een Nederlandse documentairemaker, Marijn Poels, die een documentaire heeft gemaakt waarin heel duidelijk wordt dat je, op het moment dat je er maar een klein beetje negatief over bent of je afvraagt of de mens er iets mee te maken heeft, nul op het rekest krijgt en meteen wordt weggezet als een paria.

Of de mens er nou invloed op heeft of niet, Al Gore vindt wel dat de mens invloed heeft op het klimaat. Dat weerhoudt hem er niet van om het hele jaar door met een privévliegtuig de hele wereld over te vliegen. En waar hij ook veel invloed op heeft, is zijn eigen financiële klimaat. Ik heb het even nagekeken: als je Al Gore wil boeken, bijvoorbeeld als spreker voor een dagdeel, dan ben je 200 000 euro kwijt. Ja, ik zeg 200 000. Dan moet je tien kamers boeken in een vijfsterrenhotel voor z’n gevoel. En dan moet je natuurlijk ook nog die privévlucht betalen. Dus, Voorzitter, dat weet ik wel zeker.

Wat ik ook zeker weet, is dat de energierekening van Nederlandse gezinnen de afgelopen vier jaar met 200 euro is gestegen. Dus die is weer ouderwets, spreekwoordelijk, de sjaak, Voorzitter. En dat is regelrechte diefstal.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι προσπάθειες καταπολέμησης της υπερθέρμανσης του πλανήτη και των ανθρώπινων παρεμβάσεων που την προκαλούν δεν έχουν τα επιθυμητά αποτελέσματα. Πολλές χώρες έχουν παραμείνει σε απλές δεσμεύσεις, που δεν συνοδεύονται από πρακτικές εφαρμογές, ενώ κάποιες άλλες δεν συμμετέχουν στη Συμφωνία των Παρισίων λόγω οικονομικών και πολιτικών συμφερόντων. Οι συνέπειες όμως της υπερθέρμανσης του πλανήτη στο κλίμα, τους ωκεανούς, την υγεία και τη γεωργία είναι αδιαμφισβήτητες και τείνουν να γίνουν μη αναστρέψιμες. Είτε μιλάμε για υπερθέρμανση είτε για υπερψύξη του πλανήτη, γεγονός είναι ότι η γη έχει φτάσει σε οριακό επίπεδο απορρόφησης των επικίνδυνων ρυπογόνων ουσιών, αερίων, υγρών και στερεών. Το δεδομένο αυτό χρησιμοποιείται βέβαια ως πεδίο αντιπαράθεσης επιστημόνων και πολιτικών, ειδικά πρώην κομμουνιστών του υπαρκτού σοσιαλισμού που ενδύθηκαν τον μανδύα των οικολόγων πράσινων, και θεωρώ ότι η προσασία του περιβάλλοντος είναι σοβαρή υπόθεση για να την εμπιστευτούμε είτε σε αυτούς είτε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Europa debe ejercer el liderazgo en la consecución de los objetivos que nos dimos en la COP21 y, en este sentido, hoy el 20 % del presupuesto de la Unión se destina a acciones de lucha contra el cambio climático.

Estamos en pleno desarrollo de actualización del mercado del comercio de emisiones y en el establecimiento de una economía circular que minimice los residuos y optimice las primeras materias, y debemos hacer más. De poco servirá que tengamos un acuerdo si, al final, no se acaba cumpliendo o si los principales actores no se acaban implicando, favoreciendo una situación de externalizaciones de la industria europea que acabe manteniendo el mismo número de emisiones y, por lo tanto, no haya ningún avance en la parte ambiental, y por otro lado, de rebote, tengamos un grave impacto negativo en la parte social y económica en Europa.

Por ello, queremos pedir a la Comisión y al Consejo que velen para que en el cumplimiento del Acuerdo de París se celebre un diálogo constructivo para conseguir los objetivos que nos hemos marcado entre todas las partes y para que lleguen los recursos necesarios para alcanzar el objetivo conjunto de 100 000 millones de dólares estadounidenses anuales para el 2020.

Hace ya dos años que llegamos al Acuerdo, y cada minuto que pasa nos aleja más de la meta.

Jo Leinen (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die COP23 findet zwar in Deutschland statt, aber die Präsidentschaft liegt bei einem Land, das vom Klimawandel bereits enorm betroffen ist – den Fidschi-Inseln –, genauso wie die anderen Inselstaaten im Pazifik. Ich glaube deshalb mit anderen Kollegen hier im Haus, dass Bonn noch mal ein Moment sein muss, wo sich die Welt zum Übereinkommen von Paris und zum Klimaschutz bekennt und wo wir die Klimazweifler und -kritiker in die Schranken weisen, sie in die Isolation weisen. Wir wissen, dass wir im Moment natürlich näher beim Drei-Grad-Celsius-als beim Zwei-Grad-Celsius-Ziel sind. Von daher ist gar kein Zweifel, dass Industrieländer wie die EU-Mitgliedstaaten noch mehr machen müssen.

Ich erhoffe mir, Herr Kommissar, dass wir die *High Ambition Coalition* noch mal neu aufleben lassen können. Wir müssen das mit unserer Agenda 2030 machen. Das Parlament schlägt ja für erneuerbare Energien und Energieeffizienz wesentlich höhere Ziele vor, als das die Kommission gemacht hat, und bis 2030 müssen wir auch wesentlich besser werden.

Ich glaube, dass wir auch langfristig bis 2050 die Ziele klar haben müssen – die Akteure müssen wissen, wo es hinget –, und Klimaschutz ist auch Entwicklungspolitik, er ist auch Industriepolitik. Hier ist China erwähnt worden. Herr Kommissar, Sie machen mit China gemeinsame Sachen. Passen Sie auf, dass uns China in dem Tempo der Erneuerung und des technologischen Wandels nicht überholt.

Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Zeitfenster, um etwas gegen die globale Erwärmung zu tun, wird immer kleiner. Wir brauchen eine Transformation hin zu einer Politik, in der die Sorge um den Planeten und seine Bewohner im Fokus steht – und nicht wirtschaftliches Wachstum, die Profite der Konzerne und die Schaffung möglichst vieler Arbeitsplätze.

Um die Klimaziele zu erreichen, müssen wir den Fokus stärker auf die klimaschädlichen Emissionen aus der Landwirtschaft richten. Ich habe hier in diesem Hause bereits mehrfach darauf hingewiesen, dass die globale Fleisch- und Milchwirtschaft für rund 18 % der in CO₂-Äquivalenten berechneten Emissionen verantwortlich ist. Die Rodung von Flächen für die Viehwirtschaft schlägt nach neuesten Studien sogar allein mit 20 % zu Buche. Deshalb sind die nationalen Klimaschutzbeiträge, was die Landwirtschaft betrifft, unbedingt massiv nachzubessern. Der klimaschädlichen Landwirtschaft, insbesondere der Massentierhaltung, muss Paroli geboten werden.

Ob wir unsere Erde noch vor einem Klimakollaps bewahren, steht und fällt mit dem politischen Willen, neue Wege zu gehen. Ich hoffe, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie diese brisanten Themen in Bonn auch anschneiden werden.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, on a tout eu cette année: les sécheresses, les inondations, les feux et les ouragans qu'il serait temps de renommer Exxon, Total, BP ou Trump!

Évidemment, on a besoin de l'accord de Paris, mais l'accord de Paris, c'est deux choses: la diplomatie, avec un objectif ambitieux, sérieux de 1,5 ou 2 degrés, mais c'est aussi l'action climatique et, sur ce point, l'action climatique des États, aujourd'hui, c'est 3, 4, 5 degrés de réchauffement climatique. Par conséquent, c'est le chaos.

Notre sujet, c'est de passer de la diplomatie à l'action climatique parce que c'est là que se glissent toutes les schizophrénies. Mon président de la République, Emmanuel Macron, le président de la France, garant de l'accord de Paris, fait un magnifique discours sur le climat aux Nations unies mais, au niveau européen, vous le savez, il sabote les objectifs en énergies renouvelables et il sabote les stratégies de coopération européenne sur l'action climatique.

Oui, la bonne nouvelle, c'est que l'Union européenne doit être leader de l'action climatique. La bonne nouvelle, c'est que l'Union européenne a tous les éléments: les énergies renouvelables pas chères, les emplois créés, l'aménagement du territoire.

Alors, que l'Union européenne devienne le leader de l'action climatique, c'est bien pour le climat et c'est un magnifique projet pour tous les Européens.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Mr President, I have been listening to my colleagues' beautiful words about the future of our countries and the future of our children, and I think they have been the best words we can say in such circumstances.

My question is, how many of you really want to pass from words to facts? Because it is a fact that climate change and global warming are caused by fossil fuels. However, while we are here, among the best words we can say to save the planet, the governments of the Member States are financing fossil fuels with an incredible – an astronomical – amount of money. While we are here speaking, France is giving EUR 250 million to the Green Fund but at the same time financing fossil fuels to the tune of EUR 1.5 billion. Germany is giving EUR 250 million to the Green Fund but at the same time financing fossil fuels to the tune of EUR 5.5 billion. And Italy, my country, while contributing only EUR 84 million to the Green Fund, is at the same time financing fossil fuels with EUR 3.5 billion.

We are here to find the best solution to save the planet and not to find the best compromise with oil companies. Therefore, let us stop saying beautiful words and let us move on to facts. Let us eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels right now. There is nothing else to do.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – De Overeenkomst van Parijs eist het: alle sectoren samen op voor de redding van het wereldwijde klimaat. Daarom vraag ik de Commissie en de lidstaten in het bijzonder om de klimaatspanningen van familie- en gezinsbedrijven in de Europese landbouw eindelijk te erkennen en financieel te bevorderen. Ik herinner u eraan dat de Overeenkomst van Parijs eist dat de landen zich aan de negatieve gevolgen van klimaatverandering aanpassen op een wijze die de voedselproductie niet in gevaar brengt.

Boeren en tuinders in lidstaten als Nederland zijn al volop bezig met de vermindering van hun broeikasgasuitstoot en met een klimaatvriendelijke productiewijze van ons dagelijks brood – met beleg erop.

Daarom moet de Europese Unie snel aan de slag met actieplannen voor financiering van klimaat-efficiënte landbouw, zoals het Parlement ook eiste in het ESR-verslag, het verslag-Gerbrandy. De groeiende wereldbevolking ontwikkelt een groeiende voedselvraag. De groeiende middenklasse buiten ons werelddeel vraagt om "luxe" voeding zoals vlees en zuivel.

Omwille van het wereldwijde klimaat en het kostbare regenwoud moet de Europese Unie, die straks in Bonn deelneemt, bij alle klimaatmaatregelen voorkomen dat er koolstof- en investeringslekkage van Europese landbouwproductie naar derde landen optreedt! Onze boeren en tuinders produceren duurzaam voedsel voor de wereldbevolking. We moeten onze Europese boeren en tuinders koesteren, helpen bij de overgang, meer vertrouwen geven en uiteindelijk duidelijk bieden over de klimaattransitie. Uiteindelijk is dat van groot belang voor een leefbaar platteland.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, qu'il est bon de se taper sur l'épaule en se félicitant du travail bien fait. De COP en COP, on se plaît à dépeindre l'Union européenne comme étant à la pointe du combat climatique.

Et pourtant, que voit-on? Que certains objectifs 3X20 ne seront pas tenus, que le système SEQE, même révisé pour la phase 4, restera bien trop généreux pour les pollueurs, pas assez ambitieux pour atteindre des objectifs et générera un prix du CO₂ bien trop faible pour réorienter les priorités. Que la TTF, dont certains imaginaient qu'elle puisse financer le Fonds vert, n'a toujours pas vu le jour. Et pourtant, qu'entend-on? Que le rapport Stiglitz évoque un prix pour l'ensemble des émissions mondiales compris entre 50 et 100 dollars pour 2030, nous en sommes très loin.

Il nous faut donc des mesures d'urgence, et je plaide par exemple depuis longtemps pour la mise en place de l'ajustement carbone aux frontières, mais cela fait tellement longtemps qu'on en parle et que rien ne bouge.

Ce manque de volonté politique est renforcé par le confort de se dire qu'on fait mieux que les autres. On connaît la formule de Talleyrand: «Quand je me regarde, je me désole, quand je me compare, je me console», mais méfions-nous, car si nous sommes tous désolants, ce sont nos enfants et nos petits-enfants qui seront désolés.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Wer die Klimaziele von Paris und die Klimawissenschaft ernst nimmt, weiß, dass uns nur noch ein sehr enges Budget für Treibhausgasemissionen bleibt. Und, Herr Arias Cañete, das direkt an Sie: Die Klimaziele, die Sie für die Europäische Kommission vertreten und die auch im Rat nicht überschritten oder nicht getoppt werden, bedeuten, dass fast alles, was die EU-Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der Ziele von Paris noch freisetzen dürfen, bis 2030 aufgebraucht sein wird. Ihre Zögerlichkeit über die Jahre bedeutet, dass die Emissionen nach 2030 — in nur einem Jahrzehnt! — dann auf null gebracht werden müssen, wenn wir auch nur eine geringe Chance haben wollen, das 2-Grad-Ziel zu erreichen.

Und der fehlende Mut und die ganze Zögerlichkeit in der Europäischen Kommission führen eben nicht nur dazu, dass wir beim Klimaschutz verlieren, sondern gleichzeitig wird die Europäische Union im internationalen Wettbewerb um kreative Lösungen und zukunftsfähige Technologien abgehängt. Es ist heute schon so – Jo Leinen hat das angesprochen –, dass die kreativen Lösungen, saubere Autos, Solar- und auch Effizienztechnologien außerhalb der Europäischen Union politisch gestützt und forciert werden – zum Beispiel in China –, dass dort dann auch die Produktionsstandorte entstehen und dass dort die Arbeit der Zukunft stattfindet. Wir denken, dass das, was Kohle und Stahl in der Gründungsphase der Europäischen Gemeinschaft waren, nämlich ihr Mittelpunkt, und das was da gemacht worden ist, jetzt Effizienztechnologien, Klimatechnologien werden müssen, und dass da auch die eigentliche Erneuerung des Industriestandorts der Europäischen Union liegt.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, gospodine povjereniče, ne treba puno dokaza da bismo vjerovali u postojanje klimatskih promjena, one su evidentne. I zato se rukovodim govorom Jeana-Claudea Junckera koji je rekao da moramo kao Europska unija predvoditi u borbi protiv klimatskih promjena kada je govorio o stanju Europske unije.

Jasno je da će biti vrlo teško nadoknaditi izlazak Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, ali Bonn je prilika da Europska unija i dalje nastavi ovdje biti lider. Ali je potrebno prijeći s naših političkih odluka stvarno na konkretna djela i moramo naše odluke konkretizirati. Konkretno, moramo do 2020. doći do 100 milijardi eura godišnje ili dolara godišnje, o kojima smo govorili, da bismo stvarno mogli provesti sve ove zaključke.

Ono u što vjerujem, to je energetska učinkovitost, to je energetska sigurnost, to je manje onečišćenje zraka kako bismo utjecali na bolje zdravlje ljudi. Vjerujem isto tako da je potrebno u svakom slučaju upotrijebiti u svakom diplomatskom dijalogu, koristiti kao našu stratešku osnovu, govor o klimatskim promjenama i borbi protiv klimatskih promjena.

Isto tako se moramo boriti protiv svih ovih situacija na način da klimatske promjene stavimo uvijek u prvi plan, da se borimo na razini cijelog planeta. Nijedna nacionalna politika, nijedna nacionalna strategija ne može sama za sebe donijeti rezultat i stoga idemo zajedno u Bonn i pokušajmo se i dalje postaviti kao nositelji borbe protiv klimatskih promjena.

(Govornica je pristala odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 162. stavak 8. Poslovnika))

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *Kékkártyás kérdés.* – Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Képviselő asszony, Ön azt mondta, hogy eljött a tettek ideje, tenni kell, és föl is sorolt nagyon sok mindent, hogy mi mindent lehet tenni. Én tisztelettel kérdezem, hogy Ön ezt a teendők listáját hajlandó lenne-e fölbővíteni, azzal, hogy az Európai Uniónak a kereskedelmi megállapodásaiban is tüköröznie kell az akaratát? Magyarul kedvezményeket, kereskedelmi kedvezményeket ahhoz a feltételhez kötni, hogy teljesítik-e a Párizsi Megállapodásban foglaltakat.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), *odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice.* – Gospodine predsjedniče, u potpunosti se slažem s vama i smatram da upravo trgovački ugovori u koje ulazimo i koje potpisujemo moraju nositi upravo ove karakteristike, a to je borba protiv klimatskih promjena i moraju nositi sve ono što dovodi do toga da imamo održivi razvoj. Slažem se s vama. Žao mi je što izlazimo iz pregovora sa Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, a veselim se što je stupio na snagu CETA i što nastavljamo dalje pregovore s Novim Zelandom i ostalim državama i vjerujem da će Europska unija zaštititi svoje interese i interese naših nacionalnih država.

Damiano Zoffoli (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con questa risoluzione, ribadiamo il nostro impegno per dare attuazione, con forza e coerenza, all'accordo di Parigi sulla lotta ai cambiamenti climatici, Trump o non Trump.

Serve un nuovo modello di sviluppo più sostenibile a livello economico, ambientale e sociale per uscire dalla crisi e produrre nuova e buona occupazione per i nostri giovani.

L'obiettivo europeo di ridurre del 40% le emissioni entro il 2030 passa attraverso impegni trasversali a tutti i settori dell'economia e a tutti i livelli istituzionali, dagli Stati alle comunità locali.

In particolare nei trasporti, responsabili del 25% delle emissioni globali, bisogna rapidamente colmare una lacuna che riguarda i mezzi pesanti: anche le emissioni dei camion e degli autobus, che causano il 40% dell'inquinamento da trasporto su strada, devono essere, al pari di quelle delle auto, certificate, monitorate e regolate da standard a livello europeo.

Max Andersson (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the presence of the fossil lobby at the climate conferences is a huge conflict of interest that we need to address. Soon the world will be going to Bonn. Politicians, scientists and civil society will be there to seek solutions to the climate crisis. But the dirty coal and oil lobby will also be there and they have an economic interest in trying to delay, water down and prevent those solutions. We need strong rules on conflicts of interest if we are going to be able to limit emissions so that we can stay below 1.5°C. We have no time to waste. This is about our children's future.

The fossil lobby should not be allowed to pollute climate policy. I urge you all to support the Green Group amendment on conflicts of interest.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, in March of this year the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) observed that sea ice had reached a record low wintertime maximum extent in the Arctic. At the end of the summer, in the southern hemisphere, the ice around Antarctica hit its lowest extent ever recorded by satellites.

While there is year-on-year variability, up to last year the trend has been towards more melting of the ice caps. Additionally in 2016, the great barrier reef lost 29% of its coral due to rising ocean temperatures. In Port Douglas, Queensland, up to 70% was lost. Rising sea levels, along with an increase in the frequency and magnitude of storm events, will bring increased rates of coastal erosion around the world.

My own country, Ireland, and especially the south coast, is particularly exposed. Waterford and Cork are highly exposed to the problem of erosion and the local authorities are doing excellent work in developing coastal management strategies at Cork harbour and Tramore strand. Tramore is particularly subject to coastal erosion.

However, we must act at European and global level to ensure that this work and the millions of similar examples around the world are not in vain. Countering these effects is the challenge of our time. Having represented Parliament at COP21 and COP22, I am lucky enough to have witnessed at first hand the coming into force of the agreement that will see us meet the two-degrees target. That target must be met, and I compliment Commissioner Cañete for his role in that matter.

In the EU we must ensure that we reduce emissions by at least 40% by 2030 by deploying more renewable energy, pricing carbon and moving to lower carbon and a more sustainable society.

I look forward, as shadow rapporteur on the Renewable Energy Directive, to playing my part.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε λίγες ημέρες συμπληρώνουμε ένα χρόνο από την έναρξη εφαρμογής της Συμφωνίας του Παρισιού. Δυστυχώς, μέσα σε αυτό τον χρόνο, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής, ο δεύτερος μεγαλύτερος ρυπαντής στον κόσμο, αποφάσισαν να αποχωρήσουν από τη Συμφωνία. Ευτυχώς, οι πρώτες αντιδράσεις απομόνωσαν τον κύριο Trump και απέτρεψαν ένα φαινόμενο ντόμινο. Παρ' όλα αυτά ο κίνδυνος παραμένει. Στην επικείμενη COP23 που, αν και θα πραγματοποιηθεί στη Βόννη, διοργανώνεται από τα νησιά Φίτζι, μία χώρα που κινδυνεύει να εξαφανιστεί λόγω της κλιματικής αλλαγής, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να φανεί αντάξια των προσδοκιών. Οι πρωτοβουλίες μας και οι προτεραιότητές μας πρέπει να είναι προς τη διασφάλιση των συμφερόντων όλων των λαών. Να παραμείνουμε πρωτοπόροι στον αγώνα κατά της κλιματικής αλλαγής, ακόμα και αν η Αμερική αλλάξει στρατηγική και υπαναχωρεί από τις δεσμεύσεις που ανέλαβε ο Πρόεδρος Obama. Να διασφαλίσουμε ότι αυτά που αποφασίσαμε στο Παρίσι θα εφαρμοστούν. Η ευημερία, η δημοκρατία, η σταθερότητα εξαρτώνται άμεσα από τις συνθήκες διαβίωσης των ανθρώπων σε όλα τα μέρη του κόσμου.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, quero falar-vos em quatro pontos. Primeiro, quero elogiar a ambição do Acordo de Paris e o seu reforço na Cimeira de Marraquexe e da rapidez da sua ratificação pela maioria das partes, bem como demonstrar a minha esperança de que, após uma fase inicial de absurdas declarações do Presidente Trump, os Estados Unidos percebam a importância deste acordo.

Segundo, importa continuar a investir em tecnologias que possibilitem uma emissão líquida nula, através de estratégias de captação de carbono, sendo uma área com um enorme potencial de criação de postos de trabalho sustentáveis. Devemos, portanto, encarar com seriedade a transição ecológica europeia e, aqui, quero enaltecer o papel da economia social neste desafio.

Terceiro, há que ter uma estratégia para a agricultura mundial que seja respeitadora da utilização de recursos hídricos e dos solos, da sua reafetação e da exploração sustentável das florestas, tal como fazemos a nível europeu. Não existem pessoas mais respeitadoras do ambiente do que os agricultores informados. Devemos, portanto, promover as boas práticas agrícolas europeias para outros locais em que possam ser uma mais-valia.

Quarto, e termino já, os mais afetados pelas alterações climáticas são, infelizmente, os países mais pobres em desenvolvimento, ou mesmo insulares, como vimos recentemente pela devastação causada numa das regiões mais ultraperiféricas europeias, Martinica e Guadalupe, pelo furacão Maria.

Expresso aqui a minha solidariedade para com elas, uma vez que também venho de uma região ultraperiférica, os Açores.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! FN's Klimakonference COP23 i Bonn er vigtig. Klimaforandringerne er en af de allerstørste udfordringer for menneskeheden i vores tid. Vi skal altså bruge denne konference til at vise, både at EU er klar, og at EU er villig til at tage førertrøjen på globalt. Vi skal i øvrigt også fortælle, at en indsats for klimaet ikke er en hæmsko for vækst og udvikling. Tværtimod: En grøn omstilling er faktisk nøglen til at sikre en bæredygtig vækst og nye jobs såvel som en renere fremtid. Vi har vist en del af vejen for dette i Danmark. Vi har vist, at en grøn omstilling giver flere jobs, og vi skal være med til at sprede det budskab, for ellers tror jeg, vi får for meget modstand mod at levere. Parisaftalen skal føres ud i livet. Vi har brug for mere handling og hurtigere handling. Det bør være EU's

budskab i Bonn. Kloden og verdens borgere har brug for det.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε Cañete, στη Βόννη ένα από τα κύρια θέματα συζήτησης θα είναι η κλιμάκωση της χρηματοδότησης για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής και των συνεπειών της. Είναι αλήθεια πως ο κοινός στόχος για την κινητοποίηση 100 δισεκατομμυρίων δολαρίων σε ετήσια βάση για το περιβάλλον είναι φιλόδοξος και ενδεχομένως να μην είναι αρκετός, αν και εδώ στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουμε ήδη δεσμευτεί να δαπανούμε το 20% του προϋπολογισμού μας σε σχετικούς με το περιβάλλον στόχους.

Ωστόσο, είναι πολύ κρίσιμο να δούμε πώς γίνεται η εφαρμογή αυτής της δέσμευσης, ειδικά στα κράτη μέλη. Η αγωνία για την απώλεια θέσεων εργασίας από τομείς στους οποίους υπάρχουν δικαιώματα εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα πρέπει να αντικατασταθεί από την απάντηση που θα δώσουμε με τη δημιουργία βιώσιμων θέσεων εργασίας σε νέες τεχνολογίες. Είναι απαραίτητο να δημιουργήσουμε μια πολιτική που θα ενισχύει έργα και υποδομές για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Μια στοχευμένη πολιτική που θα δημιουργήσει βιώσιμες αγορές και έτσι θα μπορέσουμε να είμαστε ελκυστικοί και για πόρους από τον ιδιωτικό τομέα. Τα παραδείγματα είναι πολλά: η απεξάρτηση από τον άνθρακα, η ενθάρρυνση της χρήσης εναλλακτικών πηγών ενέργειας στις μεταφορές, η περαιτέρω προώθηση της ενεργειακής αποδοτικότητας των κτιρίων και των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας. Εμείς εδώ στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορούμε, με ή και χωρίς τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, να συνεχίσουμε να διαδραματίζουμε ηγετικό ρόλο στην επίτευξη των στόχων του Παρισιού. Το χρυσάμε στα παιδιά μας.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, saúdo a resolução em debate que é uma posição forte e consistente do Parlamento Europeu. As alterações climáticas são os mais importantes desafios que a Humanidade enfrenta e já não se trata apenas de prognósticos, é algo que os povos sofrem quotidianamente.

Em Portugal, por exemplo, a brutal vaga de incêndios florestais este verão é apenas um entre muitos exemplos com que quotidianamente nos defrontamos em consequência das alterações climáticas. Estão a destruir o planeta, a afetar as populações, em particular as mais vulneráveis economicamente. E, por isso, é preciso agir agora e já, pôr em prática o Acordo de Paris em todas as suas políticas.

Combater a visão retrógrada da administração americana, aproveitar a transição energética digital para criar novas oportunidades de crescimento sustentável e emprego com qualidade, combater as desigualdades e melhorar as condições de vida no planeta.

Devemos reforçar as parcerias existentes e procurar novas alianças económicas, políticas e de investigação e desenvolvimento.

Por isso, esta resolução constitui um forte mandato político para a delegação do Parlamento Europeu que participará na COP23 e é também um mandato político para a Comissão e para os Estados-Membros.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, as alterações climáticas são uma das maiores ameaças ambientais, sociais e económicas que o Planeta e a Humanidade enfrentam. Todos os dias, assistimos a exemplos de fenómenos climáticos severos e sem precedentes que mostram a todos essa verdade.

Desde os furacões Irma, Maria, que tudo devastam na sua passagem, aos fogos florestais que no meu país, recentemente, ceifaram a vida a 64 pessoas.

Na COP23 será discutida e negociada a implementação do Acordo de Paris e, em particular, as questões da transparência, adaptação, redução de emissões, financiamento, capacitação e tecnologia, permitindo que estas matérias venham a ser aprovadas na próxima COP, que se realizará em 2018, na Polónia.

A assinatura do Acordo de Paris foi um momento histórico em torno de um consenso na luta contra as alterações climáticas. Trata-se de um acordo multilateral sem precedentes. O Sr. Trump invocou, para abandonar o Acordo de Paris, que este é injusto para os trabalhadores americanos e perverso para a competitividade dos Estados Unidos. Mas se este anúncio pode tornar mais difícil a luta contra as alterações climáticas, estou certo de que não há retorno neste combate e de que a transição mundial para a energia limpa veio para ficar.

O êxito da COP23 implica uma determinação política forte e uma robusta diplomacia climática. A União Europeia deve continuar a liderar através das suas políticas climáticas ambiciosas e de um apoio aos que são particularmente vulneráveis, a fim de construir economias fortes e sustentáveis.

O mundo está numa corrida contra o tempo e a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros devem manter-se unidos e absolutamente comprometidos com uma aplicação plena e rápida do Acordo de Paris. Daí a importância que entendo que a COP23 trará para o nosso Planeta.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'enciclica Laudato si', citata anche nella risoluzione che andremo ad approvare, Papa Francesco scrive «Dio perdona sempre l'uomo; qualche volta la natura non perdona mai». E in effetti basta vedere che cosa sta succedendo oggi: siccità prolungate, dimezzamento delle piogge e poi alluvioni, bombe d'acqua, trombe d'aria anche nelle nostre regioni europee.

Questi sono dati, sono fatti; quindi non serve scomodare la scienza per dare un nome a tutto questo. Serve però agire e agire presto. Il cambiamento climatico non è un problema che possiamo pensare di spostare nel futuro, perché stiamo già assistendo ai suoi effetti. E se non agiremo, il cambiamento impatterà molto più di quanto si pensi sulle nostre comunità, causando costi sociali ma anche danni economici a persone e a interi sistemi produttivi.

E allora, Commissario, abbiamo una grande responsabilità: dobbiamo accelerare in Europa la transizione verso un'economia sostenibile, a basse emissioni di carbonio e circolare e coinvolgere, come Europa, in questo processo anche gli altri attori globali, anche chi oggi si permette di stracciare la Carta degli accordi di Parigi e mette però a rischio il futuro nostro e delle prossime generazioni.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo di Parigi è irreversibile e non rinunciabile e, nel percorso di contrasto al cambiamento climatico, la COP 23 di Bonn deve essere una tappa fondamentale per portare a termine entro il 2018 l'elaborazione delle modalità di dettaglio di attuazione dell'accordo. La tabella di marcia per la mobilitazione di 100 miliardi di dollari entro il 2020 da destinare all'azione per il clima nei paesi in via di sviluppo rappresenta solo un punto di partenza.

Il costante aumento dei finanziamenti dell'Unione europea a favore del clima non è soddisfacente e non dà garanzie sul raggiungimento dell'obiettivo: serve un impegno ambizioso da parte dei governi e degli studi finanziari pubblici e privati, delle banche, dei fondi pensione e delle compagnie di assicurazione per allineare le pratiche di prestito e di investimento all'obiettivo di contenere l'aumento della temperatura ben al di sotto del 2% e per abbandonare gli investimenti a favore dei combustibili fossili.

Servono garanzie pubbliche specifiche a favore degli investimenti verdi, nonché certificazioni e vantaggi fiscali per i fondi di investimento verdi e per l'emissione di obbligazioni verdi.

Insomma, dobbiamo passare dalle parole ai fatti.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, v dveh stvareh se, mislim da, širom po svetu strinjamo.

Prvič, da smo ljudje povzročili klimatske spremembe, ki nam delajo takšne težave, kot smo jim priča, bodisi v Karibskem morju ali pa v Evropi.

In drugič, da je bila Evropa tista, ki je prva prepoznala svojo obveznost in tudi svojo vlogo na področju zelenih ekonomij in na področju zmanjševanja izpusta toplogrednih plinov.

Imamo številne politike, bodisi prehod in strategija prehoda na krožno gospodarstvo, kjer govorimo o učinkoviti rabi virov.

Na področju energetike smo marsikaj že postorili, na področju učinkovite rabe energije vedno bolj prehajamo na obnovljive vire energije, potreben je še velik korak na področju transporta.

Veseli me tudi to, da takšne onesnaževalke, kot je Kitajska, sledijo evropskemu zgledu, ki so povsem prenehale z izdelavo novih termoelektrarn, in da Kitajska danes že proizvaja več vetrne energije kot celotna Evropa.

Z zgledom bomo največ pokazali in na tej poti moramo vztrajati.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πραγματικά η υπερθέρμανση του πλανήτη έχει τεράστιες συνέπειες και για την ανάπτυξη της γης συνολικά, αλλά βεβαίως και για το μέλλον μας. Από την άλλη πλευρά, πρέπει να εξετάσουμε σε ποια κατάσταση βρισκόμαστε, γιατί ο δεύτερος μεγαλύτερος ρυπαντής του κόσμου, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, έχουν αποσυρθεί από τη Συμφωνία. Επιπλέον, η Κίνα, θα έλεγα, «πετάει την μπάλα στην εξέδρα», διότι μέχρι το 2030 δεν έχει αναλάβει καμία δέσμευση. Αυτοί λοιπόν οι οποίοι έχουν αναλάβει τη δέσμευση είναι η δική μας πλευρά, χωρίς όμως αυτό να σημαίνει ότι επί του πρακτέου μπορεί να συμβεί κάτι, διότι, όταν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και η Κίνα αλλά και η Ινδία δεν έχουν δεσμευτεί, η όποια δραστηριότητα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης θα έχει πολύ μικρές συνέπειες για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Ταυτόχρονα, με τις πολιτικές που ακολουθούμε διαλύονται και παραδοσιακές βιομηχανίες. Πρέπει λοιπόν να ληφθεί σοβαρά υπόψη ότι οι βασικοί ρυπαντές δεν δεσμεύονται καθόλου.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει λόγος για κανέναν αγώνα και καμία μάχη αν δεν καταφέρουμε να σώσουμε τον πλανήτη. Αλλά πώς θα επιτευχθεί αυτός ο μεγαλεπήβολος στόχος, όταν εμείς δεν βρίσκουμε τρόπο να πιέσουμε τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες να αλλάξουν τη στάση τους; Αν δεν βρίσκουμε τρόπους ή δεν θέλουμε να βρούμε τρόπους να αντιμετωπίσουμε τη Monsanto, την εταιρεία που υποτάσσει την παγκόσμια διατροφική αλυσίδα με ενέργειες που επηρεάζουν αρνητικά το κλίμα; Χρειαζόμαστε πολιτικές που να προάγουν την αλλαγή στη λειτουργία της οικονομίας η οποία προωθεί την ιδέα του υπερκαταναλωτισμού, καθώς και τερματισμό της αλόγιστης χρήσης των φυσικών πόρων της γης.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Den klimatutveckling vi ser i stora delar av världen kommer att bidra till politisk instabilitet och en upptrappning av flyktingströmmarna. Runt år 2050 menar FN att världen kan ha 200 miljoner människor som drivits från sina hem på grund av klimatförändringar.

Europaparlamentet noterar med oro att cirka 21,5 miljoner människor tvingades lämna sina hem mellan 2008 och 2013 på grund av naturkatastrofer. Det är viktigt att vi tar fördrivning och migration av människor som en följd av klimatkatastrofer på allvar. Vi måste utveckla FN-systemen för migration och de befintliga definitionerna och verktygen så att de också inkluderar denna kategori av flyktingar.

Jämställdheten lyser med sin frånvaro i de olika processer som pågår inom ramen för Parisavtalet. Det är ett allvarligt misstag. FN:s gröna klimatfond kommer att spela en viktig roll för finansieringen av anpassningsbehov i de länder som drabbas hårdast. På klimatoppmötet i Bonn kommer förhoppningsvis en handlingsplan för ökad jämställdhet att förhandlas och antas. Jag uppmanar därför kommissionen och våra medlemsstater att medverka till att ett beslut tas i Bonn om en ambitiös handlingsplan med specifika mål, för vi kan glömma klimatet om vi inte satsar på jämställdhet.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, it's impossible to talk about climate change without drawing attention to the grave situation in Amazonia, Brazil, where violence, land grabbing and serious human rights violations are now endemic under Michel Temer's corrupt presidency. The current administration is propped up by agri-business, extractive industries and the hydro-electric dam lobby. Multinationals given carte blanche to tear down the forest, rip open the earth, pollute the water supply and flood historic settlements such as San Juan de Araguaia, a 400-year-old town doomed to inundation by plans for mega electric hydroelectric dam on the nearby Tocantins river.

The guardians of the environment are the indigenous people and it is them we should be listening to. I listened and I saw. I went to Amazonia in August — into the heart of the forest — and I bore witness to the unfolding environmental disaster, not just for the indigenous people or for Brazil, but for the whole world. There is a direct link between the extratropical storm Desmond that devastated my constituency in December 2015 and the destruction of the Amazon. Climate change knows no borders. The Amazon is the lungs of the world, and its breath is life on earth.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I have listened carefully to the debate today and I am encouraged by the engagement shown by the Members of this House. I appreciate your commitment to maintaining the European Union's role as a pathbreaker in the field of international climate action.

I would like to thank the honourable Members for raising this important issue in Parliament, thereby providing additional political momentum, and I am convinced that, with your support, the Commission and the Council under the leadership of the Estonian Presidency will be able to deliver substantial progress on the implementation of the Paris Agreement at the next climate conference in Bonn in November.

Many of you referred to the need to raise our level of ambition. In this regard, I would say that the European Union, along with the other parties, is required to communicate by 2020 its mid-century development strategy for the long-term lowering of greenhouse gas emissions. These long-term strategies will have to explore the feasibility of our 1.5°C scenario, which certainly goes beyond the level of domestic reduction we are heading towards with the current 2030 policy framework.

For the long-term strategies, we are, however, dependent on further international developments in order to have the necessary science and analytical basis in place. We will have to obtain the science on the 2°C and 1.5°C pathways, including through a report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in the second half of 2018. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Facilitative Dialogue at the end of 2018 is also essential, as it will show us how countries are implementing Paris and what more is needed.

To facilitate the preparation of these strategies the Commission will prepare an in-depth analysis of the economic and social transformations needed in order to feed the political debate in the European Parliament and the Council and with the stakeholders.

I want to conclude by thanking you again for the opportunity of having this debate, and I hope we can continue our dialogue in the future.

Matti Maasilta, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank you again for your cooperation. I am very much encouraged by the debate today on COP 23 and the next steps in the implementation of the Paris Agreement. As on previous occasions, the support from Parliament in our outreach efforts to our international partners is very much appreciated. I look forward to continuing this exchange and working closely together in the run up to the Bonn Conference in order to achieve the best possible outcome.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Πρόεδρος. – Έχω λάβει σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 128 παράγραφος 5 του Κανονισμού μία πρόταση ψηφίσματος.

Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 4 Οκτωβρίου.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162)

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – Idén novemberben különösen fontos lesz, hogy konkrét, lényegi előrehaladást érjünk el a bonni találkozón annak érdekében, hogy a párizsi klímamegállapodás lendülete 2018-ban és azt követően is megmaradjon. A megállapodás gyakorlati végrehajtása mellett az egyik legnagyobb feladatunk az ambíciószint fenntartása és a klímaváltozás témájának folyamatos napirenden tartása.

További kihívást jelent a tárgyalások során a nemzeti vállalások közös jellemzőinek meghatározása, míg globális szinten a veszteségek és károk fejlődő országok által javasolt kezelése okoz fejtörést Európának és a fejlett országoknak. A polgárok egyre szélesebb köre lép fel a dekarbonizáció érdekében azzal a céllal, hogy ellenállóbbá váljanak az éghajlatváltozással szemben. Különösen üdvözlendőnek tartom a nem állami szereplők, mint például a teremtésvédelemben aktív vallásos szervezetek elköteleződését a Párizsi Megállapodás mellett.

Fontos, hogy ezt a potenciált kiaknázzuk és összehangoljuk az állami szintű vállalásokkal. Ennek megfelelően biztosítanunk kell őket elismerésünkről és támogatásunkról. Úgy gondolom, hogy megalapozott nemzeti vállalások csak a nem állami és a magánszektor részvételével határozhatók meg, amelyhez ösztönözni kell az állami és nem állami szereplők közti párbeszédet.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), in writing. – To avoid acceleration of further uncontrollable climate disruption, we must stay strongly committed to the full implementation of the Paris Agreement. We must be clear that this agreement is irreversible and will not be renegotiated. This clarity and certainty to all actors is crucial to build trust and help solidify confidence in the global commitment to climate action. In that sense I deplore the opening Commissioner Cañete made to the Trump Administration to 'chart its own path' within the Treaty and to come back on the terms under which they agreed to participate previously. Such a back step is dangerous and could open a Pandora's box, since other Parties to the Paris Agreement might start to consider weaker contributions as well. This is contrary to the Paris Agreement itself that states in art.4.3 that 'Each Party's successive NDC will represent a progression beyond the Party's then current NDC and reflect its highest possible ambition, reflecting its common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities'. Current NDCs will still lead to a global warming of 3°C. Parties should do more, not less. The EU also has to raise its ambitions. The Facilitative Dialogue in 2018 is an excellent opportunity to do so.

14. Duizenden annuleringen van vluchten door Ryanair en de naleving van de verordening inzake passagiersrechten 261/2004/EG (debat)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί των δηλώσεων του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τις χιλιάδες ακυρώσεις πτήσεων από τη Ryanair και την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 261/2004/ΕΚ σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών αεροπορικών μεταφορών (2017/2876(RSP))

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, air travel is a vital transport link for EU citizens. In the European Union, some 918 million passengers travelled by air in 2015 and this figure is increasing steadily from year to year.

Ryanair has grown to become the largest EU airline by scheduled passengers flown, and has carried more international passengers in 2015 than any airline in the world. It currently operates from 84 bases connecting 33 countries across Europe and North Africa. The abrupt cancellation, in the six weeks from September to October 2017, by Ryanair of thousands of its flights in the EU has caused major disturbances for passengers. A large number of them were left stranded at airports and many had to cancel journeys or re-route their flights. There are complaints that in a number of cases the airline has given little or no notice of such cancellations. Furthermore, there have been claims that the limited information dispensed by the airline with regard to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to assistance and the right to compensation, may have been misleading to passengers.

It is deeply regrettable that the passengers were left in such a position. Airlines operating in the EU must respect European rules. Air passengers' rights are indeed protected under EU law. The Flight Compensation Regulation sets a minimum level of quality standards for passenger protection, adding an important citizens' dimension to the liberalisation of the aviation market. When a flight is cancelled, airlines are obliged to inform passengers of their rights. These rights include the right to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to care and, in some circumstances, the right to compensation. Any EU airline not adhering to these rules must be held accountable.

The national enforcement bodies in each Member State must act to verify that airlines are respecting EU rules and that passengers' rights are protected. They must also strive to ensure that passengers are aware of their rights.

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission wishes to make the following statement on the recent case of Ryanair cancellations. A few days ago, Ryanair publicly announced that it would reduce its operations by cancelling thousands of scheduled flights, disrupting the travel plans of passengers across Europe. This affected firstly flights scheduled until the end of October, totalling 2 100 flights, and then others due to operate during the winter season.

A very large number of passengers will be affected and, just like all of you, the Commission wants to make sure that those passengers are treated fairly. The EU is the only area in the world where citizens are protected by a full set of passengers' rights, whether they travel by air, rail, ship, bus or coach. All passengers whose flights are cancelled have a comprehensive set of rights. It is essential that they receive correct and complete information about their rights in order to be able to enforce them. Let me recall that these rights include the right to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to care and, in some circumstances, the right to receive financial compensation. The Commission has asked the national authorities to be vigilant on this issue, and to try to cooperate with each other in order to ensure that passengers can fully exercise their rights.

As guardian of the Treaties, the role of the Commission is to oversee and monitor the implementation of EU law in each Member State. For this reason, the Commission immediately issued a statement underlying, in particular, that Ryanair just – like all airlines operating in the EU – must fully comply with EU air passengers' rights.

We are in direct contact with all the national enforcement bodies to make sure that passengers' rights are respected, and I specifically welcome the enforcement actions already taken by the UK civil aviation authorities and further actions by other civil aviation authorities, including in Ireland and Spain.

I'm also confident that the Irish civil aviation authority will continue to fulfil its oversight obligations and ensure that Ryanair continues to comply with our aviation acquis. Mr President and honourable members: let me also use this opportunity to remind you that in 2016, the Commission issued guidelines on the existing rules to make it easier for passengers and national authorities alike. The Commission also proposed to modernise the rules on air passengers' rights in 2013 — a proposal which is currently blocked in Council. I hope that we will soon be able to make progress on this for our passengers travelling across the EU.

This incident clearly highlights the need for a modern and robust European regulatory framework. Honourable Members, President: the Commission has contacted Ryanair and we expect them to fully comply with its obligations. Together with my colleague, Commissioner Jourová, I have written an official letter to Ryanair to underline our concerns and highlight the obligations under EU law.

Firstly, we recalled that the passengers must receive correct and complete information about their rights in due time in order to be able to enforce them, including on re-routing and compensation.

Secondly, Ryanair has to ensure that all communication channels are working properly and that passengers can communicate with staff. Thirdly, another important issue is the complaint handling process. Ryanair shall make information available on its website on its complaint handling process and on the relevant contact addresses where passengers can file claims. I am pleased to report that the Ryanair has already responded by giving a number of assurances addressing the issues we have raised.

Indeed, for September and October 98% of affected customers have had their claims processed. For November to March 2018, the figure is at 75% and we expect this to go up rapidly in the coming weeks. This is a positive development. I will be pursuing my contacts with Ryanair in the Irish civil aviation authority during a visit to Dublin in a few days, and the Commission will of course remain in close contact with all national enforcement bodies to further follow-up on this issue.

President and honourable Members, the single aviation market has many benefits, but also many obligations. We therefore expect all airlines operating in the EU to fully respect European rules.

Deirdre Clune, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for the clarification and for her action in this area in contacting Ryanair. On 18 September last, Ryanair suddenly announced flight cancellations and it was only last Friday, 29 September, 11 days later, that we seem to have come to a point where we had full clarification on the issue, and – in relation to passenger rights – for the passengers' entitlements to be communicated directly to them. That followed meetings with the Commission for Aviation Regulation in Ireland and the UK and in Spain, as you have mentioned, so it took that time to ensure that passengers' rights were outlined clearly and communicated to them directly.

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 has been in place since 2004 and we are all well aware of it, and I am sure a European airline that is benefiting from the liberalisation of European airspace should have been aware of the issue. They have said that they take the matter seriously and have put in place strong communication now with their customers.

All this came from what has been described as a rostering management failure. It is not a safety issue, as some people would like to think or would like to link it to, and we should be clear on that. Flight time regulations were established by these institutions: the amount of time a pilot can fly, and indeed the time that cabin crew can be in the air, in one calendar year was established. In an effort to ensure that they remained compliant and continued to remain compliant, Ryanair had a rostering issue and they had to cancel flights and ensure that they could remain compliant. They are compliant, they continue to be compliant, but there is a serious question mark over their management, certainly in the compliance area, when it comes to EU rules and regulations.

Ismail Ertug, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ryanair hat verkündet, dass bis zum März 2018 20 000 Flüge gestrichen werden. Ungefähr 700 000 Passagiere werden davon betroffen sein. Das wirft natürlich Fragen auf, nämlich Fragen danach, ob die Fluggastrechte auch gewahrt werden. Wer trägt z. B. die Mehrkosten, wenn eben so ein Flug gestrichen wird? Werden die Kunden auch ausreichend aufgeklärt? Die Frage muss erlaubt sein: Wo war die irische Luftfahrtbehörde? Denn sie ist ja letztendlich auch für die Genehmigung zuständig, und sie muss sicherstellen, dass der Flugbetrieb letztendlich auch reibungslos verläuft. Da muss irgendetwas schiefgelaufen sein, das müssen sich auch die Zuständigen gefallen lassen.

Warum überhaupt – stellt sich für mich die Frage – müssen Flüge gestrichen werden? Es heißt, die Pünktlichkeit soll gesteigert werden – das ist auch vollkommen in Ordnung –, nur wissen wir, dass Ryanair seit geraumer Zeit ja nicht immer nur mit positiven Schlagzeilen aufwartet, sondern auch mit negativen – negativen insbesondere, was die Beschäftigungsbedingungen der Piloten anbelangt. Mag es vielleicht tatsächlich an der Beschäftigungspraxis bei den Piloten liegen, die nur dann Geld bekommen, wenn sie fliegen? Mag es vielleicht an diesen Beschäftigungsbedingungen oder -verhältnissen liegen? Frau Kommissarin, Sie müssen da als Kommission darauf achten, dass das tatsächlich auch nicht auf dem Rücken der Kolleginnen und Kollegen und der Kunden ausgetragen wird.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Bez wątpliwości tanie linie odegrały ogromną rolę w upowszechnieniu latania jako ważnego i przystępnego cenowo środka transportu w Unii Europejskiej. Ryanair jest dziś zdecydowanym liderem w tym segmencie, dlatego trzeba podkreślić, że oprócz dużych zysków z taką pozycją wiąże się także odpowiedzialność. Obecna sytuacja, a szczególnie chaos informacyjny związany z odwołaniem tysięcy połączeń, powoduje uzasadniony niepokój pasażerów i stanowi poważne wyzwanie dla wielu lokalnych portów lotniczych, dla których połączenia realizowane przez tę linię są często kluczowe dla utrzymania rentowności. Nie do przyjęcia jest sytuacja, w której Ryanair unika lub nie w pełni wywiązuje się z obowiązków, jakie ciąży na nim w przypadku odwołania lotu, szczególnie w zakresie zapewnienia pasażerowi alternatywnego połączenia. Regulacje europejskie są tutaj jasne i pasażer musi mieć pewność, że jego prawa są respektowane. Właśnie na pani komisarz spoczywa egzekwowanie art. 5 rozporządzenia Parlamentu i Rady, do czego niniejszym Panią wzywam i namawiam. Oczekuję, że państwa członkowskie oraz Komisja będą monitorowały sytuację i podejmą odpowiednie kroki, by chronić prawa pasażerów.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I too am glad that we have this point on the agenda in the plenary today and that we can debate it. I think it is worth saying that clearly something went wrong in Ryanair. To put it bluntly, Ryanair has messed something up. If I were the CEO, I would probably take measures because, of course, the first affected in this respect is the company, with its business and its reputation. There is no doubt something went wrong: it is obvious due to the implications that we are debating.

However, the Commissioner said one important thing and I think it is something we should focus on in terms of where we go from here and what the policymaking is to be. That is that, regarding the European Union, our internal market, the rights of consumers and passengers' rights, if we compare the situation with any other region in the world, or any other country, we have the most protective legislative framework. That goes without saying. I also see that the Commission has acted and has given a response so I am sure that, as far as the competences of the Commission are concerned, it will make sure that Ryanair implements what it has promised and what it has to implement. And of course we also have the relevant national authorities.

What I am more concerned about is that, although we have had this most protective legislative framework for 10 years, there are still entities and people that do not know what passengers' rights are today, what can be reimbursed and what kind of obligations the airline has. That is something else that we need to draw conclusions from. I hope that, in the future, apart from the monitoring of implementation – on which, of course, I will focus – we will be able to bring forward the question of passengers' rights, not only in aviation but also in other modes of transport, in a combined way.

Lastly, I apologise that, due to a previous commitment, I have to leave. Please do not consider that as disrespect to you, Mr President, Madam Commissioner, or to the issue, which I think is a serious one.

Matt Carthy, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr. President, Ryanair deliberately misled customers concerning their rights as passengers under EU regulations. It refused to disclose correct information on compensation rights until its hand was forced, but we shouldn't be surprised by Ryanair's disrespectful behaviour towards its passengers. For years, its CEO has prided himself on the company's disrespectful treatment towards its workers. Ryanair refuses to negotiate with trade unions, it forbids its workers on many bases from organising, and remember this debacle of cancelled flights is the direct result of pilots and other workers fleeing Ryanair.

The episode demonstrates that promoting so-called competitiveness to the detriment of workers' rights cannot and will not succeed. Therefore we across the EU institutions have to stop pushing ahead with our aggressive competition agenda in the transport sector and acknowledge first and foremost that flights cannot run and planes cannot fly if we do not have pilots and workers to service them.

(Applause)

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, les annulations de vols par Ryanair sont une nouvelle provocation de la compagnie *low cost*. Quelque 400 000 passagers sont pénalisés à cause d'une mauvaise gestion de planning. Mais c'est une blague! Cette compagnie fait manifestement des passagers une variable d'ajustement. Je vous le dis comme je le pense: ce n'est plus du *low cost*, c'est du zéro service.

Face à de tels agissements, je demande à la Commission européenne de faire en sorte que Ryanair respecte la législation européenne sur le droit des passagers, mais également d'envisager des sanctions parce que cela ne va pas s'arrêter là. Ryanair vient encore d'annoncer l'annulation de 18 000 nouveaux vols d'ici mars prochain.

Cet épisode met en évidence les limites du modèle *low cost* qui n'est vertueux ni pour la planète, ni pour les salariés, ni pour les consommateurs. Il est grand temps que l'Union européenne en prenne conscience, et cesse d'encourager le *low cost*, le dumping social et les subventions dont il bénéficie.

Par conséquent, renforçons le droit des passagers, rendons-le plus clair, mais créons un mécanisme de sanctions à l'encontre des compagnies «voyous».

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è uno scandalo perché più di 21 000 voli sono stati cancellati. Milioni di passeggeri sono a terra e più che altro sono in zone remote e su isole. Questo perché? Perché è un monopolio. Questo signori è un monopolio a spese dei cittadini. Fatto con cosa? Con i soldi dei cittadini, per l'appunto, dei contribuenti, con i contributi che regioni e comuni danno a Ryanair per mantenere i voli sui propri territori.

Ben venga l'inchiesta della Commissione europea. I consumatori vanno tutelati ma secondo noi vanno non solo rimborsati bensì vanno risarciti. Attenzione anche alla tutela dei diritti dei lavoratori, però, perché noi vorremmo capire se il periodo di riposo proposto dall'azienda a fronte di un corrispettivo economico si in linea con il pieno rispetto della condizione psicofisica dei lavoratori di Ryanair.

L'Unione europea non si può tirare indietro, né si può girare dall'altra parte: anche se si tratta di una malagestione dell'azienda oppure se si assistesse a un'operazione di mercato, mettendo da parte risorse per acquistare slot aeroportuali o compagnie più piccole, a noi importano i diritti dei cittadini e dei lavoratori.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziesięć dni temu niespodziewanie odwołano mi lot i odzyskałem tylko dwieście euro, bo jak mi wyjaśniono, więcej się nie należy na mocy jakiejś konwencji. Jeśli ja mam problem, to jest to mój problem. Jeżeli milion ludzi ma problemy, to jest to milion problemów indywidualnych, a nie problem społeczny czy polityczny. Zawsze słyszałem narzekania, że Ryanair odbiera pasażerów innym liniom. Jeżeli teraz w okresie zimowym chce oddać dziesiątki tysięcy pasażerów innym liniom, to powinny się one cieszyć. Ryanair ma prawo zlikwidować połowę swoich połączeń. Jeśli Ryanair lata, to mówicie, że to jest bandytyzm. Jeśli Ryanair nie lata, to też bandytyzm. Ryanair odwołuje loty i płaci pasażerom wymagane prawem odszkodowania. Nie widzę najmniejszego powodu, żeby jakkolwiek instytucja wtrącała się w decyzje prywatnego przedsiębiorstwa. Na miejscu firmy Ryanair odpowiadałbym każdej takiej instytucji: pocałujcie mnie w czółko. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Frau Kommissarin Bulc! Weit über 300 000 Ryanair-Kunden sind schon von Flugausfällen betroffen, bis März 2018 werden wohl noch 400 000 weitere dazukommen. Von all den Gründen, die Ryanair bezüglich der Ausfälle und Verspätungen vorbringt, kann ich eigentlich keinen einzigen akzeptieren. Die entscheidende Frage ist jetzt, ob bei diesem Flugausfallmarathon die bestehenden Rechte der Fluggäste gewahrt blieben oder nicht. Deshalb möchte ich alle betroffenen Fluggäste dazu animieren, ihre Rechte in Erfahrung zu bringen und diese bei den entsprechenden nationalen Behörden durchzusetzen. Selbst zu spät erfolgte, unvollständige oder nicht korrekte Informationen auf der Ryanair-Website hat die Fluggesellschaft zu verantworten. Je nach ausgefallener Flugstrecke können 250, 400 oder sogar 600 Euro Entschädigung fällig werden, falls die Informationen zu spät kamen und eine Reisealternative mit wenigen Abweichungen nicht möglich war.

Den Versprechen betreffend des zukünftigen Flugverhaltens der Ryanair traue ich nicht. Für mich ist diese Situation ein Grund mehr, den Rat der Verkehrsminister dazu zu animieren, die Überarbeitung der Fluggastrechte, die in unserem Haus bereits am 5. Februar 2014 verabschiedet wurde, nicht weiter zu blockieren. Wir brauchen diese Überarbeitung der Regelung aus dem Jahr 2004 dringend, um eine weitere wirksame und einheitliche Durchsetzung von Fluggastrechten zu bewirken.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señor presidente, mientras estamos aquí, de todos modos, quejándonos con toda razón de la pérdida de derechos de 400 000 pasajeros, la propia compañía está lanzando un megasaldo de un millón de plazas para los mismos meses y a un precio que... en fin, no lo voy a decir para no hacer publicidad, pero que es vergonzoso: «Dejo a 400 000 en tierra y los maltrato y, al mismo tiempo, me hago propaganda y lanzo un millón de plazas para los otros, para los que serán maltratados en la próxima oleada».

Por eso considero que, de alguna manera —porque ya empiezo a pensar que es una ingeniería financiera perversa—, deberíamos meterle mano a esta compañía porque, desde luego, engaña a los viajeros.

Su organización no puede ser peor y sus previsiones absolutamente inaceptables. También está el maltrato a los pilotos —de quienes se ríe y a quienes critica—, además de que ataca directamente las normas europeas y la previsión de la fatiga en las tripulaciones.

Por lo tanto, señora comisaria, le pediría no solamente las sanciones concretas que podamos imponer por mandato a nivel europeo y su armonización. Porque hay unas sociedades que les piden unas cosas, otros otras... Al final, no sabemos realmente cuál va a ser la sanción definitiva.

Y, por otro lado, facilitar las reclamaciones. Desde el punto de vista digital, cada viajero debería recibir, en el momento en el que compra un vuelo, la información sobre sus derechos y sobre cómo reclamar automáticamente a la compañía.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik betreur ten zeerste dat we nu pas een debat voeren over deze problematiek. Meer dan een jaar geleden stelde ik de Commissie reeds een vraag over de klachten van klanten tegen Ryanair en over het niet naleven van de consumentenregels. Toen ontving ik het antwoord van uw diensten dat er niets aan de hand was.

Op 4 juli van dit jaar vroeg ik u opnieuw om stappen te ondernemen tegen luchtvaartmaatschappijen die het haast onmogelijk maken om klachten in te dienen. Opnieuw kwam het antwoord dat u de zaak zou bekijken.

Nu duizenden consumenten getroffen zijn, hoop ik dat u eindelijk stappen zal ondernemen.

Naar aanleiding van de Ryanair-zaak reageerde u al in de pers dat maatschappijen de Europese regels moeten respecteren, want die regels bestaan al. Het is in de eerste plaats aan de lidstaten om die regels af te dwingen en aan de Commissie om de lidstaten hierop te wijzen. Ik wil u dan ook oproepen om hier eindelijk werk van te maken en de lidstaten – en dus zo ook de maatschappijen – op hun verantwoordelijkheid te wijzen.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – Ik vraag me af: waar draait het om in de luchtvaart? Het gaat er toch om passagiers veilig en efficiënt te vervoeren naar een bestemming? Hun reisdoel is zeker niet om verzeild te raken in procedures met de luchtvaartmaatschappij, die plotseling talloze vluchten annuleert. Procedures over het recht op financiële compensatie, over het recht op alternatieve vluchten, over het recht op verzorging en op informatie, kortom over hun rechten als passagier.

Europa had ooit de ambitie mensen die vliegen te beschermen tegen wanpraktijken. Europa had de intentie om consumenten te helpen hun recht te halen. Europa heeft een voorstel om passagiersrechten in de luchtvaart aan te scherpen en die aanpassing van Verordening nr. 261 uit 2004 wordt steeds nijpender. Want in 13 jaar is de wereld van de luchtvaart sterk veranderd en passagiers moeten makkelijker hun rechten bij annuleringen en vertragingen te gelde kunnen maken. Passagiers moeten een verruimd recht krijgen op alternatieve vluchten en passagiers moeten beter geïnformeerd worden door luchtvaartmaatschappijen. Voor misleiding en niet-transparante communicatie is in mijn Europa geen plaats.

Die aanscherping van de passagiersrechten door de wijziging van Verordening nr. 261 zit muurvast in de Raad. Het Europees Parlement, wij, de volksvertegenwoordiging, wij nemen mensen die vliegen serieus. Maar de Raad, de vertegenwoordiging van de lidstaten, weigert al drie jaar met ons tot een compromis te komen. En dat allemaal, zoals bekend, vanwege het geschil omtrent de status van de luchthaven van Gibraltar.

Europese Raad, neem uw verantwoordelijkheid, hak politieke knopen door, ondanks de complexiteit van de brexit. U kunt persoonlijke drama's voorkomen rond annuleringen en met ons, het Europees Parlement, ervoor zorgen dat passagiers in de luchtvaart bij dergelijke vervelende omstandigheden alsnog – om in luchtvaarttermen te blijven – een zachte landing kunnen krijgen.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, dear colleagues, passengers' and workers' rights need to be respected. This is unfortunately not the case for Ryanair. This kind of unfair business model and ultra-low cost model in the transport sector in general needs to be avoided.

If we look at the current situation for customers, no real safeguards exist against flight cancellations or delays. How do passengers really feel when they book a Ryanair flight, but they don't know whether it will ever take off, and then the company blames poor planning of staff holidays. It is not only the customers who are affected, it is also the crew members, who work on an hourly rate and don't get paid when flights get cancelled. What are the workers' social conditions if they are only being paid for the hours when they are flying, with no income security when flights are cancelled?

Is this the model of aviation we want in Europe or elsewhere – a new model of legal slavery? We need to fix the grey areas of the current air passenger rights regulation. We know very well the regulation is open to interpretation, and Parliament is ready and willing to get an agreement on this important subject. We need a clear and fair air passenger rights regulation, and the citizens of Europe are waiting for European Union leadership in this matter and for fair conditions and fair aviation that is safe for customers and workers alike.

Jakop Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Ryanair har nyligen meddelat att det ställer in en stor mängd flygter fram till mars 2018, vilket drabbar hundratusentals resenärer.

Detta är mycket olyckligt och ett uttryck för Ryanairs mycket problematiska affärsmodell, som bygger på oanständiga arbetsvillkor för personalen och indirekt offentligt stöd från regionala flygplatser. Att på detta sätt pressa priser på flygresor som förstör klimatet och dessutom låta prisdumpningen gå ut över personal och resenärer är inte hållbart. Nu måste vi se till att de hundratusentals resenärer som har blivit drabbade tas om hand. Men på lång sikt måste vi se till att lagstiftningen stärks så att kabinpersonalen får goda arbetsvillkor och resenärer tryggt kan boka sina flygresor. Och till sist: Flyget måste börja betala för sin klimatpåverkan, och de fossila subventionerna på flyget måste ta slut.

Daniela Aiuto (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi quindici anni i vari governi degli Stati membri hanno svenduto il cielo europeo, riempiendo le tasche della compagnia irlandese, elargendo agevolazioni, contributi più o meno mascherati da aiuti al funzionamento, soprattutto per gli aeroporti minori, quelli che faticavano a mantenere un traffico passeggeri sufficiente, e il tutto in barba alle regole sulla concorrenza.

Sono i vari Stati membri che hanno consentito la proliferazione di una compagnia aerea, che ha fatto del precariato lavorativo la sua parola d'ordine. Dopo aver regalato per anni voli quasi gratis in tutta Europa – e sappiamo bene a spese di chi – oggi Ryanair è passata in cassa: ma non sono solo i governi nazionali gli unici architetti della crisi attuale in atto.

Quante volte la Commissione si è lavata le mani dalle innumerevoli violazioni segnalate da questo Parlamento? Quante volte ha ignorato le nostre interrogazioni sull'evasione fiscale di Ryanair e sugli aiuti di Stato illeciti, scaricando il barile delle responsabilità sui tribunali nazionali.

Sono vent'anni che l'Unione europea lascia nel limbo il distacco dei lavoratori e sono vent'anni che ogni Stato interpreta quelle regole come vuole: a fare le spese della vostra indifferenza sono oggi i diritti dei passeggeri, andati in fumo con un click, e dei lavoratori del settore, non solo quelli delle *low cost*, ma anche delle compagnia di volo di linea. Per non parlare del danno ai sistemi nazionali di previdenza sociale.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signor presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, devo dire che sono molto colpito dalla discussione sullo scandalo di Ryanair. Sono molto colpito, perché all'interno del Parlamento e all'interno delle commissioni in cui lavoro – la commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, la commissione per i trasporti e il turismo – spesso ci troviamo a dibattere di come tutelare il mercato europeo e tutelare le alte performance delle nostre aziende in termini di tutela del mercato stesso, di tutela della vita dei lavoratori, di tutela degli utenti e in questo caso dei passeggeri.

Ci difendiamo da chi sta fuori dal mercato, cioè da chi non rispetta le regole della concorrenza. E facciamo bene! Tuttavia, in questo caso ci ritroviamo in una situazione paradossale perché, come al solito, parlando di aziende, abbiamo di fronte il cliente, il lavoratore e l'azienda stessa.

Per quanto riguarda i passeggeri abbiamo detto: gli utenti hanno ampi margini per tutelare i loro diritti. Dall'altro lato, i lavoratori hanno fatto un ricorso, la Corte si è espressa e quindi hanno tutto lo spazio per creare le condizioni perché il loro lavoro sia tutelato e operino in condizioni tali da poter garantire un servizio corretto.

A questo punto, parliamo della compagnia. Io non sono abituato a far processi anticipati, ma a quanto pare, la compagnia ha creato condizioni di concorrenza sleale, togliendo lavoro e illudendo i passeggeri.

Bene, allora, qual è il nostro compito? Il nostro compito non è fare un processo bensì garantire che tutti lavorino secondo le condizioni attraverso le quali possiamo ancora dire che l'Europa è il più grande mercato del mondo. Ma il più grande mercato del mondo deve tener conto di tutti questi fattori e pare che in questo caso non sia stato fatto.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, ce n'est malheureusement pas la première fois que nous pointons du doigt les pratiques antisociales de la compagnie aérienne Ryanair.

Aujourd'hui, nous dénonçons de nouveau les pratiques abusives de cette compagnie en matière de non-respect des droits des passagers: 2 000 vols annulés aujourd'hui, et demain 20 000, conséquence logique de la non-prise en compte des obligations de congés des pilotes et des équipages.

Cette affaire illustre les limites des modèles économiques qui poussent les employés à bout. Droits des passagers et droits des travailleurs sont les deux facettes du même combat pour l'amélioration de la qualité de service. Sur ces deux problématiques, l'Union européenne peut agir.

En 2014, notre Parlement avait adopté une proposition de règlement pour élargir les droits des passagers en matière d'indemnisation et d'assistance. Il est grand temps que le Conseil adopte sa position afin que ce nouveau règlement entre en vigueur.

Par ailleurs, conformément à l'arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne du 14 septembre contre Ryanair, il est indispensable de mieux définir le lieu principal d'activité pour éviter que des entreprises emploient leur personnel à des conditions sociales en vigueur dans d'autres pays que leur base d'affectation. La législation européenne doit renforcer ces décisions pour mieux protéger les travailleurs en question.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι απαράδεκτη και ανάληκτη η συμπεριφορά της Ryanair, που εγκατέλειψε στην τύχη τους μέχρι στιγμής 400.000 επιβάτες και ακύρωσε πτήσεις και, όπως λέει, θα ακυρώσει και άλλες μέχρι την έναρξη της άνοιξης. Η Ryanair είναι η μεγαλύτερη εταιρεία, δρα σε 84 αεροδρόμια και φυσικά έχει μονοπώλιο. Αυτή είναι η κατάσταση. Αξιοποιεί αυτή τη μονοπωλιακή της θέση προκειμένου να βγάλει υπερκέρδη. Όλα προκλήθηκαν διότι υπάρχει σοβαρή αρρυθμία και στις σχέσεις της με τους πιλότους. Δεν τους κατοχυρώνει τα δικαιώματα και φυσικά οι πιλότοι δεν είναι διαθέσιμοι να δουλέψουν υπερβολικές ώρες. Το ίδιο ισχύει και για το πλήρωμα καμπίνας.

Το βασικό όμως είναι ότι δεν αρκεί να ακούμε ευχολόγια από την Επιτροπή. Τι μέτρα θα ληφθούν κατά της Ryanair η οποία πραγματικά παρανομεί; Πώς θα υπάρξει προστασία των επιβατών; Πώς θα υπάρξει προστασία των καταναλωτών; Πώς θα πάρουν τις αποζημιώσεις τους; Αυτά είναι τα ερωτήματα στα οποία πρέπει να απαντήσουμε, για να σταματήσει η Ryanair να καταχράται τη δεσπόζουσα θέση την οποία έχει στην αγορά αυτή τη στιγμή. Όλα όσα έγιναν, έγιναν διότι στόχος ήταν τα υπερκέρδη και φυσικά η εταιρεία «δεν έδινε φράγκο» στους ίδιους τους εργαζομένους της. Αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ryanair hat angekündigt, 98 % der Passagiere, die im September und Oktober von Streichungen betroffen waren, hätten ihr Geld zurückbekommen oder eine Umbuchung erhalten. Wenn man nicht über Fluggastrechte informiert wäre, hätte man den Eindruck: „Mensch, das ist ja super, was die gemacht haben!“ Das Problem ist aber, dass sie ihre Passagiere nicht über alle Optionen, die dort bestehen, aufgeklärt haben. Es geht bei gestrichenen Flügen nämlich nicht nur darum, eventuell Geld zurückzubekommen, sondern auch um eine Entschädigung – Herr Kollege Koch hat es schon gesagt – von 250, 400 oder 600 Euro, je nach Strecke. Und man ist als Fluggesellschaft eben auch verpflichtet, auch eine Umbuchung bei teureren Airlines anzubieten.

Ich finde es sehr gut, dass die Luftfahrtbehörde in Irland gerade letzte Woche Ryanair wirklich praktisch dazu gezwungen hat, die Passagiere nachträglich über ihre Rechte aufzuklären.

Der Punkt ist der: Wenn so gehandelt wird, ist es kein Wunder, dass eben tatsächlich viele sagen: Die Fluggastrechte müssen verschärft werden. Es wurde schon von meinem Kollegen van Miltenburg gesagt: Wir haben ja bessere Fluggastrechte, die aber leider im Rat blockiert werden. Wir brauchen das dringend, denn es muss ja so sein, dass man eben als Fluggast auch seine Rechte bekommt und sich auf die Airlines verlassen kann.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, não são apenas os direitos dos passageiros que estão em causa, tal como não se pode dissociar este caso das opções políticas que a UE tem imposto no setor.

Opções como a promoção sistémica de privatizações é a destruição do modelo de companhias aéreas de bandeira e de assistência em escala, as concentrações no setor com a apologia e permissividade às abordagens *low cost* e a crescente precarização e desregulação das relações laborais, baixando os custos com pessoal, comprometendo ainda mais um elemento da soberania nacional.

É esta a raiz do problema. Os trabalhadores atingiram o limite das condições deploráveis que a Ryanair lhes impõe. Deixamos, aliás, uma fraterna saudação a todos quantos, no setor dos transportes aéreos, lutam pela melhoria e pela dignidade das condições laborais.

Urge inverter as opções impostas e afirmar a necessidade de retomar o controlo público deste setor estratégico, essencial para o desenvolvimento de qualquer país. Só assim se garantirão as melhores práticas laborais e de operação no setor.

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine lieben Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 18 000 Flüge sind gestrichen worden, fast 800 000 Kunden sind davon betroffen. Geltende Gesetze wurden verletzt – wir können sie verschärfen, aber geltende wurden verletzt –, und ich bin davon überzeugt: Die Gesetzesbrecher müssen bestraft werden, aber nicht die Kunden, wie das Ryanair gemacht hat!

Eine Kollegin hat mir erzählt, wie es war. Sie wollte von Riga nach Frankfurt fliegen. Abgesagt der Flug, keine SMS, keine Mail, keine Essensgutscheine, keine Assistenz, Auskunft nur auf einer Hotline, die erst drei Stunden später eingeschaltet wurde, Umbuchung gab es nur für einen Ryanair-Flug eine Woche später! Alles andere wurde abgelehnt. Es gab keine Übernahme von Kosten für die Unterkunft, für die Verpflegung, keine Rückerstattung. Und als sie das gesagt hat, da wurde ihr gesagt: Ja, Sie haben keine Ryanair-Reiserücktrittsversicherung abgeschlossen, deshalb kriegen Sie kein Geld. Sie wussten genau, was los war! Sie haben die Gesetze gebrochen. Das dürfen wir nicht akzeptieren. Ein Gesetz, das nicht verfolgt und nicht bestraft, nicht mit Sanktionen belegt wird, ist kein gutes Gesetz! Deshalb sind die Kommission, die Mitgliedstaaten und die Organisationen gefordert, dem nachzugehen. Der Kunde hat die Priorität, und nicht Ryanair, die die Kollegen ausbeutet, die die Piloten ausbeutet. Deshalb gab es ja nicht mehr genug Piloten, die das gemacht haben. Die Scheinselbständigkeit muss bestraft werden, und mit diesem Lohndumping muss Schluss sein! Sonst verlieren wir unsere Glaubwürdigkeit hier in Europa.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Podczas dzisiejszej debaty rodzi się wiele pytań i wątpliwości, niemniej najważniejsze, co było tu często podkreślane to kwestia praw pasażerskich oraz odpowiedzialności firmy, która dążąc do ograniczenia kosztów, lecz również cen biletów, anulowała w ostatnim czasie kilkanaście tysięcy lotów, a także, o czym nikt nie mówi, zawiesiła w okresie zimowym loty na trzydziestu czterech trasach. Pani Komisarz, jaką odpowiedzialność poniesie firma? Tysiące pasażerów dowiedziało się, że ich lot został odwołany, i nie wiemy, czy są oni świadomi swoich praw wynikających z rozporządzenia Rady, czy zostali poinformowani, że mogą domagać się rekompensat oraz czy wiedzą, że mogą skorzystać z lotów innych linii na koszt Ryanair.

Bardzo ważna jest kwestia pracowników firmy. Rodzi się bowiem pytanie, co było powodem tego, że przy stosunkowo dobrym wynagrodzeniu tylu pilotów zrezygnowało z pracy, oraz jak toczące się w Parlamencie Europejskim liczne dyskusje na temat odpoczynku, czasu pracy kierowców, wynagrodzenia kierowców, dumpingu społecznego mają się do funkcjonowania spółki Ryanair. Zwróćmy uwagę na proponowane ceny biletów. Jak to możliwe, by kupić bilet za dwa i pół euro na połączenie między dwoma krajami Unii Europejskiej? Czy nie mieliśmy tu do czynienia z dumpin-giem społecznym? Jakoś nikt tego tematu nie porusza. Jak to możliwe, że wielu z trzynastu tysięcy zatrudnionych pracowników jest samozatrudnionych, nie ma płatnych urlopów i nie otrzymuje świadczeń społecznych? Mam nadzieję, Panie Przewodniczący i Pani Komisarz, że Komisja pociągnie firmę do odpowiedzialności, a także będzie pilnowała, aby firma przestrzegała prawa europejskiego i praw konsumentów.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli deputati, sono membro della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo e ho ben presente la questione che oggi stiamo trattando. Ho a cuore il trasporto a tariffe competitive per dare un servizio più accessibile e per sviluppare il turismo, settore che ci sta dando molte soddisfazioni. Ma va detto che per essere leader nel settore dell'aviazione, non basta aver conquistato una congrua fetta di mercato: bisogna soprattutto essere rispettosi dei diritti dei lavoratori e dei diritti dei passeggeri.

Su questi aspetti ci sono legittimi dubbi, per cui è urgente che da parte della Commissione si faccia la dovuta chiarezza e in fretta. Si parla di ferie dei piloti non godute: siamo proprio sicuri che i motivi siano questi e non ci siano invece anche altre ragioni? Quanto ai voli cancellati, le norme sono chiare: non saranno accettate transazioni al ribasso. Chi causa un danno, deve risarcirlo per intero.

Infine, chiedo che si vada avanti con la revisione del regolamento sui diritti dei passeggeri, fermo al Consiglio dal lontano febbraio del 2014. Dobbiamo dare ai passeggeri una tutela maggiore e al passo coi tempi.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la anulación masiva de vuelos de la compañía Ryanair es una oportunidad para demostrar la utilidad de la Unión mediante la cooperación entre todas las partes competentes en la materia.

Aunque son las autoridades nacionales quienes deben controlar en cada Estado, la Comisión debe garantizar criterios homogéneos en todos los Estados de la Unión y que el proceso ofrezca resultados satisfactorios e idénticos. Para conseguirlo, y con más de 400 000 afectados, la Comisión podría elaborar una guía digital que, de un modo sencillo y barato, poco más que un PDF interactivo y un banner específico, podría ser ofrecido en todas las lenguas oficiales a través de los Estados miembros. Consultándola, los usuarios de Ryanair que adquieran sus billetes, principalmente por internet, podrían contrastar esta información oficial con la que ofrece la propia compañía y, de ese modo, se protegerían todos los derechos que corresponden a los usuarios y se informaría mejor sobre las reclamaciones.

Igualmente es un buen momento para volver a revisar el funcionamiento de esta compañía —desde hace años bajo la lupa por prácticas poco claras— y, además, impulsar la transparencia de las organizaciones privadas que venden sus servicios de asesoría para este tipo de reclamaciones y garantizar que ofrecen las prestaciones que anuncian.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, 18 000 vuelos de 34 rutas y 400 000 clientes afectados en cuatro meses. Si estuviéramos hablando de una compañía pública, se hablaría de gestión nefasta y seguramente los responsables tendrían que haber dimitido ya. Pero como se trata de una empresa con un largo historial de cancelaciones y desprotección al consumidor y a sus trabajadores, pareciera que hay que resignarse y creer que estas cancelaciones son debidas a una pequeña compañía que hace un reajuste de vacaciones.

Sin embargo, Ryanair es hoy la compañía que más pasajeros transporta en Europa y debemos exigirle los máximos niveles de responsabilidad. Estas irregularidades deben ser investigadas por las autoridades aéreas europeas. El Reglamento (CE) n.º 261/2004 sobre los derechos de los pasajeros establece unos mínimos en cuanto a cancelación, información, indemnizaciones y alternativas, que Ryanair no ha cumplido.

Este caso abre una caja de Pandora que la Comisión ha tratado de mantener oculta anunciando el supuesto éxito de la liberalización del sector de la aviación. Se ve que estaban más preocupados de la desregulación que de la protección de los pasajeros. ¿Van a esperar a la siguiente cancelación masiva? ¿Las cosas cambiarían si los comisarios europeos viajaran alguna vez en *lowcost*?

Wim van de Camp (PPE). – In Nederland hebben wij een prachtig spreekwoord en dat luidt “hoogmoed komt voor de val”. Ryanair laat zich altijd voorstaan: “Wij zijn de grootste luchtvaartmaatschappij, wij vervoeren de meeste toeristen.” Maar in de praktijk blijkt het toch veel moeilijker te zijn om al die mensen op een nette manier naar hun bestemming te brengen.

Dit is op zich een ernstig feit, vooral als je zoveel reclame maakt. Maar nu gaat het erom hoe we het oplossen en ik hoop dat Ryanair de hele restitutie – het schadeloosstellen van de mensen – niet ten onder laat gaan in eindeloze bureaucratische internetprocedures, maar simpel en eerlijk het geld teruggeeft en de mensen schadeloosstelt.

Tot slot herhaal ik de vraag van collega Ertug: waar was de Ierse toezichthouder? Het kan toch niet zo zijn dat Ryanair beschermd wordt door de Ierse toezichthouder op dit soort punten? Ik hoop dat de commissaris daar een helder antwoord op geeft. We hebben toezichthouders en die moeten hun werk doen.

Tweede vraag die ik herhaal, is de vraag van Van Miltenburg aan de Raad: die passagiersbeschermingsverordening ligt nu al drie, vier jaar bij de Raad en we kunnen hier allemaal krokodillentranen huilen, maar waar is de oplossing? De Raad, onder voorzitterschap van Estland, zou hier een hele goede rol in kunnen vervullen.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Mam wrażenie, że uczestniczymy w debacie, podczas której ktoś siedzi z boku i się po prostu z nas lekceważąco śmieje. Mam tu na myśli wielkiego, sławnego i wyjątkowo nietypowego menedżera, jakim jest właściciel i szef Ryanair. Po pierwsze, zbieramy owoce bezkarności, po drugie, zbieramy owoce lekceważenia obowiązujących reguł i wreszcie zbieramy owoce rozgrywek Komisji i poszczególnych państw członkowskich i zwyczajnego zabiegania o to, żeby Ryanair był wszędzie. Sprzedawano iluzję, bo niezrealizowany rozkład lotów to jest po prostu sprzedaż iluzji, a to powinno być zabronione. Pojawia się więc dylemat, gdyż śmiem twierdzić, że to Ryanair odwraca się od pasażerów, a nie pasażerowie od Ryanaira, bo spodziewam się, że niestety za marne pieniądze będą oni gotowi wrócić. Pani Komisarz, czy chodzi jedynie o Ryanair, czy sprawdziliście inne tanie linie? Będziemy mieć następane Ryanairy?

Στέλιος Κούλογλου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, θα ήθελα να αναφέρω τρία σημεία: πρώτον, η ακύρωση δεκάδων χιλιάδων πτήσεων δείχνει έλλειψη σεβασμού προς τους επιβάτες. Έλλειψη σεβασμού που έχει εκφραστεί και διαφορετικά: έχουμε έναν υπεύθυνο της Ryanair να λέει ότι εξετάζει την περίπτωση να ταξιδεύουν οι επιβάτες όρθιοι με ειδικά αεροπλάνα. Δεύτερον, σε όλες τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης όπου αναπτύσσει δραστηριότητα η Ryanair πρέπει να τηρείται η εργατική νομοθεσία και να γίνονται σεβαστά τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων. Τρίτον, το να μεταχειρίζεσαι τους επιβάτες με έλλειψη σεβασμού, να τους μεταχειρίζεσαι σαν ζώα που ταξιδεύουν όρθια, και επίσης το να μην υπάρχουν κανόνες εργασίας επηρεάζει την ασφάλεια των πτήσεων. Τα αεροπλάνα πετάνε, είναι μηχανές, αλλά τα αεροπλάνα τα χειρίζονται άνθρωποι. Προσωπικό το οποίο είναι ξεκούραστο και ευχαριστημένο είναι προσωπικό ασφαλές. Εάν δεν υπάρχει αυτό, κινδυνεύουμε να έχουμε άλλα πολύ δυσάρεστα γεγονότα και θα είμαστε όλοι υπεύθυνοι. Βλέπετε το κλίμα εδώ, κυρία Επίτροπε. Είναι καιρός να λάβετε μέτρα.

Ivo Belet (PPE). – Het is hier al vaak gezegd, maar de manier waarop Ryanair is omgegaan met de rechten van de passagiers, die brutaal met voeten heeft getreden, is werkelijk ongezien. En dat de maatschappij pas na lang aarzelen en na veel druk vanuit de media en de politiek beslist heeft om zijn klanten een compensatie aan te bieden, is echt cru en onaanvaardbaar.

Het is hier al 100 keer gezegd: de Europese regels bepalen dat de passagiers uiteraard recht hebben op een schadevergoeding als zij niet tijdig over de annulering van de vlucht worden geïnformeerd.

De Belgische minister van Consumentenzaken heeft al een onderzoek opgestart naar Ryanair vanwege oneerlijke handelspraktijken, en ik denk dat de Europese Commissie niet anders kan dan dat voorbeeld te volgen. U hebt inderdaad met uw collega een brief gestuurd naar Ryanair, maar we zijn ervan overtuigd dat hier doortastender optreden nodig is en dat Ryanair tot de orde geroepen moet worden.

Tot slot nog een ander punt dat hier ook al aan de orde is geweest, maar dat we misschien nog even extra aandacht willen geven. We moeten ook werk maken van een betere werking en een betere toegankelijkheid van de nationale bemiddelingsinstanties, zodat die beter toegankelijk zijn, sneller toegankelijk zijn, vlotter toegankelijk zijn voor gedupeerde passagiers; zodat alle consumenten, alle passagiers, op een vlotte en toegankelijke manier recht hebben op datgene waarop zij volgens de Europese regelgeving inderdaad recht hebben.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, když letecká společnost Ryanair před několika týdny uvedla, že bude muset zrušit až 50 letů denně, dotklo se toto opatření stovek tisíců cestujících. Jejich let byl zrušen ze dne na den a postižení samozřejmě byli i zaměstnanci společnosti. Zmíněný letecký dopravce slíbil odškodnit cestující, kterých se rušení letů týká. Toto odškodnění ovšem neobsahuje jasnou povinnost přeměrování cestujících k jiným dopravcům. Jinými slovy možnost letět v daném termínu s někým jiným. Tuto povinnost přeměrování přitom obsahuje mimo jiné revize nařízení o právech cestujících v letecké dopravě, kterou Evropský parlament projednal již v roce 2014. Zhruba stejnou dobu je její projednání blokováno v Radě. Výzva Radě, aby se konečně dohodla na nové úpravě nařízení, je proto více než na místě.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, os milhares de cancelamentos de viagens praticados pela companhia Ryanair causaram danos elevados na confiança dos consumidores europeus. Muitos consumidores têm relatado uma ocultação persistente da informação sobre os seus direitos e muitas reclamações apresentadas à transportadora aérea, a autoridades nacionais, às associações de consumidores e à Comissão referem a ausência de resposta, a não aplicação das regras do artigo 5.º do Regulamento (CE) n.º 261/2004 e informações enganosas para fugir às compensações ou a utilização de lacunas no Regulamento no que respeita aos voos sequenciais. É lamentável que só três autoridades nacionais tenham ameaçado com medidas sancionatórias. As outras limitam-se apenas a monitorizar a situação. O apoio tem sido prestado maioritariamente pelas organizações de consumidores e a Comissão Europeia não se tem manifestado de forma clara neste processo.

A proteção eficaz dos consumidores é um elemento fundamental do bom funcionamento do mercado. A má gestão de uma companhia não pode ser pretexto para se furtar ao dever de indemnização e compensação dos passageiros afetados. Dos relatos que nos chegaram, estamos perante casos de práticas comerciais enganosas por omissão da informação necessária para que os consumidores afetados possam fazer valer os seus direitos.

As autoridades nacionais de defesa do consumidor têm de atuar. A Comissão não deve ficar parada num caso objetivamente transnacional que afeta milhares de europeus. E a realidade dá-nos razão quando propusemos o reforço da cooperação entre as autoridades nacionais de proteção do consumidor, que iremos votar aqui em Estrasburgo já no próximo mês.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Vorgänge rund um Ryanair zeigen die Schattenseiten der aggressiven Geschäftspraktiken der Billigairline. Den Preis für diese „Geiz ist geil“-Mentalität bezahlen im konkreten Fall 700 000 Passagiere, die von Flugstreichungen betroffen sein werden. Dass Ryanair seiner Informationsverpflichtung über Fluggastrechte nachkommen wird, wage ich wirklich zu bezweifeln.

Gleichzeitig bedeutet die Streichung der Flüge für das Bordpersonal massive Einkommensverluste. Wenn die Flugzeuge am Boden bleiben, gibt es auch kein Geld. Die Konzernleitung spricht von Problemen bei der Urlaubsplanung. Tatsache ist jedoch: Die Belegschaft und die Pilotinnen und Piloten haben genug von Null-Stunden-Verträgen und prekären Anstellungen. Ryanair und alle anderen Billigairlines müssen endlich einen sozialpartnerschaftlichen Dialog und faire Beschäftigungsverhältnisse in ihren Betriebsalltag übernehmen.

Pascal Arimont (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Ich möchte mich direkt an den Chef von Ryanair wenden. Sehr geehrter Herr O’Leary, stellen Sie sich vor, Sie hätten einen Flug gebucht, z. B. mit Ryanair, und hätten in Tallinn, Paris oder London ein schönes Hotel gebucht, oder hätten einen ganz wichtigen beruflichen Termin und plötzlich sagt man Ihnen, einen Tag vor der Reise oder am Tag selbst, dass dieser Flug nicht stattfindet, weil er gecancelt ist. Ich glaube, Herr O’Leary, Sie würden fluchen wie Kapitän Haddock. Genauso ging es auch all denjenigen, die das jetzt erfahren mussten. Man spricht hier von 400 000 Personen, es kommen noch 300 000 dazu.

In meinem kleinen Wahlkreis haben mich viele Bürger wütend angerufen und dagegen protestiert, und man hat mich gefragt: „Was macht Europa denn dagegen, oder was kann ich als Bürger oder als Betroffener machen?“ Die Antwort ist hier die Verordnung aus dem Jahre 2004. Das ist eine Verordnung, die die Rechte der Bürger definiert. Diese Rechte sind gut, die Passagiere müssen diese Rechte einfordern. Man muss ehrlich sagen: Die Kurzfristigkeit der Annullierung war und ist eine Frechheit, und das kann auch so nicht sein. Die Kosten für diese annullierten Flüge muss Ryanair bezahlen, und da müssen Sie, Frau Bulc, Herrn O’Leary auf die Finger schauen. Zwar mag es sein, dass die Freiheit über den Wolken grenzenlos ist, aber der Unverschämtheit einer solchen Planung müssen Grenzen gesetzt werden. Und das haben Sie in der Hand, Frau Bulc. Schauen Sie ihm auf die Finger, und ich kann auch jedem Kunden nur raten, diese Rechte geltend zu machen. Der Kunde sitzt da am längeren Hebel. Wenn jeder diese Rechte geltend macht, verhindert man, dass solche Dinge in Zukunft wieder passieren.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la cancellazione di voli in tutta Europa da parte di Ryanair sta creando grandi disagi ai cittadini europei. La causa è da ricercare, a mio avviso, nel dumping sociale praticato in maniera spericolata sulla pelle dei dipendenti da questa compagnia, che cerca così di sbaragliare la concorrenza.

Vale la pena di ricordare che soltanto ieri, la *low cost* britannica, Monarch, operativa dal 1968 è fallita. Probabilmente va ripensata l’attuale impostazione del mercato interno in questo settore, così come vanno fatte rispettare le norme europee a tutela dei passeggeri.

La Commissione deve far luce sulle modalità con cui le compagnie aeree informano i viaggiatori. Sembra che la Ryanair proceda alla comunicazione della cancellazione dei voli tra le 48 ore e le 6 ore antecedenti l’orario di partenza: non mi sembra un margine di anticipo sufficientemente ampio. Ma al di là del rimborso del biglietto, il vero nodo è il risarcimento che spetta agli utenti in caso di cancellazione in prossimità della data del volo, che Ryanair ha il dovere di disporre in modo automatico e senza alcuna spesa per i consumatori.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar și stimate Consiliu, iată, aveți o unanimitate aici în Parlament. Toate grupurile politice susțin același lucru, s-a spus unde a greșit Ryanair. Eu cred că ne sfidează. Nu se poate să motivezi că ai anulat zeci de zboruri, sute de mii de pasageri afectați pentru că nu ți-ai planificat concediile.

Este o rușine această companie. Trebuie să găsim soluții, nu se poate să nu ajungem la o creștere a exigenței privind drepturile consumatorilor. Eu fac parte și din Comisia TRAN, și din Comisia IMCO. Eu și toți ceilalți suntem trimiși aici de cetățeni să le apărăm drepturile, toate drepturile, inclusiv acelea de pasageri. Operează această companie și în țara mea. În 21 de zboruri, chiar în orașul din care fac parte, cetățeni din țara mea au fost afectați.

Doamna comisar, stimați domni din Consiliu, trebuie să stabilim măsuri. S-a spus destul aici, nu cred că trebuie să mai argumentăm că această companie își bate joc de noi. Nu este o greșală de management, aici este un furt calificat și trebuie să punem capăt.

Un singur lucru vreau să mai spun, colegului Liberadzki a spus: doamna comisar să știți că drepturile pasagerilor sunt încălcate și la alte companii și trebuie să nu mai ajungem, nu lăsați să mai ajungem în situația lui Ryanair. Trebuie să verificați în avans.

Hugues Bayet (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, il est évident que le développement des compagnies *low cost* a ouvert le transport aérien à des millions d'Européens et, en conséquence, a généré des milliers d'emplois via le développement de certains aéroports et de leur région.

Dans ma région, à Charleroi, l'aéroport est l'une des plus grandes réussites économiques belges de ces dernières années, et on l'a démontré à suffisance. Mais l'actualité nous oblige à réaffirmer les principes protecteurs définis par l'Europe, et qui doivent obligatoirement accompagner ce développement.

Premièrement, le droit des passagers doit être totalement protégé. Le règlement est clair: toute compagnie qui annule un vol doit informer chaque passager de ses droits, notamment celui d'être indemnisé sous certaines conditions. Par conséquent, Madame la Commissaire, je pense que vous devez prendre une initiative pour faciliter cette procédure d'indemnisation et contrôler le processus. L'exemple clair de Ryanair démontre que cela ne fonctionne pas.

Deuxièmement, les droits sociaux des équipages doivent être pleinement respectés. Cela passe notamment par le récent arrêt de la Cour de justice européenne quant à la juridiction nationale compétente en matière de droit du travail. Là aussi, il faut sécuriser le dispositif.

Nous comptons évidemment sur vous, Madame la Commissaire, pour changer ces deux éléments.

Παρεμβάσεις με τη διαδικασία «catch the eye»

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-н Председател, струва ми се, че в този дебат имаше много повече емоции отколкото трябваше. Няма криза, която да може да се реши по такъв емоционален начин с крясъци и с евтин популизъм. Намирам за важно Европейската комисия, в сътрудничество и диалог с Ryanair, бързо да разяснят правата на засегнатите пътници. Не е за вярване, че във времената, в които живеем, все още има хора, които не знаят какви права имат. И тук отговорността е наша. Да предоставим тази информация по достъпен начин, на достъпен език, така както хората очакват.

Учуден съм да разбера, че масовата практика е авиокомпаниите да уведомяват пътниците по имейл. За добро или лошо има хора, които все още нямат имейл или не го ползват толкова активно. Длъжни сме на всеки един от тях да е ясно какво може и кога да ползва. Защото щетите стигат много повече от просто един отменен полет: провалени планове, хотелски резервации, изхранване, настаняване и прочие.

Тази криза ще отmine. За съжаление обаче можем да очакваме други като нея да дойдат. Тя е показател, че имаме за решаване проблем: да реформираме защитата на потребителите и разясняването на техните права по възможно най-добър начин.

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

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Es geht nicht darum, dass die Passagiere die Rechte nicht kennen, die sie haben. Selbst wenn sie sie kennen und sie einbringen wollen – Ryanair ist derjenige, der die Rechte genau kennt, sie aber nicht wahrhaben will! Das ist das Problem, nicht die Inkompetenz der Passagiere, sondern die brutale Handlungsweise von Ryanair gegen die Passagiere, die ihre eigenen Rechte einfordern! Das wird zurückgewiesen, das ist der Skandal, nicht die Unkenntnis der Passagiere!

Андрей Новаков (PPE), отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Да приемем, г-н Крамер, че Вие сте прав и има случаи, в които дадена авиокомпания е злоупотребила със своите права и е нахърнила правата на своите пътници. Затова сме създали система и процедура – хората да знаят къде да се оплачат и какво могат да получат. В противен случай какво – ще закриваме всяка авиокомпания, която е нахърнила или нарушила дадена процедура? Хората трябва да знаят във всяка една ситуация какво могат да направят, как да потърсят правата си и, ако някой ги е нарушил, да си плати справедливо за това.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Mr President, an airline's operational measures cannot be influenced but, in every circumstance, airlines must act in accordance with the high standards of the consumer protection rules established by the EU. Therefore the failure to inform passengers or others of passenger entitlements, as happened in the case of Ryanair, is unacceptable. After announcing thousands of flight cancellations, Ryanair failed to inform passengers on several occasions that they have an option to be re-routed with other airlines where there is no suitable Ryanair service available within a reasonable time frame.

This kind of misinformation has negative consequences beyond the damage done in the given case. When consumers are misled in such a way it discourages them from seeking access to their rights and destroys the enormous work that has been done on empowering EU consumers. Ryanair must meet its legal obligations and act in compliance with EU rules, which means it must take responsibility for the re-routing of passengers, including with other airlines. However, we must not forget about the damage that has been done in the field of consumer rights awareness.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la crisis de Ryanair no ha respondido a un problema de organización y gestión de la compañía. Es más, es mucho más. Nos encontramos con una compañía con las prácticas de contratación laboral más nocivas en el sector de la aviación, lo que ha supuesto que más de 140 pilotos de la compañía irlandesa se hayan marchado de ella. Más del 70 % de la plantilla de pilotos de Ryanair está compuesta por falsos autónomos, sin derecho a cobrar durante ausencias por enfermedad, ni las vacaciones. No se respetan los tiempos de descanso y, para poder trabajar, son obligados a abrir su falsa empresa en Irlanda, beneficiando en la tributación a la compañía *low cost*.

Es la falta de regulación y control por parte de la Unión Europea de lo que se está beneficiando Ryanair y esto es la que ha llevado a esta crisis, en la que se han visto afectados cientos de miles de consumidores. La culpa no es de la gestión, sino de la denigrante práctica laboral y de la permisividad de la Unión Europea.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gospod predsednik, torej, kako daleč gre lahko gospodarska družba, podjetje, pri ustvarjanju dobička, v tem primeru letalska družba?

Ali je lahko v tem ustvarjanju dobička vključeno tudi to izkoriščanje pilotov in pa seveda kabinskega osebja, ki ga ta družba postavlja v položaj, ki je nasproten delovno-pravnim standardom in razmerjem? Ali je torej v tem kovanju dobička primerno in upravičeno tudi zavajati potnike in odpovedovati toliko in toliko tisoč letov?

In seveda se tukaj utemeljeno zaradi vsega tega postavlja lahko tudi vprašanje varnosti.

In če ob tem seveda Ryanair oceni skupne stroške svojih odpovedi na manj kot 50 milijonov eurov, vendar pa je dejal, da to ne bo spremenilo napovedi letnega čistega dobička v višini okoli 1,4 milijarde eurov, pomeni, da se mu tako ravnanje splača, mislim pa, da je seveda tu Evropska komisija in pa seveda Evropski parlament tisti, ki na to morata reagirati in pa seveda sprejeti tudi ustrezne sankcije.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, I apologise that I was delayed getting to this debate, but it is about Ryanair so I suppose that being late is quite fitting.

Are we really surprised that we are here debating Ryanair, the airline that charges you fifty quid to check in at the airport? I mean, seriously, can you imagine if any other business made its customers' lives a misery on purpose? Imagine if it was somewhere like McDonalds and they charged you extra to have a cup for your drink or to carry your food on a tray?

And now we've got planes with no pilots because they treat their pilots in the same way that they treat their customers and there is not the slightest hint that they give a stuff about their customers.

On a serious note, the Irish Government needs to pull its finger out and do something about it. The worst part of it all is that Ryanair loves it: they love the rumours about standing-room on planes, or charging to go to the toilet, because they see criticism as free advertising. Ryanair literally wants to charge you for absolutely everything.

Frankly they'll probably want to charge us for Brexit as well! No, hang on, that's the European Union.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, como disse o representante do Conselho, o transporte aéreo é um dos principais meios de comunicação e um dos principais motores de desenvolvimento de qualquer nação moderna.

A Ryanair – uma das principais companhias aéreas a operar na Europa – cancelou milhares de voos entre setembro e outubro deste ano causando com isso milhares de euros de prejuízo aos seus clientes.

Caros Colegas, todo e qualquer operador que opere no espaço da União Europeia tem que, como disse a Sra. Comissária muito bem, tem que respeitar a legislação europeia. Os direitos dos passageiros têm que ser escrupulosamente defendidos e protegidos e os faltosos penalizados com sanções adequadas e, no meu entender, bem pesadas.

Senhora Comissária, a liberalização do espaço aéreo não pode ser entendida como libertinagem ou a aplicação da lei do faroeste. A Comissão tem que ter mão firme e não deixar que este tipo de atitude, violadora dos direitos dos passageiros aéreos, por parte da Ryanair, se volte a repetir em prejuízo dos cidadãos e das economias dos Estados-Membros.

Senhora Comissária, quem não cumpre não deve ser permitido operar no espaço da União.

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

Arne Gericke (ECR), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Herr Faria! Eine ganz kurze Frage: 800 000 Passagiere in kürzestem Zeitraum. Könnten Sie mir verraten, wie viele der Passagiere, die gegebenenfalls für 15 Euro von Hamburg in die Ukraine oder sonst wohin fliegen, wirklich daran geglaubt haben, dass sie da kostendeckend fliegen?

José Inácio Faria (PPE), *Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul».* – Caro Colega, não percebi muito bem a sua pergunta, mas o que eu quero dizer é que os passageiros têm direito a ser ressarcidos pelos prejuízos que sofrem, seja 15, seja 20, seja 30, seja o que for e há, de facto, dispositivos na lei que dizem o montante pelas horas de atraso e pelos cancelamentos. Portanto, não é nada que seja novo. É preciso é que sejam aplicadas as regras e elas existem. A legislação europeia existe, está aí. É preciso é que ela seja implementada.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, αν δεν θέλουμε «να κάνουμε τα στραβά μάτια», το πρόβλημα με τη Ryanair υπάρχει εδώ και πάρα πολλά χρόνια και διαπράττεται παραβίαση βασικών εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων όχι μόνον των πιλότων αλλά και πολλών άλλων εργαζομένων. Το θέμα που εγείρεται σήμερα είναι ποια μέτρα θα λάβει η Επιτροπή για την αποκατάσταση των ζημιών που υπέστησαν 400.000 περίπου άνθρωποι και ποια μέτρα θα ληφθούν έτσι ώστε η ίδια η εταιρεία να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες της. Δεν είναι δυνατόν οι εταιρείες να εργάζονται με αυτά τα δεδομένα για τόσα πολλά χρόνια και εμείς εδώ «να κάνουμε τα στραβά μάτια» και απλώς να ερχόμαστε να συζητήσουμε ένα θέμα, αφιερώνοντας έστω και λίγο περισσότερο από τον προβλεπόμενο χρόνο.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I believe I am the last passenger for tonight's debate.

I just want to say that I am sure Michael O'Leary, Chief Executive of Ryanair, is listening to this debate and his ears are burning, and that may be no harm. I hope he has heard the emotion of many colleagues in the Chamber, who have expressed the upset caused to passengers and the fact that we need to take this on board.

Ryanair is a very large airline. The statistics, if you bear with me, are these: 131 million customers this year; operating in 33 countries; an unblemished safety record of 32 years. But the cancellations were of such a scale that people did begin to question whether there was more behind this than simply a rostering error. So Ryanair has work to do. On connecting with passengers, they have work to do, as all airlines have. When there is a problem, we need to talk to a human being, and perhaps that is something we could stitch into a regulation.

Two further points. Firstly, could the Commission study the follow-up to this crisis? How many people actually claimed their rights? This would be an exercise that would be useful to us, to see if the legislation is working effectively. And lastly, Commissioner, do you think there is a need to tighten up the rules, or do you think everything is fine as we have it today?

(Τέλος παρεμβάσεων με τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye»)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first let me thank you for this very rich debate and I would like to assure you once more that the Commission will be in close contact with all national authorities and enforcement bodies concerned, to make sure that European rules, including those on passengers' rights, are strictly respected.

Let me now address some of your more specific questions.

First on social problems. I'm not here to really speculate on the root causes of Ryanair's decision. At this stage, Ryanair has confirmed that this is solely due to rostering issues and management failure. European rules are really crystal clear. It is the responsibility of the Irish authorities to oversee Ryanair as an Irish airline and I'm confident that they are closely monitoring that Ryanair respects all its obligations. If they discover wrongdoing, I'm also confident that they will act accordingly.

On communication with stakeholders – information campaigns have been present since 2010 including videos, brochures, leaflets and so on. Interactive content is present on Your Europe.

Coordination with NAPS ensuring airlines provide info, check-in online and at the airports is also ensured and present, and there are also more mobile applications that the customers can download. Obviously, this still is not enough. I issue a special statement before every holiday, summer and Christmas, and we can still look to see if anything else can be done so that people learn about their rights.

What were we doing on social conditions? There were several questions regarding that. There are concerns regarding the development of social conditions of mobile workers in aviation and I am very committed to moving forward on the social dimension of aviation and it will be the focus of my portfolio and an aviation strategy next year.

As far as state aid is concerned, the rules are the same for all airlines.

My services will soon launch also a study on certain employment and social aspects including bogus employment and alleged pay-to-fly schemes for pilots. The purpose is to understand better the facts on the ground and how they relate to existing legal obligations and EU policy for the future. Our work will take into account the case-law of the EU Court of Justice, including the recent one on the home base of air crews and the determination of the place of work.

The next question was related to intervening and sanctioning Ryanair, and, here, let me say the following. Member States have designed national enforcement body called NAPs, which are responsible for the enforcement of EU air passengers' rights. The sanctions for infringements of this regulation are laid down by Member States. For the time being, there is no reason to initiate any infringement procedures against Ireland and, as I said, I'm confident that they will do the work that they have to do.

And last but not least, EU safety rules – EU rules are the same for legacy and low-cost carriers. The EU has the highest aviation safety standards in the world and I'm also confident all national authorities follow this closely, including Ireland. So let the system do the job.

President and honourable Members, the single aviation market has propelled European mobility forward, bringing Europeans closer together and providing a solid foundation for more jobs and economic growth. Successful reforms played a key role here and the Commission along with national authorities has ensured and will ensure that these common rules are respected by all players, big or small. It is thanks to the EU that all passengers have a full set of rights when flying.

This very unfortunate event has only further cemented the importance of these rules and the need for their full implementation, and it is in this spirit that I'm inviting you to see the challenge in front of us, as well. A challenge that we are actively addressing to the benefit of passengers. I can only hope that we can unblock the new proposal on passengers' rights in the Council and get it up and operational as an important tool for even stronger enforcement of passengers' rights.

And I really welcome your support, honourable Members, on this point. This is exactly why we put forward guidelines last year to provide clarity and certainty, and yes I do travel low-cost, as a Commissioner and as a private citizen.

Matti Maasilta, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, some speakers have referred to the revision of the current legislation, something the Commission duly proposed in 2013. We all know what the state of affairs is with this piece of legislation, and we also all know why that is. The Council is, however, aware of its obligation. Similarly to the Commissioner, I can only hope that this highly regrettable Ryanair case will also give incentives to the Member States concerned to reconsider their position, so that we can adopt this set of stronger new rules for the passengers' sake – for our citizens' sake.

Meanwhile the Ryanair case must be resolved. It must be resolved soon and all affected passengers must be duly compensated. Secondly, the national enforcement bodies must do all they can to assist passengers affected and to ensure that EU airlines abide by their legal obligations in the future.

Similarly, EU airlines should be more proactive in providing clarity to their customers regarding the rules on compensation and assistance. The airlines are legally obliged to make passengers aware of their rights and should act accordingly.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162)

Andor Deli (PPE), *írásban*. – Az utóbbi időben nagy port kavart a hír, amely szerint a Ryanair fapados légitársaság több ezer járatát volt kénytelen törölni, utasok tízezreinek életét megkeserítve ezzel. Pár nappal később a társaság bejelentett egy még nagyobb törlési hullámot a téli menetrend során. Lépésüket azzal indokolták, hogy ezzel szeretnék növelni járatainak pontosságát, amely szeptember első két hetében az előző 90%-ról 80 % alá esett, valamint, hogy új szabadság-rendszerre állnak át, amely az eddigi április-március helyett a naptári évre vetíti előre a szabadságokat.

Ezen intézkedések negatív hozománya a rengeteg járatotrlés. Amit mindenképpen szem előtt kell tartania a társaságnak, az a 261/2004-es európai rendelet, amely szigorúan szabályozza az utasok jogait járatotrlések esetén. Nagyon fontos, hogy ezt a Ryanair figyelembe vegye, és ennek megfelelően járjon el a kárt vallott utasok esetében. Nem elég, ha kompenzációt fizet az érintetteknek, hanem adott esetben szállodai szállást és egyéb szolgáltatást is biztosítania kell a rendelet előírásainak megfelelően a külföldön rekedt utasai számára.

Még így is sok ezer ember lehet abban a szituációban, hogy már lefoglalta a szállását, megvette múzeumi belépőit, koncertjegyét konkrét időpontokra. Ilyen esetekben fontos, hogy egyéni elbírálásban részesüljenek az érintettek. Csak remélni tudom, hogy a társaság tanul a jelen helyzetből és a jövőben sokkal körültekintőbben jár el hasonló esetekben, mindenkor az utasok jogait és érdekeit szem előtt tartva.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Sytuacja, która miała miejsce z tysiącami odwołanych lotów linii Ryanair, jest w sposób oczywisty nieakceptowalna i nie powinna nigdy mieć miejsca. Pokazuje ona jednak również wyraźnie, jak bardzo potrzebna jest Europejczykom Unia Europejska w ich codziennym życiu. Gdyby bowiem nie istniało unijne prawodawstwo, pasażerowie zdani byłiby jedynie na dobrą wolę linii lotniczych. Tymczasem to właśnie dzięki Unii Europejskiej poszkodowani pasażerowie mają prawo do otrzymania odszkodowania oraz pomocy, między innymi w formie zapewnienia zakwaterowania i posiłków na czas przedłużonego pobytu wskutek odwołania lotu.

Odszkodowanie i zwrot kosztów są jednak należne pasażerom na podstawie proaktywnego wystąpienia o nie do linii lotniczych, uważam zatem, że Ryanair powinien przeprowadzić szeroką kampanię informacyjną i zachęcać pasażerów do dochodzenia swoich praw.

Alex Mayer (S&D), *in writing*. – This crisis of cancellations, inconveniencing thousands of passengers has been on the cards for some time, and it is right that we debate how passengers' rights should be enforced but what people really want is a convenient and reliable service. The truth is there is an inherent vulnerability in the Ryanair model, relying on unsustainable employment practices: zero-hour contracts, bogus self-employment, degrading treatment and even paying for one's own training. You cannot pummel pilots for decades and then expect a smooth ride. This crisis may pass but the problems will roll on unless there is a change of mind-set. As MEP for the East of England, covering Stansted airport, my message is clear. This does not take blue-sky thinking just an end to employment practices that are unsustainable and wrong.

József Nagy (PPE), *írásban*. – Nem maradhatott le a plenáris agendájáról a Ryanair járatörléseinek ügye, hiszen az mintegy 2000 járatot és több százezer utast érint. Az Európai Unió különösen magas standardokkal rendelkezik a légitözlekedést illetően, és ebbe az utasok jogainak megfelelő védelme is beletartozik. Éppen ezért volt fontos felhívni a Ryanair figyelmét arra, hogy az érintett utasokat időben értesítsék a kialakult helyzetről és a rendelkezésükre álló eszközökről ahhoz, hogy megfelelő kárpótlásban részesülhessenek.

A Ryanair Európa legnagyobb fapados légitársasága és családok ezreinek teszi lehetővé, hogy megfizethető áron utazzanak. Ebben az évben 131 millióan vették igénybe a légitársaság szolgáltatásait, melyek 33 országban üzemelnek. Bizom benne, hogy a légitársaság vezetősége tudatosítja a járatörlések komoly következményeit és minden megtesz majd annak érdekében, hogy a jövőben elkerülje az ilyen jellegű intézkedéseket.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Od dwudziestu lat Unia Europejska próbuje bronić praw pasażerów linii lotniczych. Okazuje się jednak dzisiaj, iż europejskie przepisy nadal są niewystarczające i nieprecyzyjne, pozostawiając przewoźnikom szeroki margines interpretacyjny. Pasażerowie wbrew naszym oczekiwaniom są coraz słabiej chronieni. Ostatnie wydarzenia i nagłe, masowe odwoływanie tysięcy lotów przez irlandzkiego przewoźnika Ryanair wyraźnie pokazują, że pasażerowie ciągle narażeni są na nieprzewidywalne zachowania i arbitralne decyzje linii lotniczych. Brak umiejętności racjonalnego planowania i skutecznego zarządzania nie tylko obniża wiarygodność przewoźników i niszczy ich reputację, ale przede wszystkim obniża zaufanie społeczne do transportu. Ryanair często nie informował z wyprzedzeniem o odwołanych lotach. Tysiące pasażerów bez prawa do odszkodowania, ograniczone możliwości przebookowania biletu na lot innego przewoźnika i linie lotnicze uchylające się od odpowiedzialności to obraz dzisiejszego lotnictwa pasażerskiego. W obliczu zaistniałej sytuacji Unia musi niezwłocznie zwiększyć zakres odpowiedzialność przewoźników i wzmocnić obowiązek wypłaty odszkodowań w przypadku odwołania lotu. Uważam również, iż w przypadku odwołania lotu przez linie niskokosztowe, należy wprowadzić również obowiązek przebookowywania biletów na loty przewoźników tradycyjnych bez określania limitów cenowych tak, aby uniemożliwić liniom uchylanie się od wypełniania swoich obowiązków.

Tokia Saïfi (PPE), *par écrit*. – Alors que la compagnie aérienne low cost avait déjà annoncé le 17 septembre dernier l'annulation de 2 100 vols, Ryanair vient, à nouveau, de décider de l'annulation de plus de 18 000 vols. Ce seront près de 400 000 passagers européens qui seront affectés par ces annulations.

Cette situation est inacceptable. Les voyageurs européens sont pris en otage par la mauvaise politique de gestion du personnel de Ryanair. Notre priorité doit être de faire respecter le droit européen et les droits des passagers. En effet, la Commission européenne doit veiller à ce que Ryanair ne s'exonère pas de ses responsabilités et respecte la législation européenne de 2004 en matière de protection des droits des voyageurs.

Les passagers doivent avoir un complet accès aux informations sur l'indemnisation ainsi qu'à l'ensemble des options de réacheminement disponibles. Ces annulations viennent rappeler la nécessité de débloquent au niveau du Conseil les discussions au sujet de la révision des règles relatives aux droits des passagers pour laquelle le Parlement a donné sa position en 2014. Il y a urgence, l'Union européenne et les États membres doivent agir.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Pasażerowie wciąż znajdują się na słabszej pozycji niż linie lotnicze, mimo posiadania konkretnych praw. Bardzo często zdarza się, że linie lotnicze nie powiadamiają pasażerów o przysługujących im prawach w przypadku zakłócenia lotu (opóźnienia, odwołania), chociaż rozporządzenie dotyczące praw pasażerów lotniczych nakłada na nie taki obowiązek.

Tylko w ostatnim tygodniu irlandzki przewoźnik Ryanair poinformował o anulowaniu, do końca października, ponad dwóch tysięcy połączeń do różnych miast europejskich. Unijne regulacje mówią, że jeśli lot jest odwołany, pasażer ma prawo do zwrotu kosztów, zmiany planu podróży lub lotu powrotnego, a także prawo do uzyskania pomocy i odszkodowania. Linie lotnicze działające w UE muszą respektować europejskie przepisy!

Oczekujemy, że Ryanair będzie przestrzegał europejskich zasad odnoszących się do praw pasażerów. Działanie Wspólnoty w dziedzinie transportu lotniczego powinno mieć na celu zapewnienie wysokiego poziomu ochrony pasażerów. Ponadto winno zwracać uwagę na ogólne wymogi ochrony konsumentów.

Należy podjąć dalsze kroki, aby linie lotnicze konsekwentnie stosowały się do przepisów, a państwa członkowskie skuteczniej egzekwowały ich przestrzeganie. Istnieje potrzeba przeprowadzenia dalszych prac w wielu obszarach, takich jak: poprawa egzekwowania przepisów, interpretacja niejasnych aspektów rozporządzenia, rozróżnienie opóźnień od odwołań lotu (jako że pasażerom przysługują różne prawa w zależności od okoliczności) oraz zwiększenie roli krajowych organów wykonawczych nadzorujących stosowanie wspólnych zasad.

15. **Bezwaar tegen een uitvoeringsmaatregel: wetenschappelijke criteria voor de bepaling van hormoonontregelende eigenschappen (debat)**

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί:

της αντίρρησης σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 106 του Κανονισμού σχετικά με το σχέδιο κανονισμού της Επιτροπής για την τροποποίηση του παραρτήματος II του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009 με τον καθορισμό επιστημονικών κριτηρίων για τον προσδιορισμό των ιδιοτήτων ενδοκρινικής διαταραχής (2017/2872(RSP))

Jytte Guteland, författare. – Herr talman! Jag ska prata svenska för det är ett sådant ämne som jag känner så starkt för. Hormonstörande ämnen förekommer bland annat i barns leksaker, i matförpackningar, i kläder, i olika sorters plaster, men också i bekämpningsmedel som vi kan få i oss genom livsmedel.

De här kemikalierna kan leda till flera typer av ohälsa, bland annat problem med att få barn, cancer och risk för diabetes. Små barn och foster är extra utsatta och känsliga för dessa kemikalier och effekterna visar sig senare i livet. Ändå saknas i dagsläget ett ordentligt regelverk i EU som ger ett heltäckande och fullgott skydd mot hormonstörande ämnen.

Kommissionen fick för mer än sju år sedan i uppdrag att ta fram vetenskapliga kriterier för att identifiera vilka kemikalier som är hormonstörande. Kommissionen har, jag är ledsen att säga, hanterat det här mycket dåligt. Efter flera års försening och efter att ha dömts i EU-domstolen för underlåtenhet att agera har man nu presenterat ett förslag.

Frågan vi måste ställa oss är: Lever det här förslaget upp till det som det är till för, att skydda miljö och folkhälsa? Tyvärr är svaret nej. Vi har givit kommissionen i uppdrag att identifiera vilka kemikalier som är hormonstörande – inget mer än detta. Det kommissionen nu föreslår är varken förenligt med EU-rätten eller ger tillräckligt skydd för människors hälsa och miljön mot hormonstörande ämnen i bekämpningsmedel.

Det handlar om den grundläggande principen om rättsstaten här. Kommissionen har inte rätt att bryta mot EU-rätten med det här förslaget. Det är en överträdelse av kommissionens mandat. Men kommissionens förslag om ett undantag för bekämpningsmedel är framtagna just för att attackera skadedjurs hormonsystem. De är alltså till designen hormonstörande. Ändå tycker inte kommissionen att bekämpningsmedlen ska klassas som hormonstörande ämnen, även om de har inverkan också på andra djur än målgruppen. Vi pratar exempelvis här om bin, fjärilar, humlor, kräftor och krabbor, som alla har hormonsystem som kan påverkas av de här bekämpningsmedlen. Det är inte vetenskapligt försvarbart.

Idag handlar det om bekämpningsmedel, men kommissionen uppger att de föreslagna kriterierna i framtiden ska kunna användas också inom andra områden. Därför är det ännu viktigare att de här kriterierna är bra. Vi kräver att kommissionen gör rätt. Ta bort det här regelvidriga undantaget och kom tillbaka med ett nytt förslag utan dröjsmål. Barn och bin går före enskilda intressenters ekonomiska intressen.

Bas Eickhout, *author*. – Mr President, I think my colleague Ms Guteland has already explained the importance of this debate on endocrine disruptors. To be very clear, we have been debating this since 2009 when the Commission was asked to come forward with criteria to define what endocrine disruptors are. This was part of the regulation on biocides and pesticides and it was one of the key debates. What are the criteria for endocrine disruptors?

It took many years before the Commission finally came up with those criteria. It actually took the Court of Justice to push the Commission to come forward with the criteria.

But another very important discussion that took place in 2009 was to ask what the cut-off criteria were with regard to the definition of endocrine disruptors. These cut-off criteria were crucial because, of course, if you fall outside the scope of the definition, you are not considered to be an endocrine disruptor. That was a crucial debate. An entire annex was drafted to design these cut-off criteria, and one of the key provisions there was that substances should be approved only if they were not considered to have endocrine-disrupting properties on non-target organisms. I repeat: 'on non-target organisms'. It is precisely this provision that the Commission is now changing – through comitology and a delegated act.

The Commission is changing a key provision of a law through comitology, and that is precisely what we are objecting to. The key question is whether the Commission is exceeding its implementing powers and the answer is 'yes'. We even have advice from the Legal Service saying 'yes', the Commission is exceeding its implementing powers. That is exactly what we are discussing here. The Commission will say that we need to hurry up now, as this will delay things. Well, sorry! I say to the Commission: you have been delaying since 2009.

Secondly, the Biocides Regulation is putting the same criteria on the table and there is no objection to that one. So we are objecting to the Commission exceeding its implementing powers, and that is a legal question that all our colleagues need to answer. This is not about whether you like it or not: this is about whether we allow the Commission to change a crucial part of the law through implementing powers. If they want to make that change, then they should come forward with a proposal for codecision. That is the way we do it. My question to our colleagues is: are we here for the rule of law or for the rule of industry?

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, yes, we will together follow the rule of law. It is crucial today for all of us, and I stress it because the Commission is following the mandate from the pesticides and biocides regulation, and of course this Commission started work in 2014 and started to deal with these very complex issues.

We are here today debating the draft objection tabled in Parliament against the Commission regulation setting out criteria to identify endocrine disruptors in the context of the pesticides legislation. This proposal was sent by the Commission to Parliament and the Council for scrutiny on 20 July. I strongly ask the honourable Members to support the proposed criteria. I strongly request this. There is no benefit for health and the environment in keeping the interim criteria that are currently applicable. These are clearly not fit for purpose and this is recognised by all the stakeholders. Indeed, they fail to identify those that are real endocrine disruptors.

I would like to stress that our proposed criteria are protective of human health and the environment, and are based on the widely agreed World Health Organisation definition of an endocrine disrupter. The criteria are also designed to identify known and presumed endocrine disrupters on the basis of all available scientific information, including human and animal evidence, as well as in-vitro and in-silico data.

Furthermore, a 'weight-of-evidence approach' is to be used for the analysis of all the available scientific information. The Commission's proposal is thus based on science and reflects a reasonable approach. It is supported by a clear majority of Member States. In fact, on 4 July this year after more than a year of intense negotiations, a qualified majority of Member States supported the draft Commission regulation setting criteria to identify endocrine disrupters for pesticides. Twenty-one Member States, representing more than 72% of the population, voted in favour, while those voting against, or abstaining, did so for different and sometimes opposite reasons. Some wanted stricter criteria, others weaker criteria or more possibilities for derogation.

The proposed criteria are therefore a careful compromise and I would like to draw your attention to that. Yes, we know very well how difficult it is to build a compromise. This one would not have been reached without the inclusion of the specific provision which is at the centre of the draft objection tabled here in Parliament. This particular provision was added at the request of some Member States, during the negotiations – yes, during the negotiations – to improve their policy on sustainable use of pesticides, and was instrumental in getting the necessary support. And here we are discussing necessary support. The Commission did not want to oppose a reasonable and limited exemption for substances which target only arthropods and have no impact on vertebrates (human or animal).

The Commission strongly believes that it has not exceeded its powers by including this provision in the draft Commission regulation, as it does not concern an essential element of the regulation. Furthermore, this provision is in line with the general objective of the regulation to promote the development and use of active substances that have, overall, more favourable properties in relation to the protection of human health and the environment.

Let me also remind the honourable Members that, with the adoption of the draft regulation under scrutiny, the European Union would become the first regulatory system in the world with legally binding criteria to define what an endocrine disrupter is and to apply those criteria to pesticides, not only with regard to human health but also with regard to the environment.

I am aware that some consider the proposed criteria to be imperfect, for different reasons. However, their adoption would be a significant step forward compared to the current situation with respect to better protection of human health and the environment. We are not in a hurry: our concern, as always, is how to protect human health and the environment. I strongly believe we owe that better protection to European citizens and the European environment.

Only when the new criteria start to apply and we gain experience with them can we evaluate how they work in practice. The Commission had proposed to evaluate and report on their functioning at the latest in seven years' time.

In addition, the adoption of the criteria would constitute a solid basis for the Commission to advance in developing a new strategy on endocrine disrupters. Without finalised criteria there is no chance of obtaining a horizontal perspective, in relation to various types of chemicals. We need to have final criteria now because otherwise there is no possibility of moving forward.

This House has repeatedly asked the Commission to come forward with criteria to identify endocrine disrupters. I believe we now have a solid compromise and criteria which represent a real step forward. Therefore, and to conclude, I invite you to seize the opportunity for better protection of human health and the environment from endocrine disrupters in the area of pesticides by not supporting this objection, and by enabling the Commission to adopt these protective criteria and move forward. Otherwise we will remain in the same situation as now. Today's situation is very dangerous for people's health and for the environment.

Angélique Delahaye, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, cela fait presque huit ans que nous demandons des critères d'identification des perturbateurs endocriniens à la Commission européenne.

Nous avons enfin une proposition, qui n'est certes pas parfaite, mais qui a au moins le mérite d'exister. Elle reprend non seulement la définition des perturbateurs endocriniens donnée par l'OMS, mais surtout elle permet à l'Union européenne de se placer une fois de plus à l'avant-garde en matière de protection de la santé et de l'environnement.

Les perturbateurs endocriniens sont partout: dans les meubles, les vêtements, les emballages, les contenants et les produits alimentaires.

Il est donc primordial de fixer des critères stricts et scientifiquement fondés. Nous ne pouvons plus attendre. De plus, cette proposition permettra de remplacer la législation actuellement en vigueur, qui est dépassée et ne répond plus aux enjeux auxquels nous sommes aujourd'hui confrontés.

Nous devons assurer un niveau de protection toujours plus élevé aux citoyens. Pour cela, il faut avancer avec les connaissances techniques et scientifiques dont nous disposons et il est donc fondamental d'encourager la recherche et l'innovation dans ce domaine.

Or, ce sont les industriels, les PME et les TPE qui développent la recherche et l'innovation. Ils ont donc besoin d'orientations claires pour savoir quelle direction prendre et pour être en mesure d'élaborer des produits plus sûrs pour l'avenir.

Si nous refusons la proposition de la Commission, et adoptons cette objection, nous conserverons la législation actuelle et repartirons pour des négociations qui risquent de durer encore dix ans. Ce n'est pas un pas en arrière, comme certains l'insinuent, mais bien un pas en avant vers la mise en place d'une des législations les plus strictes au monde.

Miriam Dalli, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, as a matter of fact, the issue of the definition of endocrine-disrupting chemicals, as was mentioned, has been an ongoing and contentious issue over the past years. And trust me, we are not enjoying it! However, it is totally unacceptable and uncalled for to place the responsibility of the delay in the adoption of identification criteria on the European Parliament, particularly when the delay is mainly due to the unnecessary, and often biased, impact assessments carried out, despite the pressure from the European Parliament.

And yes, the European Parliament has the right of scrutiny. If every time we object we are told that nothing else will be proposed, this is completely unacceptable. Ultimately, as I have said, we have the right of scrutiny even when the Commission thinks it should not be reminded of the limits of its regulatory power.

Yes, in this case the Commission has exceeded the mandate granted by Parliament and the Council by coming back to the co-legislators' decision to impose a strict ban on endocrine-disrupting pesticides. It is not acceptable that, in the current proposal, the Commission incorporated a special exemption for certain types of pesticides. This goes way beyond what we asked for as the European Parliament. Furthermore, the way the proposal is presented, it is simply introducing a derogation – an exemption – that is creating an improper loophole in the regulation, allowing continuous use of dangerous pesticides.

The Commission's task was to set scientific criteria – nothing more, nothing less – and we will not accept the Commission deciding to go beyond its legislative power and introduce exemptions. That is why we want the Commission to withdraw the draft regulation and submit a new one, setting strict, straightforward and legally sound, scientific criteria without this aforementioned derogation.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir diskutieren EDs, endokrine Disruptoren – unappetitlich, aber allgegenwärtig: Kinderspielzeug, Lippenstift, S-Pestizide, überall –, viele in der Wirkung gänzlich unerforscht. Genau deshalb ist die EU seit 2000 aktiv, um neue Wege gegen EDs zu gehen.

Seit 2009 verhandeln wir über das heute diskutierte Registriersystem, um EDs besser zu erfassen und zu verbieten. Ich bin mit der langen Dauer dieses Prozesses nicht zufrieden. Ich halte das von der Kommission vorgelegte System allenfalls für einen kleinen Trippelschritt in die richtige Richtung – einen Schritt, dem viele folgen müssen.

Ich bin daher auch besorgt über die ablehnende Haltung einiger. Wollen wir wirklich fünf Jahre wissenschaftlicher Arbeit in den Wind schlagen – zurück auf null –, obwohl wir gerade auf dem richtigen Weg waren? Nein! Denn wer dagegen stimmt, stimmt gegen die Gesundheit unserer Kinder. Folgen wir den Wissenschaftlern, nicht der Lobby – für die Bürger. Ich respektiere deshalb auch die Warnungen der 3 000 Petenten und zahlreicher nichtstaatlicher Organisationen. Lasst uns einen Anfang in die richtige Richtung machen – für unsere Umwelt, für unsere Kinder, gegen hormonstörende Chemikalien!

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, it is a very bad thing that we are having this debate here tonight, because the issue of endocrine disruptors is a very serious one that should have been settled years and years ago. The Commission had to set the scientific criteria, but by introducing a derogation it took not a technical decision but a political decision. That leaves us with no other choice than to object.

Commissioner, I am afraid you have just given all the arguments why this is a political decision. You talked about year-long negotiations within Council. Why should you negotiate for a year if it is a technical decision? That is incomprehensible. You talked about a balanced compromise, but that is incompatible with a technical decision. I am afraid that you have completely side-lined the European Parliament: we should have been part of these negotiations with Council, and that is why you leave us no other solution than to object.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – De Europese Commissie verzint al jarenlang smoesjes om hormoonverstorende stoffen op de markt te houden, terwijl honderden studies aangetoond hebben dat ze zelfs in lage doses schadelijk zijn voor de gezondheid.

En ze zijn overal. Ze zitten in cosmetica en speelgoed, ze zitten in landbouwgif en ze zitten in de rubberkorrels op de kunstgrasvelden waar onze kinderen op spelen.

De Commissie heeft de wettelijke plicht om mens, dier en milieu te beschermen tegen hormoonverstorende stoffen. Ik herinner de Commissie eraan dat die bescherming niet doeltreffend zal zijn als zij de achterdeur openhoudt voor hormoonverstoorders en dat ook nog eens doet via een illegale procedure die de inspraak van het Parlement onmogelijk maakt.

Ik herinner de Commissie eraan dat die bescherming niet doeltreffend zal zijn als de bewijslast wordt verzwaaard en het voorzorgsbeginsel niet wordt gehanteerd. Halve maatregelen worden niet geaccepteerd. Alle hormoonverstoorders moeten van de markt.

De Commissie heeft daartoe al vele kansen gehad. Commissaris, wat mij betreft heeft u meer kansen niet verdiend.

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

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich hoffe, wir sind uns hier alle dessen bewusst, dass hormonverändernde Stoffe – sprich: endokrine Disruptoren – hochproblematisch sind. Deshalb hat sie der Gesetzgeber ja auch 2009 in Pestiziden weitestgehend verboten – mit gutem Grund. Der Auftrag 2009 war, dass die Kommission Kriterien festlegen soll, wie man endokrine Disruptoren denn wissenschaftlich bewertet und wie man einvernehmliche Kriterien festlegt. Das, was die Kommission jetzt vorlegt, geht aber weit darüber hinaus. Es geht deshalb darüber hinaus, weil die Kommission an vielen Punkten jetzt nicht versucht, Kriterien festzulegen, sondern schlichtweg versucht, Verbote im Umweltbereich damit wegzubekommen.

Das können wir nicht tolerieren, Herr Kommissar! Sie ändern sozusagen eine gesetzliche Grundlage, und deshalb ist das keine Frage, wie man das bewertet, sondern das ist eine hochproblematische politische Entscheidung, die Sie hier treffen und die wir nicht akzeptieren können. Unser Juristischer Dienst beim Parlament sagt ganz klar: Das ist ein Rechtsverstoß! Wenn wir uns als Parlament ernst nehmen – das muss man ganz klar sagen –, dann muss dieses Parlament sein Veto dagegen einlegen. Sie haben noch genügend Zeit, das zu überarbeiten und eine neue Vorlage zu machen. Wir lassen uns aber jetzt nicht zeitlich unter Druck setzen. Sie hatten immerhin lange genug Zeit, etwas Vernünftiges vorzulegen. Das haben Sie leider nicht getan, Herr Kommissar.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner. Endocrine disruptors are a problem but I think the problem with this issue is the time it has taken to get to this stage. Others have mentioned the eight-year gap in addressing the issue, which does not help in terms of confidence.

I think all of us want to protect public health. The question I face, somewhere in between the extremes in this debate, is whether we are better to go with what the Commission has tabled, so that we make progress – it is better than the status quo, as I understand it, and I listened carefully to the Commissioner's statement – or whether we should go with the objectors and say that we reject the Commission proposal and start from scratch.

My fear with that proposal is that we would then wait another eight years to achieve any progress at all. Perhaps I am exaggerating the case but it does seem to me that that is the likely outcome. I am looking towards an election in the European Parliament, a change of Members of Parliament, a change of Commission, and all the reasons why things get delayed along the way.

I am not sure what is wrong with the World Health Organisation definition, which we are accepting here, and I think that is something to follow, and wisely so. But if we accept the Commission proposal, which is my inclination at this stage, and reject your objections, colleagues, then I would like us to keep a close eye on the monitoring in relation to your idea of the definition, so that we can intervene earlier than is suggested.

These are my thoughts at this stage. But we are talking about the health and well-being of consumers and of farmers, and we have to put that as our priority.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Hormonforstyrrende stoffer er et stort sundhedsproblem for os. Vi bliver nødt til som lovgivere at gøre noget ved det. Det er derfor, vi i Europa-Parlamentet i årevis har ønsket at få en basis for at kunne gribe ind over for de hormonforstyrrende stoffer. Det er altså vigtigt at få nogle kriterier.

Når vi nu skal til at gøre det, bliver vi også nødt til at gøre det ordentligt. Det forslag, der ligger fra Kommissionen, er simpelthen ikke godt nok. Den ene del handler om det, som kollegerne har talt om, undtagelsen. Det nytter ikke noget, at vi starter med vores basiskriterier og så allerede der indfører en undtagelse. Men det handler også om flere ting. Det handler også om niveauet for den dokumentation, der skal laves for overhovedet at finde et hormonforstyrrende stof. Dokumentationsniveauet er så højt, at det ligger langt, langt over de kriterier, vi har, når vi for eksempel skal vurdere kræftfremkaldende stoffer. Det går simpelthen ikke! Det er ikke kun os her i Parlamentet, men også nogle medlemslande, som synes, dette er et problem. Dertil hører mit eget medlemsland, Danmark, som bestemt ikke ønsker, at vi skal sige ja til det forslag, der ligger på bordet nu.

Jeg bliver vred, når vi får ansvaret for, at det trækker ud, når ansvaret ligger hos jer i Kommissionen for ikke at have ageret. Der bliver talt om, at dette er et kompromis. Jeg mener ikke, at vi kan gå på kompromis med borgernes sundhed. Vi bliver nødt til at gøre det ordentlig fra starten.

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, cette question de la définition des perturbateurs endocriniens est essentielle. L'OMS a fait les comptes en 2013: 800 substances chimiques modifient le système hormonal humain. Il s'agit de 800 substances qui sont responsables ou que l'on soupçonne de l'augmentation de toute une série de maladies: certains cancers, le diabète, l'obésité, l'infertilité, ainsi que différents troubles liés au développement du cerveau. C'est dire si l'enjeu de santé publique est majeur, mais les États membres se divisent sur la question de l'identification de ces critères.

Le compromis adopté au début des vacances en est la meilleure preuve, avec son boulevard de dérogations. En outrepassant ses compétences, et Bas l'a parfaitement expliqué, la Commission a exclu de la définition de ses pesticides ceux qui sont conçus précisément pour viser les systèmes hormonaux des insectes et des plantes avec des dégâts considérables sur ceux aux alentours qui ne sont pas visés.

L'*Endocrine Society*, qui regroupe 18 000 chercheurs et cliniciens dans le monde, nous fait part de son extrême inquiétude. Les citoyens en Europe sont mobilisés. Nous demandons donc demain une nouvelle définition des perturbateurs endocriniens, définition protégeant réellement la santé publique et l'environnement.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Commissaire à la santé, il y a quelques jours, le Parlement européen fermait ses portes à Monsanto, parce que Monsanto ne méprise pas simplement notre santé, Monsanto méprise notre démocratie.

Cela fait huit ans que, sur les perturbateurs endocriniens, la Commission laisse porte ouverte à tous les lobbies de la chimie, des pesticides... Cela fait huit ans que vous méprisez notre santé et que nous sommes en permanence obligés de vous rappeler à vos prérogatives et à la démocratie.

Alors aujourd'hui, maintenant qu'il est avéré que vous outrepassiez vos prérogatives, que vous outrepassiez vos compétences, vous avez raison de mentionner que les États membres ne sont pas clairs sur ce sujet-là, et j'ai moi-même profondément regretté le recul de la France sur le sujet, mais c'est votre responsabilité d'être garante des lois qui sont adoptées, y compris dans ce Parlement.

Vous les lisez tous les jours, les études qui dénoncent les dangers. Alors demain, pour des raisons de santé, pour des raisons de démocratie, nous allons refuser vos critères pour que vous fassiez de nouveau votre boulot, pour la santé et pour la démocratie !

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, hormonihäiritsijät vaikuttavat pieninä annoksina usein ylisukupolisesti ja niitä saadaan useista lähteistä. Me kaikki tiedämme, että tämä on aliarvioitu, peruuttamaton ja pitkäaikainen riski. Siksi on ollut valitettavaa nähdä, miten komissio on laahannut jalkoja tämän asian kanssa sekä kriteerien valmistelussa, jossa oikeuden kautta jouduttiin vauhdittamaan tätä prosessia, että sisällön muodostamisessa. Siksi tuntuu myös pahalle, että nyt komissio viittaa parlamenttiin suhteessa kiireeseen, kun ensin koko valmisteluprosessi on ollut hyvin ongelmallinen.

Toiseksi komissio todellakin on parlamentin lainopillisen arvion mukaan ylittänyt toimivaltansa. Se on tehnyt poliittisen kompromissin. Arvoisa komissaari, ymmärrän kuinka hankalaa poliittisten kompromissien tekeminen on, mutta ihmisten terveydellä ja juridisesti se ei ollut tässä mahdollista. Joskus on parempi olla tekemättä huonoa lainsäädäntöä, joka on pitkäaikainen, kuin jättää se tekemättä. Se on syy parlamentin hylkäyskantaan, joka on mielestäni järkevä.

Guillaume Balas (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'histoire se répète indéfiniment. La Commission n'agit pas sur des problèmes de santé absolument essentiels, comme celui des perturbateurs endocriniens, si bien qu'elle finit par être condamnée pour cette inaction. Ensuite, elle entreprend d'agir, mais le résultat est médiocre et insuffisant. Des dérogations graves sont accordées pour inscrire dans le marbre le fait que de grandes entreprises, de grandes multinationales de la chimie, puissent continuer à nous polluer. Mais vous nous dites: «C'est à prendre ou à laisser, et si vous n'acceptez pas notre proposition, alors vous n'aurez rien».

Donc là, on s'attaque non seulement à la santé des gens, mais aussi à la démocratie. En somme, nous, qui avons été élus par les peuples européens, nous n'aurions pas la légitimité suffisante pour vous demander à vous, l'exécutif européen, de faire une chose très simple, à savoir de retirer votre proposition et de nous en présenter une nouvelle. C'est là qu'est votre rôle, et c'est ce qu'aujourd'hui, vous devez aux peuples européens et ce que vous nous devez à nous, qui avons été élus par les citoyens européens.

Donc, que ce soit sur la question de la santé, gravement mise en danger, tous les scientifiques le disent, par les perturbateurs endocriniens – et l'on sait que votre proposition actuelle sur le sujet est insuffisante, voire dangereuse – ou que ce soit sur la question de la démocratie, aujourd'hui, vous avez tout faux.

C'est pour cela que nous allons voter cette objection, et nous vous demandons de faire preuve de responsabilité et de nous faire une nouvelle proposition qui, cette fois-ci, réponde aux attentes, notamment en ce qui concerne la santé de nos concitoyens européens.

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, je vedecky podloženým faktom, že endokrinné disruptory sú látky, ktoré majú schopnosť ovplyvňovať hormonálny systém ľudí, a tým negatívne vplyvať na ich zdravie. Tieto chemické látky bývajú často spájané s vážnymi ochoreniami, nevynímajúc rakovinu, obezitu, problémy s plodnosťou, mutagenitu či rôzne nervové ochorenia. Európska únia si plne uvedomuje závažnosť súvisiacich rizík a proti následkom takýchto negatívnych vplyvov bojujeme už dlhodobo aj v tomto parlamente. Veď mnohé látky, ktoré endokrinné disruptory obsahujú, už v súčasnosti platná európska legislatíva o pesticídoch a biocídoch aj zakazuje. Z pohľadu lekára považujem ľudský život a zdravie za tie najvyššie hodnoty a cieľ, ktorý by sme mali primárne sledovať aj v procese normotvorby. Domnievam sa zároveň, že aj v súvislosti s aktuálne diskutovaným legislatívnym návrhom je nevyhnutné prihliadať predovšetkým na poznatky vedy a dbať na dôsledné zakomponovanie vedeckých kritérií do právnych predpisov, aby sme zabezpečili čo najvyššiu možnú ochranu zdravia dospelých i našich detí. Regulačný rámec Únie sa prijatím kritérií navrhovaných Komisiou stane v globálnom meradle vôbec najprísnejším, a teda postačujúcim z hľadiska efektívnej ochrany zdravia európskych občanov. Kľúčový bude však dôsledný proces implementácie – na tom trvám –, bez ktorého je aj najkvalitnejšie pripravená legislatíva len úmyslom, a nie faktom.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich sehe es als unsere Aufgabe, zwei wesentliche Dinge zu tun: Das eine ist, Umwelt und Gesundheit zu schützen, und das andere ist, unsere Rechtsgrundsätze einzuhalten. Mit dem, was Sie uns präsentiert haben, werden beide Kriterien nicht erfüllt. Wir erfüllen nicht den höchstmöglichen Schutz der Gesundheit, und wir erfüllen nicht den höchstmöglichen Schutz der Umwelt, aber wir widersprechen auch unseren Rechtsgrundsätzen. Denn im Gegensatz zu dem, was Sie in Ihren Ausführungen betont haben, dass die Kommission die Befugnisse nicht überschritten hat, ist dieses Hohe Haus und ebenso auch der Juristische Dienst des Parlaments ganz eindeutig der Auffassung, dass Sie genau das getan haben, dass nämlich mit dieser Ausnahmeregelung der Basisrechtsakt so wesentlich verändert worden ist, dass das nicht in Ihrer Kompetenz liegt.

Die sachlichen und fachlichen Argumente gegen Ihren Vorschlag haben Sie heute wirklich deutlich zu hören bekommen. Wir erwarten von Ihnen, dass wir schnellstmöglich einen geänderten Vorschlag erhalten, in dem diese Ausnahmeregelung nicht zu finden ist. Wir fühlen uns auch nicht dafür verantwortlich, dass es fast acht Jahre gedauert hat, bis etwas vorgelegt worden ist. Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass, wenn dieser eine Absatz, um den es hier geht, nämlich diese Ausnahmeregelung, entfernt ist, wir sehr schnell etwas finden werden, das der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und auch dem besten Schutz für Gesundheit und Umwelt gerecht wird.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Mr President, the Commission's proposal is the result of efforts and dialogue between the Commission and the Member States, and it is very balanced and reasonable. The proposal is based on the WHO definition of endocrine disruptors and it is based on three elements: adverse effect, endocrine activity and causal link. Unfortunately, the discussions on endocrine disruptors derive from arguments that are more emotional, and much incomplete and false information has been circulated. The stringent EU regulation framework in place does address endocrine disruption, maybe not as ideally as some of us would want to, but there is no legal vacuum now in Europe.

As we speak, citizens are not left unprotected. I do not understand the goal of the objection because there is no benefit for health and environment in maintaining the interim criteria. The criteria are based on science and reflect an approach supported by 21 Member States, as the Commissioner stated earlier. The EU would be a pioneer in this field, and we could inspire other global players in legislating on endocrine disruptors.

Those colleagues who are now initiating the objection, opting instead to reject the proposal and ask the European Commission to come with a new proposal, are either idealistic or are merely engaging in an exercise of rhetoric. It is impossible to come up with a new proposal as soon as possible. It will take some time, maybe years. So let us be reasonable and really work to the benefit of European citizens.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è la prima volta che affrontiamo in quest’Aula il tema degli interferenti endocrini e non sarà nemmeno l’ultima. Sappiamo tutti, ad esempio, che il regolamento europeo relativo all’immissione sul mercato dei prodotti fitosanitari prevede che una sostanza attiva possa essere autorizzata solo se non altera negativamente il sistema endocrino.

Ritengo che la proposta di individuazione degli interferenti endocrini avanzata dalla Commissione vada oltre i poteri conferiti alla stessa, perché restringe arbitrariamente il campo degli interferenti ed è quindi inadatta a garantire un’adeguata protezione della salute umana e dell’ambiente.

Una simile decisione dovrebbe essere preceduta da una modifica del regolamento sui prodotti fitosanitari, modifica che può avvenire solo attraverso un normale iter legislativo e quindi con l’approvazione del Parlamento e del Consiglio. Ma vi è di più: la mancata inclusione nella proposta della Commissione di una categoria di interferenti endocrini sospetti e di riferimenti incrociati, in caso di presenza concomitante di due o più interferenti, è una carenza inaccettabile.

Non possiamo continuare ad anteporre gli interessi economici dei grandi gruppi industriali alla salute dei cittadini europei.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι ενδοκρινικοί διαταράκτες είναι επικίνδυνες χημικές ουσίες που περιέχονται σε υλικά, σε παιχνίδια, σε τροφές. Είναι δεδομένο ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα κατά της χρήσης όλων αυτών των χημικών ουσιών που έχουν βλαβερές επιπτώσεις στη δημόσια υγεία και στο περιβάλλον. Όπως προκύπτει, τα κριτήρια ταυτοποίησης και εντοπισμού των ενδοκρινικών διαταρακτών πρέπει να καθοριστούν βάσει επιστημονικών και τεχνικών προδιαγραφών. Δεν μπορεί να είναι αποτέλεσμα ενός πολιτικού συμβιβασμού των κρατών μελών. Αυτό που βλέπουμε όμως είναι ότι υπάρχει ένας πολιτικός συμβιβασμός που δεν έχει καμία σχέση με επιστημονικά κριτήρια. Ούτε βέβαια πρέπει να δεχθούμε την αντιστροφή του βάρους απόδειξης.

Κατά την άποψή μας, η Επιτροπή έχει υπερβεί τις εξουσίες τις οποίες έχει αποκτήσει στο συγκεκριμένο αντικείμενο. Θεωρούμε, λοιπόν, ότι πρόκειται για μονομερή υπέρβαση των εξουσιών και φυσικά αρμόδιο για τη λήψη των αποφάσεων είναι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο σε συνεργασία με το Συμβούλιο. Επαναλαμβάνουμε, λοιπόν, ότι πρόκειται για «καραμπινάτη» υπέρβαση εξουσιών εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez dit qu’il faut protéger la santé et l’environnement. Si nous en sommes là aujourd’hui, si nous faisons cette objection, c’est d’abord à cause de la Commission.

La première fois, en 2013, vous deviez définir des critères. En 2015, ces critères n’avaient toujours pas été fixés. Il a fallu saisir la Cour de justice européenne. Maintenant, nous ne sommes pas d’accord avec votre définition. Pourquoi? Parce que vous faites une exemption sur des produits qui sont fabriqués pour être des perturbateurs endocriniens. Les services juridiques disent que vous outrepassiez vos droits.

Aussi, je m’adresse à mes collègues: aujourd’hui, si nous votons cette définition qui ne satisfait pas les endocrinologues sur le plan international, nous l’aurons tout au long de législation car elle fera référence. Il ne faut absolument pas être complice d’une définition qui ne correspond pas à la protection de la santé et de l’environnement.

Par conséquent, Monsieur le commissaire, il faut revoir cette définition. Il ne faut pas que vous soyez complice d’un système dans lequel les lobbies chimiques poussent à avoir cette dérogation. Revoyez votre copie parce que si nous en sommes ici aujourd’hui et que nous nous bagarrons autant, c’est dans l’intérêt des citoyens européens et non pas dans l’intérêt du privé.

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

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Komisijos narys. – Gerbiami kolegos, gerbiami Parlamento nariai, aš labai įdėmiai klausiau jūsų pasisakymų. Norėčiau dėl kiekvieno pasisakymo pasakyti keletą pastabų, bet gaila, kad kai kurie kolegos nutarė neklausyti mano atsakymo, išėjo iš salės, nors kalbėjo labai kategoriškai. Ir aš norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį, kolegos, į keletą būtinų faktų.

Pirmas dalykas, puikiai žinome, kad šie pasiūlymai buvo pradėti diskutuojant su visa moksline bendruomene Europos Sąjungoje: endokrinologais, toksikologais, onkologais, kardiologais. Aš pats esu kardiologas. Aš žinau, ką reiškia žmonių sveikata. Ir jokios multinacionalinės korporacijos čia nepadės. Ne apie tai eina kalba.

Kalba eina apie mokslinius kriterijus ir mes matėme, kad tarp mokslininkų daug labai skirtingų nuomonių. Kadangi ir reguliavimo sferos labai plačios, tad nutarėm pasiekti mokslinio sutarimo. Mes nesame mokslininkų teisėjai. Jie pateikė savo sutarimą ir bendrą žvilgsnį. Ir taip pat jie diskutavo dėl metodologijų ir dėl reguliavimo mechanizmo.

Aš labai norėčiau išgirsti jūsų konkrečius pasiūlymus dėl metodologijų. Juk mes pradėjome diskutuoti ENVI komitete nuo pat 2014 m., man atėjus čia. Pristatėm 2015 m. pozicijas, po to diskutavome dėl *impact assesment'o*, tuomet buvo *public consultations* laikas, diskutavom labai daug. Tiesą pasakius, komitete mes ne vieną kartą apie tai kalbėjome, nes profiline komitetas dirba su tomis pozicijomis. Man tai priimtina, man priimtini argumentai. Suprantama, kad diskutavom ir teisinius argumentus, ir štai – net ne prieš metus su Europos Taryba pradėjom diskutuoti, o tik šių metų liepos mėn., kadangi užbaigėm sudėtingus derinimus, Komisijoj derinom su Komisijos Teisės tarnyba, ji nėra nekompetentinga, nes, kaip žinot, neįmanoma pateikti pasiūlymo negavus Teisės tarnybos sutikimo.

Aš suprantu, kad skirtingų institucijų teisės tarnybos gali skirtingai interpretuoti, bet aš nesu šalininkas teisinio ginčo. Ir todėl aš manau, kad mes pateikėme subalansuotą pasiūlymą ir su tam tikromis metodologijomis. Kai diskutavom su Taryba, taip, šalys narės pateikė skirtingus argumentus, reikėjo juos derinti, bet šita pateikta pataisėlė – ji nepažeidžia bendrų kriterijų ir mokslinių apibrėžimų. Daugiau nėra, yra tik Pasaulio sveikatos organizacijos bendras apibrėžimas. Mes juo ir remiamės. Todėl aš manau, kad šiandien yra tikrai puiki proga diskutuoti, ypač su tais, kurie išėjo, kurie dabar manęs neklauso. Diskutuoti, nes aš atviras diskusijoms. Daug kas kalbėjo apie demokratiją, čia ir yra demokratija – diskutuoti, bet ne pasakyti nuomonę ir išeiti. Aš linkęs į diskusijas.

Let me conclude. I am aware that some of you consider the criteria proposed as imperfect. I would, however, like to strongly emphasise once again that their adoption would be a significant step forward compared to the current situation with respect to the better protection of human health and the environment.

The current applicable interim criteria are, indeed, not fit for purpose. It is true. We could discuss the theory of the perfect criteria for many more years, as opinions and views on this topic remain deeply divided. However, we will only make progress on this issue if we replace the interim criteria and start to apply new criteria. We will be the pioneering Union in the world. These criteria will constitute a unique opportunity to better protect the health of citizens and the environment. I therefore ask you not to vote in favour of the proposed objection tomorrow.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Carolina Punset (ALDE), por escrito. – Nos hemos acostumbrado a las primaveras silenciosas, casi sin insectos, sin pájaros y con muy poca vida silvestre. El uso extendido químicos en todos los ámbitos de la actividad humana y sus efectos como disruptores endocrinos fue advertido en 2013 por la OMS. Este organismo destacó que la exposición a estos productos es preocupante no solo para la vida salvaje, sino también para los seres humanos. La OMS insistió en que los legisladores debían tomar medidas para regular la exposición humana y ambiental a estas sustancias. Después de una larga espera, la Comisión nos sorprende con una definición de disruptor hormonal, que excluye a los plaguicidas disruptores hormonales de insectos y los exige de ser considerados como tales, incluso si tienen efecto hormonal en otros artrópodos. ¿Es así como la Comisión cumple su mandato de protección de las personas, los animales, el medio ambiente y sus ecosistemas? Esta exclusión afecta al 95 % del reino animal formado por artrópodos, con roles clave en el equilibrio de los ecosistemas, además de arriesgar la salud de humanos y otros vertebrados. Es inaceptable una definición así que, además, obliga a efectuar pruebas de peso para la determinación del efecto endocrino que podrían dilatarse años.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – Les perturbateurs endocriniens, ces substances qui perturbent l'organisme et induisent des effets néfastes, ne peuvent en aucun cas être autorisés. Malheureusement, sous pression de certains États membres, la Commission européenne a, dans le cadre du texte qui va nous être soumis, largement outrepassé son mandat, en ajoutant une dérogation autorisant des pesticides. La raison: le but desdits produits est précisément d'éviter aux nuisibles de se reproduire.

Mais qu'en est-il vis-à-vis des êtres humains? Après la saga du glyphosate, voici donc venue la saga des perturbateurs endocriniens? Non. Dans ces deux cas, le principe de précaution doit continuer à prévaloir! Cela sera le sens de mon vote, comme cela l'a d'ailleurs toujours été.

Supprimons la clause visant les perturbateurs par conception. Demandons le retrait du règlement d'exécution et demandons la présentation d'une nouvelle proposition, sans délai. Une fois le texte, je l'espère, adopté, la Commission européenne devra retirer son projet et revoir sa copie en négociations avec les États membres. Et l'on prouvera au passage que, non, «Bruxelles» ne décide pas de tout.

16. Samenstelling fracties: zie notulen

17. Veiligheidsvoorschriften en -normen voor passagiersschepen – Registratie van de opvarenden van passagiersschepen die vanuit of naar havens in de lidstaten varen – Inspectiesysteem voor de veilige exploitatie van ro-ro-veerboten en hogesnelheidspassagiersvaartuigen op geregelde diensten (debat) (debat)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate conjunto sobre:

— el informe de Daniela Aiuto, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/45/CE sobre las reglas y normas de seguridad aplicables a los buques de pasaje (COM(2016)0369 - C8-0208/2016 - 2016/0170(COD)) (A8-0167/2017),

— el informe de Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo que modifica la Directiva 98/41/CE del Consejo, sobre el registro de las personas que viajan a bordo de buques de pasaje procedentes de puertos de los Estados miembros de la Comunidad o con destino a los mismos y la Directiva 2010/65/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, sobre las formalidades informativas exigibles a los buques a su llegada o salida de los puertos de los Estados miembros (COM(2016)0370 - C8-0209/2016 - 2016/0171(COD)) (A8-0168/2017), y

— el informe de Dominique Riquet, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre un sistema de inspecciones para garantizar la seguridad en la explotación de transbordadores de carga rodada y naves de pasaje de gran velocidad en servicio regular y por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/16/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre el control de los buques por el Estado rector del puerto y se deroga la Directiva 1999/35/CE del Consejo (COM(2016)0371 - C8-0210/2016 - 2016/0172(COD)) (A8-0165/2017)

Daniela Aiuto, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo arrivati al termine di questo percorso di revisione della legislazione europea in materia di trasporto marittimo, svolgendo un ottimo lavoro di concerto tra Parlamento, Commissione e Consiglio. Ringrazio tutti i colleghi della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo, i rappresentanti della Commissione europea, i rappresentanti della Presidenza del Consiglio maltese per il proficuo e costruttivo lavoro.

La sicurezza marittima è un tema di vitale importanza per tutti i passeggeri europei ed è fondamentale che si lavori per raggiungere standard sempre più elevati negli Stati membri, pur nel rispetto di tutte quelle che sono le norme internazionali definite nell'ambito dell'IMO. È dunque importante che vi sia congruità ed efficacia di tutte le norme adottate e che l'Europa mantenga sempre un ruolo proattivo e da protagonista in tal senso.

Parlamento e Consiglio hanno accolto con favore la proposta di revisione e di semplificazione della Commissione, al fine di rendere più chiari svariati settori previsti dalla legislazione vigente e rimuovere le ambiguità che creavano problemi nell'attuazione e nella trasposizione delle norme.

Siamo stati concordi sull'esclusione dal campo di applicazione della direttiva di una serie di categorie di imbarcazioni per le quali, effettivamente, si riteneva sproporzionata l'attuazione delle norme prescritte. Mi riferisco in particolare alle navi da passeggeri di lunghezza inferiore a 24 metri, alle navi di servizio che trasportano lavoratori verso impianti offshore, alle navi a vela, purché munite di propulsione meccanica ausiliare.

Ritengo sia stato invece importante chiarire e includere il concetto di alluminio come materiale equivalente. È importante che ciò avvenga, in quanto dobbiamo tenere in considerazione quelle che sono le proprietà intrinseche del materiale e la necessità di compararle alla capacità ignifuga di materiali simili. L'alluminio deve essere considerato un materiale equivalente all'acciaio: ne va della sicurezza dei passeggeri in caso di incidenti e incendi.

Tuttavia, come Parlamento, abbiamo molto insistito affinché non vi siano zone grigie di sicurezza per le categorie escluse. È per questo che abbiamo ribadito la necessità di un impegno, da parte della Commissione e degli Stati membri, ad adoperarsi, sia a livello nazionale che a livello di IMO, affinché la garanzia della sicurezza sia sempre garantita.

Altro punto per noi importante, emerso nei lavori parlamentari e portato avanti anche nei negoziati con il Consiglio, è stato quello dell'importanza data all'elemento umano e di correlare la dimensione sociale dei lavoratori direttamente alla sicurezza a bordo. Le condizioni che riguardano la vita a bordo del personale e gli aspetti sociali influiscono sull'efficienza e sull'efficacia della prevenzione di rischi, di problemi e di incidenti.

È importante che questo collegamento diventi una costante e sia trasversale in tutte le politiche dell'Unione europea in materia di trasporti. È per questo che mi rivolgo al Commissario affinché si faccia portavoce di questa istanza anche nelle future iniziative legislative. Solo se gli addetti ai lavori operano in condizioni ottimali, i passeggeri potranno avere standard di sicurezza adeguati.

Punto ancora importante per il Parlamento è stato quello della trasparenza: abbiamo insistito affinché qualsiasi esenzione, equivalenza e ulteriore misura di sicurezza sia pubblicata su un sito web accessibile al pubblico e anche su tale tema siamo riusciti a trovare una convergenza con la Presidenza maltese.

Abbiamo accolto le istanze provenienti da alcuni Stati membri al fine di tutelare le specificità nazionali, in alcuni casi di natura geografica, in altri legate ad aspetti occupazionali e lavorativi. Siamo riusciti a raggiungere, dunque, un accordo con il Consiglio, consci che le disposizioni adottate da questa Assemblea devono sempre essere un valore aggiunto per gli Stati membri e non un elemento deleterio, come purtroppo talvolta è accaduto in passato.

In conclusione, mi auguro che questa procedura di revisione della legislazione vigente nel settore marittimo possa portare a un effettivo beneficio ai passeggeri, agli addetti ai lavori, alle imprese del settore e, più in generale, al tema della sicurezza dei trasporti in Europa.

Mi auguro che la Commissione continuerà in futuro a monitorare con attenzione l'evolversi delle norme adottate per assicurare standard sempre elevati ai cittadini europei.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, ponente. – Señor presidente, mejorar la seguridad de los pasajeros en el transporte marítimo, ofreciendo datos homogéneos a los servicios de rescate en caso de accidente en toda la Unión, y hacerlo desde el más escrupuloso respeto de la privacidad y de la normativa europea de protección de datos, es el objetivo de este informe.

Recogemos aquí un acuerdo que ha contado desde el principio con la mejor disposición por parte de todos, una actitud que quiero reconocer y quiero agradecer especialmente a Itxaso y Mae el trabajo desempeñado, a los ponentes alternativos y también a la Comisión. Pero permítanme que subraye especialmente el papel de la Presidencia maltesa, que merece un público reconocimiento por el empeño con que ha desempeñado su presidencia semestral.

Este informe quiere contribuir además al objetivo compartido de legislar mejor, de eliminar obstáculos gracias a normas más simples, porque, en este concreto aspecto de los datos de los pasajeros, la dispersión normativa, los condicionantes organizativos y la distancia que había entre lo que planteaban las normas y lo que permite la tecnología era ya hoy inaceptable: una brecha que, además de penalizar la eficacia en una posible operación de rescate, abonaba la inseguridad jurídica.

Así, este acuerdo con el Consejo se centra en las nuevas reglas para digitalizar el registro de pasajeros de buques y ofrecer datos completos a los servicios de rescate para mejorar su operatividad. Así protegemos el derecho y respondemos también a la necesidad de los familiares de disponer de una información constatada y segura en situaciones de emergencia y de angustia.

El propósito es hacer que el número exacto de pasajeros y otra información útil esté inmediatamente disponible para los servicios de búsqueda y salvamento en caso de accidente. En la actualidad se pueden perder valiosos minutos, porque los datos de las personas a bordo son almacenados por una compañía naviera. El centro de búsqueda y de rescate tiene que pedir a la persona de contacto de la compañía la información necesaria, y, en forma digital, la información será directamente accesible.

Para facilitar la asistencia a las víctimas y sus familiares, los datos registrados incluirán la nacionalidad de los pasajeros. La normativa vigente obliga a la compañía naviera a registrar el nombre, la fecha de nacimiento, el sexo y, si así lo desea el pasajero, la necesidad de asistencia especial en caso de emergencia. Además, se añade la posibilidad voluntaria de que el pasajero incluya un número telefónico de contacto para casos de emergencia.

Con arreglo a los nuevos requisitos, los datos se enviarán a la autoridad competente en formato electrónico en los quince minutos siguientes a la salida del buque. Pueden utilizarse dos medios de transmisión: la ventanilla única nacional o el sistema de identificación automática, sujeto a ciertas condiciones. Los avances en el desarrollo de las ventanillas únicas nacionales espero que sirvan de base para impulsar una ventanilla única europea en un futuro.

El acuerdo se caracteriza, además, por su capacidad para ofrecer soluciones y flexibilidad y contempla situaciones específicas para travesías breves que afectan a Alemania, Dinamarca y Suecia. En estos casos, se aceptará la transmisión de datos hasta una hora después del comienzo del viaje. La privacidad y la protección de datos queda garantizada por la inmediata destrucción de estas listas de pasajeros, automáticamente y sin demora injustificada, en cuanto concluya el viaje y los datos dejen de ser necesarios para apoyar a los servicios de rescate en un accidente, emergencia o para su uso en causas judiciales.

Los Estados miembros dispondrán de cuatro años para realizar la necesaria transición tecnológica y organizativa y de otros dos a partir de la entrada en vigor de la Directiva para poder incorporar las nuevas normas a su legislación nacional.

Dominique Riquet, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers confrères, mes chers collègues, ce rapport sur le système d'inspection des transbordeurs rouliers et des ferries est l'occasion de rappeler cet affreux accident qui a eu lieu à une heure du matin, le 28 septembre 1994, entre Tallinn et Stockholm. Ce jour-là, en moins de dix minutes, une ouverture non contrôlée des portes de chargement a permis à l'eau de s'engouffrer dans le ferry Estonia qui a sombré entraînant la mort de 852 personnes. C'est l'accident impliquant un navire de passagers le plus mortel en Europe après le Titanic, et cela s'est passé il y a moins de 23 ans. Et ce n'est pas un accident isolé. Quelques années auparavant, c'est au large du port de Zeebrugge qu'une autre catastrophe avait causé la mort, dans les mêmes conditions, de 193 personnes. Et, il y a quatre ans, au large de la Corée du Sud, 454 enfants ont trouvé la mort dans le naufrage d'un ferry.

En 2015, les ports de l'Union européenne ont enregistré 395 millions de passagers maritimes. C'est un nombre considérable, c'est pourquoi il est primordial que la sécurité de ces passagers soit assurée selon les normes les plus élevées.

Cette directive relative à un système d'inspection pour l'exploitation en toute sécurité de services réguliers de transbordeurs rouliers et d'engins à passagers à grande vitesse est une modification de la directive relative au contrôle par l'État du port, qui devient la directive de référence, et abroge par la même occasion la directive sur un système de visites obligatoires spécifiques aux transbordeurs rouliers.

L'exercice a d'abord été de simplifier, rationaliser et concentrer les normes existantes. Nous avons ensuite renforcé et clarifié le règlement, les éléments clés du rapport étant les suivants: clarification des responsabilités entre l'État du port et l'État du pavillon en évitant les doublons et les vides juridiques; définition de l'autorité compétente de l'État membre; clarification de la périodicité des inspections, lesquelles doivent avoir lieu deux fois par an, dont une en opération, et à intervalle de quatre à huit mois.

Une autre nouveauté est que les inspections des transbordeurs rouliers et des engins à passagers à grande vitesse doivent être considérés comme absolument prioritaires dans le quota des inspections annuelles des États membres.

Un article a été ajouté sur la prise en compte des risques liés aux passagers et à l'équipage, afin d'inclure un élément humain supplémentaire dans ces inspections.

Une formulation de la Commission permet d'adopter autant que nécessaire les actes délégués dans des conditions adaptées. Enfin, nous avons un accord sur les réinspections en cas de changement d'affectation du navire.

Finalement, une base de données sera mise en place pour permettre d'échanger les informations dans les plus brefs délais lors des inspections en cours entre les États membres.

Laissez-moi remercier ici tous les rapporteurs fictifs de la commission des transports et du tourisme pour leur travail et leur excellente collaboration, le directeur compétent de la Commission européenne pour son soutien et son expertise, sans oublier bien sûr la Présidence maltaise pour sa coopération, son ambition de mener à bien cette tripléte de directives et sa capacité à faire droit aux remarques et aux demandes du Parlement européen.

C'est ainsi qu'en juin dernier, nous avons trouvé rapidement un accord en trilogue sur cette directive. J'espère qu'elle recueillera un vote massif de notre Parlement.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, passenger ships play a key role in the mobility of our citizens as well as being a holiday experience. With more than 200 million passengers embarking from European Union ports each year, their safety is at the heart of our common transport policy. The vote in this House will make our safety rules clearer, more proportionate and better fit for purpose.

The three directives on passenger and ship safety that we are debating today were put in place 20 years ago to provide for a common level of safety and to remove barriers to trade. It was now high time to ensure that these objectives are improved upon in view of the implementation of experience and technological progress. We can only applaud the constructive and positive approach of the co-legislators that made it possible to reach a compromise in one month. This clearly shows that the safety of European Union citizens is our principal and shared objective.

The new legal act can still be adopted this year as we regard 2017 as 'Maritime Transport' year, during which we are working intensively with all stakeholders and, of course, for the benefit of citizens as is the case when safety rules are reviewed.

On Directive 2009/45/EC on safety rules and standards for passenger ships: concerning the safety rules and standards for passenger ships, we welcome an agreement reached on how to deal with an aluminium ship built outside the scope of the directive. The agreed phase-in period provides for a clear direction to influence the business strategies of the shipyards in question in order to adapt and maintain jobs. The duration of this transition still remains long.

On the issue of derogation for land-locked countries with no passenger ships, we are reassured by the agreed solution. While minimising the administrative burden, it provides for strong safeguards that prevent Member States from allowing ships to fly their flag unless they have transposed the corresponding directive.

On Directive 98/41/EC on the registration of passengers, we are glad to see that the Commission's proposal has been preserved and the vision of electronic data reporting confirmed. However, the six-year phase-in period is a lost opportunity considering the speed of digitalisation in many areas of life. We truly hope that most Member States will not make use of such a long phase-in period in practice. To finish on a positive note, the Commission wholeheartedly welcomes the amendment driven by Parliament to halve the delay in reporting the information on persons on board to the single window.

On Directive 1999/35/EC, the inspection proposal means a reduced administrative burden for shipowners. Member States maritime administrations will be able to rationalise their inspection efforts, all the while preserving the same safety level. The new rules should make it easier for the operators to comply with legislation and for the national competent authorities to apply it. It also makes it easier for us – the Commission and the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) – to support Member States in implementation and enforcement. We want to take this opportunity to highlight the indispensable contribution of the EMSA in this respect, including its role in enabling the information sharing between Member States.

Joëlle Bergeron, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission JURI*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, je tiens à féliciter ma collègue Daniela Aiuto pour avoir présenté dans son rapport les objectifs que nous nous étions fixés en commission juridique, à savoir le maintien d'un niveau de sécurité élevé sur les navires et la préservation de la confiance des passagers.

Dans le cadre du processus de simplification opéré par la Commission, bon nombre des définitions contenues dans la directive ont été adaptées aux circonstances actuelles, en raison notamment de l'évolution des technologies dans le domaine des transports maritimes. Tel est le cas en particulier pour les matériaux de construction des navires.

En effet, dans sa version initiale, la directive ne s'appliquait, par exemple, qu'aux navires en acier et matériaux équivalents, mais elle n'a pas été mise en œuvre de la même manière dans tous les États membres, et ce au mépris des règles de sécurité.

La proposition clarifie donc le champ d'application de la directive en ce qui concerne la définition de l'aluminium en tant que matériau équivalent et résistant autre que l'acier, et ce afin de parvenir à des normes de sécurité élevées et communes pour tous ces navires.

Il s'agit donc ici d'élever le niveau de sécurité pour les navires à passagers, et il y a lieu de réserver un accueil favorable à cette initiative européenne.

Helga Stevens, *rapporteur voor advies commissie LIBE*. – De richtlijn van 1998 was de eerste Europese wet rond de veiligheid van passagiersschepen in de EU. Het doel is niet alleen te verzekeren dat de veiligheid van passagiers op passagiersschepen niet in gevaar wordt gebracht door het toegestane maximum aantal passagiers te overschrijden, maar de richtlijn bepaalt ook dat opsporings- en reddingsoperaties na een ongeval efficiënt dienen te verlopen.

Deze richtlijn wordt nu geactualiseerd. In de Commissie burgerlijke vrijheden, justitie en binnenlandse zaken volgde ik dit dossier op en diende ik een aantal amendementen in. Ik ben blij dat vele van mijn voorstellen zijn opgenomen in de definitieve versie, aangenomen door de Commissie vervoer.

Zo werd naast gegevensbeschermingsbeginselen ook de verplichting opgenomen om de nationaliteit van een opvarende mee te delen aan de kapitein van het schip. Op die manier kan bij ongevallen sneller betrouwbare informatie aan verwanten bezorgd worden.

Daarom werden de identificatieprocedures vereenvoudigd. Identificatie neemt altijd tijd in beslag en dus hoe sneller, hoe beter voor ongeruste familieleden.

Wim van de Camp, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Ik wil op de eerste plaats mijn collega Cláudia Monteiro verontschuldigen, die schaduwrapporteur was voor twee van deze verslagen.

Uit de belangstelling voor dit debat zou je niet afleiden dat het hier om een groot maritiem dossier gaat. Er zijn verschillende aspecten die wij vanavond bespreken, die rechtstreeks het werk van de interne markt beïnvloeden. Een interne markt op maritiem gebied, en dat is voor Europa van groot belang.

Inderdaad allereerst de veiligheid van de schepen en de passagiersschepen. Een groot onderwerp, helaas met een paar ongelukken in het verleden. En als we buiten Europa kijken, zien we nog veel van die ongelukken.

Tweede element is inderdaad de automatisering en de registratie. Mevrouw Stevens zei het al: betere veiligheid voor de passagiers, dat ze weten waar ze aan toe zijn.

Het derde onderwerp is de inspectie. Wij moeten oppassen in Europa dat we niet te veel overlapping van inspecties hebben. Met het laatste voorstel worden de inspecties versimpeld, vereenvoudigd en verbeterd.

Tot slot de service aan de burgers. Dat is toch een belangrijk onderdeel van deze drie verslagen. Men weet sneller waar men aan toe is. Men weet sneller wie er aan boord is en dat zal wederom de veiligheid bevorderen.

Tot slot dank aan de rapporteurs, de schaduwrapporteurs, maar ook aan de trialogen die toch soepel zijn verlopen voor deze technische dossiers. We brengen de veiligheid en de ontwikkeling van "Maritiem in Europa" toch wel weer een stap vooruit.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowny Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! (Chociaż szkoda, że nie ma dzisiaj pani komisarz Bulc z nami, bo mam kilka ciepłych słów dla niej, co się rzadko zdarza.) Tragiczne wydarzenie, jakim była katastrofa promu Costa Concordia, było impulsem do usunięcia istniejących nieścisłości i różnic w interpretacji przepisów dotyczących bezpieczeństwa na statkach pasażerskich, z których korzysta co roku blisko 400 milionów osób. Pozytywnie więc należy ocenić działanie Komisji mającej na celu doprecyzowanie wielu przepisów, szczególnie jeśli chodzi o zagadnienia związane z konstrukcją statków pasażerskich.

Warto pochwalić nowe ramy prawne dla przyspieszenia cyfryzacji procesu rezerwacji biletów i rejestracji pasażerów. Szybki dostęp do danych osobowych podróżnych jest niezwykle ważny ze względów bezpieczeństwa, także w trakcie akcji ratunkowych. Należy docenić również elastyczność proponowanych rozwiązań, które wprowadzą racjonalne okresy przejściowe oraz istotne wyłączenia, na przykład dla statków pasażerskich o długości do 24 metrów.

Z pełnym przekonaniem popieram przyjęcie tego pakietu i mam nadzieję, że szybko przyniesie on wymierne efekty.

Gesine Meissner, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar in Vertretung von Frau Bulc! Es ist tatsächlich so, dass nicht nur der Unfall der Costa Concordia ausgelöst hat, dass wir uns hier im Parlament mit der Schiffssicherheit befassen, sondern eben auch andere Schiffsunglücke, die da gewesen sind. Es war einfach an der Zeit, die Schiffssicherheit auch bezüglich Materialien und Digitalisierung auf einen neuen Stand zu bringen, und das ist hiermit passiert.

Das ist natürlich sehr, sehr wichtig, weil sich die Schifffahrt immer größerer Beliebtheit erfreut. Es geht ja nicht nur um Schiffe, auf denen Fracht transportiert wird, sondern vor allen Dingen um Passagierschiffe und Fähren. Da ist es wirklich sehr notwendig, dass wir jetzt eine Lösung gefunden haben, die nicht nur aktuell den Gegebenheiten angepasst ist, sondern auch weniger Bürokratie bedeutet, Vermeidung von Dopplungen mit sich bringt, also gleichzeitig auch eine bessere Rechtsetzung bedeutet. Das ist das, was die neue Kommission angestrebt hat. Das begrüßen wir sehr, und deswegen unterstützen wir als Parlament das auch sehr.

Malta ist ja eine Seefahrernation. Unter maltesischer Ratspräsidentschaft ist das noch verhandelt worden. Und die Malteser sind nicht mehr da, aber das ist auch ein sehr großer Erfolg gewesen. Darum noch mal Glückwunsch an alle, die daran beteiligt waren!

James Carver, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, a constituent of mine, Sally Lloyd, contacted me in relation to a family tragedy four years ago when her brother, Richard Fearnside, disappeared while travelling on a ferry. The lack of CCTV cameras on the ferry passenger decks left his family with many unanswered questions, not knowing whether Richard suffered an accident, took his own life, or was possibly even pushed overboard. His name is added to an increasing list of missing ferry and cruise ship passengers and I am humbled to be able to support his family's campaign for mandatory CCTV and thermal imaging cameras on all ferries operating from British and EU ports. Nearly 100 000 people have now signed their 'Change.org' petition and tonight I formally urge all international institutions to act accordingly on this important matter. All the bereaved ask for is a degree of closure. Surely that is not unreasonable?

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι αλλαγές που προτείνονται, όπως και οι ισχύουσες οδηγίες, κινούνται στη γραμμή ενίσχυσης της κερδοφορίας του εφοπλιστικού κεφαλαίου. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις της, όπως αυτή των ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ, σε συνέχεια των προηγούμενων, αναθέτουν τους ελέγχους ασφάλειας πλοίων, επιβατηγών και εμπορικών, σε ιδιωτικές επιχειρήσεις-νηγώνιμονες, συνδεδεμένες με τους εφοπλιστές και άλλα τμήματα του κεφαλαίου. Αυτές «πουλάνε» διάτρητα πιστοποιητικά αξιοπλοίας σε υπέργηρα και υποσυντήρητα «σαπάρια» του εφοπλιστικού κεφαλαίου, με μειωμένες οργανικές συνθήκες, εξοντωτικές συνθήκες εργασίας των ναυτεργατών.

Με τον τρόπο αυτό η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις συγκαλύπτουν τα εφοπλιστικά εγκλήματα, που κοστίζουν ζωές και προκαλούν περιβαλλοντικές καταστροφές, όπως αυτή πρόσφατα στην Ελλάδα στον Σαρωνικό με το ναυάγιο του γεμάτου μαζούτ δεξαμενόπλοιου. Απαιτείται εδώ και τώρα αποζημίωση όλων των πληγέντων.

Οι λαοί μπορούν να βγάλουν συμπέρασμα: το καπιταλιστικό κέρδος και το σύστημα που το υπηρετεί είναι ασύμβατα με την ασφάλεια της ζωής επιβατών και πληρωμάτων, την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, τις λαϊκές ανάγκες για σύγχρονες, φθηνές, ποιοτικές μεταφορές.

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wenn wir von der Argumentation des Vorredners ausgehen, ist es wirklich schlüssig, dass es notwendig ist, die Sicherheitsvorschriften gerade für die Fahrgastschiffahrt, für Roll-on/Roll-off-Schiffe immer wieder zu aktualisieren. *Safety of Life at Sea* – das ist das SOLAS-Abkommen. Dem müssen wir natürlich nachkommen. Da sind auch die Berufsgenossenschaften, die für die Crews zuständig sind, da stark hinterher, damit die Arbeits- und Lebensbedingungen auf den Schiffen immer weiter verbessert werden.

Aber in besonderer Weise schauen wir natürlich auch auf die Passagiere, und die Passagiere müssen so schnell wie möglich registriert werden, wenn sie auf ein solches Schiff gehen. Diese Daten sollten digitalisiert sein. Sie sollten – auch wenn ein solches IT-System nicht an Bord befindlich ist – über das automatische Schiffsidentifikationssystem auch dem jeweiligen Hafen, in den dieses Passagierschiff einläuft, übermittelt werden. Denn gerade in schwierigen Situationen – wenn Suche und Rettung angesagt ist, das heißt, wenn sich dort Seeunfälle anbahnen – müssen die Rettungsmittel zur Verfügung stehen, müssen natürlich auch landgestützte Rettungseinheiten so schnell wie möglich zu einem solchen Passagierschiff kommen können. Wir haben vorhin gerade vom Kollegen Riquet – bei dem ich mich für seine gute Arbeit, die er geleistet hat, noch mal herzlich bedanken möchte – ganz konkrete Beispiele dazu gehört.

Die Schiffskonstruktion spielt natürlich auch eine ganz entscheidende Rolle, die sich auch immer weiterentwickelt. Estonia: Was war denn die Ursache für dieses unglaubliche Schiffsunglück? Die Bugklappe hat sich nicht vernünftig geschlossen, und es kam Seewasser in den Laderaum hinein, eine freie Oberfläche, und binnen kurzer Zeit ist diese Fähre gesunken und 800 Menschen sind ums Leben gekommen. Solche Dinge müssen wir darauf haben. Ob nun Aluminiumkonstruktionen oder Stahlkonstruktionen das Richtige sind – ich glaube, beides funktioniert sehr gut.

Und bei den Hochgeschwindigkeitsfähren ist es natürlich auch notwendig, dass die Antriebsleistung entsprechend ist, auch bei den anderen Fahrgastschiffen, damit Manövrierfähigkeit da ist, die Ruderanlage in Ordnung ist, die Rettungsmittel da sind. So können wir im Prinzip auch die Zukunft des Seeverkehrs in Europa gestalten.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, uno dei compiti che ci poniamo come legislatori è quello di verificare l'impatto delle norme che proponiamo e, nel caso, successivamente di revisionarle per renderle più snelle. Ed è proprio questo che avviene con le normative che riguardano la sicurezza delle navi passeggeri.

La semplificazione, oltre che andare incontro alle mutate esigenze del settore, è il mezzo che ci permette di ottenere anche una maggiore trasparenza e di rendere più sicure tali navi. Sono quindi assolutamente d'accordo sull'esenzione, per le imbarcazioni al di sotto dei 24 metri, dal campo di applicazione della normativa e anche sull'equiparazione dell'alluminio e materiali equivalenti all'acciaio. Per quanto riguarda le ispezioni, dal 1999 a oggi, molte cose sono cambiate e quindi è opportuno rafforzare tale regime, combinandolo con la normativa del 2006.

Infine, per il regime di registrazione dei passeggeri a bordo delle navi, sono d'accordo su un invio tempestivo dei dati, ovvero 15 minuti dalla partenza della nave dal porto, per mezzo di un sistema elettronico comune. Casi tristemente noti di naufragi e incendi avvenuti a bordo e in cui molte persone hanno perso la vita in questi anni, magari non si sarebbero potuti evitare, ma conoscere il numero dei passeggeri a bordo, in maniera tempestiva e l'eventuale presenza di persone con particolari esigenze di mobilità, ci avrebbe forse aiutato a salvarne di più.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, prijedlozi koje donosi ovaj paket mjera učinit će sustav sigurnosti za putničke brodove jednostavnijim, modernijim i učinkovitijim. I Komisija i izvjestiteljica zauzeli su fleksibilan stav prema manjim plovilima kraćim od 24 metra i manjim brodarima koji uglavnom obavljaju kratku domaću plovidbu kraću od 20 nautičkih milja.

To je dobar pristup jer neće otežati poslovanje manjim brodarima, ali će svejedno podići razinu sigurnosti putnika. Načelo proporcionalnosti u ovakvim je slučajevima važno primijeniti kako ne bismo pretjerano opteretili male prijevoznike i učinili ih nekonkurentnima, što bi dovelo do velikih prometnih izazova i gubitka radnih mjesta.

Slažem se s izvjestiteljicom kako je iznimno važno uzeti u obzir zaštitu podataka putnika i da oni moraju biti automatski uništeni nakon što ispune svoju svrhu. Manipulacije podacima moramo izbjeći želimo li pridobiti povjerenje putnika i broдача u novi sustav.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, quiero agradecer a la señora Aiuto el trabajo que ha realizado en este complicado informe, porque esta propuesta añade garantías de seguridad a los pasajeros de transporte marítimo y porque clarifica los requisitos que deben respetar los buques durante su proceso de construcción. Además, detalla sus condiciones de estabilidad y mejora las medidas de protección contra incendios.

El acuerdo, que se aplicará para los barcos de más de 24 metros de eslora, refuerza la eficacia de la legislación porque los nuevos estándares que define favorecen una interpretación uniforme. La lógica consecuencia es un refuerzo de las garantías de seguridad y más posibilidades de control.

El acuerdo resuelve también el problema que suscitaba el plazo previsto inicialmente para la derogación de esta Directiva en relación con los barcos de aluminio, un problema grave para uno de los Estados miembros. La solución encontrada permite aparcar esta exigencia solo para los barcos actualmente en construcción o para los encargos de que dispongan los astilleros, para los que ya existan contratos de financiación. En todo caso, estos buques quedarán sujetos a la normativa nacional sin menoscabo de sus condiciones de seguridad.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, this is without doubt an important package of legislation, which aims to clarify the current EU passenger ship safety regulatory framework and to allow for a simple and clear application of that framework. This will ultimately contribute to a higher standard of safety for passengers, which we all welcome.

This proposed revision will simplify rules and minimise administrative costs, as well as making sea travel safer. It is important that we maintain EU rules where necessary and proportionate and ensure that those rules are applied correctly and transparently. This text achieves the right balance in this regard. Additionally, the proposal looks to prevent any clash of duties and inconsistencies between various related pieces of legislation, which is positive, and I welcome it.

It is important that passenger ships are subject to frequent systematic inspections. This revision makes a much-needed update to EU passenger safety legislation and brings our laws in line with the evolving demands and limitations of modern safety standards. The proposal prioritises efficiency and frequency of inspections conducted by national administrations without unnecessarily restricting ships' commercial operations. With 23 coast Member States and four island Member States, passenger ships play an important role in EU citizens' mobility. This makes safety regulations in this area all the more important.

Janusz Zemke (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Katastrofa statku wycieczkowego Costa Concordia była efektem poważnego błędu kapitana tego statku, a nie wadliwych przepisów dotyczących bezpieczeństwa statków pasażerskich, jak to tutaj w dyskusji starało się nam kilka osób zasugerować. Proponowane zatem przez Parlament Europejski i Radę zmiany prawne nie muszą dokonywać rewolucji w materii prawnej. Celem nowych dyrektyw na szczęście nie jest tworzenie nowych reguł prawnych, lecz ich uporządkowanie i uproszczenie. Wydaje się, że rodzi to szansę na utrzymanie jak najwyższego poziomu bezpieczeństwa przy jednoczesnym ograniczeniu biurokracji. Przepisy prawne muszą być jasne i muszą gwarantować jak najwyższą jakość materiałów do budowy statków, wysoką jakość nawigacji i profesjonalizm załogi. Jeśli spełnimy te warunki, to jest szansa na bezpieczne podróżowanie statkami.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι μετακινήσεις με πλοία είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικές στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. 400 εκατομμύρια επιβάτες διακινούνται, εκ των οποίων 120 εκατομμύρια επιβάτες σε εγχώριες μετακινήσεις. Αν λάβουμε υπόψη και τα πλοία κρουαζιέρας, αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι πρόκειται για μεγάλο αριθμό συμπολιτών μας οι οποίοι μεταφέρονται με πλοία.

Ως εκ τούτου, πρέπει να έχουμε αυξημένα πρότυπα ασφαλείας για τα επιβατηγά πλοία και φυσικά και για τα οχηματαγωγά και τα ταχύπλοα. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να εμμένουμε στο θέμα της ασφάλειας. Πρέπει η όποια απλοποίηση διαδικασιών να μην είναι εις βάρος της ασφάλειας, πρέπει να σταματήσει η διαδικασία όπου σε ορισμένες χώρες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της Ελλάδος, δίνονται περιέργα πιστοποιητικά αξιοπλοίας σε «σαπάκια». Είχαμε την περίπτωση της βύθισης του «Αγία Ζώνη II» που κυριολεκτικά μόλυνε τον Σαρωνικό και αποδεικνύεται ότι χρειάζονται αυστηρότερες προδιαγραφές, γιατί το βασικό είναι η προστασία των επιβατών και όχι φυσικά η κερδοφορία των επιχειρήσεων και των εφοπλιστών. Αυτό είναι πάρα πολύ σημαντικό.

Τέλος, η καταγραφή των στοιχείων των επιβατών πρέπει να πραγματοποιείται, αλλά με τέτοιο τρόπο που να προστατεύονται τα προσωπικά δεδομένα. Αυτό είναι επίσης ένα ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό θέμα.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le tre proposte di direttiva sulla sicurezza delle navi passeggeri mirano ad obiettivi comuni, che sostanzialmente sono quelli di migliorare la legislazione in materia di trasporto marittimo, standardizzare le procedure di sicurezza e introdurre l'utilizzo di tecnologie digitali nella gestione dei flussi passeggeri.

Il lavoro di razionalizzazione della normativa attraverso il REFIT va focalizzato sull'eliminazione delle incertezze tutt'oggi presenti, concernenti, ad esempio, la classificazione delle zone di rischio in mare, le ispezioni di sicurezza e la registrazione digitale dei dati dei passeggeri e offrendo strumenti efficaci pensati per gli operatori del settore e le autorità, nel rispetto dei dati sensibili dei passeggeri.

A questo proposito, è importante che si valorizzi il ruolo e le competenze dell'EMSA, l'Agenzia per la sicurezza marittima, che negli ultimi anni sta assolvendo a compiti complessi e delicati, soprattutto nel bacino del Mediterraneo. Il 2017 è l'Anno marittimo europeo: non c'è occasione migliore per dare una nuova spinta al settore, valorizzando il trasporto marittimo come parte essenziale dell'economia dell'Unione europea.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, doresc să felicit raportorii pentru toate cele trei rapoarte. Sunt rapoarte complexe, sunt rapoarte tehnice și, cu atât mai mult, merită să fie felicitați pentru faptul că au reușit să meargă în direcția propusă de Comisie, dar, sigur, să aducem și îmbunătățiri.

Ca membră a Comisiei TRAN, dar și IMCO și LIBE, am încercat să țin cont de toate cele trei atribuții ale comisiei: protecția consumatorilor, protecția datelor, siguranța cetățenilor.

Pentru că nu am timp, vreau să mă ocup de primul raport și să o felicit pe Daniela Aiuto. Propunerea Comisiei privind modificarea directivei este binevenită pentru creșterea standardelor de calitate, dar și pentru recunoașterea reciprocă a certificatelor de siguranță ale navelor.

Susțin raportul, sunt justificate excepțiile de la aplicarea acestei directive și le susțin. Este clarificată în raport clasificarea zonelor maritime în funcție de riscurile pentru nave care funcționează într-o anumită zonă a mării. Pentru că, așa cum spuneam, sunt și membră a comisiei IMCO, am privit acest raport și din perspectiva protecției pasagerilor. Cred că standardele de siguranță trebuie aplicate de toate statele membre.

Pentru abordări locale, specifice, scutirea navelor de anumite cerințe, de exemplu, trebuie ca statul membru să notifice Comisia. Siguranța și condițiile de viață și de muncă la bord sunt extrem de importante, iar aceste trei rapoarte aduc o îmbunătățire a siguranței și a vieții, precum și a muncii la bord până la urmă.

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

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário Andriukaitis, o debate de hoje inscreve-se num momento crucial para o setor marítimo, uma vez que este ano celebramos o Ano Marítimo Europeu. Esta proposta diz respeito à necessidade de manter padrões elevados em matéria de segurança para os navios de passageiros na União e resulta do balanço realizado pela Comissão sobre a qualidade da legislação existente relativa à segurança dos navios de passageiros, incluindo consultas aos Estados-Membros e às partes interessadas.

Senhor Comissário, este balanço demonstrou que certas ambiguidades das disposições jurídicas produziram leituras divergentes por parte das autoridades nacionais e por isso, a presente proposta propõe alterações para colmatar estas divergências.

Caros Colegas, a segurança dos passageiros e das tripulações tem que ser a principal prioridade e preocupação de todos nós e, muito particularmente, da Comissão e dos Estados-Membros. Senhor Comissário, os passageiros e as tripulações têm que se sentir seguros e viajar com confiança a bordo das embarcações de passageiros na União Europeia.

Quero congratular os colegas relatores, especialmente a colega Aiuto, por este relatório que acredito permitirá ajudar à execução, monitorização e aplicação das regras nos Estados-Membros e, por conseguinte, contribuir para a manutenção de um alto nível de segurança global e reformar a dimensão social e laboral do pessoal marítimo a bordo dos navios.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, με το πρόσχημα της ασφάλειας των επιβατών που ταξιδεύουν με επιβατηγά πλοία από και προς λιμένες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, το Συμβούλιο και το Κοινοβούλιο πρότειναν να τροποποιηθεί η ισχύουσα οδηγία. Η πρόταση είναι να καταγράφονται ηλεκτρονικά, ψηφιακά δηλαδή, τα δεδομένα των επιβατών. Είναι γεγονός ότι η ασφάλεια είναι πολύ σημαντικό θέμα και πρέπει να το προσεγγίζουμε με προσοχή και υπευθυνότητα. Η ασφάλεια όμως δεν εξασφαλίζεται με το να καταγράφουμε τα δεδομένα των επιβατών· εξασφαλίζεται με το να χρησιμοποιούμε σύγχρονα πλοία, να επιβιβάζουμε και να αποβιβάζουμε γρήγορα τους επιβάτες και να υπάρχουν, ενδεχομένως, κάμερες σε διάφορα σημεία των πλοίων και των λιμανιών.

Αντιθέτως, η ψηφιακή καταγραφή των προσωπικών δεδομένων των επιβατών ενέχει τον κίνδυνο αυτά να υποκλαπούν, να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο επεξεργασίας από αναρμόδιους ή και από εγκληματίες και να χρησιμοποιηθούν για παράνομες δραστηριότητες. Για αυτό ακριβώς το λόγο, θεωρώ ότι η ψηφιακή καταγραφή των δεδομένων των επιβατών εξυπηρετεί μόνο διαδικαστικούς σκοπούς και δεν έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία ούτως ώστε να την επιδιώξουμε και να την αποδεχθούμε.

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

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of Commissioner Bulc, I would like to thank the Parliament and, in particular, all three rapporteurs and the shadow rapporteurs for their work on these files and for their constructive approach which facilitated reaching an agreement with the Council. Thank you so much.

On safety rules and standards, we are sending a clear signal to our citizens travelling on board passenger ships in EU waters that their safety is our priority. I wish to reiterate that the Commission's services, with the assistance of the European Maritime Safety Agency, are currently focusing on developing guidelines for small passenger ships. We will also duly respond to the Parliament's call to assess the need for common European requirements for sailing ships and ship carrier tenders.

Concerning the legislation proposal, we are ensuring that the competent authorities have immediate access to accurate data on persons on board in case of emergency, and that they can therefore deal with any accident more effectively. I am sure that you will continue to fully support our efforts to further digitalise maritime transport and to enhance the single window for reporting formalities. This is where the Commission is committed to proposing revised legislation on reporting formalities by next April, which will establish a harmonised European maritime single window environment.

The new rules on inspections will ensure that the respective regime brings value for money for all parties concerned. Besides the cost savings, it removes the unnecessary duplication and complexity of existing regimes, which had developed over time and resulted in overlapping requirements spread across different pieces of legislation. The new rules will facilitate implementation, monitoring and enforcement.

I am sure that you will continue to fully support our efforts to further improve, simplify and modernise maritime legislation, and Commissioner Bulc looks forward to our future cooperation.

Daniela Aiuto, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ringrazio il Commissario per l'apprezzamento per il lavoro svolto, l'attestazione di stima e ringrazio anche tutti i colleghi, anche quelli che sono giustamente già andati via. Questo dossier, quando è stato votato in commissione, ha avuto pressoché l'unanimità e quindi, un po' da come si è evoluta la discussione e da come sembrano andare le cose, mi auguro che anche domani ci sia un'evoluzione positiva perché, appunto, ne va della sicurezza dei cittadini europei e quindi credo che vada riconosciuto il valore dell'ottimo lavoro svolto.

Grazie ancora anche agli altri relatori dei due dossier, perché comunque abbiamo lavorato di concerto ed è stato veramente un piacere lavorare con due colleghi di questa caratura.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, para nosotros está claro que son tres informes muy importantes, pero no han debido de generar mucho entusiasmo en la Cámara. En cualquier caso, sí que voy a responder a la intervención de nuestro compañero, que ha hablado de que la seguridad de los buques no se consigue con el registro. Evidentemente, estamos hablando de una directiva que va a mejorar la recopilación de los datos para que la búsqueda y el salvamento sean efectivos en caso de accidente. Por lo tanto, tenemos que centrar los argumentos en esta Directiva y en este contenido.

Respecto al miedo que usted tiene, hablaba usted del posible abuso que se pueda hacer de esta información, debo decirle que aquí se va a aplicar el Reglamento (UE) 2016/679 —por lo tanto, votado muy recientemente por todos nosotros—, que habla de la protección de los datos personales y de la privacidad. Además, yo, en mi intervención, he hecho una referencia a que los datos van a ser eliminados, o sea toda la información, cuando esta ya no sea necesaria para los fines para los cuales han sido recuperada. Y va a ser borrada de manera automática y sin demora injustificada. Por lo tanto, todos los miedos que usted podía tener están cubiertos en este informe.

Nada más que decir, aparte de expresar mi agradecimiento a todos.

Y un último mensaje sobre el problema que tenemos siempre: nosotros hemos hecho el esfuerzo; espero que mañana el Parlamento efectivamente vote con una amplia mayoría, pero lo que necesitamos es que los Estados miembros cumplan las directivas en los plazos que están recogidos, porque esto sí va a contribuir a la mejora y la seguridad de todo el sector marítimo.

Dominique Riquet, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, ayant l'avantage et l'honneur d'être le dernier orateur de cette journée de session, je ne voudrais pas abuser de votre patience, ni de celle de la Commission ou des très nombreux collègues qui assistent encore à la séance.

Je voulais simplement remercier mes collègues et, comme l'a dit M^{me} Aiuto, cela a été un plaisir et un bonheur de travailler ensemble dans un excellent esprit, en collaboration étroite avec la Commission, et avec un Conseil, celui de la présidence maltaise, qui a été particulièrement efficace et qui, je crois, tenait absolument à ce que nous arrivions à une conclusion sous cette présidence.

Ce rapport sur les inspections des transbordeurs rouliers et des ferries, de même que l'entière du paquet sur la sécurité des navires à passagers, revu dans le cadre d'un REFIT, est l'illustration concrète des défis posés par le maritime et montre comment les institutions de l'Union européenne y répondent, en protégeant les citoyens, ce qui est, selon moi, la chose la plus importante.

Je pense que demain, Mesdames et Messieurs, nous aurons un vote massif sur ces trois rapports qui concluront cette amélioration significative de notre sécurité.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate conjunto.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

18. Agenda van de volgende vergadering: zie notulen

19. Sluiting van de vergadering

(Se levanta la sesión a las 22.40 horas)

—

Verklaring van de gebruikte tekens

*	Raadplegingsprocedure
***	Goedkeuringsprocedure
***I	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (eerste lezing)
***II	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (tweede lezing)
***III	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (derde lezing)

(De aangeduide procedure is gebaseerd op de in de ontwerp tekst voorgestelde rechtsgrond.)

Afkortingen van de commissies

AFET	Commissie buitenlandse zaken
DEVE	Commissie ontwikkelingssamenwerking
INTA	Commissie internationale handel
BUDG	Begrotingscommissie
CONT	Commissie begrotingscontrole
ECON	Commissie economische en monetaire zaken
EMPL	Commissie werkgelegenheid en sociale zaken
ENVI	Commissie milieubeheer, volksgezondheid en voedselveiligheid
ITRE	Commissie industrie, onderzoek en energie
IMCO	Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming
TRAN	Commissie vervoer en toerisme
REGI	Commissie regionale ontwikkeling
AGRI	Commissie landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling
PECH	Commissie visserij
CULT	Commissie cultuur en onderwijs
JURI	Commissie juridische zaken
LIBE	Commissie burgerlijke vrijheden, justitie en binnenlandse zaken
AFCO	Commissie constitutionele zaken
FEMM	Commissie rechten van de vrouw en gendergelijkheid
PETI	Commissie verzoekschriften
DROI	Subcommissie mensenrechten
SEDE	Subcommissie veiligheid en defensie

Afkortingen van de diverse fracties

PPE	Fractie van de Europese Volkspartij (Christendemocraten)	
S&D	Fractie van de Progressieve Alliantie van Socialisten en Democraten in het Europees	Parlement
ECR	Fractie Europese Conservatieven en Hervormers	
ALDE	Fractie Alliantie van Liberalen en Democraten voor Europa	
GUE/NGL	Confederale Fractie Europees Unitair Links/Noords Groen Links	
Verts/ALE	Fractie De Groenen/Vrije Europese Alliantie	
EFDD	Fractie Europa van Vrijheid en Directe Democratie	
ENF	Fractie Europa van Naties en Vrijheid	
NI	Niet-fractiegebonden leden	