

DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV 5. APRILA 2017

(C/2024/2683)

EVROPSKI PARLAMENT

ZASEDANJE 2017–2018

Seje: 3. – 6. aprila 2017

STRASBOURG

Vsebina	Stran
1. Otvoritev seje	5
2. Izjava predsedujočega	5
3. Razprave o primerih kršitev človekovih pravic, demokracije in načela pravne države (razglasitev vloženih predlogov resolucij): glej zapisnik	5
4. Delegirani akti (člen 105(6) Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	5
5. Izvedbeni ukrepi (člen 106 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	5
6. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (razprava)	5
7. Čas glasovanja	43
7.1. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (RC-B8-0237/2017, B8-0237/2017, B8-0241/2017, B8-0242/2017, B8-0243/2017) (glasovanje)	43
8. Pogajanja pred prvo obravnavo v Parlamentu (člen 69(c) Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	43
9. Čas glasovanja (nadaljevanje)	44
9.1. Določeni vidiki prava družb (A8-0088/2017 - Tadeusz Zwiefka) (glasovanje)	44
9.2. Ratifikacija in pristop k protokolu iz leta 2010 h konvenciji o nevarnih in zdravju škodljivih snoveh z izjemo vidikov, povezanih s pravosodnim sodelovanjem v civilnih zadevah (A8-0076/2017 - Pavel Svoboda) (glasovanje)	44

Vsebina	Stran
9.3. Ratifikacija in pristop k protokolu iz leta 2010 h konvenciji o nevarnih in zdravju škodljivih snoveh glede vidikov, povezanih s pravosodnim sodelovanjem v civilnih zadevah (A8-0078/2017 - Pavel Svoboda) (glasovanje)	44
9.4. Uporaba določb schengenskega pravnega reda na področju schengenskega informacijskega sistema na Hrvaškem (A8-0073/2017 - Nuno Melo) (glasovanje)	44
9.5. Medicinski pripomočki (A8-0068/2017 - Glenis Willmott) (glasovanje)	44
9.6. In vitro diagnostični medicinski pripomočki (A8-0069/2017 - Peter Liese) (glasovanje)	44
9.7. Skladi denarnega trga (A8-0041/2015 - Neena Gill) (glasovanje)	44
9.8. Prospekt, ki se objavi ob javni ponudbi ali sprejemu vrednostnih papirjev v trgovanje (A8-0238/2016 - Petr Ježek) (glasovanje)	45
9.9. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (A8-0110/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)	45
9.10. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (resolucija) (A8-0117/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)	45
9.11. Sprostitev varnostne rezerve (A8-0104/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)	45
9.12. Načrt prihodkov in odhodkov za proračunsko leto 2018 — oddelek I – Evropski parlament (A8-0156/2017 - Richard Ashworth) (glasovanje)	45
9.13. Predlog spremembe proračuna št. 1/2017 — Spremi dokument k predlogu za uporabo sredstev Solidarnostnega sklada EU za zagotovitev pomoči Združenemu kraljestvu, Cipru in Portugalski (A8-0155/2017 - Jens Geier) (glasovanje)	45
9.14. Uporaba sredstev Evropskega sklada za prilagoditev globalizaciji (vloga EGF/2017/000 TA 2017 — tehnična pomoč na pobudo Komisije) (A8-0157/2017 - Victor Negrescu) (glasovanje)	45
9.15. Uporaba sredstev Solidarnostnega sklada EU za zagotavljanje pomoči Združenemu kraljestvu, Cipru in Portugalski (A8-0154/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes) (glasovanje)	45
9.16. Avtomatizirana izmenjava daktiloskopskih podatkov v Latviji (A8-0089/2017 - Claude Moraes) (glasovanje)	45
9.17. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov o DNK na Slovaškem, Portugalskem, v Latviji, Litvi, na Češkem, v Estoniji, na Madžarskem, Cipru, Poljskem, Švedskem, Malti in v Belgiji (A8-0091/2017 - Judith Sargentini) (glasovanje)	46
9.18. Avtomatizirana izmenjava daktiloskopskih podatkov na Slovaškem, v Bolgariji, Franciji, Češki republiki, Litvi, na Nizozemskem, Madžarskem, Cipru, v Estoniji, na Malti, v Romuniji in na Finskem (A8-0092/2017 - Tomáš Zdechovský) (glasovanje)	46
9.19. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov o vozilih, registriranih na Finskem, v Sloveniji, Romuniji, na Poljskem, Švedskem, v Litvi, Bolgariji, na Slovaškem in Madžarskem (A8-0095/2017 - Filiz Hysmenova) (glasovanje)	46
9.20. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov iz registrov vozil na Malti, Cipru in v Estoniji (A8-0090/2017 - Maria Grapini) (glasovanje)	46
9.21. Gensko spremenjena koruza Bt11 × 59122 × MIR604 × 1507 × GA21 (B8-0236/2017) (glasovanje)	46
9.22. Obravnavanje tokov beguncev in migrantov: vloga zunanjega delovanja EU (A8-0045/2017 - Elena Valenciano, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (glasovanje)	46
10. Obrazložitev glasovanja	46

Vsebina	Stran
10.1. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (RC-B8-0237/2017, B8-0237/2017, B8-0241/2017, B8-0242/2017, B8-0243/2017)	46
10.2. Medicinski pripomočki (A8-0068/2017 - Glenis Willmott)	53
10.3. In vitro diagnostični medicinski pripomočki (A8-0069/2017 - Peter Liese)	55
10.4. Skladi denarnega trga (A8-0041/2015 - Neena Gill)	55
10.5. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (A8-0110/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas)	55
10.6. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (resolucija) (A8-0117/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas)	56
10.7. Obravnavanje tokov beguncev in migrantov: vloga zunanjega delovanja EU (A8-0045/2017 - Elena Valenciano, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)	57
11. Popravki in namere glasovanja: gl. zapisnik	58
12. Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje: gl. zapisnik	58
13. Sovražni govor, populizem in lažne novice v družbenih medijih – odzivu EU naproti (razprava)	58
14. Veleprodajni trgi gostovanja (razprava)	84
15. Veleprodajni trgi gostovanja (nadaljevanje razprave)	94
16. Tretje države, katerih državljani morajo imeti vizume ali so oproščeni te zahteve: Ukrajina (razprava)	102
17. Sestava delegacij: glej zapisnik	115
18. Razmere v Venezueli (razprava)	115
19. Ustreznost varstva, ki ga zagotavlja zasebnostni ščit EU-ZDA (razprava)	124
20. Sestava delegacij: gl. zapisnik	132
21. Poročilo o nekdanji jugoslovanski republiki Makedoniji za leto 2016	132
22. Priporočilo Svetu o Komisiji za položaj žensk (razprava)	142
23. Nadaljnje obravnavanje stališč in resolucij Parlamenta: glej zapisnik	149
24. Predložitev dokumentov: glej zapisnik	149

Vsebina	Stran
25. Prerazporeditev sredstev: glej zapisnik	149
26. Dnevni red naslednje seje: gl. zapisnik	150
27. Zaključek seje	150

DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV 5. APRILA 2017**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI***Presidente***1. Otvoritev seje***(La seduta è aperta alle 9.05)***2. Izjava predsedujočega**

Presidente. – Prima di dare il via alla discussione sulla Brexit, vorrei esprimere a nome del Parlamento europeo il forte sdegno per l'orribile strage avvenuta in Siria con l'utilizzo di armi chimiche.

Tutti quanti noi siamo rimasti colpiti nel vedere le orribili immagini di bambini che morivano soffocati a causa dell'uso di armi chimiche. Questo è inaccettabile, è in contrasto con i valori dell'Unione europea, che noi abbiamo il dovere di difendere all'interno dei nostri confini ma anche al di fuori dei nostri confini. A tutto il popolo siriano martoriato da anni di guerra va quindi la nostra solidarietà.

Oggi a Bruxelles si apre la conferenza promossa dall'alto rappresentante Federica Mogherini sulla Siria. Sono fiducioso che un'Europa unita potrà giocare un ruolo importante per un indispensabile processo di pace.

3. Razprave o primerih kršitev človekovih pravic, demokracije in načela pravne države (razglasitev vloženih predlogov resolucij): glej zapisnik**4. Delegirani akti (člen 105(6) Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik****5. Izvedbeni ukrepi (člen 106 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik****6. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (razprava)**

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione prioritaria sui negoziati con il Regno Unito a seguito della notifica della sua intenzione di recedere dall'Unione europea (2017/2593(RSP)).

La discussione che sta per iniziare segna l'inizio di uno dei processi politici più complessi mai affrontati dal Parlamento europeo. Sarà un negoziato delicato, dove noi saremo chiamati a giocare un ruolo centrale, prima di tutto per tutelare gli interessi dei cittadini europei.

Ascolteremo le posizioni di tutti i gruppi politici prima di approvare una risoluzione che definirà le linee guida del Parlamento europeo nella trattativa. Il vostro voto sarà decisivo per l'esito finale delle condizioni di uscita del Regno Unito e per i futuri rapporti con questo paese.

I recenti gravi episodi di terrorismo ci ricordano che tutti i paesi europei sono chiamati a lavorare assieme. Il terrorismo non conosce confini e la sicurezza dei nostri cittadini va sempre anteposta a ogni interesse particolare.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, last week we officially received the letter. It took nine months to write a letter of six pages, but finally, we received the letter. Today is the day at the European Parliament and today's signal is that we are ready, we can start and, hopefully, after the vote we can say we are united and we stay together in these negotiations.

First of all, I would like to thank Guy Verhofstadt for his work in preparing our resolution. The message is clear on the procedure: first, divorce and, second, the future treaty. Then we underline what should be the atmosphere in the negotiations; we want to have a fair, constructive atmosphere built on trust. Then we have defined our priorities regarding citizenship: do not play with the legal uncertainty of citizens. We are underlining that, for us, the Northern Ireland question is a decisive one: avoid a hard border in Ireland.

Then we have to talk about money. The top priorities are defined. Finally, we hope that London respects that the EU27 will continue. The Rome Declaration is clear and we have to talk about the future in our Union.

The point is, from our point of view, a decisive difference. It is a very fundamental question: what does leave mean? What does it mean to leave the European Union? For example, on the question of security, I heard last week that Theresa May said that they want to stay in Europol. Europol is a European Agency – it is the European Union who is organising Europol – but they want to stay.

So does leave mean no further access to Europol and to the Schengen Information System, or does leave mean to stay in them? Then we talk about the research union. Cambridge, Edinburgh, Paris and Milan are working closely together. So does this mean that with leave there will be no further cooperation, because at the moment the European Union is financing this?

Then there is the single market. Trade is positive. Does leave mean no more access to the single market? Does leave mean no more cooperation? I feel that London thinks they will find the perfect deal, and that means they take the positive points and they leave the negative points. I have to clarify that this will not happen. Cherry-picking will not happen. A state outside the European Union cannot have the same, or better, conditions than a state inside this European Union.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was machen wir hier eigentlich? Beispielsweise Nordirland: Dort haben wir jetzt viele Sorgen von den Kollegen, die aus Belfast zu uns kommen, die äußern, dass der Friedensprozess unter Druck steht, dass wir eventuell Rückschritte machen. Oder Gibraltar: Da kann man darüber lachen, dass es in den letzten Tagen Diskussionen über möglichen Krieg gab. Aber tatsächlich hatte die Premierministerin eines großen Landes, nämlich Großbritanniens, die Notwendigkeit gesehen klarzustellen, dass es keine militärischen Aktivitäten gab. Wo sind wir denn gelandet? Über was reden wir eigentlich? Ich muss mal sagen: Sind wir eigentlich noch ganz bei Trost?

Wir müssten eigentlich über Digitalisierung, über die Sicherheitsfragen unseres Kontinents reden und nicht über Debatten der letzten Jahrzehnte. Das zeigt uns, dass wir in die vollkommen falsche Richtung diskutieren, die uns leider Gottes von den Nationalisten und Populisten aufgedrückt wird.

Und ich möchte den Spaniern und auch den Iren zurufen, dass sie dieses Mal eine andere Lage haben. Sie werden nämlich nicht ihre Interessen als Iren beispielsweise allein gegen London durchsetzen können. Oder auch die Spanier werden sich darauf verlassen können, dass sie nicht alleine stehen in der Debatte gegenüber London, wenn es um Gibraltar geht. Wir werden die große Chance haben, dass die EU-27 deutlich macht, dass wir eine große Familie sind und zusammenhalten, dass die irischen Interessen nicht nur irische, sondern europäische Interessen sind und dass die spanischen Interessen europäische Interessen sind.

Und zu guter Letzt: Austritt aus der Europäischen Union. Theresa May formulierte: 'Es ist kein Austritt aus Europa.' Das mag für Menschen gelten, in der Beziehung zwischen Menschen mag das gelten. Wir bleiben Freunde, das ist vollkommen klar. Aber die Idee der Europäischen Union ist eine Idee des Miteinanders. Großbritannien wird zukünftig nicht mehr am Tisch sitzen, wenn die Außenminister über Syrien beraten. Sie werden nicht mehr am Tisch sitzen, wenn wir über die Ukraine beraten. Das heißt: Natürlich tritt Großbritannien aus der politischen Idee Europas aus, und das ist das, was leider Gottes sehr, sehr negativ ist.

Positiv ist, dass wir am Ende des Tages Partner und Freunde bleiben. Aber in den Verhandlungen muss sich Großbritannien auf eine harte Verhandlungsposition der Europäischen Union vorbereiten.

(Beifall von der eigenen Fraktion)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche il pensiero dei Socialisti e Democratici va alle vittime degli attacchi chimici in Siria. Pietà per le vittime. Sono morti venti bambini. Vergogna! Vergogna per i mandanti, vergogna per i responsabili politici e anche per chi, lavandosene le mani, ha dato l'impressione di dare carta bianca al regime siriano.

Quando ci si trova di fronte ad una guerra vera, ci si rende conto della irresponsabilità di certi politici. Non bisogna ridere! Due giorni fa, come ha ricordato il collega Weber, un ex leader conservatore britannico ha paventato il rischio di una guerra tra Regno Unito e Spagna. Sono parole da dilettanti allo sbaraglio. Spero che i cittadini inglesi capiscano in quali mani sono finiti. I Tories hanno voluto il referendum e il giorno dopo il voto non conoscevano nemmeno la procedura per chiedere il divorzio. L'integrità del Regno Unito è a rischio. Volevate riprendervi il controllo, ma di che cosa? Avevate promesso un futuro migliore. Le vostre bugie hanno creato soltanto il caos nel Regno Unito. Noi non mentiremo.

(Applausi)

Questa istituzione è la prima a rispondere. E ringrazio anch'io il collega Verhofstadt e coloro i quali hanno lavorato di più attorno a questa risoluzione. Siamo pronti ad usare il nostro potere di veto se non saranno rispettate le condizioni stabilite nella risoluzione. La nostra priorità è quella di tutelare i diritti acquisiti da quei cittadini europei oggi minacciati dalla Brexit.

Vogliamo dire alcune verità. Primo: un paese fuori dall'Unione europea non potrà mai beneficiare delle stesse condizioni di quando era membro. Dobbiamo discutere le condizioni del divorzio. Solo quando avremo fatto progressi sostanziali si discuterà delle future relazioni. Inoltre rispediamo al mittente qualsiasi ricatto o ricattuccio. Se qualcuno del Regno Unito vuole usare la sicurezza comune come arma di ricatto, si sbaglia!

Seconda verità: qualsiasi accordo futuro col Regno Unito sarà condizionato al rispetto degli standard sociali, ambientali e fiscali dell'Unione. Non tolleremo mai che alle porte dell'Unione europea si crei un maxi paradiso fiscale. Non ci sarà nessun trattamento di favore nei confronti della City, e non accetteremo alcuna corsa al ribasso per i diritti dei lavoratori.

Terza verità: oggi la pace nell'Irlanda del Nord – e questo dovrebbe preoccuparvi! – è più fragile, e noi dobbiamo preservarla. E tutti gli impegni finanziari assunti, come succede in tutte le famiglie, quando si esce di casa e si va in un'altra casa, bisogna pagare le bollette della luce, del gas, dell'energia. E questo riguarda tutti, non è un trattamento di sfavore nei confronti di qualcuno.

E infine, la Brexit ci ha insegnato che l'Unione europea non può essere solo la somma di interessi nazionali uniti da un mercato unico. Noi siamo innanzitutto una comunità di valori, primo tra tutti la solidarietà. La Brexit sia l'occasione per ritrovarci ancora più uniti attorno al nostro destino comune.

(Applausi)

Presidente. – Data la delicatezza della discussione, non concederò domande «cartellino blu» durante la mattinata di oggi. Ci sono tantissimi iscritti per gli interventi. Ogni gruppo ha il diritto di esprimere le proprie posizioni a favore o contro la Brexit, ma questa discussione non deve trasformare quest'Aula in uno stadio di calcio dove ci sono tifosi da una parte o dall'altra.

Come sono sempre stato equanime nel presiedere quest'Aula, se sono flessibile per quanto riguarda i tempi nei confronti dei presidenti dei gruppi, lo sarò nei confronti di tutti i presidenti dei gruppi. Ho sempre presieduto l'Aula con grande equilibrio, intendo farlo anche oggi. Quindi vi invito ad affrontare la discussione con serietà, entrando nei contenuti – tanto non cambiano le decisioni politiche se qualcuno alza la voce o non la alza, quello che conta sono i contenuti.

Ogni gruppo politico avrà il diritto di esprimersi più volte su questa questione. Non è un caso che sia stato deciso dalla Conferenza dei presidenti di avere al termine della discussione gli interventi, ancora una volta, dei presidenti dei gruppi. Quindi sarà una discussione completa, e ognuno potrà esprimere compiutamente le proprie idee e le proprie posizioni.

Helga Stevens, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, today, I hope, begins the process of shaping a better future for the peoples of Europe. The peoples whose jobs, businesses, economy and security all depend on us to take the EU in the right direction. A new direction. The UK leaving must not be a missed opportunity to create positive change. That is why the ECR Group adopted last week its vision of a reformed and decentralised European Union. I can recommend it to you.

Britain is an island, not a boat. It will remain where it is, it will remain one of our most important economic, political and security partners. The United Kingdom and the European Union are friends, not enemies. This should not be a nasty break-up but the beginning of a deep and special partnership between long-standing allies.

We need to start work on a comprehensive deal right now, a deal that looks at everything: cooperation on security, trade, education, research, transport and, yes, money. Everything from the start. There is no time to lose.

If we do anything less, history will judge us harshly as having been small and petty when the challenges of our age required us to be bold and visionary. Mr Verhofstadt, you spent a great deal of time in your campaign for president of the Parliament distancing yourself from the backroom deals of the past. Yet, once again, the pleas for openness and transparency feel like the same old empty promises – promises which those outside of Brussels are increasingly frustrated with.

The negotiation and process of this resolution have sought to exclude the opinions of some political groups and Members in this Parliament. When you do that, you do not just exclude the voices of those Members, but also the voices of their electorates. Mr Verhofstadt, no one is asking you to agree with everyone, but you could at least listen to what they have to say.

That is not to say that we do not agree with anything in the joint motion. We do. We agree, for example, that it is essential that the rights of EU citizens in the UK and of UK citizens in the EU are dealt with quickly and fairly. But we do not share other key points.

We believe the European Parliament should seek to support the EU negotiator not make life more difficult by making excessive demands in advance. That just looks like the same old tired tactics, which undermine the credibility of this Chamber. The three-year limit on transitional arrangement seems arbitrary. We might want different lengths for different issues. We deeply regret that all the work prepared by Parliament's committees was just brushed aside.

Mr President, fellow Members, my hope is that the EU will emerge from Brexit renewed and able to prevent the departure of other Member States. The next two years should be about building the faith of the peoples of Europe in the decisions we are making. If the EU is to come back stronger and if we really want to win back the confidence lost by our citizens, then this is not only the moment to determine how we will work with the UK in the future, but also how we can get the EU back on track.

I call on all colleagues to listen to the recent statements by several European leaders who show that there are alternatives to ever more Europe. We need to follow the path to a decentralised confederal Europe. There simply is no support for more centralising Euro-federalism. With or without Britain, we need a new direction for Europe.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I have the feeling that it was a very sad moment on Wednesday of last week when the British ambassador gave his letter to President Tusk. That was my feeling anyway: a very sad moment.

It is true, naturally, that the relationship between Britain and Europe was never an easy relationship, let us recognise that. It was never a love affair and certainly not a question of wild passion. I think it was a little bit like a marriage of convenience, if I can use that term.

It was already clear, dear colleagues, from the beginning. In the 1950s Britain decided against membership of the European Coal and Steel Community. Attlee and Labour did not want it, and it was Churchill and the Tories who were in favour, it is good to recall this. And in 1955 at the start of the Common Market, Britain walked away from the negotiating table.

In the early years of the Union it was the British Prime Minister Macmillan who looked at the continent with nothing less than suspicion. What were they cooking up there in Brussels, were they really discussing coal and steel and customs union, or were they also talking politics in Brussels, plotting on foreign policy? Oh, God forbid, defence matters even!

So British Prime Minister Macmillan wrote to his foreign minister, and, I quote, I have the quote here: 'For the first time since Napoleon the major continental powers are united in a positive economic grouping, but considerable political aspects', and to his own surprise, Macmillan had to admit this new experiment, and I quote further, 'was not directed against Britain.' So when Britain finally joined the European Union in 1973 after, as we all know, several blockades by General de Gaulle, the headlines were festive. You have to read all the British press in 1973, it was a great day for Britain to join the European Union.

Let us be honest about this, it was only a short honeymoon, as we know, because Margaret Thatcher asked for her money back and her successor John Major called the euro, and I quote again, 'a currency as strange as a rain dance, with the same impotence'. Well, I have to tell you that the pound slipping against the euro, as we see today was not exactly what Major expected at that moment.

But all the rest, let us be honest with each other, is history. Perhaps let us recognise that it was maybe impossible to unite Great Britain with the Continent, and naive maybe to reconcile the legal system of Napoleon with the common law of the British Empire, and perhaps it was never meant to be.

(Applause)

But, and this is important – and I hope you are applauding this also – our predecessors should never be blamed for having tried, because it is important in politics, as it is in life, to try new partnerships, new horizons, to reach out to the other, to the other side of the channel. I am also convinced and 100% sure about one thing: that one day or another, dear colleagues, there will be a young man or a young woman who will try again, who will lead Britain into the European family once again.

(Applause)

And a young generation that will see Brexit for what it really is: a catfight in the Conservative party that got out of hand. A loss of time, a waste of energy, and I think, a stupidity.

Although I continue to think that Brexit is a sad and regrettable event, I also believe it is important to remember something. Remember what Britain and Europe in these more than 40 years have achieved together. It is true, we may not have had the most passionate relationship, but it was not a failure either, not for Europe, and certainly not for Britain and the British.

Let us not forget, Britain entered the Union as the sick man of Europe, and thanks to the single market, came out the other side. Europe also made Britain punch above its weight in terms of geopolitics, as in the heyday of the British Empire. And we, from all sides, must pay tribute to Britain, to Britain's immense contributions as a staunch and unmatched defender of free markets and civil liberties. And thank you for that because as a Liberal, I will miss that in the future.

Colleagues, within a few weeks we will start the process of separation. And I think, Mr Juncker and Mr Barnier, the goal must be to have a new and stable relationship and a deep and comprehensive partnership and association between the UK and the EU that certainly will be very different, as we all know, from membership.

In this new venture let us always remember one thing. Our common bonds, our common culture, our common and shared values, our joint heritage, our history. And let us never forget that together we in fact belong to the same great European civilisation, from the Atlantic port of Bristol, I go as far as to the banks of the mighty river Volga; but maybe that is a little too far for the moment.

But let us be honest, and this will be my final point. Brexit is not only about Brexit. Brexit has to be also about our capacity for a rebirth of our European project, because let us recognise that Brexit did not happen by accident. Even though since Brexit I see what I call a change for the good in the mood of the public, let us not fool ourselves: Europe is not yet rescued and Europe has not yet recovered from the crisis.

Europe is still in need of change, I think in need of radical change: change towards a real Union, an effective Union based on values and based on the real interests of our citizens. And a Union also – and I want to conclude with this – that stands up against autocrats. Autocrats will close down their universities, to give one example.

(Applause)

Autocrats will throw journalists into jail, as is happening today. Autocrats will make corruption their trademark. And yesterday, as we all have seen, beyond any humanity, autocrats again bombed innocent women and children with chemical weapons in Syria, to give the nastiest example.

So in these negotiations which will have to start in the coming weeks, let us never forget why our founding fathers – British and other Europeans alike – launched this European project. There are three words: freedom, justice and peace – these are three great things that are worth fighting for.

(Applause)

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ein knappes Dreivierteljahr ist nach dem britischen Referendum vergangen. Vorige Woche wurde nun Artikel 50 ausgelöst, und damit ist klar, dass die Scheidung zwischen dem Vereinigten Königreich und der EU vollzogen wird. Die Zeit, in der sich die Streitenden die Instrumente und die Waffen zeigen, ist vorbei. Die Zeit der verantwortungslosen Demagogie, insbesondere von Herrn Farage und anderen, ist vorbei.

Jetzt muss hart verhandelt werden. Jetzt ist die Zeit derer, die tatsächlich klar und deutlich, besonnen, fair und respektvoll miteinander umgehen müssen, um zu Lösungen zu kommen, die ein gemeinsames Miteinander zwischen dem Vereinigten Königreich und der Europäischen Union ermöglichen. Im Rahmen dieser Trennung wird offenkundig sichtbar, wie eng verwoben die Strukturen, die Lebensadern zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten inzwischen geworden sind. Es betrifft alle Bereiche. Die Zeit dafür das in 15 Monaten so weit auszuhandeln, ist ungeheuer kurz – das wissen wir alle. Also erfordert es, dass wir als Parlament nicht nur heute, nicht nur am Ende, wenn es um den Trennungsakt geht, einbezogen sind, sondern dass wir uns auch bei den Zwischenbewertungen hier im Parlament verständigen können, dass wir in dem Moment, wenn gesagt wird: „Phase zwei wird ausgelöst“, hier ebenfalls als Parlament mit gefragt werden.

Was ist uns wichtig? Wir meinen, dass im Vordergrund die Rechte der Menschen, der Bürger, der *citizens* der Europäischen Union, und zwar der bisherigen 28 stehen müssen. Uns ist wichtig, dass die Rechte der UK *citizens*, der Bürger des Vereinigten Königreiches in der EU, der EU *citizens* im Vereinigten Königreich, die ja zusammen schon über 4 Millionen sind, plus die Rechte der 1,8 Millionen Menschen, die im Norden Irlands leben, gewahrt werden. Und wir wissen alle ganz genau, dass es dann nicht nur die direkt Betroffenen gibt, sondern dass Auswirkungen auf das Verhalten, auf das Miteinander in wichtigen Regionen der Europäischen Union gibt.

Wir begrüßen, dass in dem gemeinsamen Vorschlag das Karfreitagsabkommen zum Norden von Irland fest verankert ist und in der Gesamtheit betrachtet wird. Die Europäische Union war zu jedem Zeitpunkt ein aktiver Mitgestalter und ein Garant für das Wirken dieses Karfreitagsabkommens, und schon aus diesem Grund sollten wir uns hier in die Pflicht nehmen, das wir zu jedem Zeitpunkt die Interessen der Menschen auf der irischen Insel insgesamt betrachten und dort nicht zulassen, dass im 21. Jahrhundert in der Europäischen Union eine neue Grenze entsteht. Ich möchte auch keine Grenze in meinem Land wieder haben, niemals mehr eine Grenze und eine Mauer, die undurchlässig ist.

(Beifall)

Worum geht es uns auch? Wir wollen, dass insgesamt die Grundrechte, die sozialen Rechte, also praktisch das, was die Würde von Menschen ausmacht, in diesen Verhandlungen immer im Vordergrund stehen. Das muss unser gemeinsamer Ziel- und Angelpunkt sein, und ich sage Ihnen: An der Art und Weise, wie wir miteinander verhandeln werden, wird sich auch entscheiden, welche Zukunft die Europäische Union hat.

Und wir müssen uns auch die Frage stellen, warum es den Demagogen wie Herrn Farage gelungen ist, eine Stimmung in Großbritannien so umzudrehen, dass letztendlich dieses Ergebnis herausgekommen ist. Das sind doch nicht nur die nationalen Probleme im Inneren Großbritanniens oder der Tories gewesen, das sind doch auch die Probleme, die wir innerhalb der EU haben, die wir nicht gelöst haben. Wo bleibt also unsere soziale Union? Wo bleibt der Beschäftigungsschutz? Wo bleibt der Sozialschutz, die soziale Säule? Wo bleibt unser Versprechen für mehr Demokratie? Das ist das, was wir den Menschen signalisieren müssen. Lassen Sie uns gemeinsam diesen Kampf führen. Dann kommen wir am Ende dabei auch gemeinsam heraus – im Interesse aller Bürger und Bürgerinnen, aller Menschen, und ich schließe dabei die Migranten insgesamt mit ein.

(Beifall)

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Prime Minister May, you inherited a situation you did not create, yet you had a choice. And by choosing the hardest form of Brexit you chose the most extreme interpretation of the referendum. In doing so, you encouraged all those on the continent as well as in the UK from the fringes of the political landscape and the benches of your own governments who have made grandstanding and threatening their brand of politics.

On the one hand, we have to all those who call for making Britain the world champion of social and tax dumping, or even for starting a war with Spain. On the other hand, we have those who say we should punish the United Kingdom. Have the last 70 years not told them anything?

Mrs May, by your own choice you dug yourself a hole of contradictions. How can you have a hard Brexit without having a hard border in Ireland? How can you – to use your own words – have the freest possible trade in goods and services between Britain and the EU while you take the UK out of the single market, which allows precisely that?

But above all, how can you reconcile a hard Brexit with your own stated desire of a more united UK and our claim to represent every person in the United Kingdom, including the large number of people, especially the young generation who voted in favour of remaining in the European Union?

Resolving those contradictions, so as to minimise damage to our citizens must be the objective of the negotiations to come. If we want common sense and the general interest to prevail we must ignore those who shout and posture. I agree with you, Mrs May, when you say you want to build a stronger, fairer, better Britain. Achieving stronger, fairer and better societies is a goal that many share in this Chamber.

Delivering this requires us to face the Trumps and the Putins of this world, to tackle climate change, to fight terrorism and organised crime, to find common responses to the global migration challenge, to curb corporate power. And who can believe, who seriously can believe when EU citizens altogether represent 7% of the global population on 2% of the land, that any – I say any – of our Member States, including the largest is better equipped to faces challenges on its own?

Mrs May, like it or not, we are in this together. Taking back control, being recognised as global players, requires all Europeans, including Britons, to act together. There is no such thing as absolute sovereignty. In the 21st century we can only reconquer sovereignty for democracies by sharing it.

Mrs May, you want to build a Britain your children and grandchildren are proud to call home. Let me remind you that, as we speak, many of your own citizens are proud to call not just Britain but Europe home. Let us not let them down.

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, it may have taken nine months – a pretty full gestation – but be in no doubt that last Wednesday was a great historic day when the United Kingdom announced that we were going to become an independent, self-governing, democratic nation once again, an act that has been cheered by hundreds of millions of people all over the world.

We have had a little history lesson this morning from Mr Verhofstadt, but he made one mistake. In 1973, sir, we did not join the European Union; we joined the European Economic Community. Had the British people known that it was the intention to get political and take away our ability to govern ourselves, we never would have done so.

I am sorry to say that the response to the triggering of Article 50 has been all too predictable. Already you have made a series of demands that are not just unreasonable, but, in some cases, clearly impossible for Britain to comply with. You began by telling us that we have to pay a bill: a cool GBP 52 billion, a figure that has clearly been plucked out of the air, which is effectively a form of ransom demand. What you could have acknowledged is that we put over GBP 200 billion net into this project. We are actually shareholders in this building and the rest of the assets and really you should be making us an offer we cannot refuse, to go.

The ever-charming Mr Verhofstadt, Parliament's chief negotiator, in his resolution that we are to vote on later today, tells us that we cannot discuss potential trade deals with anybody else in the world until we have left the European Union. That has no basis in Treaty law whatsoever. It is rather like saying you cannot guarantee yourself a dwelling for when you leave prison and I trust the British Government will completely ignore you.

I suspect that Mr Tusk, who is not with us today, is still crying. He looked pretty tearful, did he not, after the British Ambassador delivered the letter last week? He tells us in his memorandum that any future trade deal must ensure that the United Kingdom is not allowed to have a competitive advantage. This is all impossible. Add to that the hypocrisy of saying, on the one hand, that the EU will negotiate as one, and clause 22 of the Tusk document which says that the Spanish can have a total veto over the whole trade deal if they are not happy with the sovereignty of Gibraltar.

We believe in national self-determination. Your aim and ambition is to destroy nation state democracy. Gibraltar is clearly a deal-breaker on current terms. With these demands, you have shown yourselves to be vindictive, to be nasty, and all I can say is thank goodness we are leaving. You are behaving like the mafia. You think we are a hostage, we are not, we are free to go, and 85... I know and I do understand ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Presidente. – On. Farage, io sto garantendo a lei la possibilità di parlare, di dire tutto quello che vuole, però quando si parla di mafia, quando lei dice che il Parlamento si comporta come la mafia, questo per quanto mi riguarda è inaccettabile.

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I do understand national sensitivities. I will change it to gangsters. All right? And that is how we are being treated. We are being given a ransom note.

(Noisy interjections from the floor)

What must be very difficult for all of you to get into your minds is that there is a bigger world out there than the European Union. 85% of the global economy is outside the European Union. If you wish to have no deal, if you wish to force us to walk away from the table, it is not us that will be hurt. Do you know, we do not have to buy German motor cars, we do not have to drink French wine, we do not have to eat Belgian chocolate. There are a lot of other people that will give that to us.

A return to tariffs will risk the jobs of hundreds of thousands of people living in the European Union, and yet what you are saying is you want to put the interests of the European Union above that of your citizens and your companies. If you continue with that route it won't just be the United Kingdom that triggers Article 50. There will be many more to come.

(Applause from the EFDD Group)

Marcel de Graaff, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, I send my congratulations to Ms Theresa May, to the United Kingdom and the British people. I say to them that you have regained your freedom and your sovereignty by invoking Article 50 and leaving the European Union. You have now regained the opportunity to flourish as a nation, to control your borders, to make their own laws and to make your own trade deals.

The bureaucrats from the EU will try to make you pay about EUR 60 billion. They will try to force you to comply with all EU directives and standards, to accept hundreds of thousands of migrants, and even to accept the rulings of the European Court of Justice. They will try to open an Irish road for migrants to the UK.

I say to you that you should not give in to these demands. You are far better off outside the EU, a union which is going the way of more and more isolation. They are calling you a friend here. A friend, but they want to punish you and make you bleed.

Let me therefore remind you of the famous words of Sir Winston Churchill: 'we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender'. God bless the United Kingdom.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, as Brexit negotiations begin, it is a joy to watch the towering masters in the art of EU diplomacy in full flow here today. Those like Mr Weber, whose bellicose, threatening and theatrical words no doubt entertain this Chamber but are like a pen with no point in the negotiating rooms.

He said on his recent tour of the British media that politicians who fought for Brexit were allowed to grow up in a free Europe, and that the UK should now pay more. Well, Mr Weber, may I remind you that the freedom that you say you promote came at a mighty cost to Britain. It came in the blood and sacrifice of millions of Britons those who, like my grandfather, when asked unhesitatingly fought in the sands of Africa so Europe can be free.

It came in the 120 billion it cost Britain to fight a German dictator, it came in the 5 trillion Britain contributed to NATO to help build a shield of freedom around Europe from communism. It came on the 500 billion or more we have contributed to the EU and the billions more we spend each day more than we receive.

Mr Weber, on Radio 4 you asked 'Mrs May, please tell me what leaving the EU means?' Well, I will tell you. It means we are leaving the European Union that has forgotten the costs and sacrifices Britons freely gave to ensure you are free to exercise your diplomacy of the defeated in this Chamber of the forgetful.

Ian Borg, *President fl-Kariga tal-Kunsill*. – Kif qalu bosta ġimghat ilu, waslet l-ittra tan-notifika mir-Renju Unit, lill-President tal-Kunsill Ewropew is-Sur Tusk, u proprju anki kien hemm ir-reazzjoni tal-Kunsill Ewropew għal din in-notifika.

Kulhadd jaf ukoll li l-President Tusk ftit tas-sighat wara kien qieghed iżomm laqgħa mal-Presidenza tal-Kunsill Rotating ta' Malta u hemmhekk ukoll kien hemm l-ewwel reazzjonijiet flimkien ma' dawk prezenti, u għalkemm uħud irreferew għal din il-ġurnata tad-29 ta' Marzu bħala wahda storika, nahseb illi wiehed irid ikollu diskussjonijiet bħal dawn illi qed jagħmel illum l-istituzzjoni li inti tmexxi, Sur President, mingħajr isteriċiżmu, fejn kulhadd jagħti l-fehmiet tiegħu fuq din il-firda li se jkollna minn mar-Renju Unit.

Nahseb illi l-istituzzjonijiet jistgħu jesperenzjaw biss esperjenza pożittiva jekk jimxu bl-ordni u jzommu quddiem għajnejhom l-aħjar interessi: l-aħjar interessi fuq kollox tan-nies, tač-čittadini Ewropej, tan-negozji tal-Unjoni Ewropea, kif ukoll anki jridu jaħdmu sabiex inaqqsu l-impatt negattiv illi aħna konxji – għaliex din hija telfa għall-partijiet kollha – u allura huwa kruċjali li nimminimizaw l-impatti negattivi għač-čittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea, u allura jintlaħaq anki l-bilanč tad-drittijiet u obbligazzjonijiet rispettivi.

Il-pożizzjoni u d-dikjarazzjoni tal-Kunsill Ewropew, illi rreaġixxa għall-ittra tal-Prim Ministru May, kienet ippubblikata u dan kien nahseb l-ewwel pass fejn intwera li s-27 Membru Stat huma magħquda u għandhom messagġ wiehed – messagġ uniku dwar din is-sitwazzjoni, u nahseb li issa huwa kruċjali li fil-gimghat li ġejjin dan jinżamm sakemm ikunu adottati l-linji gwida mill-istess Kunsill Ewropew, u allura nkomplu naħdmu f'dan il-qafas bħala Unjoni wahda.

Kif tafu, il-Kunsill Ewropew huwa msejjah għad-29 ta' April u matul dan il-Kunsill Ewropew se jkun hemm maqbula l-linji gwida ta' dawn in-negozjati. Nahseb li għaldaqstant dan huwa l-hin opportun illi dan il-Parlament illum qieghed jiddiskuti u jagħti l-hsibijiet u l-pożizzjoni tiegħu dwar il-prinċipji u l-prijoritajiet tan-negozjati u rrid infakkar kif il-Prim Ministru Malti, meta anki indirizza din l-istess istituzzjoni fil-bidu tal-Presidenza Maltija, enfasizza kemm huwa kruċjali li din l-istituzzjoni – istituzzjoni demokratika, intom il-koll eletti mill-popli rispettivi tagħkom – tinżammu fil-qalba ta' dan il-proċess mhux biss għaliex jingħad fit-trattati iżda għax hekk għandu jkun. U nista' nassigurakom li dik il-pożizzjoni l-Prim Ministru Malti u l-Presidenza Maltija esprimewha f'kull laqgħa li zammejna matul dawn it-tliet xhur.

Għandi nifhem ukoll li l-prijoritajiet u l-prinċipji huma simili għal ta' xulxin, fejn anki intom taħsbu li l-interessi tač-čittadini tagħna għandhom jitpoġġew quddiem nett fuq dawn il-prijoritajiet tan-negozjati. Ovvjament, iva, hemm *financial settlement* xi trid tiġi diskussa, u għandha tkun prijorità wkoll u allura mbağħad insegwu l-appročč għan-negozjati.

L-Unjoni wkoll, nemmnu li għandha taħdem fil-prinċipju ta' kooperazzjoni sinciera mar-Renju Unit sakemm din toħroġ mill-istess Unjoni Ewropea u wara li l-linji gwida jkunu maqbula fil-Kunsill Ewropew, Sur President, il-Kunsill ser jimxi immedjatament sabiex jimplementa d-deċiżjoni u allura jawtorizza l-ftuħ tan-negozjati u d-direttivi tan-negozjati fuq is-sustanza li fuqhom bħala Presidenza wkoll qegħdin naħdmu b'mod parallel.

Nantičipaw ukoll li dawn in-negozjati proprja jibdeu lejn l-aħħar tal-Presidenza Maltija meta dawn id-direttivi tan-negozjati jkunu adottati. Hawnhekk irrid nirrimarka – forsi *rightly so* dawk kollha li tkellmu u forsi ser jtkellmu llum ser niffukaw fuq Brexit – però din l-Unjoni Ewropea għandha hafna aktar aġenda pożittiva x'tiddiksuti, x'tirrisolvi, x'tiddeċiedi, favur ič-čittadini Ewropej, u allura importanti u kruċjali li jintlaħaq il-bilanč: iva nieħdu bis-serjetà n-negozjati tal-hruġ tar-Renju Unit imma daqstant iehor; kemm il-Presidenza Maltija hija kommessa – u jien konvint anki li dawk li ser ikunu qegħdin jidhlu warajna, kif ukoll anki intom bħala Parlament – inkomplu naħdmu fuq id-diversi dossiers u files li għandna sabiex inkomplu nagħtu r-risposti pożittivi li č-čittadini Ewropej qegħdin jistennew mingħandna dwar il-futur tagħhom, u jiena konvint li intom ukoll se tkunu qegħdin taħdmu id f'id mal-istituzzjonijiet l-oħrajn sabiex inkunu qegħdin nagħmlu dan fil-gimghat, ix-xhur u s-snin li ġejjin.

Dan anki sabiex inkomplu nonoraw u issa nimplimentaw dak li qbilna s-27 Membru Stat flimkien ġewwa Ruma, u allura l-futur tal-Unjoni Ewropea u r-risposti li rridu naghtu liċ-ċittadini Ewropej għas-snin li ġejjin. Ejja nidhlu – jiena ngħid – għal dan iż-żmien u anki dan l-impenn b'approċċ kostruttiv. Qed isiru wkoll l-arranġamenti fil-Kunsill sabiex [apparti] dan li għadni kif għedt, ix-xogħol l-iehor li jrid jitkompla, jitkompla bl-iktar mod seren u allura anki b'separazzjoni ċara bejn ix-xogħol li se jkompli għaddej mit-28 u x-xogħol li se jkun għaddej fuq in-negozjati tal-hruġ mis-27, u dan sabiex, kif għedt aktar kmieni, nilhqu l-għanijiet li għandna. Jiena konvint li jekk l-Unjoni Ewropea taħdem b'dan il-mod mill-aktar effiċjenti u f'din is-sekwenza, għandu jkollna l-aħjar riżultati għalina u għaċ-ċittadini tagħna, fuq kollox.

Jean-Claude Juncker, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, there is no better place to start the debate on our negotiations with the United Kingdom than in the place where they are supposed to end in less than two years' time. In a defining and challenging moment for our Union, the role of this Parliament is more important than ever. You must scrutinise and validate the final agreement. No negotiation, no separation without representation.

This is the reason that from the very start I pushed for this House to have a full and active role in the process. I would like to thank and congratulate my friend Guy Verhofstadt and all parties involved for the speed and clarity of the resolution that you are voting on today.

I will not give a detailed response today on each point but, given the cross-party support in this House, it is clear that we are on the same lines when it comes to the big issues. That is absolutely crucial because this is the time to stay united, this is the time to stay undivided.

During these negotiations, every one of our institutions and every one of our 27 Member States must be singing from the same hymn sheet. The stronger we are as 27, the stronger we will be in the negotiations.

You already know our chief negotiator Michel Barnier very well, but over the course of the next two years you will become even more familiar with him. I have to say, before the start of the negotiations that he is doing a good job. Sometimes, not very often, I take wrong decisions but – don't laugh – but one of the best decisions I have taken since I have been President of the Commission was the appointment of Michel Barnier as our chief negotiator.

(Applause)

It is normal that your Parliament will have a say on the final deal, but more importantly, you are the checks and balances during the negotiations themselves. This is fundamentally a constitutional question for our Union: a third country cannot have the same benefits as a Member State. This Parliament must, and will, ensure that this reality is fully upheld over the course of the next two years.

We will negotiate in friendship and openness, not in a hostile mood, with a country that has brought so much to our Union, and will remain close to our hearts long after they have left. But this is now the time for reason, rather than emotion.

Sehr verehrter Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kollegen! Es geht bei diesen Verhandlungen nicht nur um Verträge und Paragraphen, schon gar nicht um diplomatisches Pingpong oder intergouvernementales Scharmützel. Es geht um das Leben von vielen Millionen Menschen.

Mehr als vier Millionen Menschen haben berufliche und familiäre Brücken von und nach Großbritannien geschlagen und damit grundlegende biografische Entscheidungen, ja Lebensentscheidungen getroffen. Sie haben sich in ihre Arbeit gestürzt mit vollem Vertrauen in die Zuverlässigkeit der Europäischen Union, haben Kinder in die Schule geschickt, erfolgreich Geschäfte gemacht und sich so ein auf Dauer angelegtes Leben aufgebaut.

Wenn wir nun in die Verhandlungen einsteigen, dann tun wir dies auch und vor allem in ihrem Namen. Die Kommission wird Fürsprecherin der direkt Betroffenen diesseits und jenseits des Kanals sein. Wir treten dafür ein, dass Arbeitnehmer, Unternehmer, Studenten, Rentner nicht diejenigen sein werden, die den Preis für den Brexit zahlen. Menschen sind keine Verhandlungsmasse.

(Beifall)

Und sie dürfen nicht zum Faustpfand in den Verhandlungen werden. Ihre Interessen sind unser Auftrag, und wir werden deshalb sicherstellen, dass die britische Brexit-Entscheidung sie nicht in Unsicherheiten und ins Ungewisse stürzt. Das gilt übrigens auch für alle diejenigen, die sich auf EU-Projekte verlassen, die bereits geplant und genehmigt sind. Eingegangene Versprechen, eingegangene Verpflichtungen sind absolut einzuhalten!

Allgemein gilt: Eine ungeordnete Scheidung ist der denkbar ungünstigste Fall. Kein Deal, das wäre ein äußerst nachteiliges Szenario für viele Menschen und für viele Familien, ein nachteiliges Szenario für Forschung, für polizeiliche Zusammenarbeit, für Handel. Kurzum, kein Deal heißt: Niemand gewinnt, alle werden verlieren. Deshalb werden wir die Verhandlungen mit Großbritannien so führen, dass wir die menschlichen, wirtschaftlichen, politischen Unwägbarkeiten des Brexit so weit wie möglich abmildern. Wir wollen in aller Fairness verhandeln – in aller Fairness, ja, aber ohne nachsichtige Naivität.

Ich weiß: Sanfte Neugeburten sehen verlockend aus. Aber – ich möchte das auch Herrn Farage sagen – nicht die Europäische Union verlässt Großbritannien, Großbritannien verlässt die Europäische Union.

(Beifall)

Unsere Scheidungsanwälte, vor allem Michel Barnier, werden nun im Detail die vielen Errungenschaften auseinanderdividieren müssen, die wir in 44 Jahren gemeinsamer, nicht krisenfreier Ehe angehäuft haben. Dies ist die notwendige Voraussetzung, damit unsere neue Partnerschaft auf eine solide Grundlage zu stehen kommt. Neue Partnerschaften können erst nach sauberer, klarer, unmissverständlicher, nicht interpretierbarer Klärung früherer Verhältnisse erfolgen. Parallele Verhandlungen über die Zukunft können nicht stattfinden. Verhandlungen über die Zukunft finden erst statt, wenn die Fragen, die uns aus der Vergangenheit erwachsen, allesamt zufriedenstellend geklärt sind.

(Beifall)

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, le choix du Royaume-Uni de sortir de l'Union, c'est un choix qui annonce la fin de l'Union européenne à 28. La séparation qui se profile à l'horizon me rend profondément triste. Le choix du peuple britannique, si respectable qu'il soit, ne va dans le sens ni de l'histoire continentale, ni de l'histoire mondiale.

Toutefois, la séparation annoncée marque une nouvelle naissance, celle de l'Union européenne à 27. Cette Union européenne à 27 fonctionne déjà: dès le mois de septembre de l'année passée, les 27 se sont réunis à Bratislava pour adopter une feuille de route qui englobe nos priorités pour les années à venir. Ce travail de réflexion et d'action s'est poursuivi lors du sommet de Malte en février dernier pour connaître son apogée lors de la célébration du soixantième anniversaire de l'Union européenne, à Rome, le 25 mars dernier.

À Rome, nous avons renouvelé nos vœux de mariage, par choix et fierté, avec le sentiment d'avoir accompli, sans l'avoir terminé, notre devoir à l'échelle du continent. Loin d'en rester là, nous allons continuer à bâtir l'édifice européen avec une énergie renouvelée.

Alors que nous étions réunis à Rome, une mobilisation citoyenne et populaire en faveur de notre projet commun s'exprimait avec vigueur dans beaucoup de villes européennes. Je voudrais saluer, et avec une certaine émotion, tous ceux qui, dans nos rues et sur nos places publiques, marchent pour l'Europe. Ils me rappellent l'ardeur des pères fondateurs de l'Europe.

(Applaudissements)

Aujourd'hui, nous devons opérer des choix quant à la façon dont nous voulons travailler, agir et progresser concrètement ensemble. Ce débat peut prendre appui sur le livre blanc publié par la Commission.

Ce débat sur l'avenir et le devenir de l'Europe, nous devons l'organiser dans toute l'Europe avec nos parlements nationaux, avec nos régions, si nécessaires pour notre cohésion, avec nos sociétés civiles, avec les artistes et les créateurs, sans l'apport desquels nous ne serions pas devenus ce que nous sommes. Les choix que nous faisons maintenant, aujourd'hui, demain, d'ici deux ans ou d'ici 2025 doivent tenir compte de leurs conséquences non seulement pour nous, mais surtout pour les générations à venir, parce que nous serons jugés non pas sur ce qui nous a été légué, mais sur ce que nous aurons laissé en héritage.

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef*. – Monsieur le Président, bonjour à chacune et chacun d'entre vous, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés. Merci, Messieurs les Présidents, de m'autoriser à m'exprimer aujourd'hui directement devant votre Parlement, en tant que négociateur et aux côtés du Président Jean-Claude Juncker qui, le tout premier, m'a fait confiance pour cette mission, et que je remercie.

Je voudrais saluer le travail très important que vous avez d'ores et déjà accompli ensemble sous l'égide du Président Tajani avec l'ensemble des groupes et des commissions et, naturellement, derrière Guy Verhofstadt et son équipe. Cher Guy, nous avons commencé à travailler de manière constructive et efficace et je suis sûr que cela continuera jusqu'au bout de la route.

Ainsi, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, votre résolution aujourd'hui sera la toute première prise de position politique d'une institution européenne en réponse à la lettre que Theresa May a adressée la semaine dernière au Président du Conseil européen. Avec cette résolution, vous allez donner le ton en vous adressant bien sûr au gouvernement britannique, aux gouvernements des vingt-sept pays de l'Union européenne, mais aussi et surtout aux citoyens européens. Pour ce qui me concerne, je comprends évidemment le message que vous souhaitez en même temps m'adresser.

Notre objectif commun est de réussir cette négociation, c'est-à-dire de parvenir à un accord. Il y a pour cela trois conditions que je voudrais rapidement rappeler.

La première condition, qui vient d'être soulignée par Jean-Claude Juncker, c'est l'unité. C'est en restant unis que nous défendrons au mieux, ensemble, les intérêts des vingt-sept pays de l'Union européenne et de leurs citoyens et, en même temps, comme chacun des présidents de groupe l'a souligné, les principes fondamentaux et les valeurs sur lesquels se fonde, depuis le tout premier jour, le projet européen, qui a été rappelé à Rome. L'unité est surtout indispensable pour l'Union mais aussi pour nos partenaires britanniques. Au bout de la route – et je voudrais le dire pour que chacun soit bien convaincu –, si l'Union était désunie, nous prendrions le risque, tout simplement, qu'il n'y ait pas d'accord. Or l'absence d'accord – Philippe Lamberts l'a dit avec beaucoup de force tout à l'heure – aurait des conséquences très lourdes. Bien sûr et d'abord pour le Royaume-Uni, mais aussi pour l'Union. Voilà pourquoi je redis que le scénario d'un *no deal* n'est pas le nôtre. Notre ambition doit être de réussir, non pas contre le Royaume-Uni mais avec le Royaume-Uni. *Not against the United Kingdom but with the United Kingdom*. Madame Helga Stevens, j'ai bien entendu l'appel que vous avez lancé tout à l'heure. Pour cela, nous devons expliquer ce que nous faisons et pourquoi nous le faisons. Nous avons un devoir de vérité envers les citoyens. Nous devons peut-être enfin dire objectivement, sans agressivité et sereinement ce que signifie le Brexit, ce que veut dire tout simplement le fait de quitter l'Union européenne. Puis-je dire aussi que cette négociation devrait avoir pour nous tous une dimension pédagogique? Elle sera l'occasion de rappeler jour après jour, voire de redécouvrir, tous les progrès réalisés ensemble et que nous avons souvent oubliés: les progrès pour la vie quotidienne des citoyens, des consommateurs et des entreprises. Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, notre unité sera d'autant plus forte qu'elle sera construite dans la transparence et dans le débat public. Cette négociation extraordinaire – qui doit rester extraordinaire – que nous mènerons dans la transparence ne sera pas une négociation secrète.

La deuxième condition, c'est de lever les incertitudes. Là où la décision du Royaume-Uni de quitter l'Union crée de l'incertitude et de l'insécurité, notre rôle est de rétablir de la certitude et de la sécurité juridique, d'abord pour les citoyens, mais aussi pour les bénéficiaires du budget européen, au Royaume-Uni comme dans les autres pays de l'Union ainsi qu'aux frontières de l'Union. Pour lever cette incertitude, les principes que j'aurai à défendre en votre nom devront être parfaitement clairs. Pour les citoyens européens au Royaume-Uni et vice-versa, la continuité et la réciprocité des droits dont ils disposent actuellement, jusqu'au jour du Brexit, devront être effectivement garanties et sans discrimination, comme l'a dit le président Pittella tout à l'heure avec force.

J'ai été évidemment attentif à ce qu'ont dit tour à tour chacun des présidents de groupe. La lettre de Theresa May, d'ailleurs, appelle aussi sur cette question un accord rapide. Mais, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés – et je peux le dire à la lumière du travail que j'effectue avec notre équipe depuis six mois –, le diable est dans les détails. Nous devons veiller, au-delà d'un accord de principe, à ce que cet accord apporte des garanties effectives aux citoyens, comme vient de le dire le Président Juncker, et ce sera aussi le rôle du Parlement que d'être vigilant.

Pour le budget, un règlement financier unique couvrira l'ensemble des engagements pris par le Royaume-Uni avec nous, et nous avec lui, en tant qu'État membre. Là encore, votre résolution est sans ambiguïté. Nous ne chercherons jamais à punir le Royaume-Uni. Jamais! Nous demanderons au Royaume-Uni de payer simplement ce à quoi il s'est engagé en tant qu'État membre. Mesdames et Messieurs, Monsieur Farage, nous devons simplement solder les comptes, ni plus ni moins. Ni plus ni moins!

(Applaudissements)

Enfin, pour les frontières, notamment en Irlande – comme M^{me} Gabriele Zimmer l'a rappelé –, il faudra trouver des arrangements qui ne remettent jamais en cause les équilibres fragiles existants, le dialogue et, en particulier, le *Good Friday Agreement*, tout en étant naturellement compatibles avec le droit de l'Union.

The third condition is doing things in the right order and putting them into perspective. The UK letter makes clear that the UK Government will push for parallel negotiations on withdrawal and on future relations. This is a very risky approach. To succeed, we need, on the contrary, to devote the first phase of negotiations exclusively to reaching an agreement on the principles of the exit. We are not proposing this to be tactical or create difficulties for the UK. On the contrary, it is an essential condition to maximise our chances of reaching an agreement together within two years, which is very short. It is also our best chance, as Manfred Weber mentioned very clearly, to build trust before proceeding to the second phase of negotiations. This second phase will be devoted to scoping our future relations and to discussing the necessary transitory arrangements. To put it differently, the sooner we agree on the principles of an orderly withdrawal, the sooner we can prepare our future relations in trade: obviously, a free and fair trade agreement, a level playing field, but also in security and defence. It is on the basis of these three conditions – unity, lifting uncertainty, and phasing of negotiations – that we can succeed, and your resolution will set the tone. My hope is that the European Parliament makes these three conditions its own.

Pour finir, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, Monsieur le Président, j'ajouterai juste un mot sur notre travail en commun à partir de maintenant et jusqu'au bout de la route.

Comme l'a dit le Président Juncker, dans cette négociation, votre rôle sera essentiel du début à la fin. Le début, c'est la résolution d'aujourd'hui, et la fin, ce sera votre vote sur le projet d'accord de retrait que nous allons négocier pendant deux ans. Avec ce vote, vous aurez le dernier mot. Tout au long de la route, c'est d'abord au Parlement européen qu'aura lieu le débat démocratique sur cette négociation, qui n'est pas et ne sera pas une négociation comme les autres. Ce débat public, ici et dans chacun de vos pays, est indispensable pour réussir le Brexit, mais aussi pour parvenir à un accord sur d'autres relations futures, dont je rappelle qu'il devra être ratifié par votre Parlement mais aussi par les parlements nationaux.

Tout au long de la route, nous allons travailler ensemble, à chaque étape et à chaque moment. C'est pourquoi je suis heureux d'être, aujourd'hui, devant vous, d'avoir eu la possibilité de m'exprimer aux côtés du Président Juncker et du Conseil, et c'est pourquoi, aussi, je continuerai à travailler en confiance avec le Président Donald Tusk et son équipe à la veille du Conseil européen extraordinaire du 29 avril.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je resterai disponible pour votre Conférence des présidents de groupe, pour la Conférence des présidents des commissions et, autant que je le pourrai, pour chacun de vos groupes. En conclusion, je tiens simplement à vous confirmer que, tout au long de cette longue et extraordinaire négociation, mon équipe et moi-même serons toujours à votre disposition.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor presidente, durante los últimos trescientos años los políticos británicos han acertado tantas veces con el lado correcto de la política que han terminado por creer que lo correcto era simplemente ser inglés. Y ahí es donde, por desgracia, ahora se equivocan.

Se equivocan porque la razón está siempre del lado de la solidaridad. Se equivocan cuando se marchan, pero quieren organizarnos la vida a los que nos quedamos, como hoy, que los conservadores presentan un plan para el futuro de una Unión Europea en la que ellos ya no van a estar.

Se equivocan cuando quieren que cerremos el mercado único a Escocia, que quiere ser europea, pero pretenden dejarnos dentro Gibraltar, que no es parte constitucional del Reino Unido y que es un paraíso fiscal.

Se equivocan cuando no ven que el nacionalismo extremo conduce al racismo. Han pasado solo siete días desde el *brexit* y no paramos de escuchar desprecios a España y a los más nacionalistas con la palabra «guerra» en la boca.

Se equivocan si creen que fuera de la Unión Europea van a tener los mismos amigos que dentro, los mismos derechos que dentro, las mismas oportunidades que dentro. Se equivocan si creen que los europeos preferimos una buena pelea a un buen acuerdo.

Se equivocan si tratan a la Unión Europea como un proyecto divisible sin darse cuenta de que el Reino Unido también es divisible. Se equivocan si creen que la Unión Europea no va a defender a todos y cada uno de sus Estados miembros, que no nos vamos a rendir ante el futuro. Europa es el mayor mercado del mundo. Europa es el mayor espacio de paz, libertad y seguridad del mundo. Europa es el mayor prestador de servicios sociales del mundo. Europa es la mejor idea que tuvieron los políticos del siglo XX. No nos vamos a rendir.

Se equivocan si creen que no nos duele que se marchen. Nos duele, y mucho. Por desgracia, esta vez va a ser el Reino Unido el que camine por el lado equivocado de la historia. Se lo digo con amistad, se lo digo con lealtad. Se están equivocando. Se van a hacer daño ustedes. Nos van a hacer daño a todos. Con la misma lealtad les digo: ojalá rectifiquen. Y les digo también: ojalá no les ciegue la soberbia.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Mr President, with this resolution, the European Parliament takes a clear strong and balanced position on the negotiations with the United Kingdom. We regret the decision to leave the EU, but we respect it. We also know, and will not forget, that a large number of UK citizens voted to remain because they understand that the European project is the only way to protect and to recover our sovereignty in a globalised world.

Our guiding principle in the whole process will be to protect the rights and interests of the citizens we directly represent. We want to ensure an orderly withdrawal of the UK from the EU, avoiding a no-deal scenario, which would have negative consequences for all, but in particular for the United Kingdom. For this reason, we call on the UK Government to agree as soon as possible on the principles of the withdrawal provisions in order to allow us to begin talks on the main features of the future relationships and on the necessary transitional arrangements. We fully support the sequencing set out by Michel Barnier. In this context, Parliament will pay particular attention to the need to protect the rights of the EU 27 citizens living or having lived in the UK and vice versa, because people – as President Juncker said – are not negotiating chips. We will also ensure that the financial settlement will cover all the commitments and liabilities, and we will insist on the absolute need to safeguard the Northern Ireland peace process and to avoid a hardening of the border in Ireland.

The future relationship between the EU and the UK should be a close partnership, based on balanced and comprehensive agreement, but it cannot provide similar benefits to those enjoyed by the Union Member States. The European Parliament will not accept any trade-off between security and economy, nor any cherry-picking. We will want an agreement which is fully in line with our standards on the environment, the fight against tax evasion and the protection of social rights. I am confident that the vote will show that this Parliament is united in line with this principle, that we back the EU negotiator and that we will honour our constitutional obligations, contributing to that unity of the EU, to a successful negotiation and to the defence of our common values and projects.

Ashley Fox (ECR). – Mr President, last week Prime Minister May triggered Article 50. In doing so she gave effect to the democratic decision of the British people to leave the European Union.

I want Members to see today as a beginning and not an end. It is the start of a new relationship between the European Union and the United Kingdom. Although we will be leaving the EU, we want to forge a deep and special partnership with our friends and allies in Europe.

The negotiations that follow will be difficult at times, and you will sometimes hear an angry voice. I hope that colleagues here will focus on the outcome we seek and not the process we undertake, because we all need a good agreement, rather than a good fight.

This Parliament has a role to play in ensuring we protect our citizens. I want the rights of all EU citizens in the UK and all British citizens in the EU to be guaranteed. I want Britain's borders with the EU to be as invisible as possible, to allow as much trade as possible. I want us to respect the right of self-determination. The sovereignty of Gibraltar is not part of these negotiations.

My group was disappointed that Mr Verhofstadt felt he could only consult on the draft text with a few close political friends. We also regret that he ignored so much good work by the Parliament's committees. Perhaps it was inconvenient. We hope in future we can work with you in the same good faith and full transparency that you request in your motion.

As we look to the future, it is in the interests of all our citizens that we reach a comprehensive agreement between Britain and the EU. We see no reason to delay any aspect of any of these talks. So let us go forward together and reach that deep and special partnership that will benefit all our nations.

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). – Mr President, the lies and blatant mistruths of the referendum campaign are crumbling before our eyes. They told us food prices would not rise. They have. They told us businesses would not move abroad. They are. They told us we were scaremongering. We were not. Sixteen million Brits did not say they wanted to leave the European family. Those who did will not be fooled again by false promises from nationalists

This month of May the British people will send a message to Mrs May in local elections and the Westminster seat of Manchester Gorton. That message reads loud and clear: you lied to us. We are angry, and we want our country back. It belongs inside the European Union.

As a Liberal Democrat, I will continue to fight against Brexit, and to give the people a final say on the deal. I am proud of this House, uniting with a positive but firm resolution. It is fair, it is just, and it is very European. And if the deal goes badly, the British people will welcome the chance to revoke Brexit and Article 50, and vote to remain.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, today in this Chamber the influence of the late Martin McGuinness is present. He met with virtually every signatory of the joint resolution, and he asked three things from this House: one, that you preserve the Good Friday Agreement in all its part; two, that there would be no hardening of the Irish border; and three, that the unique circumstances and special status of Ireland would be supported.

In his memory, we thank you for this. This is why we associate ourselves with this resolution. We feel that the European Parliament is a partner to the people of the North of Ireland and particularly those living across the partitioned border areas, north and south. No other MEP understands the disaster of partition better than MEP Matt Carthy.

Despite the fact that we support the joint resolution, we all have to recognise that this is not the Europe we want, or that the people need. We need an open and critical debate on the future of Europe, something that the resolution also calls for. We need to engage the public in this debate.

Together we can shape a better Europe, a more social Europe, a democratic Europe, a Europe of equals. We have done our part, now it is the turn of the European Council meeting on 29 April. To the European Council I say: it is over to you. Enda Kenny, Taoiseach, your day has come. Now it is your time to stand up for the Good Friday Agreement in all of its parts. Irish citizens are depending on you. You must be the voice of the people, north and south.

It is clear from this resolution that Ireland has friends in Europe. And I want to end with a quote from Manfred Weber, somebody I do not usually quote. He said that 'if the UK tries to endanger the Good Friday Agreement we will not give our support to an agreement on Brexit'.

Neither will we, and neither should the Taoiseach. So harness that support, Enda, and stand up for Ireland.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, to this point almost everything has been said on Brexit, even if nothing has been done so far. I will just underline four ideas that seem to me of the utmost importance on the subject.

Firstly, the resolution on which this Parliament voted today sets the framework for any future negotiation. Five parliamentary groups have, happily, presented it. Secondly, both sides have to concentrate on fair and discreet negotiations, conducted in a spirit of good faith and political rigour. Thirdly, we will have to learn to divorce, since we have not been able to learn to live better together. That means we have to prepare a future that can make it possible to combine distance with collaboration. Fourthly, and finally, as Chair of the EFA Group, I wish to express my conviction that both parts will be able to give fair treatment not just to the territories that have expressed their will to remain: Scotland, Northern Ireland and Gibraltar, but also to Wales.

We have a long way in front of us. Let's honour each other at least with two virtues: loyalty and courage.

Paul Nuttall (EFDD). – Madam President, I think what we have witnessed over the past week has been the unedifying spectacle of posturing and veiled threats, from the ludicrous suggestion that we will be saddled with a GBP 50 billion divorce bill (although we are a net contributor to the EU budget) to the claim that no trade will be negotiated until the end of the Article 50 process. This, I guarantee, would cause immense damage to the economies of the European Union and would result in putting many of your citizens out of work. It is what we call, in the UK, cutting off your nose to spite your face.

However, the most offensive position that you have taken is the proposal that Spain will have the right to veto any Brexit deal over the issue of Gibraltar. I want to make it clear in this Chamber today that the people of Gibraltar are proudly British. In 2002, 99% of Gibraltarians voted in a referendum against shared sovereignty with Spain, and the wishes of the people should be upheld. I do, however, have a solution to prevent Gibraltar being used as a pawn in Brexit negotiations and, indeed, end Spanish claims once and for all. Make Gibraltar a fully integrated part of the UK; give her and our other overseas territories their own Member of Parliament. Give Gibraltar real influence and a voice in Westminster and send a clear message that Gibraltar is not for sale.

In this area, we, the UK, can learn from our continental cousins, because the French give representation to their overseas territories, and I propose that we should too. I have been calling for this for many, many years, and with the unique opportunities that Brexit has given us, I believe it is an idea whose time has come.

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Madam President, I know what a divorce is like. I came through one and you will too. Both parties seek to damage each other and the kids and blame each other. You know, the kids and the bank accounts get damaged. But my ex-partner: you will recover. Your hate will lessen, but you will need a bit of counselling along the way.

Jean-Claude: get off the booze! Donald is in denial. He is in depression, trying to claim Gibraltar as his own, as so often happens when you are splitting the divorce assets. Then you appoint a crack team of negotiators, only to find you have got Mrs Malmström in there, and that she is not a trade negotiator at all. She is a sociology lecturer. Guy, you sent in your army, you sent in your barmy army for the one Spanish Armada that is left to you to retake Gibraltar. But it didn't happen. And Northern Ireland – the only way that the Good Friday peace agreement is going to fail is if you start bombing us again.

And one party thinks you owe them a bonus and an income for life just because they are injured. But our bill to you is GBP one trillion of contributions. That has been the amount of money that we have paid into this place. You failed us, so we want that back.

So it is not going very well. But d'you know what, we don't want to damage you, we don't want to damage the kids and your finances. So let's complete a free trade agreement, because if not, our friends at the World Trade Organization are looking jolly nice and very attractive, and I am not seeking an affair in this divorce but a partner for life, and I think that is where we are heading.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Madam President, the triggering of Article 50 was a good day for democracy in the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister upheld the democratic result of the referendum, when the UK voted decisively to leave the European Union last June. However, I respect that for many in this place there is genuine disappointment, maybe some sadness and even some anger. In the negotiation to come, on all sides emotion must be tempered by a practical and positive willingness to find common ground. We have an opportunity to write a new chapter on cooperation in trade, security and prosperity.

Whilst I have many difficulties with the text – not least on phasing, on finance, on trade, and on Gibraltar – I am pleased that this resolution does recognise Northern Ireland's unique position in respect of the land border with the Republic of Ireland. Both the United Kingdom and Irish Governments have said there will be no return to a hard border. The Council's draft guidelines pledge a flexible and imaginative approach. All of these commitments are welcome.

However, any solution must also respect that Northern Ireland will be an integral part of an independent United Kingdom. I hear – and appreciate – support for the peace process in this House. The greatest support for the process will come from stable government, and my party pledges to work hard to ensure that in this, and in the outcome of Brexit, we will represent the best interests of Northern Ireland.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Herr Ratspräsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich muss mich in diesem Augenblick daran erinnern, dass ich 1975 in London an einer Demonstration teilgenommen habe für den Verbleib von Großbritannien in der Europäischen Union – in einem Großbritannien, das von Streiks, Niedergang der Industrie ökonomisch und politisch zerrissen war. Wir debattieren heute über ein Großbritannien, das wieder zu Stärke gelangt ist durch Mitgliedschaft innerhalb der Europäischen Union. Und bei dieser Demonstration war eine Frau Thatcher dabei, die für britische Mitgliedschaft war und immer gekämpft hat und die den Binnenmarkt möglich gemacht hat, die auch in der Tory-Regierung den Maastricht-Vertrag möglich gemacht hat. Ich muss sagen: Alle Verträge, Herr Farage, sind seitdem vom britischen Unterhaus ratifiziert worden und deswegen voll legitimiert. Europa von heute hat die Legitimation auch von Großbritannien! Das sollte festgehalten werden.

Wir wollen konstruktive Verhandlungen, faire Verhandlungen, keine Revanche – in unserem gemeinsamen Interesse. Aber es muss auch klar sein: Wer nicht die Lasten der EU, des Binnenmarktes oder der Zollunion tragen will, kann auch nicht deren Vorteile durch einen Handelsvertrag retten. Deswegen muss es klar sein, dass man nicht dieselben Möglichkeiten auf dem Binnenmarkt oder sonstwo hat, als wäre man Mitglied. Das ist faires Verhalten.

Und ich meine, dass wir aus diesem Grund auch nicht sehen können, dass wir Drohkulissen erlauben sollten. Ihr folgt uns beim Scheidungsvertrag und beim Freihandelsvertrag, dafür sichern wir eure Sicherheit. Die Sicherheit in Europa gegen Terror – London sollte das wissen –, gegen Terror, gegen Außenangriffe ist im britischen Interesse, dies ist im gemeinsamen Interesse, dies kann nicht aufgerechnet werden. Ich glaube, auch dies wird im Vereinigten Königreich verstanden werden. Deswegen ist das keine Drohkulisse, sondern ein Unverständnis.

Und man muss wissen: Dieses Europäische Parlament muss dem Scheidungsvertrag zustimmen. Wir werden auf die Konditionen achten. Es wird einer Transitionsvereinbarung zustimmen müssen, und es wird dem endgültigen Ergebnis zustimmen müssen. Deswegen ist es, glaube ich, gut, sich mit dem Europäischen Parlament gut zu stellen und dass wir hier für Ihr Land und alle als EU der 27 kämpfen, um die Rechte der Bürger – die Rechte der Bürger in Nordirland und in der Republik von Irland –, in der gesamten Europäischen Union zu sichern.

Wir wollen keine Rhetorik des Krieges, wie das mit Gibraltar wieder passiert ist, sondern ein Europa, das 70 Jahre Frieden gebracht hat, wollen wir verteidigen, auch in dieser Stunde! Deswegen ist Großbritannien, ein großes Land, eingeladen, in dieser Frage des Friedens und der Freiheit mitzuwirken. Und bitte nicht solche Reden, wie wir sie hier manchmal hören! Gemeinsam werden wir unsere Zukunft gestalten, und nicht durch diese nationalistische Diskussionsform der Vergangenheit.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señora presidenta, yo quiero empezar por decirles, señorías, que ha habido intervenciones esta mañana que me han parecido gratuitamente agresivas. Yo pienso que no es el camino de esta negociación tan importante para nosotros.

En primer lugar, querría reivindicar que es necesaria una negociación exigente sobre las condiciones de salida. Europa tiene derecho a establecer una exigencia para que irse del «club» no sea gratis, para que no sea mejor marcharse que quedarse. Es una pedagogía del coste que Europa tiene que establecer como condición de su propia continuidad.

En segundo lugar, me parece importante señalar al señor Barnier que podría ser importante que al mismo tiempo que negociamos la salida de la Unión Europea, tengamos un marco que asegure los derechos de los cuatro millones de ciudadanos británicos y europeos que conviven, porque es importante que ese acuerdo sea simultáneo a la salida.

Y, en tercer lugar, querría reivindicar lo que yo creo que es el final de este proceso. Y es que tenemos que buscar un acuerdo, pero, señorías, un acuerdo que tiene que ser fruto también de una voluntad de convivencia, también con Gibraltar.

España no pretende hacer una guerra de soberanías, no pretende hacer una guerra de soberanías con Gibraltar, pero España tiene un contencioso histórico pendiente y quiere convivir con Gibraltar. Pero tampoco podemos admitir que en el siglo XXI haya una colonia en Europa: tienen ustedes que entenderlo. Esta es la voluntad de España.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru formand! Brexit er ikke sygdommen, men symptomet. Sygdommen er den tankegang, som trives nogle steder i EU, men i særdeleshed her i Europa-Parlamentet, der går ud på at ønske, at dette projekt skal udvikles til en føderal superstat. Hvis man tager ved lære af Brexit ved at gå videre med fælles hær, med fælles initiativer på en række områder, ja med hele Hr. Verhofstadts store projekt om en ny forfatning for Europa med henblik på at indføre en sådan superstat, så vil Brexit blot være startskuddet til, at en række medlemslande ikke længere vil kunne se sig selv i det europæiske samarbejde. Det er derfor også beklageligt, at den beslutning, som vi står med i dag, handler om alt det, vi ikke kan gøre med Storbritannien, alt det Storbritannien ikke skal have lov til. Som den tidligere taler sagde: »En pædagogisk øvelse, der skal afskrække andre fra at lave samme fejl, som Storbritannien har begået ved at forlade EU.« Det er en hel forkert lære at tage! Fejlen er, at hvis vi straffer Storbritannien nu i stedet for at se på de muligheder, vi har sammen i fremtiden, så vil det betyde, at flere går i samme retning. Vi har derfor brug for en god og fornuftig aftale med Storbritannien, som sikrer fælles handel og fælles sikkerhed.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Madam President, in my one minute I will concentrate on how Brexit affects the island of Ireland. The words Ireland and Northern Ireland appear eight times in the document we are discussing today, and that in itself indicates the importance that the European Parliament attaches to the unique position and special circumstances confronting the island of Ireland. It is crucial to safeguard peace and, therefore, to preserve the Good Friday Agreement in all its parts. We insist on the absolute need to ensure continuity and stability of the Northern Ireland peace process and avoid the re-establishment of a hard border. Those are not my words; those words are written in the document we will agree today.

So we start with good intent, but over the next few months all of us will have to come forward with workable solutions that will make a reality of those fine words. We share a border of almost 500 kilometres with Northern Ireland. We must maintain our common travel area, otherwise the dislocation could be catastrophic for our small island. Finally, I want to agree with Michel Barnier that we should ensure a free and fair trade agreement with a level playing field. That must also be the outcome between the Republic and Northern Ireland.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono d'accordo con l'impianto della risoluzione comune, anche se non contiene le autocritiche che avrei desiderato, ma nella difesa dei diritti dei cittadini è più precisa delle linee del Consiglio europeo.

La nostra battaglia parlamentare comincia oggi, e spero che tutti saremo vigilanti su due punti cruciali: i diritti dell'Irlanda del Nord, garantiti dal *Good Friday Agreement*, e quelli di milioni di cittadini, europei e non, che vivono nel Regno Unito. In Irlanda sono in gioco pace e guerra. Per i cittadini sono in gioco i fondamenti normativi dell'Unione – preferisco parlare di fondamenti normativi, più che di valori, troppo soggettivi, dunque opinabili.

La Brexit, da questo punto di vista, mi preoccupa. Milioni di cittadini europei nel Regno Unito e di britannici nell'Unione rischiano di perdere diritti fondamentali, sociali e civili, attualmente garantiti dal diritto europeo. Uno degli scopi della Brexit è il *Great Repeal Bill*, che cancellerà tale diritto, creerà un'economia ancora più sregolata e potrebbe preludere all'uscita dalla Convenzione dei diritti dell'uomo.

Ecco un equivoco della campagna Brexit: i cittadini vulnerabili rischiano di non riprendere il controllo cui aspirano, ma di perderlo. Solo a una condizione vedranno tutelati diritti acquisiti precisi: che questi non diventino merce di scambio e siano iscritti nell'accordo di recesso. Spetta a questo Parlamento dare certezze legali all'Irlanda del Nord e ai cittadini impauriti. Spetta a noi capire i nostri errori e costruire un'unione sociale che eviti il rigetto di tanti suoi cittadini e una fuga dall'Europa che dobbiamo cominciare a capire.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I campaigned for the European Union as a peace project and a beacon for democracy and human rights. The journey towards Brexit is proving how powerful the Union has been in this civilising mission and how flimsy these basic freedoms seem without European support.

The vote for Brexit has been hijacked to build an ugly coalition to undermine our civilised society. Within a week of triggering Article 50, we have a senior Conservative threatening war against a European country. This is sadly symbolic of the loss of commitment to peace and to basic standards of diplomacy, to say nothing of friendship and loyalty. I represent the people of Gibraltar and I will fight for their right to self-determination. They value being British citizens – as I do – because Britain is a country of decency and democracy. What value a British passport if the Prime Minister can change fundamental legislation without reference to Parliament? What value a proud history if our future allies will be despots? What value international respect if it is squandered for narrow economic advantage?

(Applause)

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Dames en heren collega's van de EU-meerderheid in dit Parlement: stop alstublieft met de geëmotioneerde half hysterische nummertjes met een air van morele superioriteit. Wij als Parlement moeten ook niet doen alsof wij hier een veto kunnen uitspreken. De enige die in deze zaak een politieke beslissing moest en kon nemen, was de bevolking van het Verenigd Koninkrijk, en ook binnen de Europese Unie zijn er veel sympathisanten van wat Groot-Brittannië nu doet.

Al de rest is een technische afwikkeling. Als wij hier iets nuttigs zouden kunnen doen, in plaats van allerlei suggesties van wraakgevoelens of allerlei voorstellen voor het blijvend koppelen van vrijhandel aan open immigratiegrenzen, dan is het onze wens te uiten, onze politieke wens, om het Verenigd Koninkrijk zonder rancune te behandelen als een geprivilegieerde partner en een buitengewoon goede vriend.

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, the statements today by Europhile party political leaders were everything I had anticipated and feared: total misrepresentation of facts and issues by the Socialists and the EPP Group, and misleading interpretation of history, UK economics and EU evolution by the Liberal Democrats, all allowed to pass uncorrected. This morning has seen political theatre, histrionics and political opportunism at full throttle by the Europhiles, and all because the United Kingdom has chosen to leave the European Union.

Well, I suggest we get real and start adopting grown-up politics because there is a serious leg of negotiations ahead of us and we do not need to see yet more Project Threat, Revenge and Penalty from the likes of Mr Juncker, Mr Barnier and Mr Verhofstadt. That is not helpful, and all it does is pander to a press which at the moment is misrepresenting both the EU position and the United Kingdom position. I do not feel that is helpful. So please can I ask everybody to calm down and be calm, and get on with it.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, the process of Brexit has formally started and is testing political and technical capacities on both sides to get a timely and – as Michel Barnier said – successful agreement. The challenges the Union is now facing in the context of the UK withdrawal are well understood and also shared by the Union institutions. The European Parliament is, and will be, at the forefront of the process and has shown a high level of political openness and cooperation, but also unity, in helping to define the Union's path for the upcoming negotiations.

We cannot but welcome the constructive approach set out in the letter notifying the UK's intention to withdraw and setting out the approach to the negotiations, but the truth is that the really hard choices are yet to come, and for many citizens transparent negotiations will be a learning process. We want to ensure legal certainty and stability and to avoid disruption for citizens and businesses across the Union through an orderly and phased withdrawal, in line with Union law and with a view to mitigating economic, political and emotional – Mr Annemans – damage. But this damage is already a fact of life. European institutions are united on basic guiding principles and values, as well as on ensuring the protection of the Union's autonomy and legal order. All this sets the right path for cooperative and, above all, principled negotiations based on good faith.

For the European Parliament the principles are clear. First and foremost, we must defend and promote the interests of the citizens of the Union whom we represent, and safeguard the integrity and the coherence of the constitutional framework of the Union. These are the key building blocks for the negotiation and also the absolute boundaries on the basis of which the European Parliament will assess the outcome of the withdrawal negotiations through the consent procedure. We must be clear that abandoning membership cannot lead to a *status quo ante* and to unrealistic expectations.

Let me finish just by expressing my conviction that the concerns of those who were against abandoning membership should not remain unaddressed.

Sergei Stanishev (S&D). – Madam President, the time for regrets is over. The process of the UK leaving the European Union is under way. What we need is sober heads, good faith, but also a very clear mandate from the European institutions. This is what this House is doing today.

First and foremost, we should aim to overcome the uncertainty regarding the lives of both EU citizens on the island and UK citizens in the European Union. Their lives should not be used as a bargaining chip, as has been underlined many times. There is also the issue of security cooperation, which is beneficial for both sides in this process.

Second, trading freely would be in everyone's interest, but the UK cannot have a better deal outside the Union and the single market than it has currently. In any future arrangement, the UK will have to play by the same rules as everyone else.

Third, last but not least, we must also urgently launch debates on how the EU of 27 will adjust its budget, its policies and its institutions after UK withdrawal, in order to respond to the expectations for our citizens.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, решението на гражданите на Обединеното кралство е законно и суверенно. Никой, който твърди, че уважава правилата на демокрацията, не може да твърди обратното. Всеки опит да бъдат наказани, унижени и оштетени британските граждани е дълбоко погрешен. Той ще е признание за провала на федералисткия опит за политика и показва гузна съвест.

Обединеното кралство е наш приятел, съмишленик и съюзник – основен стълб на общата ни отбрана в изключително трудни времена. Северна Ирландия и Гибралтар без съмнение са интегрална част от Обединеното кралство и не може да бъде поставен никакъв подобен въпрос.

Това, което трябва да се постигне и изработи в преговорите, а те ще се водят между държавните и правителствените ръководители, е една добра, изгодна и честна сделка в отношенията между Европейския съюз и Обединеното кралство. Сделка, която трябва да гарантира правата и законните интереси на британските граждани на територията на Съюза и на гражданите на европейските държави в Обединеното кралство.

Това е. Нищо повече и нищо по-малко.

Jill Evans (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I was elected to represent the Welsh national interest, and that is what I will continue to do. The people of Wales have the democratic right to decide on their own future, and that includes the kind of EU withdrawal that takes place and the way that it affects our nation.

The devolved administrations of the UK, including Wales, should be involved at every stage of the negotiations. I do not accept that the interests of Wales can be ignored by the UK Government, but that is exactly what is happening, despite the publication of the white paper 'Securing Wales' Future,' produced by Plaid Cymru and the Welsh government. It is a comprehensive and constructive plan, which includes our continuing participation in the single market, which is a top priority for our economy and our communities.

I see Wales' potential as a successful nation. We have a lot to contribute to this process and to build in the future, and our voice must be heard.

Nicolas Bay (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, avant toute chose, permettez-moi de saluer une nouvelle fois le courage du peuple britannique, qui a su voter contre les prophètes de malheur qui lui annonçaient le chaos en cas de Brexit.

Oui, la démocratie britannique, l'une des plus vieilles démocraties du monde, a su déjouer les pronostics de la technocratie mondialiste qui sévit à Bruxelles, mais aussi à Paris. À présent, nous nous devons et vous vous devez de respecter la décision souveraine du peuple. Inutile de menacer les Britanniques, nous avons tous intérêt à ce que cette sortie se fasse dans la sérénité et le respect. Le Royaume-Uni ne quitte pas l'Europe, il quitte l'Union européenne, une organisation supranationale qui s'est construite sans les peuples, et même contre eux, en organisant l'impuissance collective de nos nations au seul profit des multinationales.

Depuis longtemps déjà, les peuples vous demandent d'en finir avec ce fonctionnement bureaucratique, attentatoire à la démocratie, et ses orientations idéologiques qui nuisent à nos intérêts vitaux. C'est particulièrement le cas du dogme de la libre circulation des capitaux, des biens et des personnes. L'Europe, notre Europe existe depuis des millénaires, et c'est vous qui la détruisez. Il faut donc la reconstruire par d'utiles coopérations, en redonnant à nos nations leur souveraineté, c'est-à-dire en rendant à nos peuples leur liberté, à commencer par celle de défendre leur identité, leur culture, ce formidable héritage que nous devons transmettre et enrichir. Il s'agit là du droit fondamental des peuples à disposer d'eux-mêmes et à rester maîtres de leur destin.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, talk of Brexit and divorce reminds me of the song '50 ways to leave your lover'. You know the one: 'Slip out the back, Jack; Hop on the bus, Gus' and now we have 'Say day-day, May'. I wish it was that simple but this divorce, after 44 years and with no precedent, looks like it is going to be tough, and possibly rough. For that reason we need calm heads, clear minds and creative thinking, and with Michel Barnier at the helm, I think we have the package.

Where Ireland is concerned, we are very grateful to all groups in the European Parliament for taking the concerns of our Taoiseach, our government and my colleagues on board. The special circumstances of Ireland are referenced, and this sends out a powerful message to the citizens of Ireland and of Europe that when one country, no matter how small, is adversely affected, disproportionately threatened, the European Union will stand in solidarity behind them. And boy are we threatened, both economically and politically. But with this solidarity we can be confident that the terms of the Good Friday Agreement will be observed to the letter, that there will not be, cannot be and must not be a return to a hard border and that the prosperity of Ireland, especially our exporting sector, must not and cannot and will not be sacrificed on the high altar of expediency or pride.

Common sense not nonsense, pragmatism not pride must prevail. This is the best way to leave your lover.

Glenis Willmott (S&D). – Madam President, last June I toured my constituency, day in and day out, making clear my concerns about the dangers of Britain leaving the EU – dangers for our economy and British businesses, and the threat to the jobs they create; dangers for British workers, as the Tory right clamour to use Brexit to spark a bonfire of EU workers' rights; dangers for British and EU citizens, with our cooperation on issues like counter-terrorism and security linked to our EU membership.

We lost the EU referendum, and while it saddens me to say it, Britain is leaving the EU – but those dangers are still there. In all our countries, there are families for whom the Brexit vote has created worrying uncertainty – millions of people concerned about their rights to live and work in countries they have made home. Citizens across Europe are now at risk of the economic consequences of a bad deal – or even worse, no deal at all – and people in all 28 countries will suffer if Brexit means competition on low wages, lax environmental standards and scaled back rights for workers and consumers. These are the people we represent, and these are the people to whom this Parliament must give a voice.

It will not always be easy to take the responsible path in the coming months, but it is what we must do. There are some in this House and beyond who are actively hoping to plunge Europe and Britain into chaos through a disorderly no-deal Brexit. Why? Because they have no answers to the questions that constructive negotiations will bring. So let us work for a constructive deal. And to those leave campaigners who now sit in the British cabinet or on the benches opposite – there is still one of them there, I can see – you won. Now take responsibility for the promises you made. As we all consider how we conduct ourselves over the coming weeks, let us remember that we are here representing people whose lives and livelihoods depend on the outcome. Serious times call for a serious response.

(Applause)

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wielka Brytania, jak powiedziała premier Theresa May, opuszcza Unię, ale nie Europę. To przypomina nam, że wbrew obecnej, wykluczającej nowomowie, Unia to nie Europa. W negocjacjach z Wielką Brytanią nie powinniśmy o tym zapominać. Nie powinniśmy zapominać o wspólnym dziedzictwie i wspólnych interesach, które będą nas łączyć także wtedy, gdy Wielka Brytania opuści Unię. W negocjacjach nie może chodzić o to, by ukarać Wielką Brytanię za demokratyczną decyzję, zgodną z prawem do opuszczenia Unii zapisanym w traktatach. Unia nie może być Wspólnotą opartą na strachu i przymusie, bo to jest droga do jej końca. Zamiast tego powinniśmy jednocześnie z negocjacjami rozpocząć proces głębokiej reformy Unii, przywracającej jej ducha wolności i solidarności opartej na wolności.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, as a Scottish European I have long wondered how I would feel today. The answer is, I am heartbroken, not for myself, but for the people I serve, for future generations. Scotland will not be silent within this process, as our rights are taken away by an administration we do not support, by a vote that we clearly rejected and a process that is demonstrably against our interests.

While being heartbroken, I am also angry. I am angry at this process, and I am angry at the way the UK is representing itself, doing a bad thing badly. Mrs May and Nigel Farage do not speak for Scotland, do not speak for me, and do not speak for 48% of the UK's population. The UK is not one bloc, much as Mrs May would like it to be; the UK is a complicated set of various interests, all of which are better reflected in this resolution than in anything the UK Government has put forward to date.

Scotland will not be silent in this process, and Scotland's top priority, in the words of our First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, is to keep our citizens safe. Scotland is your home, you are welcome here. I appreciate that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed but please, colleagues, let us make our citizens feel safe, our citizens from the UK in other countries, and citizens from other nations in ours. Let's deal with that first, let's deal with that fast and let's deal with it now.

Herbert Reul (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herren Präsidenten, meine lieben Kollegen! Da brauche ich nicht viel hinzuzufügen. Der Brexit ist ärgerlich. Er ist, glaube ich, auch am Ende ein Fehler. Aber jetzt kommt es eben drauf an, ordentlich damit umzugehen, fair damit umzugehen, sauber die Arbeit zu machen. Ich finde das, was die Kommission, was Präsident Juncker und auch was Michel Barnier vorgetragen hat, total in Ordnung. Jetzt muss man Schritt für Schritt ordentlich arbeiten und gute Ergebnisse abliefern.

Auf der anderen Seite ist eine solch schwierige Lage auch immer eine Chance, eine Chance für die restlichen 27. Darüber sollten wir vielleicht auch öfter reden. Eine Chance, sich wieder ein bisschen stärker aufeinander zu verlassen, sich wieder mehr zuzutrauen, auch ein Stückchen verlässlicher zu werden und das gemeinsame Projekt auch wieder offensiver nach außen zu vertreten, sich auf das Wesentliche zu konzentrieren und dafür zu sorgen, dass das europäische Projekt bei den Leuten auch wieder Begeisterung auslöst. Es ist doch vielleicht kein Zufall, dass in diesen Tagen gerade wieder Menschen überall auf die Straßen gehen und sich zu Europa bekennen. Diese Chance müssen wir nutzen. Dafür brauchen wir gute Ergebnisse, ordentliche Arbeit, Verlässlichkeit untereinander und den Beweis, dass wir in der Lage sind, die Probleme, die Anliegen auch zu lösen. Wir müssen beweisen, dass die Probleme, die die Menschen beunruhigen, gelöst werden können von uns, von den Politikern, die hier im Europäischen Parlament sitzen. Und dann wird die Sache ein gutes Ende nehmen.

Und wenn wir den Beweis dafür liefern, dass es in Europa eine Chance auf Beschäftigung und Wohlstand gibt, wenn wir uns vielleicht mehr darum bemühen, auch wirtschaftliche Innovation, wirtschaftliche Stärke zu entwickeln und nicht nur darüber zu reden, wie man Schwierigkeiten und Schwächen gegenseitig ausgleicht, sondern nach vorne zu gucken –: Ich finde, das kann eine große Chance werden, auch wenn der Brexit im Ergebnis ein großer Fehler ist.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Juncker, Herr Minister, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herr Barnier, Sie haben in Ihrem Statement erwähnt, dass es bei der Klärung der Finanzbeziehungen zwischen der EU und dem Vereinigten Königreich um die Klärung der Konten geht und nicht um eine Strafe, und Sie haben völlig Recht. Das Vereinigte Königreich hat sich nicht in ein Unternehmen eingekauft, aus dem es jetzt sein Kapital abzieht, sondern es hat eine Zeit lang in ein politisches Bündnis investiert, für das es politische und wirtschaftliche Vorzüge und Dienstleistungen erhalten hat. Auch wenn das Vereinigte Königreich dafür keine Wertschätzung mehr hat: Die Abmachungen, die die Unterschrift eines britischen Regierungsvertreters tragen, müssen respektiert werden, auch wenn diese Abmachungen zeitlich über den britischen Austritt hinausreichen.

Um es bildlich auszudrücken: Auch in einem englischen Pub kann man nicht einen lustigen Abend verbringen, gut essen und trinken und einfach gehen, bevor die Rechnung kommt. Das gilt für den mittelfristigen Finanzrahmen – der ist vom Vereinigten Königreich unterzeichnet –, das gilt für die bestehenden Verpflichtungsermächtigungen aus den gültigen EU-Haushalten – denen allen hat das Vereinigte Königreich zugestimmt –, und das gilt für die Pensionskosten für die europäischen Beamtinnen und Beamten – viele von ihnen kommen aus dem Vereinigten Königreich –, von deren Arbeit in der Zeit der Mitgliedschaft auch das Vereinigte Königreich profitiert hat.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Madam President, I do not want to dwell on the past today, but rather to look to the future. We all need to come together with a plan that works for everyone and build a good foundation for our future relationships with the European Union. For the sake of all our people, the United Kingdom and the European Union need to work together as strong allies and close friends when we leave.

Europe has been a strong friend to Northern Ireland and gave us strong support during our darkest days. I am confident that friendship will continue. I welcome the fact that all sides want a frictionless border. However, we all know that finding a solution will require a lot of innovative thinking. Any solution must not diminish Northern Ireland's place as an integral part of the United Kingdom, as enshrined in the principle of consent in the Belfast Agreement.

And can I make it clear to you, Mr Barnier, that I will not accept a hard border. I will also not accept an internal UK border. I would also urge EU leaders not to heed those who are merely using Brexit as an excuse to break up the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Let me also say to you very clearly – and I hope you are listening, Mr Barnier, and not twiddling with your telephone as you seem to be doing; I would suggest, with the greatest respect, that you actually listen to the speech – that Dublin does not speak for Belfast. We will take care of ourselves.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Mogło dzisiaj nie być tej debaty, mogło nie być rezolucji i wszystkich związanych z tym kłopotów, gdyby w kraju, który ja osobiście bardzo podziwiałem (był dla mnie inspiracją, gdy byłem za żelazną kurtyną), ta egzystencjalna kwestia *to be or not to be in the EU* nie stała się zakładnikiem wewnątrzpartyjnych porachunków i rozgrywek i gdyby samo referendum nie było do tego stopnia zatrute demagogią i nieprawdą. Ale Brexit jest faktem: idziemy w nieznaną, wiedząc tylko, że inna przeważa wizja przyszłości w Szkocji, inna wizja przyszłości przeważa w Irlandii Północnej, inna – w samej Anglii. Mamy mapę drogową na tę niepewną przyszłość w postaci projektu rezolucji i od tej pory będziemy kształtowali los Wspólnoty Europejskiej w 27 krajów i nie potrzebujemy specjalnych wypowiedzi ze strony naszych angielskich kolegów.

Projekt rezolucji odpowiada wyobrażeniom mojej delegacji, a zainteresowania mamy duże, zważywszy na prawie milion naszych rodaków na Wyspach Brytyjskich. Prawdy są fundamentalne: porozumienie jest lepsze niż brak porozumienia, uporządkowany rozwód lepszy niż niekontrolowane rozejście się w gniewie, najpierw rozstanie, potem kształtowanie przyszłości, sytuacja w Wielkiej Brytanii nie może być lepsza niż jakiegokolwiek innego kraju. Widzę odświeżenie na kontynencie europejskim, również w moim kraju, i to jest znak pewnej refleksji, która wywołana została Brexitem.

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, personne n'a rien à gagner dans le fait que le Royaume-Uni quitte l'Union européenne. Une rupture est toujours douloureuse, et si l'union fait la force, la désunion est une terrible source de vulnérabilité.

Les Britanniques n'ont rien à gagner à se retrouver isolés sur la scène internationale et à perdre tous les bénéfices que leur apportait l'appartenance à l'Union européenne: la liberté de circulation, la liberté de résidence, le marché unique, la charte des droits fondamentaux, et j'en passe. L'Union européenne sera elle aussi perdante. Elle se retrouve amputée d'un membre, affaiblie dans plusieurs de ses politiques et avec des millions de ressortissants à l'avenir incertain. Là encore, la liste est longue.

Mais si la peine que ressentent aujourd'hui tous les pro-européens est vive, nous restons néanmoins des responsables politiques. Alors, malgré la tristesse que nous pouvons ressentir à titre individuel vis-à-vis de nos collègues, camarades ou amis, nous devons aller de l'avant et transformer cette crise politique en occasion pour la refondation de l'Europe. Il nous faudra nous battre pour que les citoyens soient la première priorité des négociations de sortie du Royaume-Uni, puis de l'éventuel partenariat qui suivra. Mais, surtout, il faudra entendre la colère qui a porté les tenants du Brexit et réformer l'Europe en profondeur pour que demain, l'adhésion à l'Union européenne soit à nouveau une évidence pour ses habitants. L'Europe de la protection, de la paix, de la prospérité, l'Europe que nous aimons doit retrouver toute sa splendeur. Le sursaut démocratique sera la condition de la survie du projet européen.

Franck Proust (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, enfin, nous sommes rassemblés aujourd'hui car le Royaume-Uni a finalement déclenché la procédure de retrait de l'Union européenne. Le moins que l'on puisse dire, c'est que le chemin a été long, synonyme d'une certaine impréparation du gouvernement britannique.

Au nom de la délégation française du groupe PPE, je souhaite bon courage à Michel Barnier, qui a l'expérience et le charisme nécessaires pour conduire ces négociations avec efficacité et pragmatisme. Il y a d'un côté les aspects techniques, qui se comptent en milliers: la résolution que nous présentons aujourd'hui, qui fait de notre institution un bloc démocratique capable de s'accorder sur les lignes rouges et qu'il importe de défendre dans les négociations, est une base de travail pour la Commission et les États membres.

Mais de l'autre côté, il y a le fait de communiquer, d'expliquer, de parler aux citoyens, qui relève de la politique concrète et utile. Nous sommes des élus au contact des femmes et des hommes dans nos eurocirconscriptions. Dans le flou qui a régné jusqu'à présent, certains ont pu me dire: «Vous voyez, Monsieur, cela ne change rien de sortir de l'Union européenne», croyant que le Royaume-Uni était déjà dehors.

Les populistes ou extrémistes jouent aussi sur les peurs et les destins nationaux isolés de l'Union, mais disons la vérité: l'isolement conduit au déclin. Ne plus appartenir à notre communauté de destin affaiblira inévitablement ce royaume sans doute désuni demain, avec une Écosse désireuse de faire partie de la première puissance économique du monde qu'est le continent européen.

Les choses doivent être claires: le Royaume-Uni a choisi de quitter le marché unique, il perdra en souveraineté économique. Si Theresa May souhaite conserver demain une relation stable avec l'Union européenne, elle devra s'acquitter des engagements politiques et financiers pris par son pays.

Avant de quitter la table, il faut payer l'addition et un divorce coûte cher, malheureusement. Alors, ne tergiversons pas ! Les citoyens ne supportent plus l'eau tiède. Soyons francs avec nos amis britanniques, pragmatiques dans les négociations et réalistes quant au partenariat nécessaire qui forgera notre relation de demain.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Jacques Delors amava ripetere che è impossibile innamorarsi del mercato interno. Probabilmente continua ad avere ragione, ed è forse per questo motivo che gli inglesi se ne sono andati. Eppure il mercato unico rappresenta una delle storie di successo del processo di integrazione europea. Se la Brexit ha un merito, è quello di far emergere ogni giorno di più i benefici, percepiti o meno, che il mercato unico realizza nella vita di ciascuno. Il nostro compito consiste nel preservare i valori e le libertà che ne sono alla base nella loro integrità.

La Brexit impone alle istituzioni europee e agli Stati membri un passo avanti. In un mondo sempre più diviso, sempre più protezionista, sempre più ostaggio degli estremismi di ogni tipo, oggi è il giorno dell'orgoglio europeo. In gioco non c'è il futuro, per quanto importante e per quanto a noi caro, del Regno Unito, ma il destino di 27 popoli europei. A questi dobbiamo delle risposte. Su queste ci giudicherà la storia.

Lorenzo Cesa (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, penso che la gran parte di noi non avrebbe mai voluto affrontare questa discussione. Penso che la gran parte degli europei non avrebbe mai voluto che si parlasse di Brexit. Adesso dobbiamo affrontare con decisione, ma anche con equilibrio, questa fase negoziale, caro presidente Barnier.

Approveremo oggi con tempismo e lungimiranza una risoluzione molto puntuale e precisa. Voglio ringraziare di questo il Presidente del Parlamento e i presidenti dei gruppi politici che l'hanno sottoscritta. Sappiamo che le trattative non saranno né brevi né semplici. Quello che occorre fare è parlare con un'unica voce, con la voce dei 27 paesi e di tre istituzioni che devono marciare unite. Occorre negoziare con il pensiero rivolto ai nostri cittadini, occorre essere ambiziosi con le nostre richieste e trasparenti e lineari con i nostri valori di unità. Occorre usare il linguaggio della verità.

La Brexit, sia ben chiaro, non ci fermerà: è stato ribadito a Roma in occasione dell'anniversario dei trattati. Dobbiamo guardare avanti senza distrazioni e alibi, certi che il nostro progetto di Unione di pace e prosperità si fortificherà. È questa, cari colleghi, l'occasione per il rilancio della nostra Unione.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Eine Mehrheit in Großbritannien hat entschieden: raus aus der EU. Und das hat Konsequenzen: Knapp drei Millionen EU-Bürger leben heute im Vereinigten Königreich. Sie leben, lieben, arbeiten, haben geheiratet, zahlen Steuern, haben ihre Kinder großgezogen – und ihre Zukunft? Völlig ungewiss. Ähnlich geht es mehr als 1,5 Millionen Briten in der EU: heute noch Unionsbürger mit allen dazugehörigen Rechten, aber was passiert zukünftig, was in zwei Jahren, nach dem tatsächlichen Austritt?

Der Konservative David Cameron wird in die Geschichte eingehen als ein Mann, dem kurzfristige populistische Erfolge wichtiger waren als das Schicksal all dieser Menschen.

Und eine Bemerkung in Richtung der britischen UKIP:

You are not taking back your country. You are trying to destroy this continent, and you do not care how much your citizens and our citizens will suffer from it. But listen carefully: we will not let you succeed. We will continue to fight for a Europe based on solidarity and justice, a Europe where facts expose the lies, a Europe that protects its citizens and does not leave them with the prospect of an uncertain and gloomy future. And I hope that one day the UK will become a real, full member of this European Union.

Adina-Ioana Vălean (PPE). – Madam President, while I join my voice with those who express their regrets to see the United Kingdom leaving the EU, I respect the will of the British people. I still believe they were wrong.

It is a difficult moment, as we have never faced such a complex challenge to undo the deep ties that we have founded in our common history. However, let's be pragmatic, as British people like to be.

As chairwoman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, I want to send a strong message both to the EU and UK. We are bound to work together constructively in the best interest of our citizens, to ensure a clean and safe environment and a high level of public health and food security, and to pursue our common commitment to the climate change.

We will need to ensure a rapid transfer of our European Medicines Agency as soon as is practical, as is said in the resolution, because we have to make sure to avoid uncertainty regarding its future and limit the loss of skilled staff and their vital expertise. So we have to cooperate together in good spirit. It makes no sense believing that environmental and health issues stop at the borders.

I wish us all the best for the future.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Dieser Brexit wird uns noch lange beschäftigen. Wie viele meiner Kollegen bin ich der Meinung, dass er eine schlechte Entscheidung war, unvorbereitet, unüberlegt und kurzsichtig. Wie viele bedaure ich, was jetzt passiert. Unsere britischen Freunde werden uns abgehen, und auch für die Menschen im Vereinigten Königreich werden die Zeiten schwieriger werden. Wir müssen aber zur Kenntnis nehmen: Die Geschichte lässt sich nicht aufhalten. Das ist wie bei einem Scheidungsverfahren, aber da muss man auch an die Kollateralschäden denken.

Es dürfen vor allem nicht Unbeteiligte draufzahlen. Das sind die über drei Millionen EU-Staatsbürger, die gegenwärtig in Großbritannien leben. Ihre Entscheidung, in das Land zu ziehen, haben sie auf der Basis anderer Voraussetzungen getroffen. Sie haben zum Wohlstand des Vereinigten Königreiches beigetragen. Sie und ihre Kinder müssen jetzt in einer erträglichen Ungewissheit leben. Eigentlich müsste deren Schicksal außer Streit stehen. Wir erwarten uns klare Antworten von unseren politischen Freunden, und es dürfte ihnen eigentlich nicht schwerfallen, weil Fairness und Pragmatismus Eigenschaften sind, die wir an ihnen schätzen.

György Schöpflin (PPE). – Madam President, we can be certain that this resolution will not be popular in Brexit circles. There will definitely be those who will denounce it as impertinent, or worse. There are many in the United Kingdom who see leaving the European Union as a kind of liberation. It can take quite a while for illusions to dissipate. For the time being, the launching of Article 50 has brought with it an early silly season. Bizarre things are being said and, no doubt, will continue to be said. This can be irritating, even provocative, but that is no reason for us to follow suit. On the contrary, we can stay calm and pursue negotiations with the same professionalism and commitment that is reflected in this resolution. After all, the UK will always have a relationship with Europe. Our aim is, and should be, to frame the long term: to ensure that the future is a positive sum game.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, regrets, tristesse et déception dominant encore si l'on songe à la rupture choisie par une majorité de Britanniques. Mais notre responsabilité désormais, c'est celle de la négociation sur la base d'une stratégie constructive mais aussi pugnace et déterminée dans l'intérêt des citoyens européens, dans l'idée aussi que cette rupture, loin d'affaiblir l'Union, lui offre une renaissance.

La Première ministre britannique dit renoncer au marché unique parce qu'elle refuse les libertés qui s'y rattachent. Malgré ces dénégations, sa lettre de rupture démontre au contraire que tout sera tenté pour y accéder, y compris par la fenêtre, si c'est impossible par la porte.

Quel que soit le nom que donne M^{me} May à cet accord, nous n'accepterons aucun accord de libre-échange qui remettrait en cause nos normes sociales ou environnementales ou qui nous servirait des tribunaux d'arbitrage au dessert. Nous devons nous montrer inflexibles et balayer les menaces des conservateurs sur le dumping fiscal ou la sécurité. Nous devons nous montrer inflexibles, Monsieur le négociateur, notamment sur les questions budgétaires afin de protéger un budget de l'Union déjà sous pression et déjà affaibli par la dévaluation de la livre sterling.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to put forward our position and show it with three quotes from Shakespeare, a great British and European writer.

First, our position, our attitude as committed pro-Europeans, is very well described in Hamlet when Horatio describes the expression of the father of Hamlet: 'a countenance more in sorrow than in anger' – that will be our attitude in our negotiation.

Next, I would like to give a piece of advice to our British colleagues with another quote, because you should be very aware of what your bard Shakespeare has said: 'we know what we are, but know not what we may be'.

Finally, I would like to answer Mr Farage with a quote from Shakespeare that is probably a fake quote, which is very, very appropriate to someone that is a post-truth politician: 'Love me or hate me, both are in my favour. If you love me, I'll always be in your heart. If you hate me, I'll always be in your mind'.

David Martin (S&D). – Madam President, in September 2014 I voted to keep Scotland in the United Kingdom union and in June 2016 I voted to keep the UK in the European Union. Today, I face the reality that Brexit will remove my country from one union and leave the other union hanging by a thread. Scotland voted overwhelmingly to remain in the European Union. Edinburgh, a city I have represented in this House for 33 years, voted 75%-25% to remain in the European Union. The overwhelming feeling in Scotland is that we are being dragged out of the European Union against our will, a feeling only compounded by Ms May's determination to pursue a hard Brexit for which she has no mandate.

The resolution we are about to vote on recognises this fact, but provides no solution. The Council document calls for a flexible and imaginative solution to be found for Ireland. I, of course, agree, but I think the same should also apply to Scotland. The Scottish Government has put forward a bespoke proposal for Scotland, which I think deserves serious attention in this House. In conclusion, I want to say that if the UK does not show flexibility in these talks it will not only be the UK leaving the European Union, but the UK will not exist any longer.

Мария Габриел (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Барни, днес ние определяме принципите, които ще бъдат водещи по време на преговорите и основите на бъдещото ни партньорство.

Г-н Барни, на прав път сте. Слоганът на преговорите трябва да е: „Гражданите на първо място!“ Наш дълг е да успокоим опасенията им и да дадем конкретни отговори, например на студентите от другите страни от Европейския съюз, които живеят във Великобритания и се възползват от програми като ЕРАЗЪМ. Гарантирането на правата им трябва да е наш основен приоритет от началото на преговорите.

Европейският съюз трябва да остане непреклонен по отношение на четирите свободи. Брекзит има последствия и не може да става и дума за сценарий „Европа а ла карт“. Не може да има статут, подобен на този на държавите членки. Ключово е да има ясна визия за пътя напред.

Първо е споразумението за напускане, след това – новото партньорство. За да изградим стабилен дом, трябва да започнем от основите, а не от покрива. Отговорност на държавите членки е да се ангажират с това да няма паралелни преговори.

И накрая, пълно участие на Европейския парламент. Това е ключово за гарантиране на прозрачността и отворен публичен дебат.

David-Maria Sassoli (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non sono d'accordo con chi dice che non cambierà nulla con la Brexit, anche perché non sappiamo quali saranno le conseguenze. Sono d'accordo, invece, con coloro che dicono che il negoziato sarà costruttivo se avrà al centro gli interessi dei cittadini: dei cittadini europei e anche dei cittadini del Regno Unito.

Nessuna rivalsa, nessuna ritorsione, dunque, ma regole chiare sì. E abbiamo la necessità di ripetere quali sono le regole per l'Unione europea. Naturalmente il rispetto delle quattro libertà e, nel potere dell'Unione europea, la politica di sviluppo del commercio internazionale. Nessuno pensi di demolire l'edificio europeo, ma nessuno giochi contro per dividere o indebolire il Regno Unito.

Il negoziato deve avere visione politica, dobbiamo fare in modo che alla fine la nostra amicizia, le nostre relazioni, la nostra collaborazione risultino più robuste. Su questo dobbiamo lavorare insieme, e la risoluzione di oggi è una buona base per iniziare il nostro cammino.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, I believe in the Europe of today. I believe in our European project, a project that is based on the belief that together we are stronger and we do things better. That is why it makes me sad if you, Mr Farage and your friends, are likening this project to a prison. Let me remind you that 48% of the voters in the referendum did not share this view and many millions did not actually participate.

I also heard Mr Fox – if I am not mistaken – saying that he is calling for a close and deep partnership and for invisible borders. If this is what you are calling for, then welcome back into Europe. Welcome back into the European Union because this is what we are aiming for.

Instead of that, you are, in practice, calling for the negotiation of a similar agreement to the ones we have with the US, Korea or Canada. If this is so, please do not be surprised that in this negotiation we will represent the interest of 27 countries, like we did in negotiations with Canada, the US or Korea. This should come as no surprise to you.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie przewodniczący Juncker, drogi Michelu Barnier! Ta rezolucja jest po prostu dobra. Ja ją popieram, zwłaszcza te punkty, gdzie jest napisane: „jak najszybciej rozpocząć negocjacje zgodnie z artykułem 50”. – Tak, to robimy. Prowadzić negocjacje w dobrej wierze – taka jest deklaracja. Wreszcie Unia Europejska prowadzi negocjacje jako całość UE-27 bez wyłamywania się poszczególnych państw. Bronimy interesów obywateli Unii Europejskiej. Jestem, jako poseł z Polski, zainteresowany obroną interesów prawie miliona polskich obywateli mieszkających w Wielkiej Brytanii, których los jest niepewny.

Wielka Brytania nie może oczekiwać korzyści jednostronnych kosztem korzyści obywateli Unii Europejskiej – także to popieram. Mam świadomość, że UE-27 będzie Unią pomniejszoną, ale wcale nie musi być Unią osłabioną, i sercem jestem z moimi przyjaciółmi z Labour Party na tej sali, którzy wyrażali swój ból z powodu rozwoju wydarzeń.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Mir tun die Bürgerinnen und Bürger des Vereinigten Königreichs leid. Sie wurden jahrelang – vor dem Referendum und auch teilweise jetzt – in die Irre geführt. Es wurde Schuld der EU zugewiesen statt zur Mitverantwortung gestanden, der Mehrwert der Mitgliedschaft verschwiegen, dass der Aufstieg auch der Mitgliedschaft zu verdanken ist. Die Unabhängigkeit wurde versprochen, die Spaltung riskiert und neue Abhängigkeiten geschaffen, „Geld zurück“ wurde versprochen und die Konsequenzen verschwiegen.

Es gibt keine Teilnahme am Binnenmarkt ohne die Akzeptanz der vier Freiheiten, ohne die Einhaltung der Grundrechte, ohne Kostenbeteiligung, ohne die Akzeptanz des Europäischen Gerichtshofs. Rechte und Werte, in 44 Jahren eingegangene Verpflichtungen sind die Grundlage der Verhandlungen. Nicht mehr und nicht weniger. Lernen wir daraus!

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, quando muitos esperavam que o Brexit fosse o princípio do fim do projeto europeu, o amplo consenso político interpartidário em apoio da resolução que hoje vamos aprovar sobre as negociações do Brexit é em si mesmo um importantíssimo sinal de unidade e de esperança. É importante é também que o Parlamento tenha definido uma prioridade clara, garantir em condições de reciprocidade o respeito pelos direitos dos cidadãos europeus que residem no Reino Unido e dos cidadãos britânicos que residem na União Europeia. E não é respeitar os direitos dos cidadãos, sujeitá-los, como hoje sucede no Reino Unido, a 85 páginas de escusada burocracia para conseguirem obter o seu direito às autorizações de residência.

A liberdade de circulação vincula integralmente o Reino Unido até ao dia da sua saída e mesmo depois disso enquanto vigorar um regime transitório de acesso ao mercado único. Este Parlamento não cederá na defesa dos direitos dos cidadãos europeus.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Madam President, in a couple of weeks I will take my six-year-old son to London for the first time; he will see the Cenotaph and I will tell him about the bravery of those men who fought in two European wars and to whom we will be eternally grateful. But he will not understand because, thank God, he has never known war. Although, not too far away from here – and you can laugh – but not too far away from here children his age and younger are dying in the poisonous clouds of Idlib, the same clouds that we saw over Flanders Fields a century ago.

It is for those generations of young Europeans, those born after the fall of the Berlin Wall, that the remaining 27 Member States need to stand united and together, and work out a reformed and stronger European Union. It is for those young generations of Brits that we need a fair deal and a continued relationship with the United Kingdom, because they did not vote to leave.

Let us, dear colleagues, politicians of this very old continent, show the young people in Britain and in Europe alike that Europe is not a place of hate, of pettiness or of revenge, but that we can learn the lessons of the past and reshape a future in which the negotiating table will always, always prevail over outright conflict.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, Brexit will be the most difficult, costly and unnecessary divorce in history. In the coming months and years, we can expect the EU 27 and the UK Government to end up in any number of catfights, but let me be crystal clear: whatever the cost, whatever the hassle, whatever the differences of opinions, this Parliament will serve the citizens of Europe. Period. We are their directly elected voice. We will be their strongest defender, their best advocate in this, and their ally. This goes for EU citizens and for UK citizens. We will not allow the Brexiters' broken promises, half-truths and even lies to harm the citizens of the UK and EU any more than they have already done.

To the citizens of the 27 remaining Member States, I say we will never allow a post-Brexit UK to undermine your rights and conditions by competing in a race to the bottom. To the citizens of the UK, I say that we will continue to fight for your best interests, and we will keep a seat for you at our table.

Viviane Reding (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, mieux vaut un divorce réussi qu'un mariage raté, et pour que ce soit le cas avec le Brexit, plusieurs conditions sont nécessaires.

Tout d'abord, il faut donner la priorité aux conditions de séparation: garde des enfants, partage du patrimoine, droit de visite avec réciprocité et rapidité. Le Parlement européen l'a d'ailleurs bien compris en demandant des garanties pour les citoyens, les dettes et les frontières extérieures.

Ensuite, il peut s'ensuivre une période de transition pour que chacun s'adapte à sa nouvelle vie, à condition qu'il y ait paiement de la pension alimentaire sous le contrôle du juge. Là aussi, le message est clair: pas de droits sans devoirs, pas d'accès au marché intérieur sans respect des quatre libertés.

Une fois le divorce prononcé, et pas avant, il faut de la maturité afin d'entretenir des relations civilisées, même si rien ne sera plus comme avant. D'où nos exigences: ni dumping transformant le Royaume-Uni en pays de transit, ni chantage monnayant la libre circulation ou la sécurité des citoyens contre du commerce. Un divorce, c'est un nouveau départ. Pour nous, le Brexit sera le renouveau de l'Europe, avec les traités comme fil conducteur.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D) – Vážená pani predsedníčka, čísla Ministerstva financií Veľkej Británie hovoria, že v nasledujúcich piatich rokoch príde britská štátna pokladnica o viac ako 122 mld. eur. Najnovšie analýzy ukazujú, že kvôli brexitu v najbližších rokoch zanikne pol milióna pracovných miest. Barclays Bank potvrdila, že presun aktivít v bankovom sektore mimo Veľkej Británie je nevyhnutný. To naozaj neznie optimisticky.

Chcel by som odkázať do Veľkej Británie: aj my trpíme rovnako ako tí z vás, ktorí hlasovali za zotrvanie v EÚ. Ale rešpektujeme vôľu väčšiny. Začíname spolu hľadať novú budúcnosť. Toto obdobie neistoty môže trvať viac ako dva roky. Ak v ňom dospejete k záveru, že život mimo EÚ vážne poškodí vašu budúcnosť, neváhajte sa vrátiť späť. Rozumní politici predsa nenechajú ubližovať vlastným obyvateľom.

David Casa (PPE). – Ir-Renju Unit huwa sieheb importanti għall-Unjoni Ewropea u għal Malta. Ir-Renju Unit ser jibqa' sieheb importanti. Imma huwa diżappunt għalina li r-Renju Unit għażel li ma jibqax membru tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Però rridu nżommu f'moħħna li ser jibqa' jkun hemm rabtiet b'saħħithom anke wara li r-Renju Unit iħalli lill-Unjoni Ewropea. U għalhekk li ma nistgħux nidhlu għan-negożjati b'ċertu aġir ta' konfrontazzjoni. Issa rridu nistinkaw u naraw kif ikun hemm l-aħjar kundizzjonijiet bejn l-Unjoni Ewropea u pajjiż terz li miegħu għandna relazzjonijiet tajbin.

Madankollu r-Renju Unit irid jagħmel ċerti saġrificċji. Ma jistax jistenna privileġġi mingħajr ir-responsabbiltajiet li jiġu magħhom. Dan ifisser li rridu nimxu fuq ċerti prinċipji. Iz-żmien illi nkunu selettivi u naghżlu li jaqbel lilna biss issa għadda.

Ir-Renju Unit irid iħallas dak li hu dovut – din hija kundizzjoni obligatorja sabiex in-negożjati jkunu possibbli. Fuq kolloxx irridu nżommu f'moħħna l-element uman illi huwa l-aktar kruċjali. Hija prijorità li miljuni ta' ċittadini Ewropej u Britanniċi fuq iż-żewġ naħat nagħtuhom il-protezzjoni kollha tagħna lilhom u lid-drittijiet tagħhom.

Jien konvint illi nistgħu nsibu l-kompromess meħtieġ.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Madam President, Romanian by nationality and historian by profession, I am fascinated by your great leader, Winston Churchill. But today I have to confess that I don't know what he would say about Brexit or how he would judge the Brexiters. This is a real question mark.

When it comes to the status of the European citizens in the UK, the negotiations must be based on the principles of reciprocity and full equality among EU citizens. This means that we need to make sure that our citizens who currently live and work in the UK can continue to freely do so without any discrimination against them or between them based on their nationality. Under such circumstances, we can accept, as the EU, to grant the same status to the UK citizens in our Member States.

Equally important is the issue of security, defence and counterterrorism, where the EU and the UK are mutually fundamental. This is where we are reminded by the recent terrorist attack in London. Both the EU and the UK need to be wise and pragmatic. This is too important an issue to leave a security gap for those who threaten our common values and our challenges, equally the security of our citizens.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Schande über all jene, die jetzt vermeinen, über die Briten mit schlechten Worten zu reden, die dieser Entscheidung mit Strafsanktionen, mit absurden Zahlungsverpflichtungen, mit politischen Gehässigkeiten und Widrigkeiten begeben. Wahre politische Größe zeigt sich doch vielmehr dadurch, dass man entsprechende Volksentscheide auch anerkennt, dass man respektiert, dass die Briten entschieden haben, die Europäische Union zu verlassen.

Sie haben jetzt zwei Möglichkeiten, darauf zu reagieren. Sie haben die Möglichkeit, nach dem Modell Juncker und Schulz noch mehr zu zentralisieren, die Mitgliedstaaten noch mehr zu entmachten, noch weniger an direkten Volksentscheiden zuzulassen. Oder Sie gehen den umgekehrten Weg, Sie lassen den Mitgliedstaaten wieder mehr Möglichkeiten zu entscheiden, Sie werben die Parlamente in den Mitgliedstaaten auf, Sie lassen direkte Demokratie in den Mitgliedstaaten zu, die auch wieder über europäischem Unionsrecht stehen kann.

Das, was Sie jetzt machen sollten, ist, den Briten mit Freundschaft zu begegnen, mit den Briten zu verhandeln – sinnvolle Kooperationsfelder – und sich nicht so zu verhalten wie in einem Rosenkrieg nach einer Scheidung oder wie zwei kleine Kinder, die aufeinander hinpecken, sondern wie erwachsene Menschen nüchtern und professionell damit umzugehen und beiden Interessengruppen auch entsprechend zu dienen.

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I keep hearing what a positive project the European Union is. Article 8 of your beloved Treaty says 'the Union shall develop a special relationship with neighbouring countries' in a spirit of 'good neighbourliness'. Well I get that, I understand that, I am with that, that makes a lot of sense. So why, if that is the case, would Mr Tusk have written Clause 22 in his Memorandum giving the Spanish a veto over the future of Gibraltar when everyone knows that the Spanish are antagonistic towards the wishes of the people of the Rock? And why, Monsieur Barnier, in a spirit of 'good neighbourliness', would you have plucked this bizarre figure of GBP 52 billion out of the air that you say is our final settlement payment?

Remember one thing. From the moment we voted Brexit to the moment we leave, we will have put GBP 30 billion net into this European Union, and you want another 50. It just does not work. For any negotiation in life to work both sides stake out a position. Both sides ask for more than they realistically expect to get. I understand that, but you have gone so far with this that it is just impossible for us to see any accommodation.

I think there needs to be give and take on both sides, and I think if you gave on the money and you gave on Gibraltar, then what I would like to see the United Kingdom Government doing is saying there are 3.3 million EU citizens living in the UK, they all came to Britain legally and we will now unilaterally guarantee their rights for the future. Both sides need to give on this for any sensible deal to come out of it. We can walk away without a deal, it will hurt European workers and European companies more than us, but surely it makes sense for both of us to come to a sensible accommodation.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, if we want to get to a sensible accommodation, Mr Farage's speech is precisely the kind of nonsense that we should just ignore. I just want to say that Brexit is a lose-lose game. I would have much preferred for us to stay together. *L'Union fait la force*, we say in Belgium, and that remains the case today. But there is one thing where I believe no compromise is possible, and that is the only thing that really annoyed me in Mrs May's letter. It concerns security cooperation. Security cooperation is an area where we cannot let lose-lose logic prevail. It is in the interest of the safety and security of all our citizens, British or otherwise, to cooperate deeply in matters of security, and what we cannot accept is that any other kind of consideration – trade, commercial, whatever – stands in the way. There is no trade-off here. It concerns the lives of men and women.

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Das Europäische Parlament – und das hat sich heute gezeigt – hat eine hohe Verantwortung für die Begleitung des Verhandlungsprozesses, und ich habe mit großer Aufmerksamkeit zur Kenntnis genommen, dass uns erklärt worden ist, dass wir nicht nur heute und am Abschluss der Verhandlungen miteinander reden werden, sondern – das Angebot von Herrn Barnier und auch das Angebot der Kommission –, dass wir zwischenzeitlich ins Benehmen gesetzt werden, uns informieren können, unsere Meinung auch zum Ausdruck bringen können, also politischen Einfluss ausüben können.

Das halte ich für wichtig, weil es darum geht, dass wir vor allem – und das sind die Kriterien, die meine Fraktion auch in Anwendung bringen wird – darauf achten, wie die Rechte der Menschen, die vom Brexit direkt betroffen sind, gewahrt werden. Wir werden darauf achten, wie auch die Sicherheit der Menschen, gerade im Norden Irlands, gewahrt wird im Ergebnis des Verhandlungsprozesses. Die Menschen dürfen nicht den Preis für den Brexit bezahlen. Sie haben ihn nicht hervorgerufen, sondern es hat andere Gründe dafür gegeben. Also sollten sie ihn nicht bezahlen, und wir werden darauf achten. Lassen Sie uns hier gemeinsam zusammenarbeiten, damit wir hier als Parlament auch wirklich Einfluss ausüben können.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I find it fantastic that Mr Farage is using Article 217 of the Treaty on the Association Agreement. Now that he is leaving, he starts to read the Treaty and to find the Treaty so good. It is fantastic to see this enormous positive development, if I may say so. That said, what is clear in this debate is 'let us put the citizens first', and it does not make any difference whether they are EU citizens or UK citizens. We will be firm, we need to be firm to defend the unity and the interest of the European Union towards the UK authorities, but my appeal here in the House today is to be open, positive and generous towards UK citizens, because many of them, millions of them, want to keep their relationship, their link, their identity on the European level. And last but not least, my appeal also to the House is that, when we vote within a few minutes, we have a huge majority and almost unity in this House. It is key to do that, to have a united European Parliament, together with the EU negotiator and with the European Council, and I hope for a strong vote within a few moments.

Roberts Zile, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, 'divorce', 'sadness', 'electricity and heating bills', 'foolishness', 'disruption of transport links', etc. 'We will only speak about the future relationships when we settle on accounts'. 'We are the champions, but on the other side are the losers'. 'We will not leave them any single cherry of the cake'. That is a summary of the statements made both in the Chamber today and also in the media.

I would like to ask colleagues to calm down. Does anybody believe that in these negotiations there will be winners when it comes to citizens' rights issues? Indeed, how successful can we call an arrangement where part of the success is achieved by discriminating against the citizens of another EU nation, or take businesses that are the backbone of economies? Do we really want to extend uncertainties for the next five or so years?

It is possible within the next two years to settle the past accounts and work on the comprehensive framework for the future relationships. This allows for it, business will wait for it, and in the end the European people want it. So good luck to you in the negotiations.

Gianni Pittella, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non tutti i britannici detestano l'Unione europea come il collega Farage. Ci tengo a ricordare che il 48 % dei cittadini britannici votarono per restare nell'Unione europea, e voglio ricordare con particolare affetto e commozione la compagna Jo Cox, deputata britannica assassinata durante la campagna referendaria.

Nessuno ha mai obbligato il Regno Unito a fare alcunché. Ho ascoltato parole incredibili: minacce, castigo, mafia. Voi avete deciso di aderire liberamente all'Unione europea e voi liberamente decidete di uscire dall'Unione europea. Nessuna rivalsa, ma non potete imporci il vostro caos.

No, dunque, a negoziati paralleli: finché siete parte dell'Unione europea, non potete negoziare con l'OMC. Al disordine della Brexit noi rispondiamo con l'unità invocata da Juncker e da Barnier, con l'unità che è la forza tranquilla della nostra istituzione.

Manfred Weber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das war heute eine Diskussion mit einem guten Ton, und ich hoffe, dass viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger die Diskussion verfolgt haben, weil sie gesehen haben, dass die großen Fraktionen, die europäischen Fraktionen hier einen sachlichen Ton, einen konstruktiven Ton an den Tag gelegt haben und leider Gottes die Populisten und Extremisten, die wir hier im Haus haben, wieder Schärfe gebracht haben. Es wurde zitiert, dass auf den Straßen gekämpft werden muss und dass man die Unabhängigkeit verteidigen muss. Es war ein harter, aggressiver Ton zu spüren. Hier die Sachlichkeit, dort die Aggressivität. Ich hoffe, das haben in der Diskussion viele Bürger gesehen.

Übrigens habe ich keine Antworten bekommen. Ich habe die Frage gestellt, ob man jetzt weiter bei Europol dabei sein will, ob man weiter im Binnenmarkt dabei sein will, ob man weiter bei der Forschungsunion dabei sein will. Mister Farage hat darauf bisher keine Antworten gegeben, ob diese Partnerschaften weiter richtig sind oder nicht. Das heißt: Die Grundsatzfrage, was *leave* wirklich bedeutet, bleibt auf dem Tisch.

Eine Bemerkung kann ich mir zum Schluss nicht ganz verkneifen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Wenn wir in den Rat blicken, dann haben wir dort die Lage, dass, wenn die Staats- und Regierungschefs sich über den Brexit unterhalten, dann Theresa May nicht anwesend ist, weil das eine Sache ist, die die EU-27 zu verhandeln haben. Das heißt, Theresa May geht respektvoll mit den anderen 27 Staaten um. Wenn wir auf die parlamentarische Lage blicken, da haben wir Westminster, das am Schluss abstimmen muss – dort werden die britischen Interessen vertreten –, und wir haben das Europäische Parlament, das abstimmen muss – dort werden die Interessen der EU-27 vertreten. Und deswegen bin ich natürlich schon interessiert daran, wie Nigel Farage sich das die nächsten zwei Jahre vorstellt.

Ich möchte respektvoll anerkennen, dass Syed Kamall heute nicht gesprochen hat im Namen seiner Fraktion. Er hat das Wort gegeben an Kollegen, die nicht Briten sind, um die Fraktionspositionen deutlich zu machen. Ich würde mir wünschen, dass Nigel Farage zukünftig auch ein Ehrenmann ist und zukünftig bei Debatten um den Brexit in seiner Fraktion die italienischen Kollegen reden lässt. Nigel Farage hat uns die letzten Jahre erklärt, wie gut es ist, dass die Briten endlich die Europäische Union verlassen. Ich würde mir wünschen, dass er endlich ein gutes Beispiel gibt und dann die Debatten im Europäischen Parlament nicht mehr belastet. Herzlichen Dank dafür.

(Beifall)

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

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi, mercoledì 5 aprile 2017, alle 12.00.

Ringrazio tutti coloro che hanno partecipato alla discussione, il Presidente della Commissione europea, il negoziatore dell'Unione europea, il rappresentante del Consiglio e tutti i deputati che hanno preso la parola durante questa discussione.

Il Parlamento svolgerà un ruolo determinante durante queste trattative, voterà alla fine a favore o contro, rispettando le regole della democrazia. In quest'Aula siedono 751 parlamentari in rappresentanza di 500 milioni di cittadini europei, tutti regolarmente eletti. Non ci sono né mafiosi, né *gangster*, ci sono rappresentanti dei popoli e questa non è una questione di sensibilità nazionale, è una questione di civiltà e di democrazia.

(Applausi)

Vicky Ford (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to raise a point of order under Article 11.2 about this morning's debate. Calling other colleagues members of the mafia or gangsters does not show mutual respect, does not represent the views of the vast majority of the British people, and is not the view of the British Prime Minister, who wants to remain friends, allies and partners.

(Loud applause)

Presidente. – Ha chiesto la parola per un punto all'ordine del giorno l'on. Carver.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, there has been a lot of confusion in this House this morning, talking about British aggression over Gibraltar. Can I just remind colleagues across Parliament that it was actually Spain that sent one of their warships into Gibraltar waters.

Presidente. – Non mi pare un punto all'ordine del giorno in base al regolamento.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – 2017 m. kovo 29 d. Jungtinės Karalystės vyriausybė pateikė pranešimą Europos Vadovų Tarybai, kuriuo įforminamas Jungtinės Karalystės sprendimas išstoti iš Europos Sąjungos. Šis pranešimas yra Jungtinėje Karalystėje įvykusio referendumo pasekmė. Ir nors tai yra precedento neturintis įvykis, dėl kurio tenka apgalvoti, nes iki šiol dar nėra viena valstybė narė nėra išstojusi iš Europos Sąjungos, turime užtikrinti, kad išstojimas vyktų tvarkingai ir nebūtų padarytas neigiamas poveikis Europos Sąjungai, jos piliečiams ir Europos integracijos procesui. Europos Parlamentas atstovauja visiems Europos Sąjungos piliečiams ir todėl jo tikslas – viso Jungtinės Karalystės išstojimo proceso metu siekti apsaugoti visų piliečių interesus. Derybos dėl išstojimo turi vykti stengiantis užtikrinti teisinį stabilumą ir padėti piliečiams susidaryti aiškų vaizdą apie jų ateitį. Jungtinėje Karalystėje gyvenančių Europos Sąjungos piliečių ir Europos Sąjungoje gyvenančių Jungtinės Karalystės piliečių statusui ir teisėms būtų taikomi abipusiškumo, lygybės, vienodo požiūrio ir nediskriminavimo principai. Iki Jungtinė Karalystė išstos iš Europos Sąjungos visos teisės, susijusios su keturiomis laisvėmis, turi būti pilnai užtikrinamos, o bet koks ES piliečių diskriminavimas jiems mėginant įgyti teisę gyventi Jungtinėje Karalystėje prieštarautų Europos Sąjungos teisei ir būtų netoleruotinas.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), *írásban*. – Az Egyesült Királyság kilépése az Európai Unióból nem egy örvendetes esemény. Most, hogy a folyamat beindult, annak a lehető legeredményesebb lefolyását kell biztosítani. Ennek során mindkét fél hosszú távú stratégia céljait kell szem előtt tartani, hiszen a kapcsolat az Egyesült Királyság és Európa között megmarad. Nyugalmost megőrizve, professzionálisan és elkötelezettséggel kell a Brexit-tárgyalásokat lefolytatnunk. Nem lehet más célunk, mint hosszú távra tervezni és pozitív végeredményt elérni, amelyet minden tagország nyugodt szívvel ratifikálni fog. Ennek során bizonyosan kompromisszumokat is kötni kell, de mindig szem előtt kell tartani mind az EU, mind az Egyesült Királyság munkavállalóinak érdekeit. Az elválás során folyamatosan arra kell törekedni, hogy minél kisebb kárt, veszteséget okozzunk az Európai Unió állampolgárainak.

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Ich bedaure die Entscheidung Großbritanniens, aber ich akzeptiere sie auch. Wer nicht mehr Teil einer Gemeinschaft bleiben möchte, muss anschließend die Konsequenzen dieser Entscheidung tragen: Großbritannien behält seine Rechte als EU-Mitglied bis zu seinem Austritt, gleichzeitig gilt es aber auch, bestehende Pflichten zu erfüllen. Dies gilt auch für finanzielle Verpflichtungen, die sich unter anderem aus dem langfristigen EU-Haushalt ergeben. Und es ist klar: Wer sich gegen die EU entscheidet, kann nicht mehr von unseren Errungenschaften und Vorteilen profitieren. Entweder man ist Teil einer Sache oder nicht.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Mais uma vez se comprova que as instituições da UE convivem mal com a democracia e com as decisões soberanas dos povos. Não é de hoje. A postura de pressão, ameaça e chantagem exercida sobre o Reino Unido, na sequência da expressão soberana da vontade popular de saída da UE, é inaceitável e reveladora das intenções que norteiam as instituições da UE neste processo. Entre estas intenções – que veementemente denunciamos e combatemos – está a de levar a cabo uma operação de branqueamento das políticas da UE e das suas consequências, e a partir dela forçar uma fuga em frente no aprofundamento da integração capitalista europeia. O processo negocial que agora se inicia deve ser justo e equilibrado, partindo da ideia fundamental de respeito pela decisão soberana do Reino Unido. Deve ser uma prioridade destas negociações a defesa e a proteção dos direitos tanto dos cidadãos britânicos que residem em Estados-Membros da UE como dos cidadãos de Estados-Membros da UE que residem no Reino Unido. Direitos como: direito de residência, direito de tratamento igual e não discriminação, direito de acesso aos serviços públicos e à segurança social, direito à reunificação familiar, ao reconhecimento internacional de diplomas universitários e formações. As disposições positivas relativas à livre circulação de pessoas devem ser protegidas.

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne* – Dohoda o vystúpení, ako aj jednotlivé prechodné opatrenia by mali podľa plánu nadobudnúť účinnosť ešte pred voľbami do Európskeho parlamentu v roku 2019. Dovtedy má Veľká Británia všetky práva, výhody aj povinnosti riadneho členského štátu. To sa v plnej miere týka aj jej finančných záväzkov. Administratívne zvládnutie vystúpenia Spojeného kráľovstva z EÚ nebude jednoduchý proces. Zatiaľ je to veľká neznáma. Dôležité je však nastavenie priorít. Tými musia byť najmä istoty a stabilné právne postavenie európskych občanov žijúcich v Británii, ako aj Britov na území krajín EÚ. Odchod jedného členského štátu môže byť motiváciou pre prispôbenie fungovania Európskej únie spôsobom, aby žiadne ďalšie odchádzať nechceli. Brexit je primárne výsledkom populizmu a hazardovania bývalého premiéra Camerona, ktorý bol pre jednorazové víťazstvo vo voľbách ochotný obetovať desiatky rokov spolupráce. Lídri jednotlivých štátov by sa z toho mali poučiť. Nemôžu naďalej pokračovať v tom, že sa najskôr na niečom dohodnú, a ak je to nepopulárne, doma prezentujú, že za to môže Európska únia a úradníci v Bruseli.

Ana Gomes (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para este Parlamento há condições muito claras e necessárias para a aprovação, em 2019, de um eventual acordo entre a UE e o Reino Unido (RU), e é a esta excelente Resolução que retornaremos para analisar, ponto por ponto, se estão cumpridas. Destaco três: - Não podem ser os cidadãos – europeus ou britânicos – a pagar a conta. Nomeadamente, é preciso que ambas as partes tenham no centro das suas preocupações os interesses e direitos dos cidadãos europeus a viver no RU e vice-versa. - A UE não poderá nunca permitir que o RU se torne um paraíso fiscal e a luta contra a fraude e evasão fiscal estarão na linha frente de qualquer acordo comercial que se desenhe. - Em todas as formas de cooperação que venham a existir entre a UE e o RU, em áreas que favoreçam os interesses de ambas as partes – cooperação a que este Parlamento e a Europa a 27 permanecem abertos – a bússola serão, como em qualquer política de ação externa da União, os nossos valores e princípios, nomeadamente no que toca ao respeito pelas obrigações internacionais de proteção de refugiados e migrantes, e pelos Direitos Humanos em geral.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), *írásban*. – A népszavazás óta arra vártunk, hogy a brit kormány és parlament megfontolja, mit kezd az eredménnyel. Reménykedtünk, hogy valamilyen csoda folytán mégis a józan észre hallgatnak, illetve vártuk, hogy az Egyesült Királyság aktiválja-e az 50. cikkelyt. Sajnos Theresa May a kilépési folyamatot ellentmondásokkal terhelt és fenyegetőzéstől sem mentesen indította el, elbizonytalanítva nemcsak az Unió képviselőit, de a maradáspárti briteket is. Most az EU intézményein van a sor, hogy meghatározzák: mik azok a feltételek, amelyeknek a tárgyalások során érvényesülniük kell, annak érdekében, hogy megvédjék az Unió érdekeit és állampolgárait. A legfontosabbak: a kilépési megállapodásban megnyugtatóan, a kölcsönösség és diszkriminációmentesség elvének tiszteletben tartásával kell rendezni az Egyesült Királyságban élő európai, illetve az Európában élő brit állampolgárok helyzetét, jogait és munkavállalásuk feltételeit. Az EU–brit pénzügyi elszámolásnak ki kell terjednie a 2013–2020-as költségvetésből eredő, az unió felé fennálló kötelezettségekre éppen úgy, mint a kilépéssel járó költségekre. A jövőbeli kapcsolatokat csak a kilépési megállapodás megkötése után lehet kialakítani, beleértve a tagországokkal kötendő megállapodásokat is. A jövőbeli kapcsolatokat csak az Unió alapértékeire alapozva, az emberi jogokra, a tisztességes gazdasági és adóversenyre, a környezetvédelemre és éghajlatváltozásra vonatkozó uniós elvek és szabályok figyelembe vételével lehet kialakítani.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), kirjallinen. – On vaikea kuvitella eurooppalaista tiedemaailmaa ilman Britanniaa. Maan yliopistot ja tutkimuslaitokset ovat antaneet valtavasti EU:lle ja saaneet EU:lta monet parhaista tutkijoistaan sekä huomattavia rahasummia: 7 miljardia tutkimus- ja kehitysrahoja, maksuosuuttaan enemmän. Mitä brexitissä tapahtuu opiskelija- ja tutkijavaihdolle? Brexit koettelee sekä EU:ta että eritoten Britanniaa tavoilla, joita äänestäjät eivät osanneet edes aavistella. Tiedemaailma jää vaikeaan asemaan kuten moni muukin elämänalue ja ala – Britanniassa EU:n upeat puolet huomattiin sitten, kun oli jo liian myöhäistä. Koko tiedeyhteisö on lähes yksimielisesti sitä mieltä, että tiedeyhteistyön tulisi jatkua kuten ennenkin tai että sen tulisi jopa tiivistyä. Ei ole kenenkään edun mukaista, että brexit tuhoaa yhteistyön tiedemaailmassa. Samaa sanotaan lähes jokaisella yhteiskunnan osa-alueella. Tapasin vastikään Britannian kanta-verkkoyhtiön National Gridin edustajia, jotka kertoivat sähkömarkkinoiden yhteistyöstä, joka hyödyttää molempia osapuolia yhteysjohtojen kautta. Iso-Britannia on nettotuojaa, yhteydet lisäävät toimitusvarmuutta. Sama viesti muiltakin aloilta: "Voitaisiinko juuri MEIDÄN alallamme jatkaa yhteistyötä?" Tämä ei ole mikään ihme, sillä koko EU perustuu kaikkia osapuolia hyödyttäviin sopimuksiin. Neuvottelut tulee käydä avoimesti. Molempien osapuolten on muistettava ihmisten tilanne, mukaan lukien työntekijöiden oikeudet, sekä taattava kansainvälisten sopimusten noudattaminen. Veronkierron aukkoja ei tule hyväksyä vaan estää. Vaikka epävarmuutta on paljon, yksi on varma: korvataksemme Britannian lähdön haitat muun EU:n on tehtävä yhteistyötä entistä paremmin ja enemmän.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris. – Situația rupturii Marii Britanii de UE a fost creată de politicieni populiști care au împins Marea Britanie pe un drum care poate să o ducă într-o stare economică periculoasă și chiar către o Mică Britanie. Uniunea Europeană, la rândul ei, a trebuit să facă față semnelor de întrebare referitoare la imagine și credibilitate. UE trebuie acum să se angajeze pe un drum care să conducă spre unitate, comunicare și transparență, cooperare consolidată în domeniile care constituie provocări actuale: apărare, securitate, migrație, situația economică și socială.

Parlamentul European trebuie să-și fixeze câteva priorități clare: asigurarea drepturilor cetățenilor și bugetul. Există cetățeni britanici care locuiesc în UE și cetățeni ai UE care locuiesc în Marea Britanie, inclusiv în jur de 300 000 de români. Este nevoie de clarificarea drepturilor pe care aceștia trebuie să le mențină pe termen lung.

În ceea ce privește dorințele Marii Britanii de a participa la politica de securitate împreună cu condițiile favorabile pentru comerț, consider că nu există legătură între cele două domenii. Acordul privind relațiile economice trebuie să se încheie în aceleași condiții ca cele aplicate pentru orice țară terță.

Ева Майдел (PPE), в писмена форма. – Макар много политици във Великобритания и по света погрешно да считат, че Брекзит настъпи с референдума през юни 2016 г. или със задействането на член 50 от Договорите на ЕС през март 2017 г., на всички трябва да е ясно, че Великобритания остава пълноправен член на ЕС докато не завършат преговорите за напускането ѝ. Всички задължения – правни и финансови, остават в сила до официалното напускане. Тъй като за да влезе в сила споразумението, постигнато в края на преговорите, е необходимо одобрението на Европейския парламент, позицията, която приемаме днес, трябва да бъде отразена в преговорите.

На първо място, за нас от Европейската народна партия винаги ще бъдат гражданите. Затова и поставяме в центъра на позицията ни гарантирането на справедливо и равноправно отношение към гражданите на ЕС, живеещи във Великобритания, както и на британските граждани, пребиваващи в ЕС.

Държа да подчертая, че никой не иска да наказва Великобритания. Напротив, всички ще имаме полза от ефективно споразумение за бъдещите ни отношения и участие на британците в единния пазар. Но това може да стане само при спазване на неделимостта на четирите свободи на вътрешния пазар – свободата на движение на стоки, капитали, услуги и хора.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – A britek hivatalosan is elindították az Unióból való kilépési folyamatot. A brit nép akarátát tiszteletben kell tartani, de a következő időszak a szörnyű felismerés időszaka lesz. A nagyhatalmi nosztalgia, a nacionalista gőg senkit nem ment meg a valóságtól. Európa részesedése a globális gazdaságból tovább csökken a következő években. Nem azért, mert mi leszünk kisebbek, hanem azért, mert a kínaiak, az indiaiak, a brazilok lesznek nagyobbak. Ezért ebből a szempontból kétfajta uniós tagállam létezik: a kisebbek és azok, akik még nem tudják, hogy kicsik. A legnagyobb európai tagállamok is eltörpülnek Kína és India lakossága mellett. A játékszabályok megváltoztak, egyesek ezt észreveszik, mások a nacionalizmus mögé bújva próbálják titkolni. Hozzá kell szoknunk ezért, hogy külön-külön nem megy többé. A különutasság a múlt, az együttműködés pedig a jövő. A nacionalista vezetők hazudnak, amikor azt mondják, hogy az EU a létünkre tör. Ha nincs EU, a napjaink meg vannak számlálva, amikor a versenytársaink kontinensnyi országok. Az európai országok sorsa össze van kötve, ha szeretjük, ha nem. Csak egy út áll előttünk, méghozzá a mélyebb uniós integráció, amely képes versenyezni a világ többi részével.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Brexit-neuvottelujen on oltava läpinäkyvät, ja ne on käytävä molemmin puolin vilpittömässä hengessä. Britannia ei voi poimia rusinoita EU:n pullasta. Kansalaisten vapaata liikkuvuutta EU:n sisällä ei voida irrottaa sisämarkkinoista. Britannian on myös hoidettava lähtölaskunsa. Britannia ei voi myöskään yrittää kiristää EU:ta neuvotteluissa yhteiseen turvallisuuteen liittyvän yhteistyön lopettamisella. Vasta sitten kun Britannian eron periaatteista on riittävä selvyys, voidaan EU:n ja Iso-Britannian tulevan kumppanuussuhteen muodosta alkaa keskustella. Brexit-prosessi on monimutkainen, ja neuvotteluissa vaaditaan malttia. Molempien osapuolten on syytä toimia rakentavasti ja etsiä parhaita ratkaisuja, sillä Britannia on jatkossakin osa Eurooppaa ja EU:n läheinen kumppani.

Claude Rolin (PPE), par écrit. – Après neuf mois de gestation, le gouvernement britannique décide enfin de déclencher l'article 50, faisant ainsi officiellement débiter les négociations avec l'Union européenne. En commission de l'Emploi et des Affaires sociales, nous avons particulièrement étudié la question du Brexit sous l'angle de la libre circulation des personnes. Pas moins de 700 actes du droit de l'UE touchent à la politique de l'emploi, au social ou à la libre circulation des travailleurs et tous, sans exception, seront concernés par le Brexit. Dans un certain nombre de cas, des mesures transitoires seront indispensables pour préserver les citoyens. Cette demande de divorce doit d'ailleurs nous inciter à réviser dans les meilleurs délais la directive relative au détachement des travailleurs, afin de trouver une solution adéquate pour l'Union à 27. Enfin, le Fonds social européen, de même que le Fonds européen d'aide aux plus démunis, et le programme pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale risquent d'être affectés par le Brexit. Il est primordial que nous veillions à ce que le budget qui y est consacré soit suffisant et ce, malgré le départ britannique. Le Brexit doit être transformé en une opportunité de relance et d'amélioration du projet européen.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Riippumatta neuvotteluiden lopullisista kompromisseista, on selvää, että brexististä seuraa suuri aukko Euroopan unionin jäsenmaksuihin. Mielestäni tämä aukko pitää täyttää tulonsiirroilla muista budjettimomenteista tai vähentämällä tasaisesti kaikkia EU:n menoja. Toisin sanoen, jäsenmaksuja ei tule korottaa brexitin johdosta. Myös EU-palkkaveron korotus 10 %:sta 30 % tasolle tuottaisi lisätuloja vastaavasti. Tehtävä ei ole vaikea, sillä aukon voi täyttää budjettien uudelleenallokoinnilla kohteista, joiden tuloksellisuudesta ei ole näyttöä. Esimerkiksi ei ole näyttöä ESIR-rahaston onnistumisesta EU:n talouskasvun ja työllisyyden parantamisessa. Suunniteltu budjettikapasiteetti voidaan myös allokoida budjettiaukon täyttöön. Mikäli budjettimomenttien uudelleenkohdistuksista ei päästä sopuun, ehdotan, että erityisesti komission hallintoa ja muita menoja leikataan vastaavasti. Samalla kun säästöpolitiikat supistavat useiden jäsenmaiden budjetteja, on vain reilua ja kohtuullista odottaa komissiolta tehokkuutta toiminnoissaan.

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE), raštu. – Šiuo metu Jungtinėje Karalystėje gyvena apie 3 milijonus ES gyventojų, iš kurių 170 tūkstančių yra iš Lietuvos. Deryboms dėl „Brexit“ turim tik 2 metus, o klausimų yra daug: JK finansinis atsiskaitymas, ES išorės sienos, agentūrų perkėlimas, būsimi komerciniai ir politiniai santykiai. JK dirbančių, gyvenančių ir studijuojančių ES piliečių teisių apsauga turėtų užimti svarbią vietą. Derybos neturėtų virsti varžybomis, iš kurių visi išeisime pralaimėję. Atvirkščiai, norėčiau paraginti, kad atsakingi asmenys besiderėdami turėtų galvoje tų trijų milijonų žmonių likimus ir tokiu būdu pasiektų susitarimą, naudingiausių visiems ES piliečiams. Taip parodant, kad jie rūpi Europos Sąjungai ir kad mes esame čia tam, kad susigrąžintume ES piliečių pasitikėjimą. Aišku yra tai, kad išstodami iš ES Jungtinės Karalystės ir jos gyventojai nebegalės mėgautis tokiais pat teisėmis ar lengvatomis kaip visi kiti ES piliečiai.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), írásban. – Úgy gondolom, ezzel a határozattal az EU vívmányait, egységét és értékeit megőrző, a közös érdekek érvényesítését és az európai építkezés folytatását szavatoló tárgyalási irány mellett foglalunk állást, ami fontos politikai támogatást jelent majd a tárgyalóasztalnál ülő EU-képviselőknek. Ám ettől még sajnos változatlanul tény, hogy a Brexittel végső soron mindenki csak veszít. Ezért a határozat nyilvános kommunikációjára való tekintettel is fontosnak tartom, hogy legalább utólag levonjuk a politikai tanulságokat Cameron felelőtlenségéből, aki hosszú évek EU-ellenes, populista uszításával végeredményben hazája fejlődését, saját népe egész jövőjét tette kockára. Nem nagyon hiszem, de remélem, hogy ez az üzenet Orbán és a többi, hatalmához ragaszkodó jobboldali, nacionalista, demagóg politikus számára is súlyos figyelmeztetésül szolgál.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – Ik zie het VK niet graag uit de EU vertrekken, maar nu het proces in gang gezet is, moeten we op een constructieve manier vooruit. Vandaag bepaalt het Europees Parlement haar onderhandelingsstandpunt voor de brexit. Voor mij moeten de belangen van de burgers hierbij centraal staan. Niemand is gebaat bij een harde brexit: het VK niet, maar ook de EU niet. Tegelijkertijd moet de brexit voor de EU-27 een gezamenlijke keuze voor een sociale, duurzame en eerlijke Europese Unie zijn. De EU-27 moeten zich eensgezind rond een duurzaam en sociaal toekomstproject scharen. De brexit kan zo leiden tot meer eensgezindheid over onze gemeenschappelijke waarden.

We mogen natuurlijk niet naïef zijn. Het VK zal trachten een zo goed mogelijke deal uit de brand te slepen. Het moet echter van bij de start duidelijk zijn dat er van cherrypicking geen sprake kan zijn: je kan niet alle voordelen van lidmaatschap willen behouden en tóch de Unie verlaten. We moeten zeer duidelijk zijn dat de Unie niet zal aanvaarden dat er aan onze grenzen een fiscaal paradijs met ecodumping en sociale dumping zou ontstaan. In de brexitonderhandelingen moet daarom voldoende aandacht gaan naar het respecteren van het klimaatakkoord en het naleven van sociale en fiscale normen.

Janusz Zemke (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Debata, którą obecnie prowadzimy, jest jedną z najważniejszych w dziejach PE. Po raz pierwszy bowiem nie ustalamy zasad przystąpienia do UE, tylko warunki wystąpienia jednego z państw członkowskich z Unii. Chcę w związku z tym zwrócić uwagę tylko na jeden z tych aspektów wyjścia. Wielka Brytania jako członek Unii Europejskiej wpłacała do jej budżetu corocznie około 17 miliardów euro, a otrzymywała około 6 miliardów. Pozostałe środki, czyli ponad 10 miliardów euro, co roku były wykorzystywane na finansowanie inwestycji w wielu państwach członkowskich, w tym w Polsce. Państwa te planowały zatem swoje wydatki w oparciu o środki, które zapewnia budżet UE, pochodzący także z brytyjskich wpłat. W negocjacjach z Wielką Brytanią trzeba zatem domagać się, by wywiązała się ona do końca ze swoich zobowiązań finansowych, gdyż były one jednym z ważnych źródeł środków unijnych przeznaczanych dla pozostałych państw. Polska, podobnie jak inne państwa członkowskie, musi mieć pewność, że realizowane przez nią inwestycje zostaną sfinansowane przez budżet UE. Dlatego też uważam, że Komisja Europejska, prowadząca negocjacje w imieniu 27 państw UE, powinna konsekwentnie rozliczyć zobowiązania finansowe pomiędzy Zjednoczonym Królestwem a Unią Europejską.

7. Čas glasovanja

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

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

7.1. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (RC-B8-0237/2017, B8-0237/2017, B8-0241/2017, B8-0242/2017, B8-0243/2017) (glasovanje)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

8. Pogajanja pred prvo obravnavo v Parlamentu (člen 69(c) Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik

9. Čas glasovanja (nadaljevanje)

Der Präsident. – Wir setzen nun die Abstimmungsstunde fort.

9.1. Določeni vidiki prava družb (A8-0088/2017 - Tadeusz Zwiefka) (glasovanje)

9.2. Ratifikacija in pristop k protokolu iz leta 2010 h konvenciji o nevarnih in zdravju škodljivih snoveh z izjemo vidikov, povezanih s pravosodnim sodelovanjem v civilnih zadevah (A8-0076/2017 - Pavel Svoboda) (glasovanje)

9.3. Ratifikacija in pristop k protokolu iz leta 2010 h konvenciji o nevarnih in zdravju škodljivih snoveh glede vidikov, povezanih s pravosodnim sodelovanjem v civilnih zadevah (A8-0078/2017 - Pavel Svoboda) (glasovanje)

9.4. Uporaba določb schengenskega pravnega reda na področju schengenskega informacijskega sistema na Hrvaškem (A8-0073/2017 - Nuno Melo) (glasovanje)

9.5. Medicinski pripomočki (A8-0068/2017 - Glenis Willmott) (glasovanje)

— *Vor der Abstimmung:*

Glenis Willmott, rapporteur. – Mr President, because this is a second reading we only have votes on the amendments. This deal has been a long time in the making: it has taken at least five years to get to this point, so I am pleased to have strong support across Parliament. This is about ensuring patients' safety and encouraging innovation. It is sad for me that the Right of this House has chosen not to support something that improves patient safety and benefits patients right across the EU. Shame on you.

Peter Liese, Berichterstatter. – Vielleicht nur eine kurze Klarstellung zum Ablauf dieser Abstimmung. Normalerweise haben wir bei der frühzeitigen Einigung in zweiter Lesung überhaupt keine Abstimmung. Jetzt hat aber die UKIP einen Ablehnungsantrag gestellt, noch nicht mal die EFDD als Ganzes. Und ich muss sagen, ich bin fast dankbar, denn das gibt uns am heutigen Tag, wo wir auch über den Brexit diskutiert haben, noch einmal die Chance zu zeigen, wie einig dieses Haus gegen die Ideen der UKIP ist. Wir beschließen etwas, was für den Binnenmarkt ist, was die Patienten bestmöglich in ganz Europa schützt. Ich bedanke mich bei allen, die geholfen haben, dass wir an diesem Punkt angekommen sind – natürlich Rat, Kommission, Glenis Willmott, aber ganz besonders bei den Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern, die weit über das normale Maß hinaus gearbeitet haben, damit wir an diesem Punkt sind.

Also: Den Änderungsantrag ablehnen heißt, das Ergebnis zu unterstützen.

9.6. In vitro diagnostični medicinski pripomočki (A8-0069/2017 - Peter Liese) (glasovanje)

9.7. Skladi denarnega trga (A8-0041/2015 - Neena Gill) (glasovanje)

- 9.8. Prospekt, ki se objavi ob javni ponudbi ali sprejemu vrednostnih papirjev v trgovanje (A8-0238/2016 - Petr Ježek) (glasovanje)**
- 9.9. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (A8-0110/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)**
- 9.10. Večletni finančni okvir za obdobje 2014-2020 (resolucija) (A8-0117/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)**
- 9.11. Sprostitev varnostne rezerve (A8-0104/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas) (glasovanje)**
- 9.12. Načrt prihodkov in odhodkov za proračunsko leto 2018 — oddelek I – Evropski parlament (A8-0156/2017 - Richard Ashworth) (glasovanje)**

— Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 37, fünfter Teil:

Paul Rübige (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich wollte nur sagen: Ziffer 37 Absatz 1 ist abgelehnt. Da geht es um die allgemeine Kostenvergütung und die Veröffentlichung. Deshalb bin ich der Meinung, dass hier Teil 5 nicht mehr zulässig ist.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Rübige! Ich bin der Meinung, dass der Antrag zulässig ist. Der Absatz 1 ist angenommen. Wir haben bisher alle vier Teile angenommen.

(Zwischenrufe)

Der Änderungsantrag 1 der Grünen ist abgelehnt, und damit sind wir weiter fortgefahren mit dem Antrag 9, mit dem Antrag 17 und dann mit dem Originaltext. Und da haben wir die ersten vier Teile alle angenommen, und jetzt kommt der fünfte Teil. Über den lasse ich jetzt abstimmen.

- 9.13. Predlog spremembe proračuna št. 1/2017 — Spremní dokument k predlogu za uporabo sredstev Solidarnostnega sklada EU za zagotovitev pomoči Združenemu kraljestvu, Cipru in Portugalski (A8-0155/2017 - Jens Geier) (glasovanje)**
- 9.14. Uporaba sredstev Evropskega sklada za prilagoditev globalizaciji (vloga EGF/2017/000 TA 2017 — tehnična pomoč na pobudo Komisije) (A8-0157/2017 - Victor Negrescu) (glasovanje)**
- 9.15. Uporaba sredstev Solidarnostnega sklada EU za zagotavljanje pomoči Združenemu kraljestvu, Cipru in Portugalski (A8-0154/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes) (glasovanje)**
- 9.16. Avtomatizirana izmenjava daktiloskopskih podatkov v Latviji (A8-0089/2017 - Claude Moraes) (glasovanje)**

- 9.17. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov o DNK na Slovaškem, Portugalskem, v Latviji, Litvi, na Češkem, v Estoniji, na Madžarskem, Cipru, Poljskem, Švedskem, Malti in v Belgiji (A8-0091/2017 - Judith Sargentini) (glasovanje)
- 9.18. Avtomatizirana izmenjava daktiloskopskih podatkov na Slovaškem, v Bolgariji, Franciji, Češki republiki, Litvi, na Nizozemskem, Madžarskem, Cipru, v Estoniji, na Malti, v Romuniji in na Finskem (A8-0092/2017 - Tomáš Zdechovský) (glasovanje)
- 9.19. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov o vozilih, registriranih na Finskem, v Sloveniji, Romuniji, na Poljskem, Švedskem, v Litvi, Bolgariji, na Slovaškem in Madžarskem (A8-0095/2017 - Filiz Hyusmenova) (glasovanje)
- 9.20. Avtomatizirana izmenjava podatkov iz registrov vozil na Malti, Cipru in v Estoniji (A8-0090/2017 - Maria Grapini) (glasovanje)
- 9.21. Gensko spremenjena koroza Bt11 × 59122 × MIR604 × 1507 × GA21 (B8-0236/2017) (glasovanje)
- 9.22. Obravnavanje tokov beguncev in migrantov: vloga zunanjega delovanja EU (A8-0045/2017 - Elena Valenciano, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (glasovanje)

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

10. Obrazložitev glasovanja

- 10.1. Pogajanja z Združenim kraljestvom po uradnem obvestilu, da namerava izstopiti iz Evropske unije (RC-B8-0237/2017, B8-0237/2017, B8-0241/2017, B8-0242/2017, B8-0243/2017)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Zeit, die wir jetzt durch zügiges Abstimmen eingespart haben, bitte ich, dadurch zu honorieren, dass Sie den Raum zügig verlassen, wenn Sie die Stimmerkklärungen nicht hören möchten, und sich vor allem nicht auf den Gängen stehend zu unterhalten. Ich werde mir die Freiheit nehmen, einzelne Kollegen auch namentlich zu bitten, solche Gespräche einzustellen.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono mesi che in queste aule si parla dei probabili effetti dannosi dell'uscita del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. Sono mesi che parliamo del problema Brexit, come se ci fosse davvero bisogno di discutere del risultato democratico di un referendum democratico. Il popolo inglese ha votato e ha deciso. Il voto va rispettato. Questo non deve essere in discussione.

Ora si aprono i negoziati: da una parte c'è il governo del Regno Unito, che farà gli interessi dei cittadini inglesi, dall'altra c'è l'Unione europea, che non sono sicura farà gli interessi dei cittadini europei – penso a quei cittadini europei che da anni vivono e lavorano nel Regno Unito: i loro diritti vanno tutelati e non devono essere messi in discussione attraverso un confronto responsabile. Il Regno Unito dovrà onorare gli impegni presi fino alla conclusione del percorso di uscita effettiva dall'Unione, perché gli impegni presi vanno rispettati.

Siamo giunti a questo punto, però, perché sono stati commessi gravi errori. Chi li ha commessi deve chiedere scusa e presentare un libro nero del passato, non quello bianco e vuoto di un futuro incerto. Ognuno faccia la sua parte. Noi chiediamo un negoziato equo e giusto, e soprattutto non punitivo nei confronti del popolo britannico. Il Movimento 5 Stelle non sarà complice di scelte politiche mirate a punire uno per educarne cento.

E se si parla di mafia dentro le aule del Parlamento europeo, non ci dobbiamo scandalizzare come dei borghesi a un party esclusivo. La mafia esiste, non solo in Italia. La mafia non è l'Europa, la mafia non è l'Italia, la mafia è silenzio e censura, oltre che criminalità. La mafia è un atteggiamento di minaccia e omertà.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, lo que se pedía hoy al Parlamento Europeo era altura de miras frente a la decisión del Reino Unido de abandonar la Unión Europea y una posición clara sobre el reconocimiento de los derechos sociales adquiridos, de residencia, de movilidad, de seguridad social para los británicos que residen en la Unión Europea y los europeos que viven en el Reino Unido.

Pero hemos caído en una confrontación que fortalecerá el nacionalismo británico. Un carro al que se ha apuntado el Gobierno de España, para quien la soberanía de Gibraltar es un asunto más importante que los derechos de los 12 000 trabajadores que cruzan la valla cada día.

No nos perdamos en discursos abstractos que esconden, bajo el manto del nacionalismo o de un europeísmo hueco, el neoliberalismo que comparten la Unión Europea y el Reino Unido.

Para nosotros, las relaciones futuras con el Reino Unido deberán basarse en la solidaridad y el reconocimiento mutuo de los derechos fundamentales, porque hay otra Europa, la de la Carta Social Europea, la del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, de la que todos seguiremos formando parte.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Šiandien mes padarėme svarbų, bet nebūtinai džiugų sprendimą. Aš neprisijungiau prie tų, kurie apلودimentais palydėjo šį sprendimą. Man daugiau tai liūdesį keliantis sprendimas, bet nors mes ir apsisprendėme, o tiksliau – mūsų britų kolegos balsavo referendumė, mes turime priimti atitinkamus sprendimus. Taip, derybos dėl Didžiosios Britanijos išstojimo turi būti pragmatiškos, ir aš tikiuosi, kad Europos Sąjunga derės kaip pragmatiškas partneris, tačiau dėl susitarimo dėl ateities bendradarbiavimo, kai mes turime tapti ateities partneriais, aš tikiuosi, kad Europos Sąjungos derybininkai bus vizionieriški, kad jie pasiūlys tokius sprendimus, kurie sukurs galimybes Europos Sąjungai ir Didžiąjai Britanijai išlikti partneriais, glaudžiais partneriais, ir iš tiesų nestatyti naujų sienų Europoje. Berlyno siena buvo sugriauta europiečių, ir, aš manau, mes turime pasimokyti iš šitos ir istorijos tam, kad nesukurtume naujų sienų Europoje.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Преди седмица беше тъжен ден за Европа. Тъжен, защото една държава членка обяви официално, че напуска най-голямата организация – гарант на стабилността и просперитета в Европа.

Това решение ще има последици за милиони европейци, както за няколкото милиона британски граждани, пребиваващи в Европейския съюз, така и за всички граждани на Съюза, които живеят в Обединеното кралство. Рубикон е пресечен!

От 2019 година Съюзът ще бъде с 27 държави членки, но това не означава, че правата на европейските и британски граждани трябва да изчезнат от днес за утре. Много хора и някои политици се опитват да използват картата на миграция като елемент на несигурност и разменна монета. Това е безотговорно и несериозно.

В продължение на десетилетия всички тези европейски граждани, сред които и българите, са допринасяли за развитието и просперитета на британската икономика и общество. Призовавам британското правителство да не създава несигурност за милионите европейски граждани, сред които са и моите съграждани, с използване или дори толериране на риторика, увеличаваща страха на хората, свързан със социалните им права.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já chci konstatovat, že jsem podpořil usnesení týkající se brexitu, nicméně proti některým částem tohoto textu mám určité výhrady. V některých aspektech mně připadá ten text příliš tvrdý.

Je-li naším cílem se dohodnout na dobré spolupráci do budoucna a na obchodních dohodách, tak mám pocit, že třeba bod šest, který jasně říká, že Velká Británie nemůže vyjednávat se třetími zeměmi obchodní smlouvy do doby ukončení svého členství v Evropské unii, že takováto ustanovení za první Velká Británie nebude muset dodržet a za druhé že jsou příliš tvrdá. Zakázat někomu něco vyjednávat, když ještě dohoda nebude platit, mně připadá, že je opravdu trochu nad limit.

Nicméně vítám to, že usnesení dneska bylo přijato, že dává jasný postoj Evropského parlamentu k budoucímu procesu brexitu, a proto jsem nakonec pro celé usnesení hlasoval.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, negocierile Uniunii cu Marea Britanie pentru Brexit trebuie să fie făcute fără ură, fără răzburare și cu gândul în primul rând la oameni, cei din Uniune și cei din Marea Britanie. Pentru ei trebuie să negociem pentru comerțul liber, pentru libertatea de mișcare, pentru drepturile lor și să nu uităm că vrem să fim împreună, parteneri, ca țări și ca oameni.

Peste două sute de mii de români se află acum în Marea Britanie. Ei muncesc în toate domeniile, în funcții foarte calificate, sunt bancheri, profesori, doctori, cercetători și așa mai departe. De asemenea, există români și acolo unde există deficit de forță de muncă, în spitale, în cămine de bătrâni, în construcții, în agricultură. Sunt și mulți tineri români care studiază la universități din Marea Britanie. Ministrul britanic însărcinat cu negocierea Brexit, domnul David Jones, ne-a spus chiar ieri că dorește să îi păstreze pe români în Marea Britanie. Desigur, și Marea Britanie vrea să își păstreze cetățenii europeni în Uniunea Europeană.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, 25 giugno e 29 marzo sono due date tristemente storiche che hanno segnato un passo indietro nella storia britannica e una battuta d'arresto per l'Unione europea. Ora, dopo il referendum e la notifica dell'attivazione dell'articolo 50, dunque, che Brexit sia. Senza indugi, io direi. Perché dopo la decisione del popolo del Regno Unito, legittima quanto assurda, è l'Unione europea che non può permettersi insicurezza ed incertezza.

Credo che adesso la priorità sia pensare alla stabilità e alla salvaguardia degli interessi dell'Unione. Credo che il negoziato per l'uscita del Regno Unito debba dimostrare chiaramente che l'Unione è più forte, e che da solo il Regno Unito potrà ottenere poco. Sono convinta che non si debbano mettere in discussione i diritti dei cittadini europei, e sono convinta che questa sia l'occasione per dimostrare ai populistici, ai sovranisti e ai nazionalisti di tutta Europa che la loro è propaganda vuota e sterile, senza un progetto politico.

Sono tra quelli che sognano che, seppur difficilmente, il Regno Unito un giorno possa tornare indietro per il suo futuro e per quello dell'Europa.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, we welcome the position of the European Parliament ahead of the Brexit negotiations, that it is unambiguous in relation to Ireland. It recognises that the people in the North voted to remain and it commits that the Good Friday Agreement must be preserved in all its parts. Crucially, the Parliament position calls on negotiators to do everything to avoid any hardening of the border. Written as it was by Groups with whom we have fundamental disagreements regarding the current and future direction of the EU, we in Sinn Féin consider this report to be a successful vindication of the dialogue with which we and other Irish MEPs have been engaged in since last summer.

Parliament's position is even more positive when compared to the draft of the Council. Despite assurances from the Fine Gael Government, the Council draft is weak, non-specific, and simply not up to the standards that the Irish people, North and South, require. My appeal to this House, and to the other European institutions, today is: please do not allow the people of Ireland to suffer the consequence of our own government's incompetence.

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). – Domnule președinte, nu mi-aș fi dorit niciodată să putem da votul astăzi pentru o propunere de negociere a ieșirii Marii Britanii din Uniunea Europeană. Pe de altă parte însă, voința popoarelor trebuie respectată în această sală.

Domnule președinte, chiar dacă va părăsi în doi ani Uniunea Europeană, Marea Britanie rămâne o țară europeană și, în aceste condiții, drepturile sociale ale cetățenilor europeni, membri ai Uniunii, și ale cetățenilor britanici, membri ai Europei, trebuie respectate. Marea Britanie și Uniunea Europeană trebuie să rămână parte a unui model social european, să respecte drepturile sociale. Românii sunt foarte mulți în Marea Britanie, după cum și britanicii sunt foarte mulți Uniunea Europeană. Carta socială europeană, Convenția europeană a drepturilor omului ne obligă.

În altă ordine de idei, domnule președinte, cred că negocierea cu țările terțe trebuie interzisă. Avem nevoie de coeziune în Uniunea Europeană și Uniunea nu trebuie să facă din această ieșire a Marii Britanii un precedent.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, a divorce is always a defeat, a difficult situation for both sides. Contrary to the false promises of the Brexiters' propaganda, leaving the EU will involve difficult decisions and entail possibly unexpected, and often harmful, consequences. It is clear that the four freedoms of the single market are indivisible. This is a red line for us. We will not allow a future relationship that damages the integrity of the single market or lowers European legal, social, environmental and health standards. We want, at the same time, to ensure an orderly Brexit. We want the negotiations to be fair and in the interests of European and UK citizens, the future relationship with the UK to be balanced and comprehensive, and for the United Kingdom to remain a close political, economic and strategic partner of the European Union.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Mr President, although we had reservations on one or two points in this resolution, Labour MEPs voted in favour of this resolution, which provides more clarity and realism on the issues facing us than does the position of the British Government. The British Government still has not said what it wants on many of the key issues that will be coming up in this mother of all divorce cases, but it has said that it wants exactly the same benefits as Britain currently has as a member of the single market. Well, we will hold them to account on that, but it does seem, generally, that the British Government is intent on testing to destruction the theory that you can have your cake and eat it. When it becomes clear that that is not possible, then there will be a question as to what happens next. What should Britain do if the outcome of this Brexit process is damaging, costly and dangerous to Britain? That is why I am glad that this resolution confirms that it is possible for Article 50 notifications to be withdrawn and revoked. We may need it.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le parole già estreme pronunciate dal ministro della Difesa inglese Michael Fallon fanno comprendere il ruolo di grande responsabilità che dovrà giocare durante i negoziati l'Unione europea, che dovrà trattare preoccupandosi anche della sorte del Regno Unito.

Con la sua scelta il Regno Unito fa un salto verso l'ignoto, fuori da ogni progetto politico di lungo respiro, ma geograficamente resta lì, vicino alla Francia e al Benelux, e la storia ci insegna che generare frustrazioni nei paesi vicini porta sempre a conseguenze nefaste. Dobbiamo lasciare una porta aperta per quando il Regno Unito comprenderà l'errore e dovrà tornare indietro, ma dobbiamo prestare attenzione ai messaggi che verranno lanciati, perché non si abbia a confondere un atto di responsabilità con una prova di debolezza. I temi sul tavolo sono molteplici, e incideranno tanto sugli obblighi finanziari, quanto sui diritti individuali.

Ai negoziatori europei, i miei migliori auguri di buon lavoro. Sono sicuro che la Brexit costituirà un'occasione per poter rilanciare con maggior forza il sogno europeo.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, považuji za velmi cenné, že 516 poslanců a poslankyň hlasovalo pro společné usnesení, protože je to signál. Evropská unie musí být jednotná, jedině tak dosáhneme dobrého výsledku pro budoucí vztah se Spojeným královstvím.

Pro obě strany je toto rozhodnutí rozvodu ztrátou a mně budou chybět britští poslanci. Je naší povinností, abychom minimalizovali tyto ztráty. Theresa Mayová odmítla účast na společném trhu a celní unii. Odmítla tedy čtyři základní svobody pro své občany. My její návrh musíme respektovat, ale znamená to nalézt nový rámec, který umožní férové podmínky pro naše občany i pro vzájemně výhodnou spolupráci. Já věřím v dobrou spolupráci s Velkou Británií a věřím ve společný postup Evropské unie a také v sebereflexi, kterou musíme učinit.

Clare Moody (S&D). – Mr President, today is the day when even Theresa May has started to acknowledge the reality of where we are. The empty nationalistic rhetoric and flag-waving that characterised the debate last year, and again in the last week, has always resulted in damaging our interests. It angers me that people wrap themselves in the British and Gibraltarian flags when they had actively worked against the interests of citizens of both places. We are about to enter detailed negotiations with our friends about the future of our country. It is time to settle down to serious politics, recognising through the process that we have lost some of our sovereignty, and focus on ensuring that eventually we will reach a deal that works for the citizens of the UK and Gibraltar, as well as our European colleagues.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Señor presidente, el Peñón no pertenece al Reino Unido ni a España, sino a los gibraltareños, y la gente de Gibraltar ha determinado que su futuro debe continuar con el Reino Unido: en un referéndum, en el año 2002, votaron por seguir siendo británicos. El resultado fue del 99 %.

No hay que discutir nada más.

El Peñón se queda con el Reino Unido, igual que Ceuta y Melilla se quedan con España. La inclusión de Gibraltar en las orientaciones para la negociación sobre el *brexit* es una amenaza sin razón. La Unión Europea habla mucho sobre la democracia, pero estas palabras no valen nada.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich bedaure das Ausscheiden von Großbritannien aus der Europäischen Union sehr, und ich denke, das ist auch keine gute Geschichte für die Europäische Union, und es ist auch keine gute Geschichte für Großbritannien.

Zweitens: Selbstverständlich sichern wir uns gegenseitig ein faires rechtsdemokratisches Verfahren zu. Man könnte mal sagen: Beide sind ja nun auch erwachsene Institutionen geworden.

Drittens möchte ich aber betonen: Die Europäische Union ist eine ernsthafte Angelegenheit und kein intellektueller Literaturzirkus. Dort hat man Rechte, und dort hat man auch Pflichten. Das heißt zunächst einmal: So lange, wie Großbritannien Mitglied der Europäischen Union bleibt – auch in der Scheidungszeit –, werden sie selbstverständlich alle Rechte haben, aber auch alle Pflichten der Europäischen Union erfüllen müssen. Das heißt aber auch: Wenn Großbritannien ausscheidet, dann haben sie zwar keine Pflichten mehr, aber auch keine Rechte.

Und viertens: Ich freue mich über die heute mit breiter Mehrheit angenommenen Entschlüssen, denn das gibt uns die Kraft, dieses Verfahren wirklich im beiderseitigen Interesse zu führen.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! Az Európai Parlament Brexitre vonatkozó határozatától azt vártam el, hogy egy súrlódásmentes, békés elválást készít elő, és egyben körvonalazza a további szoros együttműködés lehetőségét – nem ez történt. Olyan feltételeket állít az Egyesült Királyságnak 2020 után is, ami miatt a lakosság többsége épp a kilépés mellett döntött. Amellett kétségbe vonja a szuverenitását, megtagadja tőle, hogy egyáltalán tárgyalásokat kezdeményezzen a kilépést megelőző időszakban. A hangadók úgy gondolják, hogy az EU 27-ek érdekeit szolgálják. Nem, mert a tagországok érdeke is a további legszorosabb együttműködés lenne.

Bízom benne, hogy a Tanács és a Bizottság nem követi ezt az utat, mert ez nem más, mint bosszú a britekkel szemben, és elrettentése azoknak a tagországoknak, akik később esetleg a kilépésre gondolnak.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Úgy tűnik, hogy az Európai Unió nem sokat tanult a Brexitből. Nem nézték meg a mögöttes okokat, nem vizsgálták meg, hogy vajon az Önök által szélsőségesnek, nacionalistának, primitívnek, én nem tudom, milyennek bélyegzett angol többség miért akarta elhagyni az Uniót.

Nem néztek a mélyére annak, hogy az egyik fő oka a migráció elutasítása volt, és ezen belül is az Unión belüli migráció is – amit szintén okaiban, gyökereiben orvosolni kellene. Meg kellene vizsgálni, hogy mi az oka annak, és hogyan lehetne változtatni azon, hogy a közép- és kelet-európai volt szocialista országokban töredékét keresik az emberek, mint a nyugati országokban, és ezért fogják magukat, és elmennek, például Magyarországról Angliába. Most Magyarországról elindult végre egy kezdeményezés több közép- és kelet-európai ország részvételével ezeknek a brutális jövedelmi és bérkülönbségeknek a felszámolására. Kérem, figyeljék és támogassák!

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Brexit to zły moment w historii Unii Europejskiej, ale rozstanie to powinno się odbyć z poszanowaniem obu stron, a szczególnie interesu obywateli państw członkowskich i Unii Europejskiej. Wszyscy bowiem jesteśmy Europejczykami bez względu na to, czy mieszkamy na kontynencie czy na Wyspach. Dzisiaj powinniśmy więc określić najważniejsze priorytety tego procesu. Według mnie najważniejszym priorytetem jest bezpieczeństwo, także walka z nacjonalizmami. Wszyscy bowiem lepiej albo gorzej poradzą sobie ze złymi skutkami Brexitu – jestem przekonany bowiem, że będą to złe skutki – poszczególni ludzie sobie poradzą, przedsiębiorcy sobie poradzą, rynki finansowe sobie poradzą, wszyscy sobie jakoś poradzą. Natomiast nie poradzą sobie z konfliktami, nie poradzą sobie ze sporami, nie poradzą sobie z rasizmem, nie poradzą sobie z ksenofobią, nie poradzą sobie z nacjonalizmem, w końcu nie poradzą sobie z wojną.

Vicky Ford (ECR). – Mr President, the two-year negotiations for leaving the EU have now started, and I was appalled by the name-calling and jeering in this Chamber earlier from UKIP colleagues. It does not represent the views of the vast majority of the British people or the views of colleagues across this Chamber.

Real people's lives, jobs and future are at stake, and we need amicable solutions. There is a huge amount of work to be done on our future relationship. I do think this resolution could have done a lot more on that future relationship and set the tone on some of the detailed discussions that we need to go ahead. It is time to roll up our sleeves, colleagues, and help to find those solutions. I am ready to work with anyone across Europe who wants to achieve amicable negotiations and that long-term partnership.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Velika Britanija se je 29. junija lani odločila za odhod iz Evropske unije. Gospa Theresa May je 29. marca poslala pismo, v katerem je naznanila trd odhod iz Evropske unije, trd brexit.

Stvari lahko obžalujemo, vsekakor pa jih moramo spoštovati kot dejstva, ki bodo zaposlovala Evropski parlament in tudi parlamentarce v prihodnjih mesecih, letih.

Evropska unija mora biti enotna. V ospredje moramo dati interese državljanov tako Evropske unije kakor tudi interese državljanov Velike Britanije in ustvariti ločitev, ki bo zagotavljala spodobno sobivanje tudi v prihodnosti.

Čas je tudi za razmislek o prihodnosti Evropske unije. Zagotovo je treba marsikaj tudi v Evropski uniji storiti in izboljšati delovanje same Evropske unije.

Mogoče pa je pravi odgovor tudi ob brexitu to, da intenziviramo pogovore tudi o širitvi Evropske unije na države Zahodnega Balkana. Te države se želijo priključiti Evropski uniji, ker želijo živeti v miru, svobodi in želijo dobro svojim ljudem.

Mogoče je to pravi odgovor.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, the British problem – or obviously from a UK perspective, the European problem – is very simply stated. Britain wanted to be part of a common market, not a common government. Guy Verhofstadt expressed some of the reasons very well in his speech this morning: the fundamental difference between a bottom-up common law system and the Napoleonic system on the continent. It is not an argument that applies everywhere, but our economic cycle has always been Atlantic rather than European; our outlook has always been maritime rather than continental. In the talks at the beginning of last year, David Cameron tried to get a looser deal from the inside. The other Member States decided that that was not a concession they were prepared to make, which is absolutely fine. We are therefore going to seek it from the outside. What should be the framework of that deal? I think a good model is Canada's relations with the United States. Canada has, on its doorstep, a political union; it is not part of that union, but it enjoys the closest military security, economic and commercial links with that union compatible with being a sovereign state. You will lose a bad tenant, and you will gain a good neighbour.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Brexit będzie z pewnością trudnym doświadczeniem zarówno dla Unii, jak i dla Zjednoczonego Królestwa. Obie strony będą w toku negocjacji wypracowywać jak najkorzystniejsze dla stron rozwiązania. Najważniejsze jednak jest, abyśmy w tym procesie pamiętali przede wszystkim o obywatelach zarówno europejskich w Wielkiej Brytanii, jak i brytyjskich żyjących w krajach Unii Europejskiej, dla których Brexit będzie miał bezpośredni wpływ na ich życie rodzinne oraz zawodowe. Miliony obywateli żyją dziś w ogromnej niepewności. Nie wiedzą, czy nadal będą mogli korzystać z nabytych przez lata praw pracy, czy nadal będą mogli pracować i żyć w Wielkiej Brytanii bądź – jak w przypadku brytyjskich obywateli – w 27 krajach Unii Europejskiej. Obowiązkiem i priorytetem podczas negocjacji powinno być zminimalizowanie negatywnych skutków Brexitu dla obywateli. Obie strony muszą zapewnić zachowanie nabytych praw oraz umożliwić na zasadzie wzajemności swobodę przemieszczania

się, podejmowania pracy i świadczenia usług. W rezolucji jasno podkreślono, że nie ma zgody na dostęp do jednolitego rynku bez poszanowania traktatowych swobód, z których dzisiaj korzystają obywatele Unii. Dlatego dzisiaj z pełnym przekonaniem zagłosowałam za rezolucją dotyczącą negocjacji w sprawie Brexitu.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W Wielkiej Brytanii społeczeństwo rządowi może wysyłać sygnały przez wybory uzupełniające, w Niemczech przez wybory krajowe, a w Unii Europejskiej mamy tylko referenda. Referenda, które są tak naprawdę próbierzem nastrojów nie tylko w danym kraju, ale w całej Europie.

Czas przyjąć do wiadomości, że Brexit był reprezentatywną reakcją dla niezadowolenia milionów Europejczyków z polityki, którą prowadzi dzisiaj kierownictwo Unii Europejskiej. My jeszcze dzisiaj na tej sali przyjęliśmy rezolucję zapowiadającą legalizację nielegalnej imigracji. Można rzeczywistość czarować, można nad nią odprawiać zaklęcia, mówić o nacjonalizmach, populizmach, ale nie zaczaruje się faktu podstawowego: Europę tworzą narody. Jeżeli nie będziemy szanowali narodów, Europy nie będzie.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is happening. The United Kingdom are packing their bags and they are leaving the European Union. When David Cameron attempted to get what he called a better deal for Britain, he was told that the four freedoms were sacrosanct: they could not be changed. And predictably, when he went back to the people of the United Kingdom he ended up losing, and he ended up losing because he went back with nothing because he was told that the four freedoms were sacrosanct.

Yet, at the moment, we are now embarking on another process. A white paper where we look at the future of Europe, where two options could potentially have satisfied the United Kingdom's grievances. Option two is nothing but the single market, so we could potentially have a situation next December where we have decided to restrict freedom of movement whilst still negotiating with Great Britain on the basis that market access cannot happen without freedom of movement of people. Someone please explain this contradiction.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtarán, bhí díospóireacht againn i rith na maidine ar an mBreaitimeacht agus den chuid is mó bhí sé cothrom, féaráilte agus ciallmhar. Bhí áthas orm agus cuirim mo bhuíochas in iúl do na feisirí a rinne tagairt d'Éirinn – Comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta agus cás na teorann.

Anois, tar éis na díospóireachta, tá cinneadh déanta ag an bParlaimint, agus le móramh mór glacadh leis an rún a bhí os ár gcomhair: 516 i bhfabhar agus 133 i gcoinne. Ba é an móramh céanna é don chuid is mó do na leasuithe. Dá bhrí sin tá an Pharlaimint aontaithe, agus is féidir linn dul ar aghaidh anois agus idirbheartaíocht a thosú idir an Ríocht Aontaithe agus an tAontas agus teacht ar chomhréiteach a oibreoidh don Ríocht Aontaithe agus don Aontas amach anseo.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, I voted against Parliament's draft resolution on Brexit this afternoon. From the outset, I do welcome the fact that the text recognises Northern Ireland's unique position in respect of our land border with the Republic of Ireland. This builds on existing commitments by both the UK and Irish governments, and indeed the European Council, to give these challenges priority and adopt a flexible and imaginative approach.

However, I cannot neglect the fact that this resolution would severely limit what can be achieved in the talks ahead. It would prevent the UK from opening trade talks with non-EU countries before 2019. It would take future trade relations with the EU off the table for the next two years, and it would tie the UK into paying an endless and excessive divorce bill well after it leaves.

These are restrictions that would affect taxpayers in Northern Ireland very directly. They would also prevent local firms from accessing new markets and from exporting goods and services in the short to medium term. So while the text is cognisant of the needs of Northern Ireland, the resolution is not conducive.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, almost a year since the UK referendum, a period in which the EU was only a bystander to the phony war on Brexit, the start of the exit negotiations themselves comes as a sort of relief. The start of open, honest and transparent discussions between the two partners was long overdue. Euphemisms used for a radical departure, be it a 'clean exit' or 'a new partnership with Europe' might have made possible until now to mask for many the hard choices and trade-offs of the negotiations to come. But now the time is slowly coming for the cake proverb to be put to the test, the lies written on buses to be exposed, and promises of libertarian utopias to have their first contact with reality. But the need to come to terms with what an idealistic notion of undiluted 'control' in a vastly interconnec-

ted world really means, as opposed to true influence and significance, is not limited to Britain, but applies to the EU too.

Nathan Gill (EFDD). – Mr President, I represent Wales, which is a nation in the United Kingdom which voted to leave the EU. A week ago today, the Prime Minister triggered Article 50, formally beginning the UK-EU Brexit negotiation process. It was an historic day. After legal challenges, lengthy delays and threats, we will be leaving the EU, and become an independent, self-governing and democratic country once again. This Parliament is calling for unreasonable demands, some of which are going to be impossible to meet. The Commission is meeting a GBP 52 million divorce bill.

Can I just ask this: do you actually want a Brexit deal? The people of Wales and Britain voted to leave the EU, not Europe. We still want to be your friends and trading partners, but if you are not going to make us any sensible offers, we will take our business elsewhere. The EU only represents 15% of the global economy. A new, global Britain is going to see us become more forward-facing.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, this morning was important with a really strong resolution and a good debate. For me and for the people I represent, which is a border constituency in Ireland with Northern Ireland, paragraph 20 is important. It talks about the unique position and special circumstances on the island of Ireland and says it must be addressed in a withdrawal agreement. It very specifically says that we must do everything possible to avoid a hardening of the border. I drive through Northern Ireland to visit my constituents in Donegal. I see no difference in our territories except that there are kilometres where I am from and there are miles in Northern Ireland. I want that difference to be the only one that exists after Brexit, but – let us be frank and honest – there is a lot of work to do to live up to the words that we have voted through and there is a political responsibility on the British Prime Minister and her Government to deliver more on this commitment. We did not vote for Brexit, but we have to live with the consequences of it.

Seb Dance (S&D). – Mr President, I want to pick that point up actually because of course the economies of Northern Ireland and the Republic are inextricably linked, as of course is the peace process that was painstakingly negotiated over many, many years.

There was a UKIP amendment that tried to remove the competency of the European Union in relation to the border issue. It said that the Common Travel Area is not dependent on EU membership, and I was surprised to see that the Tories supported it as well. Yes, the Common Travel Area predates the European Union, but it was drawn up at a time when the immigration policies of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom were the same, and indeed the customs policies were broadly similar.

It is the policy of the British Government now, apparently, to tear those two regimes asunder. That does make the Common Travel Area an issue to do with Brexit as has been explained. It was not voted for by the people of Northern Ireland and it is an issue that the British Government has to face up to its responsibilities on. It is not enough to simply wish this issue away. We need real political leadership and we need this to be addressed.

10.2. Medicinski pripomočki (A8-0068/2017 - Glenis Willmott)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, si hablamos de dispositivos médicos, tenemos que hablar de Essure. Essure se publicita como un sistema de control de natalidad permanente sin cirugía. La multinacional Bayer ha vendido a un millón de mujeres este dispositivo.

Desde que se aprobó en 2002, se ha informado de efectos negativos en mujeres de todo el mundo: fuertes hemorragias, dolor pélvico, desórdenes del sistema inmune y, el colmo de un anticonceptivo, una alta tasa de embarazos no deseados. La intervención para extraer el dispositivo termina, en muchísimos casos, en una histerectomía.

Essure ha tenido consecuencias atroces para miles de mujeres. Nunca debió permitirse que se comercializara un método anticonceptivo así y debería prohibirse su venta de inmediato.

Celebro, por tanto, que la Audiencia Nacional española haya admitido una demanda de la Asociación de Afectadas por Essure: por fin, se investigarán las instancias responsables de controlar un dispositivo como este.

Algo así no puede volver a ocurrir, al menos en Europa. Fallamos a las mujeres y ahora debemos recuperar su confianza.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, today, having seemingly learned from the hip replacement and breast implant scandals, the medical devices regulations have been updated. This should be welcomed. Introduced are a concentration limit for 1B carcinogenic, mutagenic and repro-toxic substances (CMRs), and also for endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) in devices that include a benefit risk assessment of their presence as they are CMRs or EDCs – lots of jargon there. Such assessments would have to be updated within five years. I only wish it could have been more speedy than that. However, all changes to medical devices that increase patient safety and patient choice, without reducing their clinical effectiveness, are to be welcomed. I am 100% sure that in the post-Brexit United Kingdom these standards will be maintained in cooperation with our European Union Member State counterparts.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho votato a favore di questo regolamento perché costituisce un importante passo avanti per la salute e la sicurezza dei cittadini. Le nuove norme europee in materia di dispositivi medici avranno infatti un duplice effetto positivo: garantiranno la sicurezza di questi importanti strumenti e allo stesso tempo daranno l'opportunità ai pazienti di beneficiare tempestivamente di soluzioni innovative in materia di assistenza sanitaria.

Particolarmente importante, poi, è l'introduzione della responsabilità di chi li fabbrica. Allo stesso modo il *follow-up* della qualità e delle prestazioni permetterà ai produttori di intervenire rapidamente qualora sorgano delle problematiche e li aiuterà a migliorare costantemente i loro dispositivi. La salute dei cittadini, l'accesso a tecnologie più avanzate che migliorino i trattamenti e allevino le sofferenze sono obiettivi primari dell'Unione europea.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Jelentem, mi magyarok nem szeretnénk tovább a nyugati országoknak az összeszerelő üzeme lenni rosszul fizetett bér munkásokkal. Engedjék meg, hogy egy pár szalagcímet ismertessek: Felismeri a szívbajokat a magyar találmány, A legmodernebb vizeletanalizátor-rendszert mutatták be a Szegedi Egyetemen, Szenzációs magyar találmány az allergiások örömére, Neves amerikai egyetemek érdeklődnek egy magyar orvosi találmány, mégpedig az anatómiai szimulátor iránt, Orvostudományi áttörés, intelligens onkológiai sebészkes: egy magyar találmány útja.

Kérem szépen, kutatás, fejlesztés, innováció és ezeknek a káprázatos újdonságoknak a magyar termékkénti legyártása és piacra juttatása: ez a magyar út, kérem, hogy ha nem akarják, hogy folyamatosan belső migrációval terheljük az országait, akkor ebben segítsenek és támogassanak bennünket és mi magyarok is higgyük el magunkról, hogy erre alkalmasak vagyunk!

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl říci, že lidské zdraví by mělo stát mezi prioritami vždy v našem posuzování, a pokud jde o předložený návrh kompromisů, tak já jsem je skutečně rád podpořil. Vyjednávaly se pět let a ta hranice přijatelnosti, si myslím, byla pro plénium, pro většinu i pro mne splněna. Já jsem tedy odmítl návrh usnesení, který by zamítal dosažený kompromis. Jsem motivován několika důvody.

Za prvé, dojde nepochybně ke zkvalitnění bezpečí pacientů, ke zkvalitnění zdravotnických služeb a samozřejmě i ke zkvalitnění těch prostředků, které jsou využívány, byla už o tom tady i řeč. Zároveň si myslím, že bude tato zpráva, respektive toto doporučení, dále motivovat firmy k inovacím, k větší efektivitě v rámci již nastaveného systému.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I have worked on this dossier for almost five years with other colleagues, so it is a good day that we have approved tougher and better legislation on medical devices because public health is our primary concern here and that is vital. But so, too, is the medical devices industry: it is a vital part of our economy and it produces products that sustain lives, quality of life improves and our lives are extended by it. So good work has been done across the House.

The next step is implementation, and here the Commission and Member States and we ourselves must keep a watch so that what is in the legislation is put into effect. There are two core issues, but I will deal with one in particular and that is post-market surveillance of products. Many of the problems with faulty devices were made worse because there was not adequate post-market surveillance. In other words, there was no reporting system and the problems were not identified. This legislation changes that and let's make sure it is fully implemented.

10.3. In vitro diagnostiční medicínski pripomočki (A8-0069/2017 - Peter Liese)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořila návrh nařízení o zdravotnických prostředcích in vitro. Záměr znamená snazší identifikaci a dohledatelnost používaných zdravotnických prostředků a je správný a je také samozřejmě v zájmu pacientů. Nařízení by mělo docílit vyšší bezpečnosti zdravotnických prostředků, důslednou kontrolu před samotným uvedením na trh i poté, co na trhu již tyto prostředky jsou.

Ráda bych však upozornila na dva problémové body. Jeden se týká možnosti obnovovat zdravotnické prostředky určené na jedno použití, tedy takzvaný *reprocessing* obsažený v článku sedmnáct. Druhým bodem je elektronický systém registrací a jeho provázání s národními registry. Preferovala bych spíše možnost ponechání registrace na národní úrovni s předáváním validovaných dat do centrální evropské databáze, nicméně nařízení jako takové znamená větší bezpečnost pro pacienty. Proto jsem ho podpořila.

10.4. Skladi denarnega trga (A8-0041/2015 - Neena Gill)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, we voted today for on an important regulation that will finally, four years after the initial proposal, regulate a big portion of the so-called shadow banking system, money market funds. I strongly supported the report, as these money market funds are important in providing financing to financial institutions, corporations and governments.

Because of the financial crisis in Europe, these funds confronted problems of liquidity and stability. That is why a debate started on how to make them more shock-resistant. I definitely support the European Commission proposal for new rules on money market funds aiming to improve the ability of these funds to, where possible, reduce pressure on them by boosting their liquidity profile, and increase their stability by means of the five initiatives mentioned in the report.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože fondy peněžního trhu poskytují finančním institucím, obchodním společnostem, ale i vládám krátkodobé financování, a tím vlastně přispívají k fungování peněžního trhu. Minulé roky ve finanční krizi ukázaly, jak jsou i tyto fondy náchylné k rizikům. Je důležité, abychom stanovili právě za této situace a s touto zkušeností jakési jednotné obezřetnostní požadavky, které se budou vztahovat na působení těchto fondů na peněžním trhu v Evropské unii, a to při současném plném zohlednění potřeby vyvážit bezpečnost a spolehlivost fondů peněžního trhu s účinným fungováním právě na těchto trzích. Toto nemůže být uspokojivě dosaženo na úrovni jednotlivých států, ale bylo důležité, abychom přijali tuto iniciativu, a proto jsem ji podpořil.

10.5. Večletní finanční okvir za období 2014-2020 (A8-0110/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořila doporučení Evropského parlamentu k návrhu nařízení, kterým se upravuje víceletý finanční rámec na období 2014-2020. Revize víceletého finančního rámce se ubírá dobrým směrem, zejména pokud jde o navýšení prostředků na podporu konkurenceschopnosti o 1,4 miliardy EUR při současném nenavyšování celkových stropů. Podporuji princip formou realokace, podpoříme prioritně ty programy, které čerpají a fungují efektivně a přispívají k posilování růstu a vytváření pracovních míst ve všech členských zemích.

V rámci navrhovaného povýšení získá například program Erasmus + dodatečně 100 milionů EUR a program pro vědu a výzkum Horizont 2020 200 milionů EUR. Domnívám se, že prostředky, které byly takto nově vyčleněny na azylovou a migrační politiku, by měly být primárně určeny na financování evropské pohraniční a pobřežní stráže a Europolu.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, primii ani de punere în aplicare a cadrului financiar multianual pentru 2014-2020 au însemnat provocări mari pentru Uniune, de securitate, umanitare și acestea au cerut măsuri rapide și ample de flexibilitate bugetară, tocmai pentru a răspunde acestor crize. De asemenea, s-au activat rezerve pentru ajutoare de urgență și s-a folosit instrumentul de flexibilitate financiară. Înțeleg urgența anumitor măsuri bugetare, dar am niște întrebări:

Avem o planificare bugetară clară pentru 2018-2020? Nu avem. Iar Brexit-ul va avea un impact major asupra acestei clarități sau neclarități în ceea ce privește bugetul 2018-2020.

Mai departe: cum s-a asigurat Comisia că avem plăți transparente? Se asigură că se raportează sistematic toate cheltuielile, că acestea sunt transparente, că noi cheltuiem numai ceea ce este strict necesar, pentru că sunt banii cetățenilor?

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, děkuji i za výborné řízení této schůze. Toto doporučení jsem neváhal podpořit a jsem velice rád, že jsme ho dnes po dlouhodobé blokaci za strany Rady mohli schválit v této podobě. Je totiž potřeba co nejdříve upravit zastaralý víceletý finanční rámec, abychom mohli řešit problémy, kterým nyní Evropská unie čelí.

Mám především na mysli migrační krizi, ale jsou to i další problémy. Zdůrazňuji však, že tyto nové prostředky musí být vhodně použity. Pouze efektivní a smysluplné využití těchto peněz povede k větší akceschopnosti Evropské unie a společná ochota nás všech maximálně využít prostředky ke konkrétním krokům je klíčová pro budoucnost evropské integrace. Za sebe považuji za přínosné posílení flexibility, což umožní Evropské unii reagovat na nečekané výzvy daleko lépe než doposud.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já mám za to, že tato zpráva se ubírá dobrým směrem. Revizi víceletého finančního rámce jsem chtěl podpořit a taky jsem ji podpořil. Objevuje se celá řada nových priorit, které přináší krize, ať je to bezpečnost v Evropě, samozřejmě otázka migrační krize a důležitost zásadní ostrahy hranic Evropské unie.

Já bych chtěl ovšem ve svém vystoupení zejména podpořit to, aby tyto priority neoslabovaly dále financování kohezní politiky z příslušných evropských fondů, protože tato politika právě slouží k soudržnosti Evropské unie, k odstraňování rozdílů mezi regiony a bylo by velmi neblahé, pokud by byla oslabována tato kapitola financování z hlediska evropské podpory. Myslím si, že i pro budoucí období je naším hlavním úkolem, tedy nejen mým, ale myslím, že všech, kteří se chtějí vyslovit ve prospěch této kohezní politiky, aby nebyla oslabována i v tom následujícím novém programovacím období.

10.6. Večletní finanční okvir za období 2014-2020 (resolucija) (A8-0117/2017 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho votato a favore della risoluzione sulla modifica del bilancio pluriennale perché questa revisione effettivamente contiene degli aspetti positivi, però bisogna sottolineare, ed è inutile negarlo, che ci saremmo aspettati molto, molto di più. In un momento così delicato per l'Unione europea serviva sicuramente più coraggio. Se il senso di modificare il bilancio dell'Unione è quello di adattarlo alle nuove sfide, non credo che le correzioni proposte siano all'altezza.

Si procede a piccoli passi. Quindi è sicuramente apprezzabile lo sforzo di indicare come priorità le misure a favore dell'occupazione giovanile; 1,2 miliardi in più per i giovani sono un dato positivo. Ecco perché ho votato a favore: perché si dice chiaramente che questi fondi dovrebbero essere aumentati nel caso in cui le rilevazioni sulla disoccupazione non dovessero cambiare o dovessero sorgere nuove emergenze ed esigenze.

Un bilancio rigido è segno di miopia. Il futuro dell'Unione europea e dell'Europa stessa è incerto. Dunque la parola d'ordine non può che essere flessibilità, ma dobbiamo migliorare.

10.7. Obravnavanje tokov beguncev in migrantov: vloga zunanjega delovanja EU (A8-0045/2017 - Elena Valenciano, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Kedves Képviselőtársaim! Lehet, hogy mazochista vagyok, de nagyon-nagyon sokat szoktam gondolni a terrorcselekmények áldozataira: londoni, párizsi, brüsszeli, berlini áldozatokra, például arra az édesanyára, aki két kisgyermekéért ígykezett az óvodába a Westminster hídon, és soha nem ért oda.

Hálát adok a jóistennek, hogy Magyarországon abban a helyzetben vagyunk, hogy nem jöhetett létre radikalizálódott muszlim tömeg a határainkon belül. Hálát adok a jóistennek, hogy úgy döntöttünk bölcsen, hogy semmilyen nyomásnak nem engedünk, és nem engedjük be a tömeges migrációt. Aki tagadja azt, hogy e brutális terrorcselekmények és akár többgenerációs migrációs szokásrendszer között összefüggés van, az hazudik. Jobban tennék a nyugati országok, hogy ha azon törnék a fejüket, hogy mit rontottak el, és hogyan lehetne javítani a polgáraik helyzetén, minthogy abban mesterkedjenek, hogy ránk is ránk kényszerítsék azt, aminek...

(az elnök megvonta a szót a képviselőtől)

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, bohužel jsem nemohl tuto zprávu podpořit, ačkoliv kolega Díaz de Mera García Consuegra vynaložil mnoho úsilí při jejím vypracování, protože v celé zprávě se nachází několik problematických bodů.

Za prvé, je to rozšíření definice uprchlíka o osoby, které musely migrovat z důvodu chudoby, změny klimatu a přírodních katastrof. Těžko lze tak určit, komu udělit azyl a koho poslat zpět do země původu. Navíc to může být další motivací pro lidi, aby jednoduše šli do Evropy za lepším životem. Druhým bodem je zmíněná bezpodmínečnost rozvojové pomoci Evropské unie. Pokud máme poskytnout rozvojovou pomoc, musíme mít jistotu. Jistotu, že bude s naší pomocí naloženo zodpovědně a nebude zneužita.

Vedle těchto dvou věcí nacházím ve zprávě i další problematické body, jako je poskytnutí zvláštního statusu těm, kteří byli vysídleni z důvodu klimatické změny. Proto si myslím, že by měla být tato zpráva znovu projednána a přehodnocena.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, EU external policy should be honest. If you want to get the result we need clear understanding on what the European Union wants. How can we see the situation when EU actions contradict the EU declarations? The official EU position is that we should help people who need protection, according to the Geneva Convention. But on the other hand, the European Commission and EU Member States make deals with President Erdoğan, African strongmen and Libyan warlords.

The main aim of this deal is to prevent not only illegal economic migration, but also a real refugee movement to the European Union. The aid for poor African states becomes more and more connected with the prevention of migration. If EU countries prefer to adopt Trump's approach we should say this openly and not pretend to be angels that do not understand why these poor people do not come to us. If we adhere to formally declared principles we should show now real solidarity on the issue of development aid and refugee policy. I voted in favour.

Der Präsident. – Damit sind die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung geschlossen.

11. Popravki in namere glasovanja: gl. zapisnik

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.45 Uhr unterbrochen und um 15.10 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

12. Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje: gl. zapisnik

13. Sovražni govor, populizem in lažne novice v družbenih medijih – odzivu EU naproti (razprava)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su incitamento all'odio, populismo e notizie false sui social media – Verso una risposta dell'UE (2017/2644(RSP)).

Molti deputati hanno chiesto di poter intervenire con le procedure che generalmente sono previste nelle nostre discussioni (il «catch-the-eye» e le domande «cartellino blu»), però ricordo che, purtroppo, in questa occasione queste procedure non saranno accettate. Sapete che c'è stato un cambiamento del regolamento, su proposta dei gruppi politici, e queste procedure non sono previste per questa discussione.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, merci de me donner la parole pour ce rappel au règlement.

Je n'ai pas étudié la question que vous venez d'évoquer, mais je suis un peu étonné. Il y a eu une révision récente du règlement et, si j'ai bien compris, vous nous dites maintenant qu'il y a une nouvelle révision du règlement qui a été adoptée à la demande des présidents des groupes politiques. Or, le règlement de l'assemblée ne dépend pas de l'assentiment des groupes politiques. Si le règlement de l'assemblée contient une disposition nouvelle, cette dernière ne peut être adoptée qu'à partir du moment où elle a été votée par l'assemblée plénière elle-même, y compris par des députés qui, comme moi, n'appartiennent à aucun groupe politique.

Presidente. – On. Gollnisch, come lei sa i gruppi politici hanno deciso di mettere all'ordine del giorno la discussione che adesso iniziamo e hanno introdotto in questa discussione il nuovo regolamento, che come lei sa è entrato in vigore e che noi dobbiamo rispettare.

Tanja Fajon, representing the S&D Group. – Mr President, I am very pleased that we are having this debate today. The issues of hate speech, populism and fake news on social media are relevant given the rise in extremism, populism, xenophobia, sexism and other forms of discrimination and intolerance. Here are some of the most popular fake news titles which were making the headlines in the 2016: '1 000 Muslims screaming "Allahu akbar" set fire to Germany's oldest church on New Year's Eve', 'Pope Francis shocks world, endorses Donald Trump for President', and 'ISIS leader calls for American Muslim voters to support Hillary Clinton'.

Fake news is not a new phenomenon. It is as old as the press itself. However, it gained momentum and global visibility during the US elections, the UK referendum and even during the recent elections in the Netherlands. What is especially worrying is the accelerated spread on social media. Today around half of European citizens follow news on Facebook and other social media and six out of ten news items shared are passed on without being read first. The majority of people, mostly young, have difficulty in identifying fake news. We have already called in this Chamber in the past for a European solution to fake news.

Today I call again on the Commission to urge social media firms to boost their efforts to counter fake news. We need some kind of clarification from the EU on the self-regulatory measures in the sector. We have to strengthen efforts in working towards the establishment of online platforms so that fake news or illegal content is completely eliminated and to impose fines on those who fail to do so. We have to better support fact-checking websites. This is why I also call on the Commission to analyse in depth the current situation and legal framework with regard to fake news and to explore the possibility of legislative intervention to limit the dissemination and spreading of fake content. Next education: for children to be taught in schools how to spot fake news and the inclusion of media literacy in education as we have to

actively engage with our youngest citizens. I am convinced that part of the solution is also to strive for better quality in journalism and the media. To achieve this we need to encourage quality journalism online and to extend ethical journalistic standards to all media actors. We need more investigative journalists, professional and courageous media outlets and more transparency in media ownership.

It is also of key importance to address the particularities of hate speech online. The Code of Conduct published by the Commission is a step in the right direction. We also need more financial means to fund research on social media algorithms that create filter bubbles and prevent the viral spread of fake news.

Finally, why not launch the European Union's own broadcasting channel to counter the lies and draw Europe together and defend democracy, not as an EU propaganda system, but as a major European media platform in its own right? This idea is currently being floated in Germany and France. My group, the Socialists and Democrats, are committed to being in the forefront of this important fight. We owe this to our citizens. If we do not win this battle, fake news and propaganda will, together with its main goals: provoking fear leading to apathy, chaos or completely irrational decisions. We must not let lies dictate the truth of what is going on in our society.

Ian Borg, *President fil-Kariga tal-Kunsill*. – Grazzi tal-istedina li għamiltu lill-Presidenza sabiex f'isem il-Kunsill fuq sugġett ta' thassib komuni nagħtu l-fehmiet tagħna dwar kif l-Unjoni Ewropea tista' tirreagixxi għad-diskorsi ta' mibegħda, il-populizmu u l-ahbarijiet foloz – *fake news* – fuq il-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali.

Ippermettuli nibda bl-ewwel parti tas-sugġett, jiġifieri d-diskors ta' mibegħda. L-evidenza minn sorsi differenti bhall-Aġenzija tal-Unjoni Ewropea għad-Drittijiet Fundamentali u l-Kunsill tal-Ewropa tikkonferma zieda allarmanti fl-intolleranza u l-mibegħda fl-Ewropa. Jista' jkun hemm diversi raġunijiet li jispjegaw dan il-fenomeno, iżda żgur li ma hemm ebda lok għal ġustifikazzjoni għalih.

L-Unjoni Ewropea adottat leġislazzjoni speċifika dwar il-ġlieda kontra l-intolleranza u l-mibegħda, partikolarment anki l-*framework decision* tal-2008 dwar il-ġlieda kontra ir-razziżmu u l-ksenofobija. U f'Ġunju tas-sena l-oħra, fl-2016, il-Kunsill stieden ukoll lill-Istati Membri jiżguraw it-transpożizzjoni u l-implimentazzjoni effettiva tal-*framework decision* u ta' liġijiet oħrajn rilevanti marbutin ma' reati ta' mibegħda fuq livell nazzjonali sabiex jiġġieldu kontra l-pjaga tar-reati ta' mibegħda. U barra minn hekk, il-Kunsill talab ukoll lill-Istati Membri jiżviluppaw metodi effettivi sabiex jiġu rrapportati r-reati ta' mibegħda u allura tkun żgurata r-registrazzjoni kif xieraq tagħhom.

Ma hemmx dubju, Sur President, illi l-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali llum huma wiehed mill-mezzi ewlenin, kif qalet anki l-Onorevoli Fajon, wiehed mill-mezzi ewlenin kif id-diskors ta' mibegħda qed jinfirex ma' hafna nies u jinfirex fl-inqas żmien possibbli. U rimedju possibbli kontra din l-epidemija hija reazzjoni Ewropea li tkun koordinata u tkun determinata. Fil-kuntest tal-kooperazzjoni interistituzzjonali, il-Kunsill diġà wkoll appoġġa l-pjanijiet ambizzjużi tal-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli tal-Kummissjoni li qed jipprova jiżviluppa, mal-Istati Membri, prattici u għodod konkreti halli titjeb ir-reazzjoni għar-razziżmu, il-ksenofobija u forom oħra ta' intolleranzi. U allura nilqghu u nappoġġaw ukoll id-djalogo li għaddej fil-livell tal-Unjoni Ewropea ma' kumpaniji ewlenin tal-informatika sabiex tiġi indirizzata din il-pjaga.

Fl-ahhar iżda mhux l-inqas f'dan l-aspett għandna niftakru u nfahhru wkoll il-hidma eċċellenti li saret mill-Aġenzija li rreferejt għaliha aktar kmieni. Dawn il-kontromiżuri jkunu kollha għalxejn, però, jekk ninsew l-irwol importanti tal-edukazzjoni u l-hidma tagħna fost iż-żgħażaġh. U b'mod aktar preċiż il-bżonn li niżviluppaw ir-reżiljenza demokratika, il-litteriżmu medjatiku, it-tolleranza, il-hsieb kritiku u anke hiliet ta' riżoluzzjonijiet tal- tal-kunflitti fil-proċess ta' tagħlim.

Fl-ahhar nett, nixtieq nenfasizza wkoll li l-ġlieda kontra d-diskors ta' mibegħda fuq l-internet hija wkoll waħda mill-prijoritajiet tagħna bħala Presidenza. Fil-fatt, proprju għada fil-Belt Valletta ser jitlaqqgħu madwar mitt esperti li ser jiddiskutu kif għandhom jitwasslu b'modi effettivi narrattivi pożittivi kontra d-diskors ta' mibegħda fuq l-internet u l-irwol tal-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Istati Membri fl-appoġġ lis-soċjetà civili f'dan l-isforz. Elementi pożittivi ta' dan l-avveniment huwa, jidherli, il-fatt illi l-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali qed jitqiesu mhux biss bħala l-problema iżda bħala parti mis-soluzzjoni.

Issa nixtieq nidhol aktar fid-dettall dwar it-tieni parti tad-dibattitu: il-manipulazzjoni u l-propaganda permezz tal-*fake news*. L-ahbarijiet foloz u l-informazzjoni skorretta li jitqiesu minn hafna bhala perikolużi għad-demokraziji għax jheddu s-sisien infushom tas-soċjetajiet taghna: li ċ-ċittadini jeleggu r-rappreżentanti taghhom fuq il-baži ta' fehmiet politiċi msawra minn dibattitu miftuħ u ġust.

Iż-żieda fil-popolarità tal-internet u l-mezzi tal-komunikazzjoni soċjali wasslet għal tkattir ta' sorsi tal-ahbarijiet, u dan minnu nnifsu huwa tajjeb, iżda bosta minn fosthom mhux ta' min joqghod fuqhom. Hija realtà. U allura l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-ahbarijiet jinsabu taht pressjoni dejjem akbar biex iwasslu fluss kontinwu ta' ahbarijiet fil-mument li jsehhu, u allura jhalli anqas żmien, bhala hin, għall-kontroll tal-kwalità u tal-verifika. U allura dik hija sfida fuq il-kmamar tal-ahbarijiet illi ahna nifhmu. Barra minn hekk, inti għandek ukoll l-atturi populistici li qed ixerrdu informazzjoni skorretta sabiex jappoggaw in-narrattivi taghhom, illi hija ta' hsara partikolari fi snin b'mod partikolari meta l-poplu jkun qieghed jagħmel l-għażliet demokratiċi tiegħu.

Mhuwiex faċli li ċ-ċittadini jagħrfu liema huma l-ahbarijiet il-foloz, jew anke li jsibu u jaċċessaw l-informazzjoni affidabbli. Smajna diġà xi proposti u dwar dan nimmagina li Membri oħrajn jikkellmu matul dan id-dibattitu.

L- *algorithms* jagħlqu lin-nies f'bużżeqa: sew meta wiehed qed ifittex ir-riżultati u sew fuq il-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali, illi qed isir dejjem aktar diffiċli biex in-nies jigu esposti għal fehmiet differenti minn daww taghhom. U allura l-preġudizzji jissahhu peress li l-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali johlqu b'żieqa illi jiffiltraw l-informazzjoni.

U allura jehtieg li l-gvernijiet, l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-ahbarijiet u l-kumpanniji anke tal-informatika jagħrfu dawn il-perikli u jieħdu azzjoni kontra taghhom. Il-Presidenza tuża l-mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali, u fuq l-internet ukoll, sabiex tiżgura li tkun aċċessibbli l-informazzjoni affidabbli f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam il-hidma taghna. Però hawnhekk m'ahniex qegħdin nitkellmu biss fuq il-hidma taghna, qed nitkellmu fuq sens hafna aktar wiesa'.

Smajt ukoll illi xi organizzazzjonijiet tal-ahbarijiet, jidhri li fi Franza, bħalissa qed ukoll jingħaqdu ma' pjattaformi ta' mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali fil-ġlieda kontra fil-fatt it-tkattir tal-*fake news* fuq l-internet.

U f'xi Stati Membri oħrajn, is-sejha għal leġiżlazzjoni li thares id-dibattitu politiku minn manipulazzjoni u l-qerq sfaċċat fuq mezzi ta' komunikazzjoni soċjali qed titqawwa. Il-kumpanniji tal-informatika nemmen illi għandhom jaqdu rwol taghhom fis-soċjetà u allura dak il-harsien ta' dan l-element ewlieni li hija d-demokraziji taghna.

President, Onorevoli Membri, nixtieq nagħlaq billi nishaq dwar kemm hu importanti li ma nhallux li ċ-ċittadini taghna jittqarrqu minn fake news u anke is-soċjetajiet taghna illi jkun determinati mill-mibegħda. Ahna wkoll nużaw pjattaformi soċjali, ahna wkoll naraw dawn ir-realtajiet u jiena nittama li l-mezzi soċjali jkun l-pjattaforma fejn wiehed jesprimi l-pożittività, il-pjattaforma fejn wiehed jaqsam mal-hbieb tiegħu, mal-komunità li fiha jghix, l-esperjenzi pożittivi, u mhux ikollu jittqarraq b'ahbarijiet foloz u anke ddominati mill-mibegħda.

L-irwol taghna huwa wkoll illi nfakkru lilna nfusna dwar ir-responsabbiltajiet taghna u nkunu serji u responsabbli għal dak kollu li ngħidu.

U għal din ir-raġuni, il-libertà tal-espressjoni għandha l-limiti taghha u hija r-responsabbiltà komuni taghna li nilhqu dak il-bilanċ ġust għalkemm naf li dan huwa diffiċli hafna drabi ma jkunx faċli.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, politicians have a responsibility to uphold European fundamental values of freedom, democracy and solidarity. We have a responsibility to make sure that we have effective tools to address situations where the right to free expression is deliberately abused to promote violent extremism or discrimination against certain groups in society. This is based on the set of values laid down in Article 2 of the Treaty: 'The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.'

It is our collective duty to show that democracy is there for everyone. Countering all expressions of discrimination, violence and intolerance is a priority for all of us. It requires a joint effort. The EU has increased its actions to prevent and fight against different forms of hate crime and hate speech.

The proliferation of hate speech online is shrinking the space for democratic discussions. When 'toxic narratives' about migrants and religious minorities publicly incite hatred and violence, the thin line between hate speech and hate crime merges into one. Where public incitement to violence and hatred is spread against groups or individuals on grounds of their race, ethnicity or religion, we have EU laws that criminalise these kinds of behaviour.

The Commission has engaged with the social media operators to counter illegal online hate speech. In May 2016, IT companies – Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube – agreed a voluntary Code of Conduct with commitments to take action and tackle illegal online content that publicly incites violence and hatred. We will present the results of this self-regulatory exercise next month.

The Commission's proposal to revise the Audiovisual Media Services Directive widens the definition of hate speech by referring to 'incitement to violence or hatred', and includes ethnic origin, belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. It calls for a requirement for video-sharing platforms to protect people against incitement to violence or hatred.

The Commission is now assessing whether improved EU-wide procedures are needed for the removal of illegal content from online platforms. We will announce our conclusions on 10 May this year as part of the mid-term review of the Digital Single Market.

Fake news – or simply 'lies' – are also a serious problem...

(The speaker was interrupted by off-microphone comments from Ms Morvai)

Presidente. – On. Morvai, guardi che lei non può interrompere la discussione. Stiamo parlando di tolleranza e intolleranza, cerchi di essere rispettosa della discussione e dei nostri ospiti.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Fake news or simply lies are also a serious problem. We are aware of the need to protect freedom of speech and to trust people's common sense, but we also need to be aware of the possible negative effects of this phenomenon.

Promoting media literacy is vital, as is the need for quality journalism. All journalists' codes of conduct include accuracy as one of their main requirements. Self-regulation and ethical standards play a very important role here. Social media platforms and users are acting to expose fake news and unmask the source. I also see global brands and media organisations deciding to move advertising money only to sites that are known to be free from harmful content. I welcome private sector initiatives to cut commercial funding of fake news sites.

Last November, First Vice-President Frans Timmermans, together with Commissioners Oettinger and Jourová, organised the European Commission's Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights. This focused on media pluralism and democracy. It identified two main routes: ethical standards among those producing media, and media literacy among those using it. Lastly, the EU External Action Service has set up a taskforce on strategic communication to promote EU policies and a healthy media environment in the Eastern Partnership region. Its key task is to improve the EU's capacity to forecast, address and respond to disinformation activities by external parties.

Preventing the damaging effects of fake news is a challenge for all society. It means that industry, civil society, academia and lawmakers need to continue their discussions on this problem so that we can better understand it and identify possible policy responses.

Monika Hohlmeier, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Volksverhetzung, Rekrutierung zu terroristischen oder sonstigen verbrecherischen Zwecken, Fanatisierung, Ideologisierung, Abgrenzung, Ausgrenzung, Anstiftung zu Gewalttaten – all das ist kein Kavaliersdelikt, all das sind keine Dinge, die man einfach stehen lassen kann. In normaler Realität führt dies zu staatsanwaltlichen Ermittlungen, es führt dann anschließend zu einem Gerichtsverfahren und dann zu einer Verurteilung.

Das, was in der realen Welt gilt, muss auch in der digitalen Welt gelten. Es darf in der digitalen Welt keinen rechtsfreien Raum geben, der es Menschen ermöglicht, Hassreden auf andere zu halten, unendliches Leid zu verursachen, Menschen auszugrenzen, sie aus den verschiedensten willkürlichen Gründen zu mobben oder zu verfolgen und sich daran selbst dann auch noch zu ergötzen, ohne dafür zur Rechenschaft gezogen zu werden, sich anonymisieren zu können, ohne dass Staatsanwälte und Richter überhaupt die Möglichkeit haben, noch Zugriff zu haben auf die Person, die eine Hassrede oder entsprechend eine solche Straftat begeht. Aus diesem Grund ist es zwingend notwendig, dafür auch rechtliche Regelungen zu schaffen.

Darüber hinausgehend ist es für mich, Herr Kommissar – ich freue mich über Ihre Rede –, sehr wichtig, dass den Social Bots Einhalt geboten wird. Es kann nicht sein, dass so getan wird, als würden Hunderttausende von Menschen eine Nachricht teilen und sie wünschen, und in Wirklichkeit steckt ein Programm dahinter, eine Maschine, die nur von einer einzigen oder von zehn Personen losgeschickt wird. Wir müssen uns schützen vor dieser Art und Weise von – wie nennt man es inzwischen so schön – alternativen Fakten – es gibt keine alternativen Fakten, es gibt nur Fakten, und es gibt zwar eine Meinungsfreiheit, aber Fakten gibt es keine alternativen. Es gibt Tatsachen; Wenn zum Beispiel behauptet wird, dass ein dreizehnjähriges Mädchen mit dem angeblichen Namen Lisa von Flüchtlingen entführt und vergewaltigt worden sei, das weltweit vertrieben wird und es in Tatsache nicht wahr ist, dann ist das ernsthaft gefährlich für eine Stimmung innerhalb der Bevölkerung. Aus diesem Grund ist es zwingend notwendig, EU-weit auch rechtliche Regelungen zu ergreifen, um tatsächlich effektiv reagieren zu können.

Josef Weidenholzer, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Es ist noch nicht lange her, da haben wir den Arabischen Frühling als Facebook-Revolution gefeiert, von neuen Möglichkeiten der Beteiligung von Bürgern war die Rede, und niemand hat sich damals vorstellen können, dass wir heute darüber diskutieren, ob auf sozialen Medien verbreitete *fake news* Wahlen entscheiden können. Soziale Medien sind also weder gut noch schlecht. Sie haben eine große Wirkung und sie erweitern den öffentlichen Raum grenzüberschreitend. Soziale Medien schaffen neue Öffentlichkeiten, und sie sind eine ernstzunehmende Konkurrenz für die etablierten Medien. Aber es wäre töricht zu meinen, man könnte sich zurücklehnen und die Dinge einfach beobachten. Wir dürfen uns nicht treiben lassen, wir müssen diesen Prozess gestalten mit dem Ziel, die demokratischen Teilhabemöglichkeiten zu erweitern.

Also was tun? Was wir nicht brauchen, ist eine Zensurbehörde, ein Wahrheitsministerium im Sinne Orwells. Die User, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger sind mündig genug, die Dinge selbst zu beurteilen. Um diese Rolle wahrnehmen zu können, braucht es natürlich mehr Information, mehr Wissen über die Hintergründe, über die Wirkungsweise sozialer Medien usw. In gewisser Weise sind alle von uns digitale Analphabeten.

Zweitens: Den Unternehmen kommt eine wichtige Bedeutung zu. Der Verhaltenskodex ist ein wichtiger Schritt, freiwillige Selbstverpflichtung ist allerdings zu wenig. Wir brauchen Regelwerke, denn Sperren und Löschen muss transparent und zeitnah geschehen. Die User müssen benachrichtigt und ausreichend informiert werden. Es muss auch die Möglichkeit der Einrede und der Beschwerdeführung geben, und es braucht eine öffentliche Diskussion darüber, wie man *fake news* erkennen kann. Und schließlich muss auch die Möglichkeit der Gegenrede gestärkt werden.

Drittens: Offensichtlich kriminelle Handlungen sollten selbstverständlich ganz klar und zeitnah geahndet werden. Aber dabei sollten wir es auch bewenden lassen. Wir sollten vor allem versuchen, die sozialen Medien als eine Chance zu begreifen, die Demokratie zu festigen. Dazu braucht es mündige Bürgerinnen und Bürger, die dem Hass mutig entgegen-treten. Die Verantwortung kann man nicht auslagern.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, seven years ago the Smolensk catastrophe occurred killing Polish President Lech Kaczyński, his wife, and other members of the Polish elite. Fifteen minutes later a Kremlin-triggered avalanche of fake news and disinformation started to move, so powerful that it was winning the imagination and perception of western societies. Polish military pilots were blamed, the President himself, his generals. We had to swallow every possible humiliation, including the desecration of the bodies of the victims, which is totally alien to our civilisation. Hopefully we are able to learn a lesson from the mistakes.

Morten Løkkegaard, for ALDE-Gruppen. – Hr. Formand! Hvis nogen havde forestillet sig for blot et par år siden, at vi her i 2017 skulle stå og diskutere *hate speech*, ekstrem populisme og *fake news*, ville mange nok have rystet på hovedet og ment, at vi var paranoide. Ikke desto mindre er det en realitet. De nye teknologier har ikke bare gjort det nemmere at kommunikere, de har også skabt en voldsom fragmentering – og de har været med til at skabe ekkokamre, hvor vi som borgere kan søge tilflugt og blive bekræftet i vores værste fordomme og forestillinger.

Endnu mørkere kræfter misbruger de nye muligheder, og derfor skal vi selvfølgelig være klar til at forsvare det åbne, liberale samfund, det repræsentative demokrati og retsstaten, som er under pres nu. Propaganda og misinformation er ganske enkelt gift for de vestlige værdier, for de muligheder, vi har, for vores livsførelse og dermed også for vores sammenhængskraft. Vi skylder hinanden at tage denne trussel alvorligt. I den liberale gruppe er vi meget opsatte på at tage denne kamp og gå forrest i kampen for vores demokrati.

Det er dog som liberale også vores opgave at hejse advarselsflaget. Det er vigtigt ikke at gå i den fælde at indføre nye former for censur, at indskrænke de friheder, som netop definerer vores samfund. Svaret er ikke begrænsninger, ingen sandhedsministerier her, tak! Det, vi derimod bør gøre, er at få kortlagt truslerne, deres omfang og de mulige indsatser imod dem. Jeg vil foreslå, at man sætter ressourcer af til at oprette et videntcenter for misinformation. Her kan man på europæisk plan samle medieaktører og bede dem om at komme med idéer til selvregulering og selvjustits. Man kunne også forestille sig en form for certificering af onlineindhold, igen uden indblanding fra myndighederne, men som en mulighed for at blåstemple den kvalitet, som vi alle sammen efterlyser. Endelig mener jeg også, at man bør genoverveje en europæisk ombudsmand for ytringsfrihed. Ligeledes bør vi selvfølgelig bakke op, som der også er blevet sagt af flere talere her, om en stærkere *public service*, om undersøgende journalistik og om uddannelse af unge i internetfærdigheder. Der er gået fire måneder, siden betænkningen kom fra Parlamentet, og der er ikke sket så meget endnu. Jeg mener, at vi bør skride til handling, og vi liberale bør selvfølgelig gå forrest.

Martina Michels, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ja, es stimmt: Hetze, Populismus und gefälschte Nachrichten in sozialen Medien nehmen zu. *Fake news* zielen darauf ab, Wahlen zu beeinflussen, Länder und Organisationen und damit letztlich die Demokratie zu destabilisieren. Andererseits entsteht derzeit im Kampf dagegen eine wahre Regulierungswut, die immer absurdere Vorschläge produziert – von Klarnamenpflicht im Netz bis hin zu Netzsperrern.

Anzunehmen, man müsse in dieser Frage nur besser regulieren, und das Problem verschwinde, ist naiv. Gegen Filterblasen helfen vor allem mehr Medienkompetenz, unabhängiges Monitoring, der Einsatz für transparente Kommentator- und Diskursmoderation im Netz.

Eines bleibt Fakt: Die Ursachen von Rassismus, Populismus und seinen Informationslügen, Hassreden und Social Bots liegen nicht im Internet, sondern in der Gesellschaft. Es ist das gesellschaftliche Klima, das wir verändern müssen.

Ulrike Lunacek, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Wir leben in Zeiten, in denen falsche Nachrichten, alternative Fakten auf einmal zu absoluten Wahrheiten werden und in denen die Hetze gegen ethnische, sexuelle, religiöse Minderheiten und auch sexistische Hetze gegen Frauen immer stärker verbreitet wird und immer mehr Öffentlichkeit findet, vor allem in den sozialen Medien. Wir erkennen, dass das Internet kein rechtsfreier Raum ist und dass es dort auch Regeln bedarf. Denn dieses Internet ist Teil unserer Gesellschaft geworden, aber die freie, säkulare, demokratische, pluralistische Gesellschaft, die wir uns erkämpft haben, hat dort noch nicht Einzug gehalten. Die Trägerin des Friedenspreises des Deutschen Buchhandels, Carolin Emcke, hat letztes Jahr bei ihrer Rede gesagt, als sie Preisträgerin war: „Eine freie, säkulare, demokratische Gesellschaft ist etwas, das wir lernen müssen. Immer wieder.“ Das heißt, uns auch Regeln zu geben für dieses Verhalten. Regeln sind notwendig.

An die Kommission gerichtet: Gut, dass Sie diesen Kodex, den Verhaltenskodex mit den vier Unternehmen haben. Sie haben das Problem erkannt, aber die Umsetzung ist mangelhaft. Denn private Unternehmen können nicht einfach Gerichte ersetzen. Ja, es ist wichtig, dass Facebook hetzerische Aussagen löschen kann, aber dann braucht es eine letzte Entscheidung vor Gericht. Das heißt, das ist notwendig.

Und noch etwas: Wir brauchen eine Verbesserung des Rahmenbeschlusses des Rates über Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit. Sexuelle Orientierung, Geschlechtsidentität gehören hinein, und die Straftatbestände insgesamt müssen klarer definiert werden.

Lassen Sie mich noch zwei Beispiele erzählen, wie man auch damit umgehen kann: Meine Parteichefin in Österreich, Eva Glawischnig, und die österreichischen Grünen haben bisher über 40 Verfahren geführt, in denen es vor allem um Drohungen gegen Leib und Leben, Hass, Beleidigung, üble Nachrede und auch klare Falschheiten gegangen ist. Wir haben fast alle diese Verfahren gewonnen. Das heißt, auch das ist eine Möglichkeit, hier Stopp zu sagen. Die Gelder, die dann bezahlt werden mussten, bekommen karitative Organisationen zur Verfügung.

Und ein Letztes: Die frühere deutsche Landwirtschaftsministerin Renate Künast hat einen anderen Weg gewählt. Sie besucht ohne vorherige Ankündigungen jene Hetzer, die sie im Internet beschimpft haben. Und wissen Sie, was dann passiert? Wenn die real mit ihren Aussagen konfrontiert werden, dann werden sie ganz klein. Auch das ist eine Möglichkeit, mit diesen Hetzern umzugehen.

Presidente. – On. Morvai, ha fatto vedere i suoi cartelli, adesso però la invito a sedere, a prendere posto, e a seguire la discussione. Non mi faccia intervenire, per cortesia.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Mr President, I feel offended on behalf of the citizens of this Union, to see one of our colleagues behaving in a completely inappropriate way in this Chamber at this moment.

I would like to say that this is not a mud-wrestling arena. This is the European Parliament and things like this should not be tolerated by you or me and I kindly ask you to turn to our colleague and ask her kindly to behave in this plenary, on behalf of all of us.

Presidente. – Mi scusi, ma non c'è stato bisogno che lei me lo chiedesse, perché io l'ho fatto prima del suo intervento. Invito l'on. Morvai, che ha fatto vedere i suoi cartelli, a sedersi e a prendere posto. Non abusi della mia pazienza, gliel'ho già chiesto due volte.

Rolandas Paksas, EFDD frakcijos vardu. – Mes nuolat girdime, kad amerikiečiai išrinko ne tą Trumpą, kad Vengrijai vadovauja ne tas Orbanas, o Lenkijoje išrinktas ne tas Kaczyński. Prancūzijos žmonės gali išsirinkti ne tą Marie Le Pen.

Baimė prarasti valdžią, baimė netekti politinės įtakos, netgi baimė, kad gali tecti atsakyti už visuomenę nuskurdinusių visagalės rinkos kūrybą būtent ir gimdo tokias diskusijas, kuriose atviras ir tiesus žodis vadinamas neapykantą kurstančiomis kalbomis, kur visuomenės, o ne saujelės interesų atstovavimas ir pataikavimas juos aptarnaujančiai politikai vadinamas populizmu.

Keista ta šiandieninė diskusija. Lyg mes, o ne mus sprogdintų. Lyg mes, o ne mums Europoje neapykantą jaustų. Tarsi popiežius Europos vadovams prieš Romos sutarties metines būtų pasakęs, kad taip, vadinamoji demokratija yra labai gerai, o visuomenės atstovavimas politikoje yra blogai.

Primenu, kad žodis *populi* savo pirmaprade reiškė būtent ir reiškia visuomenę. O žodis demokratija anaipol nėra grupės politikoje esančių asmenų įrankis išlaikyti turimą valdžią ir ją gausinti. Nustokime matuoti išgalvotus demokratijos reitingus. Atsigręžkime pagaliau veidu į žmones, kurių interesams mes išrinkti atstovauti. Primenu, kad Rytų Europos valstybėse prieš daug metų buvo viena tiesa ir viena partija bei rinkimų rezultatai, kurie tenkino tuometinę valdžią. Dabar kalbame apie iš vienos pusės rinkimus, kuriems daroma įtaka, ir patys svarstome, kaip iš kitos pusės jiems padaryti įtaką. Vadinasi, prisidengdami demokratijos vardu, siekiame tokių pat rezultatų, kad rinkimais būtų išlaikyta turima valdžia, kad tie rinkimai nebūtų Europos žmonių pasirinkimu. Tai kam tada reikalingi rinkimai, jeigu nebebus pasirinkimo?

Matteo Salvini, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io mi scuso con chi ci guarda da casa, mi scuso col pubblico che sta ascoltando questi deliri. Secondo me non siete normali. Ci sono venti milioni di disoccupati in Europa, c'è il terrorismo islamico, c'è un'immigrazione fuori controllo, e voi con che cosa impegnate il Parlamento europeo, peraltro deserto il mercoledì pomeriggio? Con il bavaglio a Facebook, le bufale, le *fake news*! Voi dovrete essere curati da un medico bravo! Io vorrei sapere se...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

(Applausi)

Grazie per gli applausi. Guardate che vi buttano fuori se applaudite, quindi attenti...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Presidente. – On. Salvini, deve essere rispettoso non solo della decisione di un'Aula che, democraticamente, ha deciso di discutere di questo tema, ma anche dei colleghi che sono intervenuti.

La invito a essere attento alle parole che usa.

Matteo Salvini (ENF). – Allora, questa vaga minaccia non mi fa né caldo né freddo.

Per i popoli europei essere contro il terrorismo islamico significa essere islamofobi, essere contro le adozioni gay significa essere omofobi, voler chiudere i campi rom o bloccare l'invasione clandestina significa essere razzisti. No: significa avere buonsenso, significa essere uomini liberi.

Vi sta andando male, non riuscite più a comprare i cervelli, a controllare i giornali, i telegiornali, le radio. In Gran Bretagna hanno votato come hanno voluto, negli Stati Uniti hanno votato come hanno voluto, in Italia hanno votato come hanno voluto, e voi state impazzendo. E quindi che cosa vi inventate? Bavaglio su Facebook, bavaglio su Internet, pene – 1 milione, 5 milioni, 50 milioni! Vi inventate il ministero della Verità di George Orwell, il ministero della Propaganda.

Io aspetto che il Parlamento europeo si paghi la psico-polizia per indagare gli psico-reati di quelli che non sono allineati al pensiero unico e alla moneta unica. Potete inventarvi tutti i bavagli che volete. L'unica cosa che potete fare è preparare le valigie e andarvi a cercare un lavoro vero, perché la libertà non la ferma nessuno, né qui né altrove. Grazie e viva la rete, viva Facebook.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συμφωνώ απόλυτα πως στην Ευρώπη υπάρχει πρόβλημα με τη ρητορική μίσους και τις ψευδείς ειδήσεις. Οι πολιτικές δυνάμεις που επικρατούν αυτή τη στιγμή στην ήπειρο έχουν εξαπολύσει μια ανεπανάληπτη ρητορική επίθεση σε όποιον εκφράζει απόψεις που δεν συμφωνούν με τις κατεστημένες και έχουμε φτάσει στο σημείο να έχει σχεδόν ποινικοποιηθεί ο εθνικός αντιλογος. Το σημερινό πολιτικό σύστημα είναι εκείνο που καλλιεργεί και εκτρέφει συστηματικά το μίσος στις κοινωνίες μας, διαλύοντας την κοινωνική συνοχή και εγκαθιδρύοντας ένα πραγματικό κυνήγι μαγισσών εναντίον όσων τολμούν να έχουν διαφορετική άποψη. Αντίθετα με όσα μας κατηγορείτε, εμείς πιστεύουμε στην ελευθερία της γνώμης. Ο καθένας, χωρίς εξαιρέσεις, πρέπει να είναι ελεύθερος να εκφράζει την άποψή του, όσο και αν διαφωνούμε με αυτήν.

Όσον αφορά τον λαϊκισμό, ο ίδιος ο όρος, όπως χρησιμοποιείται σήμερα, είναι απλά άλλο ένα δημιούργημα της κυρίαρχης πολιτικής τάξης που βαφτίζει «λαϊκιστή» όποιον παρουσιάζει μια διαφορετική προοπτική η οποία είναι πιο κοντά στις πραγματικές ανάγκες των πολιτών. Φταίει ο λαϊκισμός, λέτε, που οι πολίτες συντάσσονται πλέον με κόμματα εκτός του πολιτικού κατεστημένου. Στην πραγματικότητα, απλά εσείς δεν έχετε καμία επαφή με τις επιθυμίες τους.

Σχετικά με τις ψευδείς ειδήσεις, τεράστιο μερίδιο ευθύνης έχουν οι κυβερνήσεις και τα συστημικά κόμματα με τις ψεύτικες διαρροές. Καθημερινά, μέσα κοινωνικής δικτύωσης φιλικά προσκείμενα προς το πολιτικό κατεστημένο διαστρεβλώνουν την αλήθεια και δημιουργούν μια ψεύτικη πραγματικότητα, ελπίζοντας πως θα συνεχίσουν να ελέγχουν και να καθοδηγούν τους πολίτες. Δεν υπάρχει μεγαλύτερος και πιο ύπουλος μηχανισμός προπαγάνδας παγκοσμίως από τους διαχειριστές αυτών των μέσων κοινωνικής δικτύωσης που εξυπηρετούν πολιτικά συμφέροντα.

Franck Proust (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, la démagogie, disait Aristote, c'est la perversion de la démocratie. Est-ce un hasard si la démagogie est née dans le berceau de la démocratie à Athènes? Non, car la liberté de parole offerte par la démocratie mène à la liberté des idées.

Est-ce un hasard s'il y a autant de démagogie dans les démocraties européennes? Non, car l'Europe, au-delà de favoriser la libre circulation des marchandises et des personnes, incarne aussi la libre circulation des idées. Tout dépend des intentions de ceux qui les portent sur les réseaux sociaux, ce n'est pas pour rien que l'on parle de diffusion virale sur l'internet. La notion de virus est là. Certains en profitent pour l'inoculer.

Ce n'est pas Donald Trump qui a inventé ce procédé des faits alternatifs. On a dans l'hémicycle des spécialistes, comme M^{me} Le Pen, M. Mélenchon ou encore M. Jadot. La peur est leur terreau, l'internet leur arme et les citoyens leurs cibles. Leur popularité n'est pas basée sur ce qu'ils ont fait, mais sur ce qu'ils font des faits. Leurs mentors sont connus. De Hugo Chávez à Vladimir Poutine, c'est sûr, il y a de l'expérience.

Les grands projets de l'histoire se sont pourtant faits dans la sérénité et la discrétion des négociations, comme le traité de Rome, dont on a fêté les 60 ans. Prenons du recul. Imagine-t-on le général de Gaulle répondre sur Twitter à des gens critiquant son appel de Londres? Imagine-t-on des parodies sur l'internet du Chancelier Kohl et du Président Mitterrand se tenant la main à l'ossuaire de Douaumont? Aurait-on pu montrer le débarquement de Normandie sur Facebook?

Les géants du web doivent assumer le fait qu'ils laissent les pompiers pyromanes jouer avec le feu. Et les médias doivent avoir les moyens de payer des journalistes qui prennent le temps de l'analyse. Les deux sujets sont liés pour qui entend rétablir la sérénité.

Je termine par une question rhétorique: les partis populistes sont plus puissants depuis l'avènement des réseaux sociaux, est-ce là aussi un hasard?

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señor presidente, Amnistía Internacional, en su último informe anual del 2016, estima que ese ha sido el año del discurso del odio y la demonización a través de la difusión de mensajes que trasladan la peligrosa idea de que algunas personas son menos que otras. En conclusión: rechazo al diferente.

El discurso del odio juega un papel fundamental en la perpetuación de estereotipos discriminatorios, bien sea por raza, por género, por orientación sexual. Y, en este sentido, debemos comprometernos desde las instituciones europeas a volcar nuestros esfuerzos en la erradicación de estos estereotipos.

Para preparar este debate he leído algunos informes. Uno de ellos decía que, en un estudio sobre la misoginia, realizado durante tres semanas de abril de 2016 entre usuarios de un país europeo, se encontraron más de 200 000 tuits con la palabra «zorra» o «puta», constatándose que cada diez segundos alguien insulta con esas palabras a una mujer en Twitter.

Y la verdad es que como muestra un botón. Hace un mes, participaba en un debate en esta Cámara que tuvo trascendencia mediática y pública. Recibí muchísimos mensajes a través de las redes sociales. Uno de ellos es este. No lo voy a leer al completo, pero dice: «Señora Iratxe Garper usted está muerta, puta». Lleva la foto de una mujer encadenada y ahorcada y la foto de una mano con un arma de fuego.

Comprenderán ustedes que permanecer impasibles ante esta situación es dejar que se deterioren los valores del proyecto europeo. A algunos les puede parecer intrascendente que tengamos estos debates hoy, pero creo que es necesario que seamos capaces entre todos de garantizar que la libertad de expresión tiene unos límites y ese límite es el del respeto a los derechos de las personas.

Andrew Lewer (ECR). – Mr President, there is a battle being waged at the moment against hate speech, and, while gearing up to take part in this sounds laudable, without care the result can be, inadvertently or otherwise, censorship. It leads to questions about who determines what hate speech is.

Free speech is essentially accepting that people are free to say things we do like, not merely free to say things we do not like. Should these be offensive then they can be tackled by a forthright debate. Indeed, debating ideas in a public forum makes it harder for those ideas to be formed as an individual insult, and a public debate provides the target of offence with a rebuttal.

There is a quotation that is commonly attributed to Voltaire: 'I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it'. That was in fact written by Voltaire's biographer, Evelyn Beatrice Hall, and she was absolutely right.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Mr President, when addressing fake news, or rather junk news, or broadly the impact of the technological revolution on democracy, we must ensure the rule of law retains its meaning in a hyper-connected world. Hundreds of millions of people only access news through social media, and now the largest tech players – Facebook, YouTube, Google – should act with equally massive responsibility. The algorithms they perfect for optimal advertising revenues can become propaganda and hoax vehicles and the claims that platforms are neutral intermediaries, especially with more and more self-regulation, will prove unsustainable.

No one wants a Ministry of Truth, but I am also not reassured when Silicon Valley or Mark Zuckerberg are the de facto designers of our realities or of our truths. Through the e-Commerce Directive and otherwise we must ensure that free speech, access to information and the protection from discrimination are ensured. But we must be careful not to treat hate speech the same way as distasteful, undesired, shocking or insulting expressions. Even the ones that we have heard here today should be debated in an open manner. I fully agree that we have to make sure that censorship is not the alternative when we are trying to make the rule of law meaningful online.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συμφωνώ με πάρα πολλά τα οποία έχουν λεχθεί και δεν θέλω να τα επαναλάβω. Παρακαλώ, επιτρέψτε μου να καταθέσω και τη δική μου άποψη.

Έχουμε τη δική μας ευθύνη, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι. Χιλιάδες πολιτικοί, σε κάθε γωνιά της Ευρώπης, δεν είναι έτοιμοι να πουν ψέματα στον κόσμο παρά να είναι έντιμοι απέναντι στον εαυτό τους; Ας είμαστε ειλικρινείς. Χιλιάδες πολιτικοί, σε κάθε γωνιά της Ευρώπης, δεν είναι διαπλεκόμενοι με ένα, δύο ή και περισσότερα μέσα ενημέρωσης; Αυτό δεν προκαλεί διαφθορά και δεν τρέφει τον μύθο και το ψέδος;

Εμείς, σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό, τρέφουμε το φαινόμενο που προσπαθούμε – όσοι προσπαθούμε σήμερα – να ανακόψουμε. Και έχουμε μπροστά μας ένα εμπόδιο που εμείς εν πολλοίς δημιουργήσαμε και φτάσαμε στο σημείο να πρέπει κανείς να είναι προετοιμασμένος ότι μπορεί να τον φωνάξουν «ψεύτη» αν πει την αλήθεια.

Χρειαζόμαστε παιδεία, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, - συμφωνώ εδώ πάρα πολύ με τον κύριο Borg – παιδεία για να μας βοηθήσει να πολεμήσουμε επαρκώς τα ψεύδη και τους μύθους. Ψεύδη και μύθοι που πολλές φορές χρειάζονται αιώνες για να εγκαταλειφθούν, ιδιαίτερα εάν εμείς και με πράξεις και με απάθεια τα τρέφουμε. Τα κάστρα, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, καταλύονται, αλλά οι μύθοι και τα ψέματα δεν καταλύονται, παρά μόνο με την ανάπτυξη της κρίσης των νέων. Χρειάζεται, όμως, και η δική μας πίστη και ο διαρκής δικός μας αγώνας γι' αυτό.

Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! *Fake news* hat es immer gegeben, aber ihr Ausmaß hat deutlich zugenommen. Auch Hasskommentare im Internet sind deutlich angewachsen und haben ein Maß erreicht, dass nicht toleriert werden kann. Darum ist es kein Wunder bei allen wirklich positiven Entwicklungen durch die sozialen Netzwerke, dass jetzt immer öfter auch von unsozialen Netzwerken gesprochen wird. Echokammern im Netz bedeuten, dass wir immer nur in unseren eigenen Meinungen bestärkt werden und zu wenig andere Auffassungen wahrnehmen und bedenken. Das ist aber die Essenz einer offenen demokratischen Gesellschaft, gerade andere Meinungen wahrzunehmen.

Die Meinungsfreiheit darf nicht eingeschränkt werden – das möchte ich nochmal klar betonen. Es geht hier nicht um ein Wahrheitsministerium, aber rechtswidrige Inhalte wie die Anstachelung zum Hass und zur Gewalt und gruppenspezifische Menschenfeindlichkeit sind nicht von der Meinungsfreiheit gedeckt. Und bei bereits festgestellter Rechtswidrigkeit muss umgehend gelöscht und in offensichtlichen Fällen innerhalb von 24 Stunden gelöscht werden.

Und hier tun viele Unternehmen, vor allem Twitter und Facebook, noch viel zu wenig, und hier muss mehr politischer Druck ausgeübt werden. Aber private Firmen dürfen nicht diejenigen sein, die die Gerichte ersetzen, sondern die letzte Entscheidung über die Löschung muss bei den Gerichten liegen.

Insgesamt gilt es aber, die Medienkompetenz zu stärken, und wir brauchen eine öffentliche Debatte über die Zukunft des Qualitätsjournalismus, und ich bin auch der Meinung, dass wir einen europäischen öffentlich-rechtlichen Sender brauchen, und diese Debatte müssen wir jetzt dringend führen.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho portato tre articoli presi dai media tradizionali: Colin Powell che presenta le prove dell'esistenza delle armi di distruzione di massa di Saddam Hussein, gli esiti catastrofici per la Brexit e l'apocalisse se vinceva il «no» al referendum in Italia. Sono tre esempi per dimostrare che le *fake news* sono sempre esistite, ben prima dell'avvento di Internet.

Le *fake news* sono sempre esistite, perché queste sono le informazioni che voi avete utilizzato per manipolare le informazioni, per esempio finanziando la propaganda europea. Ma chi può avere l'autorità di dire che cosa è vero e che cosa è falso? La verità è che voi siete il potere che cerca di autoassolversi per gli errori che ha fatto, per aver dato i cittadini in mano alle banche e alla finanza. Voi rimanete qui chiusi in questa torre d'avorio e neanche ve ne rendete conto. E per un motivo: perché la rete vi fa paura. Perché la rete vi permette di entrare in contatto con i cittadini, senza avere in realtà un filtro davanti a voi, e quindi per questo avete proposto, per esempio, la creazione di un'autorità indipendente per il controllo della verità sul web.

Ecco, attenzione: vi prego, non mettete a repentaglio la libertà della rete, perché è molto pericoloso, e si potrebbe avere addirittura una deriva autoritaria. La soluzione, invece, è l'educazione, il senso civico. Ben vengano in questo senso, per esempio, i progetti per l'alfabetizzazione dei cittadini ai media, soprattutto per le nuove generazioni, per gli adolescenti, per i minori. Noi vogliamo dei cittadini informati e consapevoli. Voi volete invece dei media controllabili. Chiudo citando il nostro fondatore del Movimento 5 Stelle Gianroberto Casaleggio: «L'informazione in rete può essere vera o falsa, o entrambe le cose, ma in rete è impossibile sostenere una menzogna per lungo tempo».

Marcus Pretzell (ENF). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Der Vertreter des Rates hat in seinem letzten Satz ja heute die Hose runtergelassen. Und was ich da gehört habe, hat mir überhaupt nicht gefallen, aber es war vorhersehbar. Worum es hier geht? Er hat es klar gesagt: Es sind die Grenzen der Meinungsfreiheit – wortwörtlich, das hat er gesagt.

Bei *hate speech* geht es genau darum. Denn die Meinungsfreiheit endet an den Strafgesetzbüchern. Und es ist ja nicht so, dass manche Dinge nicht bereits verboten wären. Es gibt die Beleidigung, und es gibt viele, viele andere Dinge, die in Deutschland und anderswo verboten sind. Aber politische Meinungsmache im Sinne eines Wahrheitsministeriums – das brauchen wir sicherlich unter diesem Label nicht.

Und wenn wir über *fake news* reden: Nun, es ist Aufgabe der Politik, über Wahrheiten zu streiten, aber es ist nicht ihre Aufgabe, objektive Wahrheiten mehrheitlich abzustimmen. Auch dort hat der Vertreter des Rates etwas sehr Schönes gesagt: Besonders gelte es, die Lügen durch Politiker vor Wahlen zu bekämpfen. Nun, richten Sie Ihren Kollegen im Rat doch einen schönen Gruß aus: Alle Regierungen in dieser Europäischen Union gründen ihre Regierungsfähigkeit genau darauf: auf Lügen gegenüber den Wählern in ihren Ländern vor den Wahlen.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, encore un débat de plus qui est inutile, spécieux, voire grotesque, sur, je cite: «les discours de haine, le populisme et les informations mensongères sur les réseaux sociaux – vers une réponse de l'Union».

Ce débat prouve en fait que la majorité de cette institution, confrontée à ses échecs, n'a rien de mieux à faire que d'attaquer l'opposition. Ce que vous appelez «populisme», c'est la voix des peuples victimes de l'euromondialisme qui veulent vous exprimer leur légitime colère. Ce que vous appelez «fausses nouvelles», ce sont surtout les ripostes impertinentes aux mensonges officiels des groupes de presse écrite ou audiovisuelle que vous contrôlez. Et si des informations fausses s'y trouvent, qu'est-ce qui vous empêche de les réfuter? Ce que vous appelez «discours de haine», c'est tout ce qui va à l'encontre des dogmes que vous avez établis. En réalité, la haine est le fait des tenants du politiquement correct. En Allemagne, dont le chef de l'État nous vantait, hier, le respect des droits de l'homme, il y a plus de 1 000 prisonniers politiques ou d'opinion. En France, et quoi que l'on pense de leurs idées, que chacun, naturellement, a le droit de contredire, un universitaire de 88 ans, le professeur Faurisson, un père de famille nombreuse, M. Reynouard, et un polémiste connu, M. Soral, viennent chacun d'être condamnés à de la prison ferme pour délit d'expression, et ce en vertu des lois liberticides qui existent dans mon pays. C'est cela qui devrait vous choquer. Balayez ces législations au lieu de préparer l'instauration de nouvelles censures.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso (PPE). – Señor presidente, Europa debe aprovechar las oportunidades que se derivan de la revolución digital, a la vez que hacer frente a la nueva batalla política que es la del populismo contra la democracia representativa. Pero es preciso devolver a los ciudadanos la confianza en la democracia europea.

Y para ganar la batalla al populismo, no podemos obviar el malestar social existente, algo de lo que se aprovechan los populistas. Necesitamos volver a conectar con la parte de la ciudadanía que se siente abandonada. Para facilitar la participación hay que acercar Europa a nuestras regiones con el uso creciente que hace este Parlamento de las herramientas digitales y a través de sus oficinas de información que cuentan nuestro trabajo a cada ciudadano en su idioma.

Al mismo tiempo, es necesario identificar y luchar contra las técnicas que están sirviendo a los populismos para ir en contra de la Unión Europea, especialmente a través de las redes sociales. Y en este ámbito, urge que las plataformas digitales asuman responsabilidades. Debemos asegurar que no contribuyen a propagar mensajes de odio y noticias falsas. Tienen que cortar las vías que facilitan su divulgación y deben ser más transparentes, porque los ciudadanos merecen saber cómo se decide la información que recibe. Combatir la tiranía del algoritmo es una cuestión ética.

Además, debemos garantizar recursos para combatir la desinformación que llega, por ejemplo desde Rusia. Pero no basta con desmentir los populismos que buscan deslegitimar a la Unión. Los europeístas debemos impulsar una narrativa europea sólida. Tenemos que comunicar más y mejor Europa. Porque contar a nuestros ciudadanos lo que Europa hace por ellos es el mejor camino para recuperar la confianza perdida. Claro que, habiendo escuchado algunas opiniones esta tarde en este debate, me preocupan, tanto o más que las noticias falsas, la falta de respeto, el exceso de demagogia y el desprecio a esta Institución y lo que ella representa.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Mr President, not a long time ago hate speech was a fringe phenomenon: Neo-Nazis shouting in the streets or other cowards who have a lack of intelligence, common sense and human dignity. It was, of course, still a shocking reminder of the atrocities of Nazis, not least to Jews, Roma and the LGBTI community, but a decade ago hate speech was contained. Now it has become mainstream. Due to social media it can spread without control. Hate speakers are now even in power in some countries.

Therefore I am very encouraged by the EU Code of Conduct with Facebook, Microsoft Twitter and YouTube to counter hate speech online. But we cannot rest. The hate speakers certainly will not. The IT companies need to work closely with civil society and with the victims of hate speech and share best practice among themselves. And should the EU Code of Conduct not work we need to put hard legislation in place.

We have a duty to stop the hate in time this time around, and hate speech is not what freedom of expression is.

Branislav Škripek (ECR) – Vážený pán predsedajúci, všetci si uvedomujeme enormný nárast populizmu a nenávisť v našich krajinách. Apelujem v prvom rade na zodpovednosť nás, všetkých politikov. Absencia kritického myslenia sa prejavuje vo všetkých sférach spoločnosti a ani politici nie sú voči nej imúnni. Mnohí stratili schopnosť kultivovane a demokraticky reagovať na svojich oponentov. Dnes je každý kritik okamžite označovaný nálepkou: EXTREMISTA, ak prejavuje svoj názor, ktorý ide proti väčšinovému. Ako politici musíme preto opatrne nakladať s týmto pojmom a skutočne ho používať len pre tých, ktorí popierajú pravdu či historické fakty. Slávime 60 rokov od podpísania zakladajúcich Rímskych zmlúv, ale čo znamenali pre Európu? Predovšetkým mier a spoluprácu krajín, ktoré celé roky proti sebe bojovali. Považujem za nehoráznosť, ak niekto vyvrážovanie Židov, Rómov a iných v koncentračných táborech opisuje len ako neistú historickú skutočnosť. Dnes sa zamieňa prezentovanie nepravdivých, nenávislivých a rasistických názorov s hľadaním pravdy a slobody prejavu. Ak proti tomuto nezakročíme múdro a rázne, skončí v ruínach to, čo založili naši otcovia Európy. Preto želim politikom a modlím sa za to, aby sa nebáli čeliť kritike, ale nech ich posúva vpred pri hľadaní skutočných riešení krízy, ktorú tu máme.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Herr talman! Igår bildade tusentals människor en mänsklig kedja runt Centraleuropeiska universitetet i Budapest. Detta för att regeringen Orbáns lagstiftning, som nu drabbar detta universitet, är ett frontalangrepp på den akademiska friheten och allt kritiskt tänkande i Ungern. Det kunde inte ha skett utan att det hade föregåtts av hatpropaganda, populism och alternativa medier, som gång på gång har underblåst att detta skulle kunna ske. Det var väldigt modigt av dessa personer att bilda den här ringen, för vi vet att det som sker i Ungern nu, när det gäller den akademiska friheten, har föregåtts av hatpropaganda på sociala medier, alternativa fakta och ett samhälle som mer eller mindre har kvävt yttrandefriheten och istället odlat en tystnadskultur.

Den nationalistiska, totalitära syn som präglar regeringen Orbán, som tidigare politiserat rättsstaten och infört statlig censurmyndighet, har nu gått ett steg vidare och attackerar forskning, utbildning och ytterst den akademiska friheten. Det som sker i Ungern är en förolämpning mot EU och allt det som vi står för. Och vårt svar måste vara enkelt: Botten är nådd. Vi måste nu ställa upp och försvara den akademiska friheten och de värden som denna union bygger på.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πού κερδίζουν έδαφος οι ψεύτικες ειδήσεις, η ρητορική του μίσους και ο λαϊκισμός; Εκεί όπου λείπει η διαφάνεια, υποβαθμίζεται η παιδεία και παραμένει υψηλή η ανεργία, η φτώχεια και η ανισότητα. Τι συζητούν στην Επιτροπή; Δεν γνωρίζουμε σε βάθος. Πώς παίρνει αποφάσεις το Eurogroup; Δημοσιεύονται τα πρακτικά των συνεδριάσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Μηχανισμού Σταθερότητας, της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας ή του ΔΝΤ; Όχι. Κυριαρχεί σκοτάδι, καχυποψία, πόλεμος των πληροφοριών και ανταγωνισμός στο ψέμα. Αυτά αναγκάζεται να διαχειριστεί ο πολίτης. Το ψέμα επιβιώνει εκεί που λείπει η διαφάνεια, η παιδεία και η ευημερία. Είναι θέμα δημοκρατίας. Και η απάντηση που πρέπει να δώσουμε σε αυτό είναι μία: Όλα στο φώς!

Julia Reda (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, almost any female politician will have experienced hate speech on her social media accounts. It is a widespread phenomenon that did not start with the internet. It is important not to forget that the core of the problem is not social media, it is sexism and racism.

According to Council of Europe data only 15% of hate speech messages actually qualify as illegal. Then why do certain Member States think we can fix this problem? We are simply getting Facebook and Twitter to install a content filter. No technology is qualified to make the difficult decisions needed to define hate speech. By relying solely on technology we are not helping the victims and we are silencing free speech if we try to turn private companies into enforcers of laws that often do not even exist in the first place.

Instead, we need to address the terrible experiences that many women have when they actually try to report sexist hate speech to the police. We need to invest in training for law enforcement, in easier reporting of crimes and in supporting grassroots initiatives countering hate speech. If we try to solve one problem with blunt and ineffective technological tools we will end up creating more problems.

Tim Aker (EFDD). – Mr President, we learned something from the European Parliament's reaction to Article 50. This debate is on an EU response to all the things you try and associate with the Brexit vote. If you genuinely want to build a better Europe, how about this: stop what you are doing and think about why people voted the way they did. Those you call 'populists' are patriots. We love our countries, we love our communities, we love living in nations where the people are the masters and, through democratic decisions, the people have the final say. What they hate is you lot imposing unfettered immigration that has transformed communities without the people's say. They do not like seeing their streets changed without their approval. They do not like living in places that no longer resemble those they grew up in, and they know the EU is to blame. You can call us all the names you like, but it will not change the result. The majority of the British people voted to get our borders back, to get our democracy back, to get our country back and the sooner we are out of this place, the better.

Presidente. – On. Aker, le ricordo che la discussione sulla Brexit si è svolta stamattina.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, l'Union européenne est aux abois. Le peuple britannique l'a congédiée et d'autres peuples européens s'appêtent à en faire autant. Au lieu de se remettre en cause, elle cherche à bâillonner ses adversaires, ceux qu'elle appelle d'un si joli nom: les populistes.

Le Parlement européen ose aujourd'hui faire l'amalgame entre le populisme et les discours de haine. L'objectif est transparent. Il consiste à diaboliser les patriotes pour mieux les censurer dans les réseaux sociaux. La Commission vient de l'avouer par la bouche de M. Ansip: «Nous avons pris contact avec les opérateurs de médias sociaux», a-t-il dit. Et d'autres orateurs, comme M. Proust, viennent de désigner la cible de la future censure: Marine Le Pen.

S'il vous reste un peu d'honneur, Mesdames et Messieurs les européens, attaquez-vous aux vrais discours de haine qui émanent des djihadistes et respectez la démocratie. Respectez la liberté d'expression de vos adversaires politiques.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Comissário, o objeto este debate é demasiado largo. Discurso de ódio, *hate speech*, não é o mesmo que populismo. *Fake news* não são necessariamente discursos de ódio. Receio que estejamos a misturar realidades distintas.

Mas quero referir-me a cada uma delas.

Primeiro, não podemos tolerar discursos de ódio. Nem nesta casa, nem em qualquer fórum público, e isso inclui, também, redes sociais. É necessário envolver e colocar em cooperação todos os atores: Estado, plataformas online, escolas, meios de comunicação tradicionais. Todos. Não se trata apenas de retirar o discurso de ódio que surge na praça pública, mas sim e primeiramente, evitar que ele surja. É importante educar para a tolerância, para o respeito pelos outros e pela diferença.

Em segundo lugar, não podemos ter medo de olhar para as notícias falsas, também como uma arma de propaganda com implicações geopolíticas. E para tanto, a União tem de ser forte e ter meios robustos para atacar o que muitas vezes são campanhas deliberadas de desinformação.

Em terceiro lugar, o populismo é um fenómeno extraordinariamente complexo, que cresce todos os dias. Temos de o combater, mas também compreender a sua origem. Reduzir o populismo a discurso de ódio e notícias falsas pode ser também populismo. Combater estes fenómenos exige uma resposta eficaz, robusta e abrangente da União. O perigo que eles encerram para a democracia e para a liberdade é demasiado grave. Por isso se exige aos responsáveis políticos e aos cidadãos que não cedam nem ao facilitismo nem à cobardia.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I want to emphasise the social and citizenship aspects in this debate, in particular media literacy and digital participation within a safe internet. Media literacy enable citizens to use and create media content effectively and safely. Media-literate people are able to exercise more informed choices, understand the nature of content and services and take advantage of the full range of opportunities offered by communication technologies. Media literacy and education for citizenship is not only important for learning about the tools, but also to encourage a shift in political cultures and practices so that individuals can be not only digital consumers and users but active citizens in connected societies.

I remain very concerned by the lack of effective response to cyber bullying and discrimination online. Consumers and citizens, in particular the most vulnerable, especially children, must be properly protected online. Member States and the EU must work with internet providers and platforms in order to ensure that illegal and offensive content is effectively taken down and stays down.

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Mr President, we talk a lot at the moment of fake news, whether we think of Trump's tweets, Putin's control of the Russian media or the false promises spread by some Brexiteers during the UK's EU referendum campaign. We might have a new word for this but it is plain, old-fashioned, populist propaganda, lies and half-truths, seeking to muddy the waters and twist reality for political gain. The internet, social media and 24-hour news cycles have made their job all too easy.

Fake news is not the only addition to the political lexicon in recent years though. 'Truthiness', 'post-fact' and the use of 'metropolitan liberal elites' as a pejorative, are all part of a wider movement against expert opinion and reasoned analysis towards a world of half-truths where views and opinions are reported as facts. We must not underestimate the difficulty in counteracting these forces. Trust in governments, politicians and traditional sources of media is low and they are deemed to be biased. Indeed, the arguments put forth by official institutions, even very credible ones, to counteract fake news are derided as nothing more but the same thing: merely another opinion, a different point of view.

Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, la libre communication des pensées et des opinions est un des droits les plus précieux de l'homme. Tout citoyen peut donc parler et écrire librement, sauf à répondre de l'abus de cette liberté. Tel est le principe posé par le révolutionnaire français en 1789 et qui est devenu une formule extrêmement célèbre.

Que dit-il? En effet, la liberté est la règle, mais la liberté d'expression n'est pas un droit au mensonge. Ce n'est pas un principe absolu, n'en déplaise à certains dans cet hémicycle qui semblent parfois se sentir visés. Sans rappeler non plus la belle légende de la *Bocca della Verità* de Rome, qui menaçait de broyer la main de celui qui mentait et sans imaginer non plus de créer une autorité de la vérité, la liberté d'expression impose aussi de protéger contre les discours de haine, contre les discours incitant au djihadisme et au terrorisme, contre les discours racistes et injurieux, contre les informations mensongères qui inondent les réseaux sociaux, à tel point qu'on les qualifie aujourd'hui souvent de réseaux sociaux.

Nous devons prendre des mesures contre les contenus illégaux et les supprimer. Nous devons travailler avec les grandes entreprises d'internet, nous devons travailler avec le monde de l'éducation afin de déconstruire la désinformation et nous devons travailler activement avec le journalisme professionnel pour supprimer ces informations mensongères.

Curzio Maltese (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il titolo di questa discussione in effetti è un po' ideologico. Il caso di *fake news* con conseguenze più tragiche nei nostri tempi è la leggenda sulle armi di distruzione di massa di Saddam, che non c'entra né con il populismo né con i *social media*.

Non voglio negare che ci sia un problema serio di qualità dell'informazione. La rivoluzione Internet ha prodotto un sistema monopolista, in questi anni, non regolamentato, dove pochissimi *player*, Google e Facebook anzitutto, raccolgono il 90 % delle risorse, non hanno responsabilità per quanto pubblicano, non producono contenuti, non pagano le tasse, mentre giornalisti, editori e indipendenti fanno la fame. E il pubblico è bombardato da spazzatura.

Si potrebbe intervenire, ma non lo vogliamo fare. La verità è che la Commissione, per esempio, non vuole mettere mano alla direttiva sull'*e-commerce*, che è vecchia di 17 anni ed è scandalosamente inadeguata. Allora c'è il sospetto che si voglia parlare di politica e non intervenire per tutelare l'interesse dei cittadini.

Mi permetta di usare tre secondi per quello che è successo in quest'Aula. L'on. Salvini non considera il lavoro politico una cosa seria. Io, prima di essere eletto qui, ha lavorato per 38 anni, da quando ne avevo 17, nei «lavori veri». L'on. Salvini da quando ha 20 anni prende stipendi da politico. Mi dispiace per lui: deve avere un'autostima bassissima.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, qui si sono volutamente mescolati ambiti molto diversi. Ma un conto sono l'incitazione all'odio, il cyberbullismo, la violenza e le minacce in rete – condannabili e inaccettabili, certo – mentre ben altra questione sono i cosiddetti populismi e le presunte bufale. Queste ultime sono infatti diventate il pretesto per rendere patologica o anormale anche la legittima espressione della diversità di opinione politica, con il conseguente rischio di una stretta antidemocratica. Sapere che, ad esempio, Facebook si rivolgerebbe a un istituto per la verifica dei fatti, sponsorizzato da realtà e fondazioni collegate agli interessi di multinazionali o di finanzieri speculatori d'assalto, proprio non ci fa stare tranquilli. Chi ha il diritto di cancellare o censurare delle informazioni?

Infine, permettetemi di dire due parole sui tanto vituperati populismi. Perché le persone, i gruppi, i movimenti che parlano ai cittadini e che agiscono per un loro maggiore coinvolgimento nei processi decisionali sono visti da tanti di voi come fumo negli occhi? Perché considerate nemico chi critica le politiche di *austerità* e di rigore, o quest'Europa dell'euro, dei mercati della grande finanza? Non sarà perché dimostrano che il re è nudo e che questa non è un'Unione dei cittadini europei, basata sulla cooperazione, sulla solidarietà e sull'uguaglianza? Colleghi, per quale ragione mirate il dito che punta che alla luna?

Auke Zijlstra (ENF). – Pluriformiteit in de media bestaat niet meer. De staatsmedia laten het volledig afweten door gekleurd nieuws te brengen dat door mensen niet meer herkend wordt. De oplages en de kijkcijfers dalen dan ook voortdurend, want niemand vertrouwt de media nog. Daarom geven gewone mensen op sociale media informatie over wat zij in hun gewone leven meemaken: dat de islam niet lief is, dat islamisering wél plaatsvindt, dat dat geen verrijking is, dat de werkloosheid niet afneemt, dat de koopkracht wél daalt, dat de belastingen wél stijgen, dat het klimaat niet als een probleem wordt ervaren en dat migranten juist wél als een probleem worden ervaren. Brussel noemt dit allemaal populisme en kijkt naar mogelijkheden voor censuur, maar als Brussel wil weten wat nepnieuws is, moet ze vooral naar haar eigen juichverhalen kijken.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Dámy a pánové, šíření falešných zpráv je bezpečnostní hrozbou pro všechny členské státy Evropské unie. Tento fenomén je potřeba efektivně konfrontovat a na základě objektivních faktů tyto dezinformace vyvracet jak na evropské, tak na národní úrovni.

V této souvislosti bych rád vyzdvihl nové Centrum proti terorismu a hybridním hrozbám zřízené Ministerstvem vnitra České republiky. Tento úřad má za cíl monitorovat hrozby spojené s vnitřní bezpečností státu, mezi které účelové dezinformace přicházející ze zahraničí nepochybně patří.

Myslím, že je nezbytné, aby podobné úřady vznikaly i v dalších členských zemích Evropské unie, aby se tak posílily již existující evropské mechanismy, jako je například *East StratCom* čelící v současnosti ruské propagandě. Dezinformační internetové platformy jako *Russia Today* či *Sputnik* jsou celoevropským nebezpečím. Žádám proto paní Mogheriniovou, aby této bezpečnostní hrozbě věnovala mnohem důkladnější pozornost než doposud, včetně dostatečného rozpočtu.

Podfinancování obrany Evropské unie před dezinformacemi pocházejícími z Ruska je pro Evropskou unii výrazným bezpečnostním rizikem. Informační válka, kterou vede Kreml proti Evropské unii, má za cíl Evropskou unii rozložit. Kremelská dezinformační kampaň cílí na každý členský stát Evropské unie z jiných pozic. Proto musí být obrana proti ní vedena jak na centrální úrovni Evropské unie, tak na úrovni jednotlivých zemí.

PRÉSIDENTE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Gyűlöletbeszéd, hamis hírek a közösségi médiában – mindez nem egészen új keletű jelenség. Az utóbbi időben azonban erőteljesen megváltozott ezeknek a jelenségeknek a megítélése, mivel hirtelen, és talán kissé váratlanul, megnőtt a politikai jelentőségük. Ez a folyamat pedig elválaszthatatlan a szélsőjobboldali pártok és mozgalmak megerősödésétől, attól a gátlástalan politikától, ami az emberek tájékozatlanságát, félelmét, aggodalmait kihasználva félrevezeti, becsapja az embereket, másokkal szemben aljas érzelmeket, gyűlöletet kelt. A szélsőjobboldal azonban nem csak a közösségi médiát használja erre a célra, hanem saját politikai kultúrájának központi elemévé, sőt kormánypolitikává tette a gyűlölködést, a társadalom megosztását.

Ha valaki azt gondolja, hogy ez túlzás, vessen egy pillantást Magyarországra vagy Lengyelországra. Az ezekben az országokban épülő illiberális demokráciának éppen ez a lényege: a félrevezetés, a csúsztatás, a demagógia. A magyar miniszterelnök azt állítja, hogy a menekültek az ország biztonságát és a magyar kultúrát veszélyeztetik. Azt állítja, hogy az Európai Unió akarja diktálni az adókat, hogy támadja a munkahelyteremtő intézkedéseket. Azt állítja, hogy az NGO-k külföldről támogatott szervezetek, amelyek az ország függetlenségét veszélyeztetik, törvényt sértenek, és az illegális bevándorlást ösztönzik, miközben tudja, hogy mindez nem igaz. De azért ezekről a kérdésekről szervez nemzeti konzultációnak nevezett propagandaakciót. Ebben a hazug világban válik ellenséggé a Közép-európai Egyetem és a kritikus, szabad akadémiai világ általában. És ez a kormánypárt ott ül, ebben a parlamentben az EPP soraiban. Élvezi annak védelmét, támogatását. Mindezt pedig azért, mert fél a demokráciától. De ha mi itt az Európai Parlamentben nem fordulunk határozottan szembe ezzel a politikával, nem zárjuk azt ki a Parlament falai közül, akkor mi is hozzájárulunk a demokrácia lerombolásához.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, știrile false, ura și minciunile transmise prin unde, discursul xenofob și populist sunt instrumente ale dictaturii și ale cinismului oligarhilor și ipocriților. Unii lideri politici vor o Europă divizată și formată din țări-insule, înconjurată de ziduri înalte și opace, create prin dezinformare și minciună, ziduri prin care să nu treacă nimic înăuntru și nimic în afară, ci doar ce vor acești lideri să transmită celor pe care îi țin în închisori de fapt. Mașinile de fabricat și răspândit știri false netezesc calea extremismului și a putinismului în Europa.

Eu mă voi referi cu precădere la influența Federației Ruse și la ura și propaganda făcute de Federația Rusă. Trebuie să recunoaștem, la nivelul Uniunii Europene în mod explicit, că Federația Rusă este principala sursă a războiului ostil de dezinformare și de aceea cer înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii Europene pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate să oprească acțiunile lui Putin împotriva Uniunii Europene.

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Madam President, first of all I have to say that I very much agree with what Tanja Fajon and Helga Trüpel said. I wanted to share with you some concerns regarding our fight against propaganda and fake news.

Like Commissioner Ansip, I was raised in the Soviet Union, where so-called anti-Soviet propaganda was perceived as one of the major reasons why the Soviet people were not happy about the regime. The Communist Party believed that people were misinformed and manipulated by foreign actors, and that is why the people looked up to the West. I am sure that the other side's propaganda has poor chances if it is not based on some real facts, or if it addresses issues that are properly touched upon by the mainstream media. As for fake news, it cannot attract public attention if it does not seem to be reliable or does not reflect the wishful thinking of the audience. For instance, any fake news about certain countries like North Korea, may be accepted by the public because the regime there is so nasty. Regrettably, mistakes, misinterpretation of data and manipulative delivery of news – I mean all these games with titles, subtitles, selection of pictures, experts and the use of specific terminology – are a big challenge for us. We need critical thinking and we definitely need to have high-quality journalism back in Europe.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, pretenden que este Parlamento dé lecciones de cómo luchar contra el discurso de odio, cuando resulta que esta Cámara está llena de diputados con discursos violentos y las sanciones son de risa. Al señor Korwin-Mikke por hacer el saludo nazi en el Pleno o por su discurso machista solo se le sancionó con treinta días sin dietas.

El otro día permitieron una rueda de prensa en el Parlamento del presidente de Hazte Oír, que está llevando a cabo una campaña transfóbica en España. Y no solo la extrema derecha, el problema es que también desde el centro del hemiciclo alimentan el odio contra las personas migrantes, cada vez que les relacionan con el terrorismo o les tachan de ilegales contra los que hay que defenderse.

No estamos para dar lecciones y menos aquellos que este fin de semana aplaudían en el congreso del Partido Popular Europeo en Malta a Viktor Orbán cuando hablaba de invasión de inmigrantes.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). – Fru talman! Jag förstår att den här ständigt mer centraliserade unionen gillar att media är centraliserad till några få mediehus.

Europeiska unionen gör samma misstag som den amerikanska vänstern har gjort, nämligen att blanda ihop falska nyheter med nyheter som tar upp andra perspektiv. När samtliga svenska medier enbart rapporterade de positiva sidorna av den enorma migration vi hade till vårt land, samt i vissa fall ren desinformation, uppkom så kallad alternativ media, där enstaka medborgare på egen hand grävde fram sanningen bakom de vinklade nyheter som dominerade i samhället. Där kom det bland annat fram att de nyheter som handlade om våldsbrott ofta helt undanhöll det faktum att gärningsmannen var migrant eller hade utländsk bakgrund. Medan i de fall gärningsmannen var svensk redovisades detta mycket tydligt med namn och bild.

Många av de stora mediehusen i Sverige har länge haft linjen att bara visa på de fördelar som de anser att migrationen har, oavsett om det kan bevisas eller ej. Oftast håller deras teser inte för närmare granskning av forskare eller belästa medborgare. Både Europeiska unionen och svenska staten håller dessa mediehus under armarna genom bidrag och lån. Redan dominerande aktörer får genom skattemedel ytterligare stöd att bedriva agendasättande journalistik istället för objektiv nyhetsrapportering. Jag vädjar till er. Lösningen kan inte vara att vi helt enkelt ger pengar till de stora mediehusen i någon slags förhoppning om att de har rätt bara för att de har funnits i många år. Det var de som hjälpte till att driva på migrationskrisen. Det var inte bara Merkel och Löfven som välkomnade hela världen till Europa, utan även mediehusens kampanjer.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, was wir heute erleben, ist eine Tragikomödie, und es ist schon interessant, dass der Herr Borg vom Ratsvorsitz heute davor warnt, dass gerade vor Wahlen von bösen Populisten falsche Infos verbreitet werden. Das ist ja eine sensationell neue Erkenntnis, aber ich bin sehr dankbar, dass Sie das heute so erwähnt haben, denn ich kann mich gut erinnern: In meiner Heimat Österreich erlebe ich seit Jahren von der Regierungspartei der Sozialisten, dass regelmäßig vor jeder Wahl die Pensionen gesichert und gerettet werden, aber sie offensichtlich einem dauernden Verfall ausgesetzt sind, auch dank der europäischen Zinspolitik. Und ich kann mich gut erinnern, wie uns unsere damalige sozialistische Staatssekretärin vor dem Beitritt Österreichs in die EU versprochen hat: „Jedem Österreicher bleiben tausend Schilling mehr im Säckel.“ Das Ergebnis ist natürlich ein ganz anderes.

Also ich bedanke mich, dass Sie offensichtlich davor gewarnt haben. Ab heute kann ich aufgrund Ihrer sachlichen Beurteilung auch die österreichischen Sozialisten als Populisten bezeichnen. Letztlich habe ich bei dieser Diskussion große Angst, denn was Sie wollen, ist eine Wahrheitsagentur, Zensoren, und ich habe Angst vor dieser Art von Zensoren, denn wer überprüft diese Zensoren!

La Présidente. – Monsieur Obermayr, vous disposiez d'une minute, il faut conclure, je suis désolée. Il n'est pas question de censure, c'est simplement que votre temps de parole est dépassé.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, le titre de ce débat m'a interpellé, car lorsque l'on parle de fausses informations – *fake news* –, il s'agit tout simplement de mensonges.

Je crains qu'il ne faille pas avoir peur d'appeler les choses par leur nom. La pratique des discours de haine, des arguments populistes et des mensonges n'est pas nouvelle. Je viens d'un pays qui a vécu cette expérience sous le communisme. Ce qui est nouveau, c'est effectivement l'usage des médias sociaux. Sinon, l'objectif des groupes terroristes et des partis politiques extrémistes est le même que celui des régimes totalitaires par le passé, à savoir mettre en place des régimes autoritaires et donc remettre les pratiques totalitaires au goût du jour.

Les attentats qui ont sauvagement frappé l'Europe nous ont permis de prendre conscience de la nécessité de travailler ensemble pour contrer la propagande terroriste. La tâche n'est pas facile car, même si les entreprises des réseaux sociaux font preuve de bonne volonté, il est très difficile de repérer des messages de ce type et de les retirer à temps.

L'Union européenne a fait des efforts importants avec la mise en place de la *Stratcom Task Force* pour lutter contre les messages de haine du groupe «État islamique», mais pour que nos actions puissent avoir une portée, il faut doter cette structure de véritables moyens. Il y a quelques mois, nous avons adopté un rapport sur la communication stratégique de l'Union dans ce domaine et une chose est claire: une communication efficace ne suffira pas, il faut investir dans l'éducation, dans la sensibilisation et, surtout, dans la liberté de la presse. Cette liberté est essentielle pour lutter contre ces mensonges.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o ódio, o racismo e os populismos que os fomentam são mais um desgracado corolário das políticas neoliberais e autoritárias que nos aumentaram o défice em democracia, justiça social e valores, polarizando as nossas sociedades, cavando divisões, marginalizando jovens, em particular de segundas gerações, criados em guetos e segregação. Alimentaram medos e inseguranças aproveitados pelos Ukip, Front National, Fidesh e quejandos para promoverem as suas venenosas agendas. Governantes europeus são cúmplices, sem políticas para o emprego, para a igualdade de justiça e controlo democrático.

Onde estão o Conselho e a Comissão na proteção de refugiados imigrantes? E nesta era de *fake news*, *trolls-online* e *Trump Tweets*, como nada fazem para impedir que um instrumento estratégico como a Euronews seja, de facto, financiado e controlado por Moscovo e por um bilionário egípcio sem assegurar a qualidade e a isenção editorial exigíveis a um canal de notícias associado à União Europeia. Não tem consciência disso, Comissário Ansip?

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Populizm i kłamstwo ma bardzo szeroki zakres. Trzeba rozmawiać o tym, co nadzwyczajne, o propagandzie uderzającej z zewnątrz Europy, chcącej wpływać na decyzje naszych narodów, naszych wyborców, propagandę organizowaną przez prezydenta Putina, przez Rosję Putina. Chcę się przyłączyć do tych apeli pana posła Śtétiny, pani poseł Macovei o mobilizację Komisji Europejskiej i Wysokiej Komisarz w tej sprawie.

I wreszcie mowa nienawiści – trzeba powiedzieć jasno: ona w realiach dotyka przede wszystkim chrześcijan i Żydów. To te dwie społeczności padają ofiarą dyskryminacji, także dyskryminacji w sieci. Trzeba o tym mówić otwarcie. Inne grupy są krzywdzone w znacznie mniejszym stopniu. Antychryścianizm i antysemityzm są zjawiskami najbardziej podstawowymi. Odpowiedzią powinna być dobra edukacja odwołująca się do tego, co podstawowe w naszej cywilizacji.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, a lot of measures have already been referred to today, and I think that one can agree with a lot of those that have been taken at national level, but this is not just a national task and I am glad that the Commission is looking into it. I am not a great fan of unnecessary regulation and I would like to point at some measures that can really work pretty well.

First of all, reinforce the Strategic Communication Task Force that we already have, and establish an online space where the public at large can find a range of tools for identifying this information, with an explanation of how they work; and of course that can also be to the benefit of civil society. Secondly, strengthen media plurality and the objectivity, impartiality and independence of the media within the EU and its neighbourhood. Thirdly, support journalists and develop capacity-building programmes for media actors. Then, develop education programmes in schools to detect fake news. That is where it starts. Finally, enhance cooperation among Member States for intelligence services.

These are concrete measures that can be taken immediately, and I think the EU Strategic Task Force has to be reinforced, and that is underestimated.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Fru talman! Först skulle jag vilja understryka att vi måste ha total respekt för yttrandefrihet och mediefrihet, och jag skulle särskilt vilja trycka på att vi måste öka stödet till public service-media. Men jag tycker också att vi behöver bekämpa det ökade hatet och hotet och diskrimineringen. Idag ser vi homofober, sexistiska, rasistiska krafter som härjar vilt, och de har också stöd av krafter på högerbänkarna på det här parlamentet. Det är en skam.

Länder i Europa har till och med lagar som innebär att man inte får prata på ett positivt sätt om homosexualitet och transsexualitet. Hur är det möjligt 2017 i Europa? Vi ser öppet kvinnohat och vi ser en islamofobi som inte blir motsagd. Vi har flyktingförläggningar i brand. En stor grupp av våra medborgare lever i otrygghet. Diskriminering och hat måste bekämpas. Hets mot folkgrupp måste utvidgas till att också omfatta homofobi, transfobi, sexism och alla former av rasism.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Herr Ratspräsident, meine Damen und Herren! Die neuen Medien waren angesehen – die sozialen Medien – als etwas, wodurch der Bürger, das Individuum, mehr Möglichkeiten hat, sich auszudrücken, wofür die neuen Medien eigentlich nur die Plattform waren. Heute stellen wir fest, dass diese mehr und mehr zu Manipulationsinstrumenten werden – von reichen Gruppen der Privaten und von Staaten unter dem Schutz der Privatheit und der Meinungsfreiheit.

Und dies muss, glaube ich, auseinandergezogen werden. Wir dürfen auf keinen Fall durch ein Wahrheitsministerium oder so etwas die persönliche Meinungsfreiheit einschränken. Aber das dürfen wir nicht aufgeben, dass wir Staaten und starken Gruppen die Möglichkeiten geben, Präsident zu werden oder andere Länder zu beeinflussen. Und aus diesem Grund muss man deutlich machen, dass hier der Manipulation Grenzen gesetzt werden. Und das muss auf rechtliche Art und Weise geschehen.

Das muss dadurch geschehen, dass klassische Medien gestärkt werden. Wenn wir die Leistungsschutzregelung, die wir in diesem Hause später diskutieren und abstimmen zerstören, werden normale Journalisten keine Einkommen mehr haben, Zeitungsverlage gehen kaputt, niemand ist mehr in der Lage, deutlich zu sagen, was wahr und was unwahr ist. Und man wird es diesem Konglomerat der Manipulation überlassen. Das heißt, es hängt mit anderen Dingen zusammen. Es sind die Fragen zu sehen, die mit Medienbildung zu tun haben, die mit Unterscheidung von Wahrem und Unwahrem zu tun haben.

Im Diktum des *Guardian* steht: „Comment is free, but facts are sacred“. Ich glaube, dieser Grundsatz des *Guardian* gilt heute nicht mehr für die Medienwelt insgesamt und Kollegen von der Seite haben ihre Verschwörungstheorien selbst in der Debatte verbreitet.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Fil-fatt illum f'dan id-dibattitu hafna qeghdin jargumentaw li l-libertà tal-espressjoni hija dritt fundamentali u suprem, u fuq dan iva: naqblu; imma l-libertà tal-espressjoni m'hijiex dritt infinit.

Il-libertà tal-espressjoni ma tibqax dritt fundamentali fil-mument li żgħażaġh trans jew gay ikunu attackkati b'mod li jwassalhom jikkomettu suwiciċċju; ma tibqax dritt il-mument li l-vjolenza domestika ssir is-sugġett ta' ċajt goff; ma tibqax dritt il-mument li tinċita n-nies biex joqtlu lil xi hadd minhabba t-twemmin politiku tagħhom. Il-libertà tal-kelma tinkoraġġixxi d-dibattitu filwaqt li d-diskors ta' mibeghda jinċita l-vjolenza, għaliex iva: il-kliem jagħmlu differenza kbira.

Id-diskors ta' mibeghda online u offline jattakka l-qalba tad-demokraziji tagħna.

Il-Gvernijiet, is-soċjetà ċivili u l-industrija tal-internet iridu jahdmu flimkien biex jedukaw, joholqu kuxjenza, jipproteġu lill-vittmi u jaċcertaw ruħhom li min jgħid dan il-kliem ikun penalizzat.

Ejja ma naghqlux għajnejna għall-intolleranza u d-diskors li jincita l-mibegħda għaliex dak ikun il-mument meta l-poplu jieqaf jinteressa ruħu u l-mibegħda ssir l-ordni tal-ġurnata.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! In der Tat ist die Debattenkultur im Internet manchmal aggressiv, verletzend und nicht selten auch hasserfüllt und bedrohlich, und das ist gesellschaftlich keinesfalls akzeptabel. Die Frage ist allerdings: Können und müssen wir dagegen staatliche Maßnahmen ergreifen?

Und ich glaube, da würden wir uns auf einen Irrweg begeben. Denn wer möchte im Voraus Regeln definieren, die man später einhalten soll? Da wird es eine große Vielzahl von Fällen geben, und wir werden in der Praxis feststellen, dass das überhaupt gar nicht leistbar ist. Es ist ein Kampf einerseits der freien Meinungsäußerung gegen Dinge die gesellschaftlich nicht akzeptabel sind. Aber da vertraue ich auf die Gesellschaft, auf die Selbstheilungskräfte. Wir brauchen hier bessere Bildung, insbesondere für die jüngere Generation, damit die lernt, wie man mit solchen Medien umgeht, damit die lernt, was ein Faktencheck ist. Und Populismus ist noch schwerer zu greifen. Wenn zum Beispiel jemand sagt: „Scheitert der Euro, dann scheitert Europa“, meine ich, das ist Populismus. Da gibt es aber in diesem Haus sehr viele Leute, die das anders sehen.

La Présidente. – Un certain nombre de nos collègues qui nous ont rejoints souhaitent faire des interventions à la demande. Je tiens à préciser de nouveau qu'il n'y a pas d'interventions à la demande dans ce cadre de débats.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Paní předsedající, základem evropských hodnot je ochrana lidských práv. Ta se zakládá na úctě k důstojnosti každého jednotlivce. Tato úcta vychází z našich křesťansko-židovských kořenů. *Hate speech* je obsahem a často i slovníkem opakem této úcty. A je jedno, jestli někdo nenávidí z přesvědčení, anebo šíří nenávisť a lži za peníze – to je případ kremelských agentů na sociálních sítích, ale i v parlamentech. Ano, jsme v informační válce, kde se z *hate speech* a lži stala zbraň. A pomocí přemíry lží jde v té informační válce o podkopání důvěry vlastně v jakoukoliv informaci. To je cesta k chaosu a následné totalitě.

Nenávisť a lež podkopávají důvěru. A na důvěře stojí naše společnost – od rodin přes peněžní systém až po demokracii. Nelze proto přijmout přejmenování lží na alternativní fakta. Prostor pro lži a nenávisť ale vytváří i přehnaná politická korektnost – nechota důstojně, ale jasně pojmenovat problémy. Bez důstojného pojmenování problémů nastupuje populismus a *hate speech*.

Jak tomu čelit? Je třeba čelit šíření dezinformací a *hate speech*, a proto vyzývám Radu, Komisi i vysokou představitelku Mogheriniovou, aby na odhalování dezinformací vyhradily adekvátní lidské i finanční prostředky.

Kati Piri (S&D). – De bewijzen stapelen zich op dat de Russische overheid zich actief met de democratische besluitvorming in het Westen bemoeit. Terwijl wij hier spreken, blokkeert Rusland een resolutie in de VN-Veilighedsraad over het gebruik van chemische wapens in Idlib, Syrië, en volgens Moskou gaat het niet om feiten, maar om *fake news*. Poetin moest zich kapot schamen.

Het verspreiden van nepnieuws op sociale media vormt een propagandamiddel met politieke doeleinden om te verwarren, om verdeeldheid in onze samenleving te creëren en om onze democratische verkiezingen te beïnvloeden. Daarbij wordt handig gebruikgemaakt van onze open democratische samenlevingen. Dat is onze kracht, maar tegelijkertijd ook onze zwakte bij het effectief tegengaan van dit soort ontwrichtende propaganda.

Tegen propaganda is niet het antwoord. We moeten meer investeren in kwaliteitsjournalistiek en hier in het onderwijs aandacht aan besteden, zodat de toekomstige generatie minder vatbaar is voor deze vorm van politieke manipulatie.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, društvene mreže predstavljaju revoluciju u ljudskoj komunikaciji i veliki dobitak za globalnu ekonomiju. Zahvaljujući njima informacije se globalno šire u sekundi, a tvrtke do svojih klijenata dolaze jeftinije nego ikad prije. No, kao svaka revolucija, i društvene su mreže često zlorabljene, a posljednji trend plasiranja lažnih vijesti zapravo je najmanje zabrinjavajući.

Prioritet nam mora biti zaustavljanje rastućeg trenda korištenja društvenih mreža za ozbiljan kriminal poput pedofilije, prostitucije, trgovine ljudima, novačenja terorista i sličnih ilegalnih aktivnosti. Nemojmo zaboraviti da su i *mainstream* mediji, svjesno ili nesvjesno, često objavljivali netočnosti, pa bi bilo kakav oblik cenzure društvenih mreža automatski uveo autocenzuru u medije, jer bi se bojali objaviti intrigantne informacije.

Nisam za ograničavanje slobode govora, ali jesam za to da se snosi puna odgovornost za zlonamjerne informacije koje ljudima mogu nanijeti psihološku ili materijalnu štetu.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, we see how the social and digital media are becoming a powerful tool for propaganda, populism and hate speech. As such, it is nothing new, therefore we should not be tempted to limit the freedom of speech. Rather we must recognise the signs early and act responsibly but decisively to counter them. It is our common challenge. We can see that this information stems from a weak institutional and democratic environment, and simultaneously feeds into preserving the same defined milieu.

This phenomenon appears inside the EU but also outside our borders. I am observing its alarming prevalence in Ukraine, in Belarus but also in the Western Balkans. Unfortunately, it became a political tool of influence used by authoritarian regimes and governments. Various disinformation techniques are used to systematically undermine the values and policies which the EU strives to defend in these countries. We experience here campaigns and increased activities during elections with the aim to influence the result. These should be our last wake-up calls. We should invest more attention and resources in resilience of the media environment and information literacy in the EU, but also in our partner countries of the neighbourhood and our future members.

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi oggi discutiamo di un tema molto delicato che riguarda alcuni aspetti, alcuni livelli. Il primo sono le condizioni di libertà di espressione, di accesso alle informazioni, di correttezza dell'informazione e quindi di deontologia e di vera responsabilità nell'epoca dei *social media*, che deve vedere un *level playing field* di responsabilità fra tutto il sistema dei media, e questo è un aspetto.

Ma c'è anche quello dei contenuti di *hate speech* o di *fake news*, che effettivamente stanno creando degli impatti molto drammatici, non soltanto sulla democrazia: penso all'intervento organizzato di vere e proprie campagne, anche da Stati esteri, che alterano le scelte democratiche, penso però anche a forme persecutorie: pensiamo al cyberbullismo, pensiamo alla folle persecuzione per cui molti ragazzi e donne si sono suicidati anche nel mio paese in questi ultimi tempi.

E qui si tratta non solo, caro commissario Ansip, di vedere come gli *over-the-top* si danno da soli dei codici – è importantissimo – ma, come stiamo facendo anche nella direttiva AVMS, noi vogliamo che siano previsti, nelle direttive della Commissione europea, dei meccanismi per rimuovere immediatamente contenuti di questo tipo e per responsabilizzare questi media.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, itse olen toiminut mukana politiikan parissa yli 30 vuotta ja olen viimeisten vuosien aikana liian usein joutunut toteamaan, että uutinen, joka on tehty jostakin tilaisuudesta tai tapahtumasta, on voimakkaasti väritetty sen kirjoittajan oman poliittisen näkemyksen mukaisesti, joka usein vastaa mediatalon omistajan näkökulmaa.

Usein nämä ylilyönnit tapahtuvat juuri ennen vaaleja, kun halutaan vaikuttaa siihen, mitä puoluetta tai ehdokasta kansalaisten ei tulisi missään tapauksessa äänestää. Kun tällainen uutisointi ylittää tietyn rajan, kääntyvät ne kuitenkin esittäjänsä tarkoituseriä vastaan, sillä kansalaiset osaavat itsekkin ajatella ja tehdä itsenäisiä äänestyspäätöksiä. Ennen vaaleja uutisoidaan usein myös tulevasta vaalituloksesta sekä puolueiden että tulevien valittujen ehdokkaiden osalta, koska halutaan, että äänestäjät siirtyvät voittajan kelkkaan.

On ikävä todeta, mutta perinteisenkin median olisi toisinaan syytä katsoa peiliin, kun keskustelemme virheellisistä tiedoista, propagandasta ja suoranaisista valeuutisista.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, en tiempos como éstos contaminados por el discurso del odio, por la posverdad y por las noticias falsas, como decía Albert Camus, la indiferencia puede llegar a ser criminal. Otro filósofo francés, André Glucksmann, en su libro *El discurso del odio* dejó escrito que la primera respuesta tiene que ser su exposición al ridículo.

Pero en Europa hemos aprendido que eso no basta. Hemos aprendido que hace falta transponer la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI exactamente para sentar los límites penales de una amenaza contra la democracia en la que Europa lo arriesga todo. Ahora hace falta más. Hace falta averiguar cómo se propaga el discurso del odio, cómo se financia, cómo proteger a las víctimas en la red y en el mundo digital y, por supuesto, hace falta además saber que nombrar las cosas por su nombre es el comienzo del rigor para evitar que la banalización del mal sea la semilla del fascismo.

Europa tiene una amenaza, se llama discurso del odio. Y Europa debe dar una respuesta, una respuesta que contemple los límites de la transigencia frente a los que desprecian a los diferentes y humillan a los inferiores.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! *Fake news* sind eine Sünde. „Desinformation ist der größte Schaden, den die Medien anrichten können, da die Meinung in eine falsche Richtung gelenkt wird.“ Dieser Satz stammt von Papst Franziskus. Desinformation kann sogar ein starkes Land zerbrechen. Wir tun gut daran, diesem Phänomen unserer digitalen Welt gemeinsam und geschlossen zu begegnen.

Deutschland ist eines der Länder, die dieses Jahr vor einer großen, wichtigen Richtungswahl stehen. Auch da kann aus Drittstaaten gezielte Desinformation und Einflussnahme betrieben werden. Das heißt für mich: *Fake news* hat die Macht, Werte zu zerstören, Menschenleben zu töten. Dem müssen wir uns entgegenstellen. Darüber hinaus darf der Kampf gegen die Hassrede nicht zum Aushöhlen der Meinungsfreiheit führen. So beginnt zum Beispiel für die Amadeu Antonio Stiftung *hate speech* bereits bei Wir- und Ihr-Kategorien. Bei der Verwendung von Mann und Frau als natürliche Kategorien und schlechter Satire. Seien wir also vorsichtig in der Bewertung von *hate speech*. Manches muss man nicht verbieten, manchem muss man einfach im direkten Dialog entschieden begegnen.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Słusznie potępiamy mowę nienawiści. Jest faktem, że media społecznościowe w dużej części stały się rynsztokiem. Obawiam się jednak, że filtrowanie i usuwanie mowy nienawiści i *fake news* z internetu będzie bardzo jednostronne i skończy się wybiórczą cenzurą polityczną.

Chciałbym w tym kontekście spytać kolegów, czy takie rzucane bez namysłu i wiedzy słowa, jak na przykład „populizm”, „populista”, „nacjonalista”, „putinizacja”, „antyeuropejskość”, inflacyjne używanie określenia „faszyzm” czy „faszyści”, to jest mowa nienawiści, czy nie? Przecież tego rodzaju określenia najczęściej nie służą do rzeczowej analizy czy charakterystyki poglądów i działań. Bardzo często są maczugą do okładania i dyskredytowania niewygodnych, zienawidzonych politycznie konkurentów.

Czy i one będą zatem usuwane i filtrowane?

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, extremist fake news and hate speech are all closely connected. They challenge the values on which the EU is based. However, each requires a different policy response. The concept of free speech protects not only that which we agree with, but also that which is critical or disturbing. We need to address the spread of false information by improving media literacy and critical thinking, as well as by better communicating why democracy, the rule of law and the protection of minorities and fundamental rights are key interests for everyone. By contrast, illegal hate speech that incites violence or hatred based on race, ethnic or national origin, colour or religion is not protected by free speech. It is illegal. The Commission will continue to make sure that EU law is enforced in the online, as well as in the offline, world.

In all these actions we have to bear in mind that it is our responsibility to protect fundamental rights and freedom of expression in the European Union. We have to believe in the common sense of our people. Once again, fake news is bad, but the Ministry of Truth is even worse. It was said more than a century ago that you can fool all the people some of the time and you can fool some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time; but it is still valid today.

Ian Borg, *President fil-Kariga tal-Kunsill*. – Nahseb illi l-kliem li uża l-Viċi President sabiex għalaq l-intervent tiegħu huma f'waqthom u ovvjament anki bhala Kunsill ahna smajna l-ħsibijiet li ġew espressi mill-Membri ta' din il-Kamra llum waranofsinar u jkomplu jikkonfermaw kemm għandna nimpjenjaw aktar rwieħna, mhux biss bhala Kunsill – li nixtieq nassigura lil din il-Kamra li żgur flimkien mal-Istati Membri ser inkomplu naraw illi l-leġizlazzjoni li għandna tkun osservata u allura anki jkun hemm ukoll tharis ahjar anki tal-vittmi; però l-ħtieġa anki li lkoll kemm ahna – l-istituzzjonijiet differenti u bhala ċittadini Ewropej aktar minn xejn – inkunu responsabbli għal dak kollu li nagħmlu u fuq kollox ngħidu.

Il-pjattaforma tal-internet u tal-mezzi soċjali aktar minn qatt qabel huma parti intrinsika minn ħajjitna u nemmen li l-aħħar haġa li għandna nesperjenzaw fuqhom ahna u uliedna hija l-mibegħda, il-ksenofobija u anki ahbarijiet li ma jagħmlux ġieħ lil min ikun qiegħed ixerridhom għaliex ma jkunx jista' jirbaħ l-argument bl-arma tal-verità.

Jiena konvint li kemm bhala Kunsill; anki bhala Presidenza, kif għedt: l-inizjattivi u l-avvenimenti li għandna matul dan is-semestru fuq dan is-sugġett u kif nistgħu ngħinu, kif ukoll anki l-Istati Membri, se jkunu qegħdin jagħtu l-piż xieraq lill-interventi li jagħmlu l-Membri ta' din il-Kamra u jkomplu jaħdmu flimkien sabiex b'determinazzjoni nindirizzaw l-isfidi f'dan is-settur.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit*. – Alors que l'Europe subit une crise sans précédent: 20 millions de chômeurs, précarité croissante, austérité, immigration de masse et surtout terrorisme islamique, l'UE ne trouve rien de mieux à faire que de lutter contre les prétendus discours de haine ou populistes. Populisme vient du latin «populus» qui signifie le peuple, qu'est ce qui dérange cette UE ? Est-elle contre la défense des intérêts des peuples? Partout les «fakenews» des médias et des politiques en place pour faire peur au peuple ne fonctionnent plus. On l'a vu au Royaume-Uni, aux États-Unis ou encore en Italie ou en Hongrie. Force est de constater que les citoyens ne veulent plus se laisser bernier d'illusions et que vos réponses ne sont rien démocratiques! Le big Brother d'Orwell n'aurait pas rêvé mieux! Les réseaux sociaux sont un outil formidable (même s'il faut demeurer prudent) de réinformation et de luttes contre votre pensée unique. Être contre le terrorisme ne signifie pas être islamophobe, être contre le mariage pour tous ne signifie pas être homophobe et lutter contre l'immigration de masse ne signifie pas être raciste! Je dis stop à la bien-pensance et oui à la vérité!

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – En tiempos como éstos contaminados por el discurso del odio, por la posverdad y por las noticias falsas la indiferencia puede llegar a ser criminal. Es necesario que la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI sea traspuesta correctamente para que despliegue todos sus efectos y contribuya a sentar los límites penales de una amenaza contra la democracia en la que Europa lo arriesga todo. Además, hace falta averiguar cómo se propaga el discurso del odio, cómo se financia, proteger a las víctimas en la red y en el mundo digital y, por supuesto, hace falta además saber que nombrar las cosas por su nombre es el comienzo del rigor para evitar que la banalización del mal sea la semilla del fascismo. Europa tiene una amenaza, se llama discurso del odio. Y Europa debe dar una respuesta, una respuesta que contemple los límites de la transigencia frente a los que desprecian a los diferentes y humillan a los inferiores.

Nicola Danti (S&D), *per iscritto*. – La circolazione di notizie false in rete – le cosiddette «fake news» - costituisce oggi un problema che deve essere affrontato il prima possibile su scala sovranazionale ed in maniera efficace. Internet rappresenta una straordinaria fonte di informazione che, tuttavia, può trasformarsi in un pericoloso strumento di manipolazione artificiosa della realtà con il fine di indebolire e dissipare il consenso attorno ai valori fondamentali su cui si fonda l'Unione europea.

La giusta e doverosa libertà di fare informazione attraverso la rete ha infatti messo in luce la necessità di una regolamentazione chiara che fornisca maggiore certezza circa le responsabilità giuridiche di coloro che, attraverso la potenza amplificativa dei social media, fanno leva sulla creazione e diffusione di calunnie, menzogne e sull'incitamento all'odio razziale ed istituzionale per generare introiti, noncuranti dei devastanti effetti sociali che siffatte attività comportano.

Poiché la rete non ha né confini né barriere, la questione può essere affrontata efficacemente solo a livello internazionale. Accolgo quindi con favore la discussione apertasi oggi in Parlamento sul tema ed auspico che tale riflessione coinvolga quanto prima anche le altre istituzioni UE per arrivare a risposte pronte, concrete ed efficaci.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – Un'intera e vecchia società dell'informazione facilmente controllabile ed asservita al potere politico ed economico è sempre più in crisi. Incitamento all'odio e *fake news* non nascono con l'avvento di Internet e dei social media, non si manifestano esclusivamente attraverso questi canali. Informazioni che hanno distorto la realtà, diffuse dai media tradizionali, e che sono servite a giustificare guerre e manovre di determinati gruppi di potere sono ricorrenti nelle società contemporanee.

Il rischio che dietro alle richieste di un'eccessiva regolamentazione di Internet si determini una forma di censura di canali informativi alternativi è evidente. Discorsi carichi di odio e false notizie hanno terreno facile in tutte quelle situazioni dove assistiamo a mancanza di trasparenza, dove vi è carenza di controllo democratico. Basti pensare ai processi decisionali che avvengono con modalità sconosciute alla maggior parte delle persone da parte di organi non eletti da nessuno.

I cittadini hanno diritto di conoscere la verità e vedersi tutelata la propria libertà di espressione. Quello di cui hanno bisogno non sono bavagli, ma politiche che sappiano offrire loro strumenti di conoscenza, che riescano a colmare lacune di istruzione e disparità economiche, al fine di sentirsi informati, consapevoli e pienamente liberi.

Eugen Freund (S&D), *scritto*. – Natürlich wissen wir Politiker genau, was Hasstiraden im Netz anrichten können. Jeder von uns wird das schon miterlebt haben. Aber das ist nichts gegen das, was Teenager oder auch erwachsene Frauen über sich ergehen lassen müssen. So werden ganz schnell aus den sozialen Medien unsoziale Medien – die in schlimmsten Fällen auch dazu führen können, dass Menschen wegen der Angriffe auf sie ihrem Leben ein Ende bereiten. Schon deshalb müssen wir hier – mit aller gegebenen Vorsicht – besonders aufmerksam sein und uns Maßnahmen überlegen. Ein ähnliches gesellschaftspolitisches Problem stellen die sogenannten *fake news* dar. Während diese Abart des Journalismus vor allem im vergangenen Wahlkampf in den USA eine große Rolle gespielt und die Aufmerksamkeit der etablierten Medien auf sich gezogen hat, ist dieses Phänomen auch im Bereich der EU immer häufiger vorzufinden. Eine zusätzliche Gefahr besteht auch darin, dass sich Spieler von außen immer häufiger dieser Lügen bedienen, um einen Keil zwischen europäische Gesellschaftsschichten zu treiben. Immer mehr Menschen vertrauen bei ihrem Nachrichtenkonsum – und der schließt mittlerweile auch *fake news* ein – dem Internet. Deshalb müssen wir müssen hier europaweit sensibilisieren und mit der Aufklärung rasch beginnen.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Europa tiene presente una amenaza ante sí, y es el denominado discurso del odio. Una respuesta por parte de Europa es necesaria, esta debe contemplar los límites de la tolerancia frente a aquellos que desprecian a los diferentes y humillan a los inferiores. Hace falta descubrir el modo en el que se propaga el discurso del odio, como se financia, así como proteger a las víctimas en la red y en el mundo digital. En tiempos como éstos, contaminados por el discurso del odio, por la posverdad y por las noticias falsas, la indiferencia puede llegar a ser criminal. Es necesario que la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI sea traspuesta correctamente para que despliegue todos sus efectos y contribuya a sentar los límites penales de una amenaza contra la democracia, en la que Europa lo arriesga todo.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Si stima che siano 3,4 miliardi gli utenti di Internet. Questo vuol dire che una *fake news* può raggiungere 3 miliardi e mezzo di persone con un solo *click*. Per le notizie girare il mondo su Internet è facile: qualche condivisione ed ecco che notizie come «Il Papa sostiene Donald Trump» rimbalza ovunque, da un continente all'altro. Inutile dire che le smentite non raggiungono mai la stessa diffusione della notizia primaria. L'informazione falsata è ormai un fenomeno consolidato addirittura cavalcato e sfruttato da chi fa *business* con i *click* e la pubblicità, certamente tutto ciò va contrastato attraverso la responsabilizzazione delle piattaforme *online* che pubblicano le notizie.

Notizie che di volta in volta, di bugie in bugie, condizionano la società civile, le scelte elettorali, la formazione dell'opinione pubblica e gli equilibri sociali. Le *fake news* sono accurate e scientifiche costruzioni di chi spesso ha un disegno politico specifico. Non è semplice, regolamentare il *web* è controverso, difficile. Oltre che la normativa, necessaria a punire chi diffonde notizie false, bisogna combattere le *fake news* sul loro stesso campo, con notizie reali e veritiere, con una militanza di verità. Con un'informazione semplice ed efficace che si opponga alla strumentalità del populismo, la forza della ragione contro la forza della falsità.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – En tiempos como éstos, contaminados por el discurso del odio, por la posverdad y por las noticias falsas la indiferencia puede llegar a ser criminal. Es necesario que la Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI sea traspuesta correctamente para que despliegue todos sus efectos y contribuya a sentar los límites penales de una amenaza contra la democracia en la que Europa lo arriesga todo. Además, hace falta averiguar cómo se propaga el discurso del odio, cómo se financia, proteger a las víctimas en la red y en el mundo digital y, por supuesto, hace falta además saber que nombrar las cosas por su nombre es el comienzo del rigor para evitar que la banalización del mal sea la semilla del fascismo. Europa tiene una amenaza, se llama discurso del odio. Y Europa debe dar una respuesta, una respuesta que contemple los límites de la transigencia frente a los que desprecian a los diferentes y humillan a los inferiores.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Populistyczna retoryka, mowa nienawiści i fałszywe informacje rozpowszechniane głównie za pomocą mediów społecznościowych to narastający problem, którego nie możemy ignorować. W świecie wszechobecnego internetu obieg informacji nie tylko przyspieszył, ale też znacznie się zdemokratyzował: niemal każdy może, pozostając najczęściej anonimowym, wypuścić do sieci informację dostępną dla setek czy dziesiątek milionów obywateli. Mamy już też coraz więcej dowodów na to, że takie działania nacelowane są na wywołanie określonych skutków politycznych: destabilizację istniejących rządów bądź wpływ na wyniki wyborów. Dlatego cieszę się, że udało się podjąć już pierwsze kroki w celu zwalczania tego zjawiska, takie jak grupa zadaniowa East StratCom, której działania obejmują m.in. walkę z fałszywymi informacjami. Przez niemal półtora roku działalności udało się jej ujawnić ponad 2,5 tysiąca takich spraw, co z jednej strony dowodzi jej skuteczności, z drugiej zaś ukazuje ogromną skalę tego zjawiska. Uważam, że wobec powagi tego problemu należy zastanowić się zarówno nad wzmocnieniem tej grupy, jak i innymi intensywnymi działaniami mającymi na celu przeciwdziałanie mowie nienawiści i populizmom.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *napisan*. – Internet može biti vrlo koristan alat za ostvarivanje slobode izražavanja, iako je potrebno uzeti u obzir i štetne svrhe koje može imati. Sloboda govora jedno je od temeljni pravila Europske unije, međutim sve češći lažni profili na društvenim mrežama ukazuju na to da se isti koriste za širenje govora mržnje, lažnih vijesti, regrutiranje i propagandu, te se time krše temeljna ljudska prava. Ekstremizam je sve prisutniji na društvenim mrežama, te nastavno tome pojedine države članice uvode posebne zakone kako bi se takvo što spriječilo. Evidentno je da su potrebne jasne smjernice kojima bi se poduzele učinkovite mjere za ograničavanje širenja govora mržnje i lažnih vijesti.

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Bajo la denominación del discurso del odio, el artículo 510 del Código Penal español incorpora un catálogo de conductas omnicomprendivas que castiga con la pena de prisión de uno a cuatro años. Tipos penales como el que acabo de citar, son el resultado que consigue el legislador cuando está pensando exclusivamente en castigar y no respeta estrictamente los términos y conceptos fijados en la DM2008/913/JAI. Hoy en día, que una opinión sea pública es casi inevitable como consecuencia de la revolución de las redes sociales. Pero ¿qué discursos son susceptibles de delito? La tendencia en el Derecho internacional y en el TEDH es la de no condenar las expresiones de odio salvo cuando éstas contribuyen de forma directa a la discriminación o violencia. Es decir, se aboga por la interpretación restrictiva. Esto demuestra que los Estados miembros no siempre cumplen con los estándares europeos y crean delitos de odio que simbolizan el desprecio por la libertad de expresión, creencia e ideología, que no hay que olvidar, son derechos fundamentales. Ya está bien de utilizar la ley como cajón de sastre. La Unión Europea y el Parlamento Europeo tienen que garantizar que el discurso del odio solo sea objeto de persecución penal cuando engendre realmente un peligro potencial de actos discriminatorios o violentos.

Krystyna Łybacka (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Mowa nienawiści to bardzo poważny, ale niestety często bagatelizowany problem, który może mieć poważne konsekwencje dla porządku społecznego, narastania agresji, przemocy, konfliktów. Obecnie obserwujemy niepokojący wzrost tego zjawiska w internecie, mediach społecznościowych oraz dyskursie politycznym. Mowa nienawiści rodzi się głównie z niewiedzy, uprzedzeń, czy braku szacunku i tolerancji dla odmienności. Jedynym długofalowym i skutecznym narzędziem walki z tymi zjawiskami jest edukacja. Edukacja pozwala na rozpoznanie propagandy i mowy nienawiści, ich zwalczanie oraz zapobieganie. Począwszy od wykształcenia umiejętności krytycznego myślenia, poprzez rozwijanie umiejętności dyskusji, komunikacji, tolerancji, edukacja umożliwia bezpieczne i odpowiedzialne korzystanie z internetu i mediów społecznościach. Dlatego istotne jest, aby programy edukacyjne ukierunkowane na osoby w różnym wieku i z różnych środowisk podejmowały tematykę korzystania z mediów i umiejętności krytycznego myślenia. Kwestie te powinny także zostać włączone w nowy europejski program na rzecz umiejętności. Kluczowe jest także zintensyfikowanie działań, we współpracy z Radą Europy, na rzecz promocji edukacji na każdym szczeblu w walce z mową nienawiści oraz organizowanie kampanii społecznych na rzecz zwalczania rasizmu i ksenofobii w internecie. Podkreślam także naszą ogromną rolę, jako polityków, w obronie społeczeństwa przed mową nienawiści i ochronie jego praw, poprzez podnoszenie świadomości na temat praw człowieka, promowanie poszanowania wolności wyrażania opinii oraz kultury politycznej.

Ramona Nicole Mănescu (PPE), *in writing*. – Fake news or, as it likes to call itself, ‘alternative news’, is not news. Yet today the scale of this phenomenon is astounding. How does it sustain itself? Let’s follow the money! Journalists found fake news websites, fake products, promoted by fake photos, fake names and fake statements and advertising agencies. All of them getting real money from gullible readers and buyers and all connected through ownership. We are talking about a huge audience and a system that produces countless financial resources. Underneath there is a whole machinery which goes much deeper than just a room with internet trolls, somewhere in Moscow. Are we worried? Apparently some of us are not. Someone asked here today: ‘who can have the authority to say what is true and what is false’. This gives credit to something that is both junk and malicious. Later I heard ‘who has the right to remove or censor the information’. A piece of junk becomes ‘information’ and later ‘freedom of speech and opinion’. That is both irresponsible and dangerous. The EU must build, as soon as possible, an institutional and legal framework capable to create the specific antibodies needed to protect European citizens from this disease.

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. – The liberal value system prevailing in Western Europe since the end of World War II has created a tolerant, open society that allows diversity, freedom of thought and speech and respect for human rights to flourish among us. However, if not in crisis, this value system is straining to cope with the ethical and social tensions generated, inter alia, by technological innovation, especially in the communications field, intercultural disparities within societies, immigration, terrorism and rising social inequalities.

In responding to these tensions, we need to update the expression of our values to make them consistent with the times, while enhancing Europe’s tolerant and liberal profile. For instance, when does the right to offend, which we recognise, become equivalent to hate speech? Under what conditions does the full observance of traditional religious customs contradict liberal practices? What justification can be advanced for rigid surveillance of internet traffic, including its ‘censorship’ in order to combat, say, ‘fake news’? To what extent should an individual’s right to privacy prevail over surveillance measures intended to address concerns about internet and other criminal activity, such as tax fraud and hate speech? We do not have clear-cut, satisfactory replies to such questions.

Claudia Țăpădel (S&D), *în scris*. – Discursul urii, populismul și știrile false sunt trei fenomene care au cunoscut o creștere îngrijorătoare în ultimii ani. Cetățenii UE sunt expuși din ce în ce mai mult unor campanii de dezinformare și propagandă, iar așa cum am văzut deja în cazul Brexit, acestea par a da rezultate.

Acest lucru ar trebui să ne îngrijoreze și să luăm o poziție fermă împotriva celor care dezinformează intenționat. Având în vedere că ne apropiem de două scrutine electorale foarte importante în Franța și Germania, este important să rămânem vigilenți și să nu permitem ca dezbaterile să fie deturnate de oameni și organizații care mizează pe ură și frică pentru a câștiga.

Trebuie să pedepsim drastic discursul urii, inclusiv antisemitismul și anti-islamismul, dar și știrile false. În același timp, cu scopul de a preveni propagarea informațiilor false, susțin consolidarea instituțiilor mass-media, pentru ca acestea să fie obiective, imparțiale și independente.

Îmi exprim sprijinul pentru investiții în toate statele membre pentru creșterea gradului de conștientizare și educație, inclusiv pentru utilizarea platformelor digitale. Acest lucru le-ar permite cetățenilor să analizeze în mod critic conținutul media și informațiile pe care le accesează pe internet, contribuind la siguranța personală, națională și europeană.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Although the Soviet Union collapsed at the beginning of the 1990s, the Russian Federation acclaimed itself as its legal successor, and the former Soviet intelligence mechanism known as the KGB went through a metamorphosis and took control of the state with Vladimir Putin coming to power in 2000. The Putin regime understood that the same tricks used by the KGB during the Cold War could be used in a modern context. The combination of hate speech, populism and fake news, with the aid of social media, was a perfect way to gain political leverage over the EU, NATO, and the Western World.

It is time for us, collectively, to take back the steering wheel. The truth will always prevail.

Mihai Țurcanu (PPE), *în scris*. – În epoca „post-adevărului”, cum au sintetizat unii momentul istoric pe care-l trăim din cauza instrumentalizării internetului, devine prioritară pentru UE combaterea știrilor false, a așa-ziselor surse alternative de informare și a avalanșei propagandistice. De regulă, haosul informațional și intoxicarea mediatică lucrează în folosul forțelor extremiste, anti-europene, ostile proiectului integrator și pacifist al Uniunii Europene.

Social media este sursa principală de informare pentru o treime dintre tinerii europeni. De aceea, conținutul ilegal online, știrile false și discursul bazat pe ură trebuie combătute ferm și eficient. Sunt necesare resurse umane, tehnice și financiare adecvate dimensiunilor provocării.

Și, în acest sens, atrag atenția asupra a două crize majore potențate de noile tehnologii: recrutarea de jihadiști și coordonarea de atacuri teroriste de către Statul Islamic, respectiv războiul informațional declanșat de Rusia împotriva UE. Combaterea propagandei ostile și corecta informare a cetățenilor sunt obligații de ordin strategic în acest context ostil.

Anna Záborská (PPE), *pisomne* – V stredu popoludní prebehla v pléne rozprava o nenávisných prejavoch, populizme a falošných správach. Považujem za dobré a dôležité, aby poslanci všetkých politických skupín o týchto témach diskutovali, pretože populizmus a lož v kombinácii s novými technológiami a službami, ako je internet, sociálne siete či schopnosť zbierať a vyhodnocovať veľké množstvá informácií o každom, kto používa internet, môže za určitých okolností predstavovať ohrozenie demokracie a slobody. Na druhej strane nesmieme dopustiť, aby sa rozmazala hranica medzi potláčaním nenávisných prejavov a obmedzovaním slobody myslenia, svedomia a náboženského presvedčenia. Niektoré z týchto problémov, ktorým dnes čelia občania všetkých členských štátov, môžu riešiť zákony, ale zďaleka nie všetky. Ukazuje sa napríklad, že krajiny s kvalitným školstvom sú oveľa odolnejšie voči falošným správam a dezinformáciám. Lenže kvalita vzdelávania sa nedá zmeniť zo dňa na deň, ani z roka na rok. Parlament k tejto téme nebude prijímať žiadne uznesenie. Vystúpenia poslancov z jednotlivých frakcií však budú zaujímavým signálom o tom, či v odpovediach na tieto témy existuje konsenzus alebo sme zatiaľ len v štádiu analyzovania problémov a navrhovania riešení, pričom niektoré sa dopĺňajú, zatiaľ čo iné si navzájom konkurujú.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), *na písme*. – Kryzys w strefie euro ujawnił głębokie nierówności strukturalne w Unii, poczucie podziału na wygranych i przegranych procesów globalizacyjnych, które doprowadziło do wzrostu eurosceptycyzmu wśród wyborców i umożliwiło partiom populistycznym zdobycie władzy w wielu krajach europejskich. Populiści podważają fundamenty demokracji m.in. poprzez próby osłabienia niezawisłości sądownictwa i niezależności mediów, często również poprzez tworzenie sztucznych podziałów w społeczeństwie opartych na dychotomii „my” przeciwko „nim”. Dodatkowo obserwujemy próby wpływu na sytuację w Europie podejmowane z zewnątrz poprzez szerzenie dezinformacji, co może stanowić element wojny hybrydowej. Populizm wewnątrz UE i dezinformacja płynąca z zewnątrz to dwa złożone zjawiska, które jednak są ze sobą ściśle powiązane. Posługują się podobnymi technikami manipulacji i dlatego musimy razem rozpatrywać środki zapobiegawcze. Odpowiedzią ze strony UE na dezinformację, stosowaną także przez populistów, może być tylko bezstronna, wiarygodna i obiektywna komunikacja oraz przepływ informacji oparty na rzetelnych faktach. Aby udostępnić obywatelom UE dostęp do takiej informacji potrzebne jest przede wszystkim wzmocnienie pluralizmu i niezależności mediów w Unii Europejskiej i jej sąsiedztwie. Elementem uzupełniającym jest edukacja na wszystkich poziomach, która zapewni niezbędną wiedzę i umiejętności krytycznego analizowania treści medialnych oraz reagowania na dezinformację.

14. Veleprodajni trgi gostovanja (razprava)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Miapetra Kumpala-Natri, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (UE) n° 531/2012 en ce qui concerne les règles applicables aux marchés de gros de l'itinérance (COM(2016)0399 — C8-0219/2016 — 2016/0185(COD)) (A8-0372/2016).

Miapetra Kumpala-Natri, *rapporteur*. – Madam Chairman, a long-standing priority will now finally become a reality. On 15 June, roaming surcharges will be a thing of the past for European citizens travelling in the European Union. Europeans will no longer face huge phone bill shocks after travelling in another EU country. In June, Europeans can use their phones just like at home without paying extra. Before, Europeans used to switch off when they crossed a border. This summer, Europeans will be able to call their friends from the beach, tweet from the work conference, or check emails and social media from Lisbon to Latvia, from Dublin to Dubrovnik, without fear of surcharges.

Often we are asked what is the benefit of the European Union, and what is the significance of the internal market, for citizens? We are and we will be reminded of the roaming surcharges when leaving the internal market when travelling outside EU borders. I will give you a concrete example: I checked many European operators, big and small, on the prices for data roaming when travelling to Croatia and to Serbia – neighbouring countries. Travelling to Croatia, a Member State of the EU, applying the rules of the internal market, the cost of using one gigabyte abroad after 15 June will be no extra cost on my tariff plan as it is included in my tariff plan at home. When travelling to Serbia, a neighbouring country but outside the EU, how much do you think that one gigabyte would cost? Make a guess! The bill sent to me would be thousands of euros for using that one gigabyte! What is the reason for this? It is that operators in visited countries, and visiting operators, can both charge much more than needed from the consumer without regulation of the internal market that has now been created over the decade by reducing roaming costs within the EU.

Tomorrow we will vote on the last piece of legislation to make ‘roam-like-at-home’ a reality. It sets a price cap for what operators can charge each other when their consumers travel. The European Parliament defended the interests of the citizens, competitive markets and small operators. As a rapporteur, I am proud of this result. I am proud of what we can achieve together. Together we have reached a dramatic drop in the prices from the original proposal by the Commission. The most important was the price on the data caps. The lower data price cap benefits European citizens directly. The lower the price on data, the more data Europeans can use when they travel.

Mobile data plays a key role in today’s digital society. The use of data is growing rapidly. Data will play an even more important role in the future. Today, Europeans use mobiles everywhere; opportunities are unlimited. Already today, mobiles are used for many services. We follow news online, order bus tickets, make restaurant reservations, use maps, look for tourist attractions, play mobile games and we can stay connected with our colleagues online. All the time we can do more and more on our mobile services using mobile data. The services must not stop at the internal borders of the European Union.

The end of roaming surcharges contributes to the freedom of European citizens; it contributes to the development of the internal market, connectivity and the use of electronic services wherever Europeans travel in the EU. I want to thank shadow rapporteurs representing all parliamentary political groups, the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, all of you my colleagues, the Commission and the Council for supporting this achievement.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the Commission warmly welcomes the political agreement achieved by the co-legislators at the end of January. It is a great achievement that will have an immediate positive impact on the lives of millions of Europeans from 15 June this year. I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Ms Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, and all honourable Members of Parliament who were involved in this work.

This is the result of more than 10 years of regulatory effort by the EU institutions. During this time, several of you played key roles in reducing roaming prices in the European Union from extremely high levels. Two years ago, Ms Pilar del Castillo led critical negotiations from which the decision emerged for full abolition of roaming charges while travelling in the European Union. Several additional steps had to be taken for this to become a reality. The main step was to reduce wholesale roaming prices. Without this, many operators would not have been able to eliminate roaming charges without increasing their domestic prices. This was technically complicated and involved finding an adequate political balance.

The new caps on wholesale roaming prices agreed with the Council – and on which you will vote tomorrow – will allow operators to provide roaming at the domestic price. At the same time, they will ensure that the networks visited can recover their wholesale costs. In addition, as you know, the Commission delivered the implementing regulation on fair use policy in time last year on 15 December, after a lively debate with stakeholders, Member States and Members of this House. Thanks to all our efforts together, the ‘roam-like-at-home’ system is now fully designed and predictable.

We have shown people across Europe that the EU institutions can deliver, also in difficult times. The widespread positive media reaction reflects that. With this deal, we should not forget that we have achieved a much more vibrant Digital Single Market. It brings many new possibilities that will benefit all of us, if they are used properly. The Commission therefore strongly urges the European Parliament to adopt the new regulation on wholesale roaming markets.

Paul Rübzig, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Recht herzlichen Dank. Ich möchte vor allem der Kommission für den Vorschlag gratulieren. Wir feiern heute den zehnten Geburtstag der Roaming-Regulierung. Eine Studentin aus Linz hat eine Beschwerde an mich herangebracht, und seitdem verhandeln wir Roaming. Wir haben uns immer drei Jahre vorgenommen, eine *sunset clause*, die es uns ermöglicht, jetzt die Roaming-4-Periode zu Ende zu bringen. In Wahrheit bereiten wir ja jetzt schon die fünfte Runde für den digitalen Binnenmarkt vor.

Und zehn Jahre heißt: Wir haben ein Kind, das zehn Jahre alt ist und das jetzt ein bisschen versteht, wie der digitale Binnenmarkt aussehen muss. Wir haben es jetzt erreicht, dass zumindest eine Konkurrenz innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten stattfindet und dass unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger endlich auf Urlaub gehen können, unsere kleinen und mittleren Betriebe endlich ihre Geschäftsreise machen können innerhalb der Europäischen Union und hier den gleichen Tarif bezahlen wie zu Hause. Also muss man nicht mehr zwei Telefone, zwei SIM-Karten haben, wenn man innerhalb der Europäischen Union reist: Natürlich ist es außerhalb der Europäischen Union noch immer sehr gefährlich. Da gehen die Tarife für ein Gigabyte bis zu 19 900 Euro, während wir heute in der Europäischen Union einen Durchschnittspreis von 2,77 Euro haben. Und wir werden erst 2022 so weit sein, dass diese Großhandelsobergrenze von 2,50 Euro unter dem durchschnittlichen heutigen Preis liegt.

Also wir legen hier keine Preise fest, sondern wir definieren nur, wo Betrug beginnt, und ich glaube, das ist auch richtig so, dass sich die Bürgerinnen und Bürger auf uns verlassen können. Wir haben natürlich auch sichergestellt, dass es zu keiner Erhöhung in den nationalen Tarifen kommt, dass die Konkurrenz auf der nationalen Ebene stattfinden kann und – das ist das Wichtigste – dass auch in Zukunft für Investment gesorgt ist. Wir brauchen dringend den *fibre rollout*, wir brauchen dringend 5G, damit gegenüber Wi-Fi eine gleiche technologische Grundlage entsteht und ein wirklicher digitaler Binnenmarkt entstehen kann.

Marlene Mizzi, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I would like to congratulate my colleague, Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, and the Maltese Presidency for reaching an agreement on the wholesale roaming markets.

The rules agreed were significantly lower caps, designed to allow mobile phone operators to offer free roaming to their customers without increasing domestic prices at home. The caps will also have a direct impact on how much mobile data a consumer can use when abroad. The lower the cap, the larger the amount of data.

This was the last stumbling block standing in the way of ending roaming charges as of 15 June of this year. This was the last, but definitely not the least. The pieces of the puzzle leading to meet the 15 June deadline to abolish roaming charges are now all in place. In two months, people travelling across Europe will pay no more extra costs for using their phones. Soon, roaming charges will be a thing of the past, and people will not even remember their existence.

It is satisfying indeed that Europe has managed to deliver on its promise to abolish roaming charges. This is the end of a very long battle for the Parliament, which started almost six years ago, a battle which was faced with a lot of opposition from different sides. This is why it is an honour for me to have been part of this battle and, in particular, part of the S&D team, who not only started it but followed it right through to the very end, until today's success story.

However, for me, the fight is not over. and now it is time to push for the next step: to make intra-EU calls non-discriminatory with the same prices for domestic and cross-border calls and SMS, so that consumers will be able to do business and speak with friends and colleagues living in another country without worrying about excessive bills at the end of each month.

Evžen Tošenovský, *za skupinu ECR*. – Paní předsedající, i když nejsem příznivcem velkých evropských regulací, v případě roamingu se bohužel ukázalo, že tento administrativní zásah je nutný. Trh v těchto přeshraničních telekomunikačních službách dlouhodobě nebyl schopen nalézt rozumné parametry.

Věřím, že ze zavedení principu *roam-like-at-home* a z rozumných cen hlavně za datové služby nebudou těžit jen občané, ale celkově napomůže rozvoji digitální ekonomiky. Chtěl bych ocenit velkou práci, kterou odvedla Miapetra Kumpula-Natriová jako zpravodajka a celý tým stínových zpravodajů, mých kolegů, a jsem velmi poctěn, že jsem se mohl účastnit této práce. A jsem rád, že se po mnoha hodinách jednání podařilo najít s Radou řešení stropů pro velkoobchodní datové přenosy, které umožní konec roamingu.

Myslím, že nalezený kompromis je ve výsledku rozumným řešením. Tím, že budou v dalších letech stoupat objemy přenesených dat, maximální cenové stropy mohou výrazně klesat. Měli bychom ale také naše občany edukovat a očekával bych v tomto aktivní přístup Komise ve věci omezení souvisejícího s takzvanou politikou férového využívání.

Ještě jednou blahopřeji paní zpravodajce ke skvělé práci.

Fredrick Federley, för ALDE-gruppen. – Fru talman! Till att börja med vill jag gratulera Mia-Petra Kumpula och alla hennes kollegor, oavsett politisk färg. Vi är nu många, även ALDE, som vill passa på att säga att det här var vår idé, men det hade inte gått att genomföra om inte kommissionen hade varit en del av det, och om det inte hade varit så att alla politiska grupper faktiskt ville ta de här stegen.

Det som också är viktigt i den här processen, det är att se att den debatt som har pågått hela tiden har också påverkat marknaden. Vi kan se hemma i Sverige hur stora teleoperatörer redan börjar göra sig av med roamingavgifterna, så att innan lagstiftningen ens är på plats börjar det hända stora grejer på den europeiska marknaden.

Det här kan också bli ett bra grundfundament för mycket som vi behöver fortsätta att göra. I en av mina första debatter i den här kammaren ville man bryta upp Googles monopolställning. För mig var det så förvånande att ingen i kammaren ställde sig frågan varför vi inte har ett europeiskt baserat Google. Där är svaret för mig ganska uppenbart: vi inte har klarat av att skapa en gemensam marknad där det finns konkurrens och där det finns växtmöjlighet för digitalt baserade företag och telekomföretag i tillräckligt stor utsträckning. Flera telekombolag har kunnat göra stora pengar på att dra in roamingavgifterna, men här har vi sagt att det är viktigt att de europeiska medborgarna har möjlighet att röra sig över gränserna för att arbeta, röra sig över gränserna för att resa och besöka andra delar av Europa, utan att komma hem och behöva lägga hela nästa månadslön på att betala räkningar.

Det här skapar såklart nya digitala möjligheter, men arbetet är inte färdigt. Vi måste se till att vi kommer längre med den digitala agendan för hela Europa. Vi ser en stor konkurrens idag från USA. Asien står runt hörnet. Indien kommer inte att vänta på att Europa ska få en gemensam marknad innan de agerar. Det här är ett första steg på vägen – många viktiga delar är kvar – och vi måste såklart också följa implementeringsprocessen för att se att den blir seriös och bra.

João Ferreira, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhora Presidente, em outubro de 2015, quando aqui discutimos o mercado único europeu das comunicações eletrónicas, lembrámos os alertas feitos por várias entidades reguladoras nacionais, segundo as quais, em face dos fluxos turísticos dominantes na Europa, os países do sul saíam prejudicados com o fim das tarifas de *roaming* na União Europeia. Avisamos então que não existia ainda uma resposta convincente para estes alertas. Um ano e meio depois assim continuamos. Sem resposta convincente, sem a certeza de que não serão os consumidores dos países do sul a pagar nas suas tarifas domésticas os custos do fim do *roaming* na União Europeia.

Intervimos neste processo com um objetivo claro: viabilizar o fim das sobretaxas de itinerância ao nível do retalho, ou seja o fim das tarifas de *roaming* para os consumidores na União Europeia, mas eliminando, ao mesmo tempo, o risco dos custos que resultam do *roaming*, nomeadamente os custos que resultam do aumento da pressão sazonal sobre as redes nacionais serem repercutidos nas tarifas domésticas nacionais.

Do nosso ponto de vista havia e há formas mais eficazes de o garantir do que as disposições que vieram a ser adotadas. Mas foi opção, quer da Comissão, quer da relatora, não as considerar neste regulamento. A lógica da liberalização e da mirífica livre concorrência subjacente ao mercado único das comunicações, neste como noutros setores, concluo, serve os interesses de grandes grupos económicos e a concentração monopolista à escala europeia. Não serve nem os interesses dos consumidores, nem o interesse nacional.

Michel Reimon, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Auch ich möchte der Berichterstatteerin und den Schattenberichterstatteern und auch der Kommission danken. Es waren sehr gute, sehr konstruktive Verhandlungen. Wir können mit dem Ergebnis so weit zufrieden sein, auch wenn gerade die Parlamentsseite gerne noch mehr gewollt hätte und gerade wir als Abgeordnete gewollt hätten, dass unsere Bürger und Bürgerinnen schon diesen Sommer oder zumindest so schnell wie möglich gar kein Roaming mehr empfinden und sich in ganz Europa wie zu Hause bewegen. Das wäre eigentlich unser politisches Ziel gewesen.

Der vorherige Tagesordnungspunkt war zum Thema *fake news*, Populismus und so weiter im Internet und sozialen Medien, da ging es um die negativen Seiten dieses Phänomens. Aber wir müssen uns darüber im Klaren sein, dass wir hier über die neue öffentliche Sphäre der Demokratie sprechen, wenn wir über digitale Medien reden, wenn wir über Onlinesein reden und darüber, dass das zuallererst eine demokratiepolitische Frage ist und erst als Zweites eine Frage des Marktes – so sollten zumindest wir in der Politik das sehen.

Ich möchte auch darauf hinweisen: Es gibt so viel Kritik an der Europäischen Union und ihrer Überregulierung und ob sie sich in alles einmischen muss. Das ist ein Beispiel, an dem wir stolz darauf hinweisen sollten, was europäische Regulierung positiv bewirken kann. Wir müssen darauf hinweisen, dass der Markt in diesem Bereich jahrzehntelang versagt hat und kläglich versagt hat. Warum? Weil ein Konsument eine Kaufentscheidung nur dann treffen kann, wenn er oder sie erstens informiert ist und zweitens auch eine Auswahl und Entscheidungsmöglichkeit hat. Aber niemand schließt einen Telefonvertrag ab, weil er vielleicht drei Jahre später, vier Jahre später nach Serbien auf Urlaub fährt. Wenn er dann dorthin kommt, muss er – Frau Kollegin Kumpula-Natri hat das Beispiel gebracht – plötzlich mit seinem Vertrag 1 000 Euro pro Gigabyte zahlen, weil er keine Kaufentscheidung mehr darüber hat. So kann ein Markt nicht funktionieren.

Deswegen funktioniert in diesem Bereich Regulierung. Deswegen ist in diesem Bereich Regulierung notwendig, gut und demokratiepolitisch richtig. Man sieht den Unterschied zwischen einem Binnenmarkt und einer Freihandelszone hier auch ganz gut. Wenn wir uns eine gemeinsame Gesetzgebung geben, gemeinsam darauf achten, dass wir für die Konsumenten und Konsumentinnen das Beste rausholen, dann hat diese Europäische Union mehr als nur Existenzberechtigung, und ich glaube, das ist ein Beispiel, das wir möglichst laut hinausblasen sollten.

David Borrelli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dal 15 giugno le compagnie telefoniche aboliranno il costo del *roaming*. Sarà possibile per tutti i cittadini europei navigare e telefonare in tutta Europa alla stessa tariffa di casa.

Fantastico, sembra uno spot pubblicitario. Perché quello che ci sfugge è proprio l'attenzione verso la tariffa nazionale. Perché il rischio è che la compagnia telefonica possa in qualche maniera compensare i mancati introiti del *roaming* andando ad aumentare qualche servizio specifico a livello nazionale, servizio che poi incide su tutti i cittadini, anche quelli che magari all'estero non ci metteranno mai piede. E questo perché? Perché le tariffe dei servizi all'ingrosso sono ancora troppo alte, e non certo per colpa di questo Parlamento che, anzi, grazie a un nostro emendamento, le aveva addirittura dimezzate. È il Consiglio che le ha raddoppiate, non il Parlamento. È il Consiglio che le ha raddoppiate, scegliendo ancora una volta di stare dalla parte del più forte, cioè delle compagnie telefoniche mobili di grandi dimensioni, penalizzando i piccoli imprenditori e i cittadini tutti.

Allora su questo, Presidente, mi permetta di essere molto chiaro: ben venga l'abolizione del *roaming*, purché non si trasformi in una beffa, con aumenti a livello nazionale per tutti i cittadini.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, nous promettons aux Européens la quasi-gratuité de l'itinérance. Malheureusement, en économie, rien n'est réellement gratuit. Tout se paye.

Nous allons donner une chance à cette initiative. Néanmoins, n'y a-t-il pas un risque? D'une part, l'augmentation des tarifs nationaux pour compenser les pertes enregistrées dans l'itinérance. Est-ce au pauvre qui ne voyage pas de payer pour le riche qui voyage? Est-ce aux exclus de la mondialisation, qui vivent dans la pauvreté et la précarité, de payer pour ceux qui en bénéficient, qui ont la chance de pouvoir être connectés dans le monde? En France, seulement 40 % de la population profite de la mondialisation.

Deuxième risque, la baisse des investissements dans le réseau alors que nous devons nous préparer à la 5G et à la fibre optique. Enfin, la baisse des dépenses dans le domaine de la recherche et du développement alors que nous sommes déjà à l'écart par rapport au reste du monde.

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, the proposed abolition of roaming charges for mobile phone users has become an icon of how slow and cumbersome the European Union has become in its ability to make decisions.

This agreement has taken 10 years. In part, progress has been made, but the fact that the telecommunications industry has such huge lobbying power in Brussels has acted as a drag anchor on the progress that could have been made.

What brings down prices is rarely legislation. That is why light-touch legislation around the world is so much more effective. What brings change is competition. If the European Union had allowed for a truly free and competitive market then the charges would have been zeroed probably decades ago.

As ever, the EU has drummed up regulations, and we have heard already from a number of previous speakers that all will happen is that income revenue for the companies will then be derived from charging domestic customers much, much more. This is hardly fair, it is hardly equitable. I think this ought to go back for review again by the committee to try to look at a more lighter-touch approach and one that is speedier in terms of delivery.

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

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Besides the fact that you think it has taken far too long and you think it is bad, but also good, how would you like to say that we could have achieved this without the European Union? Because without the European Union we would not have a Union and you would not have a European system. So please explain for us all how things could have been faster without the European Union and how this could have been achieved without the European Union. I think this is a tremendous occasion to tell us all.

Diane James (NI), *blue-card answer*. – I do not think that you listened to the whole of my speech. The point that I made was that the lobbying power in Brussels, which is actively encouraged, actively interacted with by the European Union, has proved to be a drag anchor. That was the critical point that I was making.

I was also making the point that, across the world, a lighter touch in terms of regulation, one that does not involve trilogue: Council, Commission to the Parliament and then back all the way round things, would not have achieved where we are. The point I am making, therefore, is let us just put together three components: stop the lobbying, stop the drag anchor and stop the trilogue.

Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāj! Kolēģi! Es uzdošu jautājumu: "Kurš no mums var iztikt pilnīgi pats?" Ir cilvēki, kas, teiksim, dzīvo lauku reģionos, kas varbūt gādā paši savu ēdienu, pārtiku, to audzē. Viņi saka: "Nu, es varu iztikt pats!" Bet nu tad jāuzdod jautājums: "Kā tad jūs apgērbjaties? Vai veikalā iepērkat?"

Nē, nu ir arī teorētiski iespējams, ka Eiropā vēl kāds pats šuj visas savas drēbes. Bet agri vai vēlu tam cilvēkam būs jānopērk vai nu šujamadata, vai diegs, vai arklis, vai kas cits. Viņš būs daļēji atkarīgs no citiem. Un mēs šo sistēmu saucam par tirdzniecību. Un Eiropā mūsu milzu priekšrocība un tieši Eiropas Savienības lielākā priekšrocība ir tā, ka šī tirdzniecība notiek 500 000 000 cilvēku starpā bez iekšējām robežām, bez tarifiem, bez muitām, faktiski bez problēmām. Tā ir Eiropas Savienības lielākā priekšrocība vairumam mūsu pilsoņu.

Bet ir viena joma, kas absolūti izpaliek. Tas ir tad, kad mēs dodamies ar šīm ierīcēm, kas gandrīz katram, šodien pat skolas bērniem, ir kabatās, — ar mobilajiem telefoniem — ārpus mūsu valsts robežām. Pēkšņi tas it kā vienotais tirgus vairs nepastāv. Mēs maksājam daudz, daudz dārgāk.

Tagad šis likumprojekts, par ko mēs rīdīen balsosim, — par vairumtirdzniecības cenām — uzliks punktu uz “i” un iznīcinās tā saucamo viesabonēšanu, kas, kropļojot vienoto tirgu, ārzemēs mums liek maksāt krietni vairāk. Un mēs varēsim ārzemēs lietot telefonu un maksāt tāpat kā mājās, pilnveidojot iekšējo vienoto tirgu. Mēs neviens nedzīvojam vieni paši, mums ir vajadzīgs kopīgais Eiropas tirgus, arī digitālais tirgus. Paldies!

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

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL), ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Νομίζω ότι είναι δύσκολο να υπερασπιστεί κανείς την άποψη ότι δεν πρέπει να μειωθούν τα τέλη περιαγωγής. Έχουν ακουστεί, όμως, επιχειρήματα τα οποία είναι λογικά και λένε ότι οι εταιρείες είναι πολύ πιθανόν ή απόλυτα βέβαιο ότι θα μετακλίσουν τις απώλειές τους στους ντόπιους καταναλωτές και, αν λάβει κανείς υπόψη ότι μόνο το 30 % ή το 20 % ή το 40 % των ανθρώπων των διαφόρων χωρών μετακινείται σε άλλες χώρες, αυτό θα αποβεί εις βάρος κάποιων άλλων. Θέλω ο συνάδελφος να απαντήσει απλώς σε αυτό το ερώτημα.

Kyria Prōedre, epeidh̄ ech̄ zht̄isei na omil̄h̄sw kat̄a t̄h̄ diadikas̄ia «catch the eye», parakalō na afairedei to onoma mou apō ton kat̄alogo, dedomenou oti ech̄w parēmbēi tōra.

Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), atbilde uz zilās kartītes jautājumu. – Tiesi šeit ir tā sāls šajā likumdošanā — mēs šajā likumdošanā uzliekam vairumtirdzniecības cenu griestus, kas nozīmē to, ka, ja ir operatori, kuri gribētu pašmāju iedzīvotājiem likt maksāt vairāk, viņiem nebūs nekādu šādu attaisnojumu.

Otrs ir konkurence. Es nezīnu, kā jūsu dalībvalstī, bet manā dalībvalstī ir ļoti asa konkurence. Ja viens no mūsu operatoriem pēkšņi palielinās cenas, pārējie operatori tā klientus paņems sev, pazeminot cenas. Tiesi Latvijā mums šobrīd ir vieni no visizdevīgākajiem, t. i., zemākajiem, tarifiem visā Eiropā, — tur jau šobrīd piedāvā vienu cenu visā Eiropā, un tā ir zemāka nekā vairumā valstu pat iekšzemē.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio innanzitutto ringraziare la collega Kumpula-Natri che ha lavorato con lei per questo risultato, che è certo solo il primo passo, come ha detto il commissario in qualche intervista, ma certamente è un passo molto importante. Ci abbiamo lavorato per molti anni, Pilar del Castillo, Catherine Trautmann, che io voglio ricordare qui in quest’Aula per il lavoro fatto, io stessa, sul *Single Telecom Market* eccetera, per arrivare a questa agognata tariffa *like at home*.

Questo bel risultato però – l’abbiamo sentito anche prima, in quest’Aula, in un intervento del Movimento 5 Stelle – viene minimizzato, e si dice: «Ma come, c’è il *like at home* ma poi alzeranno l’*home*, troveranno dei trucchetti...». Ecco, questi colleghi che anche sulla stampa italiana hanno minimizzato questo risultato dimenticano che noi abbiamo posto, in quel provvedimento e nei precedenti, delle salvaguardie, delle cautele. Ci sarà un controllo, oltre alla concorrenza, caro collega Kariņš, e io prego davvero la Commissione, il BEREC e le autorità nazionali di essere molto vigili e attenti, perché noi l’abbiamo fatta sul serio, questa revisione del mercato all’ingrosso, per arrivare al risultato dell’abolizione del *roaming*, e non permetteremo giochini, né permetteremo che qualcuno svilisca questo provvedimento, come se non servisse.

Voglio approfittare per dire una seconda cosa al commissario. Passo avanti: dobbiamo dimostrare che noi facciamo sul serio, senza incertezze, non un passo avanti e uno indietro. Questa è una strada tracciata che deve arrivare fino in fondo, pena la perdita di credibilità di questa istituzione. A tal proposito, la scorsa settimana qualche dubbio si è verificato: sono uscite le linee guida del BEREC che hanno dato qualche adito, qualche interpretazione non chiara sulla clausola del *fair use*. Per fortuna la Commissione è intervenuta prontamente a chiarire le cose.

Ecco signor commissario, io le chiedo, signor Vicepresidente, che col sostegno del Parlamento si vigili perché nessuno scantoni da questa strada che è stata tracciata, che guarderà anche giustamente ai risultati finanziari, alla tenuta del bilancio delle imprese, ma sostanzialmente guarda ai cittadini con un gesto e una scelta che è stata molto simbolica, perché questo è qualcosa di simbolico dell’azione dell’Europa per l’interesse dei cittadini e per l’unità dei cittadini europei.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, on hyvä, että verkkovierailuiden tukkimarkkinoille Euroopassa asetetaan ensi kesänä hintakatto. Esitys on kuitenkin ongelmallinen. Suomessa se merkitsee hintojen nousua. Samalla kyseessä on tulonsiirto operaattoreille, joiden alueelle matkustavia on paljon. Jos mobiilidatan siirtohintaa nousee, esityksellä on vaikutuksia tiedonkulkuun ja muuhun taloudelliseen toimintaan. On esitetty myös huolia siitä, että tässä yhteydessä tapahtuu tulonsiirtoja vähän matkustavilta ja pienituloisilta kansalaisilta niille, joilla on varaa matkustella paljon ulkomailla.

Irlantilaisoperaattorit ovat jo keksineet ehdotuksesta porsaanreiän, jolla ne voivat jatkaa merkittävän lisähinnan perimistä datasta EU:n alueella. Irlannin viranomaisten vakuutteluista huolimatta ainakin The Independent -lehti arvelee, että viranomaisella tuskin on valtaa muuttaa tätä. On mielenkiintoista seurata, löytävätkö muidenkin maiden operaattorit vastavia porsaanreikiä.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Madam President, at long last this final piece of the long awaited end of roaming charges puzzle is concluded. This is a very important decision and conclusion for all Europeans. I am very glad that we, as Liberals, we, as the European Parliament, we, as European lawmakers have pushed very hard to put consumers and the public interest first; to lay a good foundation through the telecom single market for an ambitious digital single market that puts people first.

I would strongly encourage telecom providers to keep that in mind. Put consumers/people first. We will keep the pulse and we will have a review after two/two and a half years. I will say that I too prefer light-touch regulation but if it is necessary we will make sure that the market works well, that it is fit for the 21st century and that we ensure that there is no abuse of the market position by telecom operators or other companies.

I think this is an important step and I am glad we can conclude it with our vote.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σίγουρα υποστηρίζουμε την κατάργηση των τελών περιαγωγής, εφόσον αυτό θα ανακουφίσει οικονομικά τους καταναλωτές. Για εμάς είναι ξεκάθαρο πως οι τηλεπικοινωνίες και το Διαδίκτυο αποτελούν δημόσια κοινωνικά αγαθά, στα οποία πρέπει όλοι να έχουμε ισότιμη πρόσβαση.

Ωστόσο, η πρόταση που έχουμε ενώπιόν μας εμπερικλείει πολλούς κινδύνους. Αρχικά, δεν περιλαμβάνει καμία πρόνοια για αποκατάσταση της ανισορροπίας που θα δημιουργηθεί λόγω του διαφορετικού αριθμού τουριστών που δέχεται η κάθε χώρα. Έτσι, οι χώρες του Νότου, που δέχονται τα μεγαλύτερα κύματα τουριστών, θα επιβαρυνθούν με ένα τεράστιο κόστος το οποίο θα κληθούν να πληρώσουν οι εγχώριοι πάροχοι.

Έπειτα, δεν υπάρχει καμία εγγύηση πως εν τέλει δεν θα πληρώσουν το κόστος οι ντόπιοι. Αντιθέτως, είναι βέβαιο πως, προκειμένου να επιβιώσουν οι εγχώριοι πάροχοι, θα μετακυλίσουν το κόστος στους καταναλωτές, αυξάνοντας τις εγχώριες χρεώσεις. Ιδιαίτερο πλήγμα θα δεχθούν οι χώρες με μικρή αγορά, όπως για παράδειγμα η Κύπρος. Το κόστος που θα κληθούν να πληρώσουν οι τοπικές εταιρείες τους καλοκαιρινούς μήνες θα είναι δυσβάστακτο, με απρόβλεπτες συνέπειες. Γι' αυτό δεν πρόκειται να υποστηρίξω μια πρόταση που θα εξυπηρετήσει πλήρως τα συμφέροντα των μεγάλων πολυεθνικών εταιρειών.

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

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), blue-card question. – There has been a lot of talking. Mr Sykliotis, as a former Minister from Cyprus, may I ask you a question? You are not supporting this result in the end. How then would you regulate markets – which, in this case, I think should be the only solution – if we were to allow visiting operators and visited operators – both sides – to charge consumers more than is necessary? Nowadays you can even have to pay EUR 10 000 for one gigabyte when travelling because, if the regulators are not regulated, they can both charge the consumer too much. What is your solution?

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL), απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Εμείς, όπως είπα, θεωρούμε σημαντικό αυτό το στοιχείο, αλλά πρέπει να δημιουργηθεί και ένα ταμείο που να στηρίζει τις μικρές χώρες, όπως είναι η χώρα μου, και τους μικρούς παραγωγούς στις χώρες αυτές, οι οποίοι θα καταρρεύσουν κάτω από αυτό το σύστημα. Ιδιαίτερα στην Κύπρο, η δημόσια εταιρεία και οι μικρές εταιρείες δεν θα μπορούν να αντέξουν αυτό το δυσβάστακτο βάρος. Είτε θα το μετακυλίσουν στους εγχώριους παρόχους είτε θα καταρρεύσουν ως εταιρείες. Για τον λόγο αυτό, ζητούμε να υπάρχει μια ισορροπία, δηλαδή μια πρόνοια που να στηρίζει τις μικρές χώρες.

Roger Helmer (EFDD). – Madam President, once again the European Union is abandoning free markets in favour of central planning. First we regulate retail prices, now we come back and regulate wholesale prices.

Will we never learn that regulatory intervention in market prices almost always produces unintended and perverse consequences? Think of the empty shelves in the Moscow Gum department store when they tried to regulate prices. Look at the ETS scheme in Europe that has failed for 10 years to deliver the sort of prices that the regulators want.

Several other speakers, including my group colleague Mr Borrelli, have remarked that operators will recover their lost revenue elsewhere, which will have a regressive effect. It is the European Union's cynical pursuit of any measure that looks vaguely like a benefit for voters or of generating any positive headline. Be sure, this proposal that we are voting on today or tomorrow, will have unintended consequences which will come back and bite our ankles.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin! Als gelernter Konsumentenschützer freut es mich natürlich, dass wir so eine wesentliche Verbesserung für die Menschen vornehmen können. Es liegt auch an den Anbieterтарifen, und wer diese schon einmal durchgeackert hat, der weiß ja: Die sind nicht immer ganz durchsichtig. Man tut sich schwer, und ich vermute mal, das ist oft auch nicht ganz unbeabsichtigt. Insofern ist hier eine Regulierung durchaus sinnvoll, auch wenn man das Instrument der Regulierung nur in sehr gezielten Dosen einsetzen sollte. Und ich denke, wir haben alle schon einmal die Erfahrung gemacht, dass wir mit sehr hohen Rechnungen von unseren Anbietern konfrontiert wurden.

Mir ist das erst letztes in der Mongolei passiert. Da habe ich im Flieger das Datenroaming ausgeschaltet, dennoch hat es sich ins Netz eingebucht, und ich musste da 400 Euro für Datenroaming bezahlen.

Insofern ist es, selbst wenn man technikaffin ist, für den Menschen nicht immer durchschaubar, wann Kosten entstehen. Daher ist dies eine sinnvolle Maßnahme, und ich sage das auch sehr deutlich: Das ist eine Stärke der Union, die jetzt hier einmal zum Tragen kommt. Man sollte sich weniger auf andere Dinge konzentrieren und mehr auf diese Dinge, und das dient auch dem Wohl der Menschen.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! To jest wielki dzień rzeczywiście, jeśli możemy mówić o tym, że za parę miesięcy znikną opłaty dodatkowe, roamingowe. Będziemy płacić każdy tak jak w swoim kraju ojczystym, wyjeżdżając do krajów Unii Europejskiej. Czekaliśmy na to dziesięć lat. Obserwowałem to, bo jestem członkiem tej komisji od wielu lat, a teraz mówię w imieniu komisji ITRE. Ważne, że przeprowadziliśmy ten proces w ciągu dziesięciu lat. Trzykrotnie dochodziliśmy do tego, co mamy dzisiaj, aby te opłaty znikły, dodatkowe opłaty. To ważne, bo obserwowaliśmy, w jaki sposób zachowują się firmy w tym czasie, czy nie wykorzystują tej sytuacji do obciążenia klientów, i dlatego między innymi był to trzystopniowy proces.

Chciałem również odpowiedzieć na absurdalne zarzuty, które zgłosiła jedna z koleżanek niezrzeszonych (nie ma jej na sali), że Unia Europejska to długo trwało i że jakieś nieporozumienie, że robimy to w ramach Unii. Proszę Państwa! Jak wyjeżdżamy z Unii, na zewnątrz Unii nadal płacimy opłaty roamingowe. Z tego wynika, że gdybyśmy rozszerzali Unię na kolejne kraje, kolejne kraje byłyby pozbawione tych opłat dla nas, dla mieszkańców Unii Europejskiej. A więc dobrze jest rozszerzać Unię Europejską czy nie? To są absurdalne zarzuty, na które właściwie trudno odpowiadać. Również koleżde Helmerowi z komisji chciałem odpowiedzieć, że takim jednym z podstawowych elementów regulacji wolnego rynku jest na przykład prawo antymonopolowe i to stosują wszystkie kraje. Nie będę mówił o dziesiątkach innych regulacji, które mamy wszędzie na całym świecie. Niestety wolny rynek nie jest całkowicie wolny, bo byłby wtedy dżunglą.

Natomiast ja chciałem powiedzieć, że nasza praca się nie kończy, trzeba wdrożyć to wszystko, co ustaliliśmy, i trzeba to wdrożyć dobrze i pilnować tego. Chciałem pogratulować koleżance Kumpula-Natri, wszystkim kontrsprawozdawcom, także poprzednikom: pani Pilar de Castillo Vera i innym, panu przewodniczącemu, wiceprzewodniczącym komisji i poprzednikom na tym stanowisku oraz prezydencji maltańskiej, poprzedniej prezydencji, które również nad tym pracowały.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a partir do dia 15 de junho, os cidadãos europeus poderão aceder a dados, voz e texto sem pagamento de taxas de *roaming*, desde que o seu consumo esteja de acordo com os padrões normais. Acederão, assim, em qualquer ponto da União Europeia, aos serviços de telecomunicações, como se estivessem em casa, e esta é uma excelente medida.

Mas, Sr. Comissário, tem de ser uma medida aplicada de forma justa e eficaz e, para isso, há duas condições. Em primeiro lugar, os operadores nacionais, tendo por base a norma que permite recuperar prejuízos demonstrados em resultado da medida, não podem permitir que os operadores imputem aos cidadãos que não viajam custos que resultam da resposta à procura dos cidadãos deslocados e, em segundo lugar, os sistemas europeus de incentivo ao investimento em redes digitais devem dar prioridade aos territórios que terão de aumentar a sua capacidade de resposta face à procura sazonal.

Existe neste relatório, eu próprio o subscrevi, instrumentos e procedimentos que permitem garantir estas duas condições. É fundamental garanti-las para que esta seja uma medida eficaz e justa.

Richard Sulík (ECR) – Vážená pani predsedajúca, stanovenie maximálnych poplatkov za roaming je klasická cenová regulácia, ktorá je zbytočná, škodlivá a nikdy nemala vzniknúť. O to viac ma prekvapuje, že vznik tejto regulácie sa odôvodňuje tým, že treba zabezpečiť, aby fungoval trh, pričom práve táto regulácia narúša fungovanie trhu. V skutočnosti prenesú operátori svoje náklady na domácich užívateľov, ktorým bude klesať cena pomalšie alebo vôbec. Roamingové stropy znejú samozrejme ľúbivo, ale v skutočnosti poškodia ľudí, ktorí cestujú menej, napríklad dôchodcov, a pomôžu ľuďom, ktorí cestujú viac, napríklad europoslancom. To sú tie nezamýšľané dôsledky a, samozrejme, táto regulácia potom vyžaduje ďalšie a ďalšie doplnenia a komplikácie a takto si my tu komplikujeme svet a potom sa čudujeme, že žijeme v prerogulovanom svete. Ostáva dúfať, že o päť rokov táto regulácia skončí.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, we have had a debate on fake news and hate speech. Well, this is not a fake, this is reality. But still, while we do not hear any hate speech, we have seen and listened to some disappointing speech, making out that this is not real progress in terms of enhancing the internal market. We hear stories, for example that Brussels is being lobbied. No! It was Brussels and the efforts of the Commission and the Parliament that made it happen. The lobbies are working in the capitals. The Council is, and was, the bottleneck. So let us finish with this fake news and face reality. There is, of course, a long way to go. This is an important step but, if we want to build a real digital market, we should be encouraged and pursue this in other sectors. That is certain.

Finally, it has been said that this is just for the globalists but, come on, this is absolute rubbish. The Czech Republic must be a rich country because millions and millions of Czechs travel on an annual basis. This is the reality for all the people around us. So, yes, there is a certain amount of concern, but that concern can be taken care of at a national level with anti-monopoly efforts, and of course with competition and enhancing the internal market. This is the way to go and we will proceed in this direction, whether we like it or not. This is reality and not fake news.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, señorías, el 15 de junio, cuando cualquier ciudadano de la Unión Europea use el teléfono, acceda a internet o envíe un mensaje, no tendrá cargas adicionales por estar en condiciones de *roaming*. Este es un enorme paso adelante que beneficia a todos los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea, a los que salen más y a los que salen menos, porque constituye un instrumento para dar la posibilidad de que nuestras empresas, nuestros profesionales, nuestros estudiantes tengan mayor libertad de movimiento, tengan más y más oportunidades en la Unión Europea, en el conjunto de los países que la forman. Esto es lo que realmente hay que tener en cuenta.

Fue este Parlamento el que lo propuso. Fue este Parlamento el que lo aprobó y lo negoció con el Consejo —con una gran colaboración con la Comisión, desde luego—. Y en este Parlamento tenemos que estar muy satisfechos de haber conseguido que, el próximo 15 de junio, esas cargas adicionales no existan y, por tanto, hayamos dado un paso en el desarrollo de un mercado digital europeo, en el desarrollo de una Europa más integrada y con más oportunidades.

Además de eso, habrá que estar atentos —como ha dicho alguna señoría— a si se producen o no distorsiones y habrá que ver si tienen o no un impacto en el mercado nacional, porque a lo mejor son otros factores y no precisamente los del *roaming*. Todo esto se puede tener en cuenta también, pero hoy es un momento de verdadera satisfacción, porque hemos dado un paso adelante en la integración europea, en responder a las verdaderas demandas y necesidades de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señor presidente, la Unión nos aporta muchas cosas en casi todos los ámbitos de nuestra vida: en seguridad, en bienestar, en defensa de nuestros derechos y libertades, pero también en nuestro día a día.

Este acuerdo es un buen ejemplo de lo que estamos hablando. La Unión es sinónimo de movilidad y, con este acuerdo, el *roaming* será historia.

Este acuerdo permitirá que los consumidores europeos se beneficien de precios asequibles y viajen utilizando sus teléfonos sin temor a facturas desorbitadas; utilizarán su teléfono, enviarán sus mensajes, utilizarán el WhatsApp como si estuvieran en su propia casa.

Sinceramente, creo que la desaparición del *roaming* va a jugar un papel clave, un papel clave para el desarrollo de todo el ecosistema digital en Europa. Por eso quiero felicitar a los ponentes por este acuerdo. Pero sobre todo, hoy, quienes están de enhorabuena son los consumidores europeos.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I welcome this proposal, which is the final piece of legislation required to ensure that mobile roaming charges will be removed by this coming June — something we have promised for a long time and something that the EU has delivered for its citizens. As an MEP who campaigned with others for the abolition of ...

(The President interrupted the speaker because of a fire alarm)

President. – There is a fire alarm. Please let us suspend our debate until the situation is clarified.

(The sitting was suspended at 18.05 and resumed at 18.25)

15. Veleprodajni trgi gostovanja (nadaljevanje razprave)

Przewodniczący. – Chciałbym przeprosić za ten incydent, nie znamy jeszcze przyczyn. Z pewnością nie było to nic groźnego. Chciałem bardzo podziękować wszystkim Paniom i Panom za zachowanie zgodne z regułami. Zagrożenie ogłoszone – zawsze należy opuścić budynek, zachować bezpieczeństwo, zostawić szanse pracy stosownym służbom. Jest swego rodzaju paradoksem, że w Prezydium Parlamentu odpowiadam za sprawy bezpieczeństwa Parlamentu. Czasami tak się zdarza, że ten, kto odpowiada, też nie wie w tej chwili, jaka była przyczyna. Przyczyny na razie nie znam.

Wznawiamy obrady.

Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia po alarmie przeciwpożarowym jest kontynuacja debaty nad sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Miapetrę Kumpula-Natri w imieniu Komisji Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady zmieniającego rozporządzenie (UE) nr 531/2012 w odniesieniu do przepisów w zakresie hurtowych rynków usług *roamingu*

(COM(2016)0399 – C8-0219/2016 – 2016/0185(COD)) (A8=0372/2016)

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I did not realise that my Kerry accent was so magnetic that I would set the alarm bells ringing in Parliament, but I do hope that you enjoyed your roaming free of charge around the Parliament.

So now to this topic. I welcome the proposals, which are the final piece of legislation required to ensure that mobile roaming charges will be removed from this coming June. It is something we have promised for a long time and something the EU has delivered for its citizens.

As an MEP who has campaigned with many others for the abolition of roaming charges for the last seven years, I am delighted that we are now nearly there.

It is already eighteen months since, in 2015, it was proudly announced here in the European Parliament that, after a long process, 'roam-like-at-home' was to be introduced by June 2017. It was a very high-profile and important announcement. While tomorrow's vote might not have the same fanfare, its importance cannot be overstated.

The introduction of this wholesale roaming cap is an absolutely essential piece of legislation, as it allows for 'roam-like-at-home' to happen in a cost-effective manner this June.

The caps that we arrived at in the end: EUR 0.032 for a voice call, a gradually-decreasing cap from EUR 7.75 in 2017 to EUR 2.50 in 2022 per gigabyte of data and EUR 0.01 for text messages represents a fantastic result for the European Parliament, particularly given that the majority of Council favoured higher caps. Wholesale data prices are declining by around 40% annually across the EU. The overly-cautious Council position just did not reflect reality. I feel the final result could have even been better, but such is the nature of compromise.

In my own country we are very pleased with the outcome, because it means that the higher caps, which would have put artificially-high costs on to Irish producers – this will not happen now. It is a good day for the European Parliament, especially when we speak about Brexit – again an indication that the United Kingdom citizens will not benefit from this. It is no wonder Roger Helmer and his colleagues were so agitated.

Przewodniczący. – Nawiązując do Pańskich pierwszych słów, sądzę, że to chyba jednak nie Pańskie słowa uruchomiły alarm, ponieważ padały tu nawet dzisiaj dużo cięższe słowa i alarm pożarowy milczał. No, ale i ciężar Pańskich słów doceniamy.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Nixtieq nibda mill-ewwel billi naghti prosit lir-rapporteur Mīapetra Kumpula-Natri għaliex naf kemm kienet biċċa xogħol kbira biex jintlaħaq dan il-ftehim. Imma dan huwa pass kbir 'il quddiem għaliex il-ftehim li ntlahaq dwar il-ligi tar-roaming kien sfida interessanti fi żmien movimentat mhux hażin għall-Unjoni Ewropea. U bosta kienu fir-realtà xettiċi kemm l-Unjoni Ewropea se tikseb ir-riżultati faspetti daqshekk importanti għaċ-ċittadini tagħha.

U llum, inhossni kburija ngħid li l-Parlament Ewropew, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea u anki l-Presidenza Maltija rnexxilhom jiksbu r-riżultati. Għaliex l-Unjoni Ewropea wriet li għadha rilevanti għaċ-ċittadini tagħha, u filwaqt li haddiehor qieghed jibni l-hitan madwaru, ahna qed jirnexxielna nneħhu aktar ostakoli li s'issa kienu qegħdin jifirduna.

Kellhom jgħaddu disa' snin biex nilhqu ftehim politiku finali, iżda finalment, it-tariffi tar-roaming huma xi haġa tal-passat.

U bit-tnehhija ta' dawn it-tariffi, għandna Ewropa aktar maqghuda milli kellna lbierah, u din għandha tkun it-triq 'il quddiem fuq temi ohra ewlenin ukoll.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan parlamentin pitkään ajama tavoite toteutuu ensi kesäkuussa, kun verkkovierailumaksuista luovutaan kokonaan Euroopan unionissa. Itse asiassa vuodesta 2007 saakka, jolloin ensimmäistä kertaa EU-tasolla säädettiin roamingista, hinnat ovat pudonneet jopa 90 prosenttia. Se on erittäin merkittävä saavutus kuluttajien kannalta.

On tärkeää, että kun haluamme edistää digitalisaatiota Euroopassa, kuluttajia rohkaistaan käyttämään digitaalisia palveluita ja myös mobiilidataa. Siinä mielessä tämä neuvottelutulos tukkuhintakatosta, joka nyt on saavutettu ja jossa parlamentti teki erinomaista työtä neuvotteluissa, oli erittäin tärkeä.

Erityisesti Pohjois-Euroopan, Skandinavian ja Baltian maissa, missä mobiilidataa käytetään erittäin paljon, on tärkeää, että operaattorit eivät voi veloittaa toisiltaan liian korkeita hintoja verkkovierailuista. Omassa kotimaassani Suomessa mobiilidataa käytetään maailmassa eniten ja jopa kymmenkertaisesti muihin Euroopan maihin verrattuna, ja siellä tällä on kuluttajille ja operaattoreille iso merkitys. Muutoin uhkana olisi ollut, että kuluttajahinnat olisivat saattaneet jopa nousta Suomessa sen seurauksena, että roaming-maksuista luovutaan.

On tärkeää, että joka puolella Eurooppaa pyritään nyt voimakkaasti edistämään mobiilidatan käyttöä, ja sitä voidaan edistää sillä tavalla, että investoidaan nopeisiin hyviin verkkoihin ja edistetään reilua kilpailua. Kun meillä on toimivat markkinat Euroopassa, se tarkoittaa sitä, että kuluttajat saavat parempia palveluja ja edullisempia hintoja ja näin myös digitalisaatio etenee Euroopassa.

Εύα Καϊλή (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, πρώτα από όλα θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ τη συνάδελφό μου, Mīapetra, για την εξαιρετική δουλειά της. Γνωρίζουμε όλοι πόσο δύσκολη ήταν η διαδικασία σύνταξης αυτού του κειμένου και η εξέταση όλων των τροπολογιών μας, ενώ υπήρχε πολύ μεγάλη πίεση στις τριμερείς διαπραγματεύσεις με το Συμβούλιο.

Η ρύθμιση της χονδρικής αγοράς είναι ένα πολύ σημαντικό βήμα για μια ανταγωνιστική ενιαία ψηφιακή αγορά που ωφελεί τους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες και δημιουργεί παράλληλα προϋποθέσεις για υγιή ανταγωνισμό, αλλά το πιο σημαντικό είναι ότι η Ευρώπη τελικά πραγματοποιεί αυτά που υπόσχεται. Καθώς πλησιάζουμε επίσης στην ενδιάμεση αξιολόγηση της ενιαίας ψηφιακής αγοράς θα πρέπει να δείξουμε ότι συνεχίζεται η προσπάθεια αυτή.

Χρειάζεται περισσότερη προστασία και ασφάλεια ως προεπιλογή για τους χρήστες, κυρίως όταν πρόκειται για τα προσωπικά μας δεδομένα, εύκολο και αξιόπιστο ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο, έτσι ώστε να ευκολυνθούν όλοι, καταναλωτές και επιχειρήσεις, χωρίς διακρίσεις, εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης φυσικά, επενδύσεις στις χώρες και τις περιοχές που το χρειάζονται περισσότερο, ώστε κανείς να μη μείνει πίσω σε αυτή τη νέα ψηφιακή εποχή, αλλά και καινοτόμες λύσεις, όπως η τεχνολογία Blockchain, που μπορεί να δώσει πίσω τον έλεγχο των δεδομένων στους πολίτες, ενώ παράλληλα προσφέρει και πάρα πολλές λύσεις σε πολλές διαφορετικές προκλήσεις. Αυτός λοιπόν ο κανονισμός έρχεται σε μια κρίσιμη στιγμή και δίνει ένα πολύ σημαντικό μήνυμα στο Στρασβούργο και στις Βρυξέλλες ότι δουλεύουμε για μια πραγματικά ενιαία ψηφιακή αγορά με περισσότερη ασφάλεια για τους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες.

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

Paul Rübiger (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Präsident! Meine Frage bezieht sich auf die positiven Effekte, die durch Roaming entstehen können. Glauben Sie, dass damit auch der Tourismus zusätzlich belebt werden kann und vor allem der Export für die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe eine wesentliche Rolle spielen kann? Für die Wirtschaftsbelebung, glaube ich, könnte auch Roaming ein signifikanter positiver Faktor sein.

Εύα Καϊλή (S&D), *απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα*. – Ευχαριστώ πολύ για την ερώτηση. Φυσικά όχι μόνο προσπαθούμε να δημιουργήσουμε μια πιο ενιαία αγορά και να αισθανόμαστε περισσότερο Ευρωπαίοι, ειδικά όταν ταξιδεύουμε, αλλά αυτό μπορεί να βοηθήσει και τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις και όλους τους επαγγελματίες ώστε να αισθάνονται ότι θα απευθύνονται σε μία ενιαία αγορά.

Έχουμε και άλλες δράσεις όμως που ακολουθούν, το WiFi for Europe, το Free Data Flow, το EFSI, το Juncker plan 2 που θα στηρίξει και θα ενισχύσει τις χρηματοδοτήσεις για την επίτευξη αυτής της ενιαίας ψηφιακής αγοράς. Εκεί έχουμε αλλάξει αρκετά και τις προτεραιότητες από την Επιτροπή, με την οποία άλλωστε συνεργαζόμαστε.

Αρα οι ευκαιρίες που δίνονται είναι πολύ σημαντικές. Αυτό που πρέπει να προσέξουμε και είναι πάρα πολύ σημαντικό είναι να μην δώσουμε στις κοινωνικές πλατφόρμες τη δυνατότητα να ελέγχουν ή να ακουμπούν το περιεχόμενο και να μην παίρνουν την τοποθεσία, τη θέση ή δεδομένα παραπάνω από ό,τι επιθυμούν οι πολίτες. Αρα ως προεπιλογή να φροντίσουμε όλα να είναι πιο ασφαλή για τους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες. Αυτό θα κάνει την αγορά αυτή ασφαλή και σημαντική.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, for me, to achieve a truly European telecom market is one of the most important priorities for the European Union, because that is a precondition for a dynamic and vibrant digital economy in the European Union – a pre-condition for us to be in the lead regarding 5G regarding all the new services that can revitalise our economies. And in that perspective, this step, with a regulation regarding the pricing between wholesales operators, are of fundamental importance. It will mean that from 15 June we can use the different services via the internet all over Europe. It will mean that citizens can travel, but it will mean that we can reach a new level of our digital economy.

I think we need now to proceed in order to create truly trans-European networks to ensure that there are no negative effects coming out of this, only positive effects, and that is something we should call on the Commission to do: to ensure that we can proceed to a truly European telecom and a truly digital market in the European Union.

Olle Ludvigsson (S&D). – Herr Talman! Att få bort roamingavgifterna har länge varit en prioriterad fråga. Arbetet sträcks över flera mandatperioder, och utan att tveka har det varit en lång resa, men äntligen närmar vi oss slutstationen för då roamingavgifterna kan fasas ut inom EU. I morgon ska vi rösta om den överenskommelse som nåtts mellan Europaparlamentet och rådet om grossistledet för roamingmarknaden. Enligt min mening är det i allra högsta grad en bra, balanserad överenskommelse, som säkerställer att Europas konsumenter snart kan åtnjuta roaming "like at home".

Med detta sagt hoppas jag verkligen att en stor och bred majoritet ställer sig bakom överenskommelsen. EU är ett viktigt verktyg för att stärka konsumenternas rättigheter. Det är ett faktum att vi är på väg att lägga sista pusselbiten, som möjliggör att roamingavgifterna snart är ett minne blott. Det visar också konkret hur vi i EU-samarbetet gemensamt kan åstadkomma positiva utfall, som Europas konsumenter faktiskt kan dra nytta av. Ett stort tack till dem som har förhandlat igenom detta.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Za dwa miesiące opłaty roamingowe w Unii Europejskiej przejdą do historii, za dwa miesiące każdy podróżujący po Europie będzie płacił za połączenia telekomunikacyjne tyle samo co w swoim kraju. Jutrzejsze głosowanie w sprawie roamingu usunie telefoniczne granice między krajami członkowskimi Unii Europejskiej. To dobra nowina przede wszystkim dla konsumentów, którzy będą płacić niższe rachunki, ale to także dobra nowina dla przedsiębiorstw, które będą miały niższe koszty działalności, a w szczególności dla małych przedsiębiorstw innowacyjnych i start-upów, które będą chciały uczestniczyć w rynku usług telekomunikacyjnych.

Dla mnie osobiście jest to bardzo ważny dzień, ponieważ dziesięć lat temu tu, w Parlamencie Europejskim, osobiście angażowałem się w pierwszą obniżkę stawek roamingowych, i nie było łatwo, ale Parlament Europejski zdecydował, że stawki będą obniżone wbrew oporowi kompanii telekomunikacyjnych. I cieszę się, że dziś czy w dniu jutrzejszym będziemy głosować całkowite zniesienie stawek roamingowych. Długo to trwało, ale warto było. Chciałbym powiedzieć, że ta dzisiejsza debata i jutrzejsza decyzja pokazują, że Unia Europejska jest w stanie podejmować decyzje, które służą ludziom i które służą gospodarce. Jest to w szczególności ważne w czasach, kiedy eurosceptyczne i populistyczne nastroje rozprzestrzeniają się w Europie i Unia Europejska jest często krytykowana zupełnie bez racji przez wszystkich tych, którzy nie dostrzegają konkretnych korzyści, jakie płyną z integracji europejskiej.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Der skal også fra mig lyde et stort tak til vores forhandlere for det gode resultat. Når vi i morgen stemmer om at få lagt et loft over engrospriserne, er det afslutningen på mere end 10 års arbejde for at sikre, at forbrugerne ikke bliver straffet for at rejse rundt i Europa og bruge deres mobiltelefoner. Det er en meget stor sejr for forbrugerne og for det arbejde, som vi har lagt her i Europa-Parlamentet. Det er hovedsageligt os, der har lagt et enormt pres på industrien for at sikre, at det kom hertil. Det er imidlertid også en god aftale af andre årsager, da den faktisk betyder, at vi ved at lægge et loft over engrospriserne også gør noget godt for industrien. Nu er det ikke længere kun forbrugerne, der kan være sikre på ikke at få chokpriser. Det gælder også industrien. Jeg synes derfor, at det er meget balanceret aftale. Dog mener jeg måske nok, at 10 år er temmelig lang tid. Jeg håber, at vi i fremtiden kan blive lidt hurtigere til at sikre noget, der gavner både forbrugerne og virksomhederne.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, 15. lipnja će biti veliki dan za mene osobno, ali i za sve one koji žele putovati Europom, koji žele poslovati u Europi i koji žele umanjiti razlike koje postoje između nas u europskim zemljama, bilo sjevera i juga, bilo istoka i zapada. Ovih dana kad se borimo oko izjednačavanja kvalitete proizvoda na istoku i zapadu, evo konačno primjera.

Ima li boljeg primjera od ukidanja naplate za roaming kako bi pokazali i dokazali da je Europska unija sposobna donositi odluke u interesu naših potrošača, u interesu naših građana. Ovo je konkretan primjer na kojem upravo to možemo dokazati. Zato sam zahvalna svima onima koji već godinama rade na ovom projektu i koji su uspjeli postići ovako dobar sporazum.

Čujem da postoje razlike između sjevernih i južnih zemalja, da će teleoperateri koristiti povećavanje cijena svojih naknada. Međutim, sve je to zanemarivo u odnosu na ovo što smo dobili. Nema više razloga da se neki s istoka osjećaju lošije u odnosu na one sa zapada, kad se vozimo u istom automobilu, pa jedni mogu *surfati*, a drugi ne mogu *surfati*, zato što je to preskupo, jer imaju previsoku cijenu u svojoj zemlji.

Stoga, još jedanput želim zahvaliti, roaming postaje povijest i nadam se da ćemo i na ovaj način pokazati onima koji misle da Europska unija nije funkcionalna da upravo na ovom primjeru može funkcionirati.

Ева Майдел (PPE). – Г-н Вицепрезидент, отпадането на таксите за роуминг е неоспорима и ключова победа за нас като потребители в Европейския съюз. Радвам се, че с утрешното гласуване ще можем да финализираме процеса и още това лято ще можем да бъдем част от един по-засилен единен цифров пазар и единен пазар.

Новите максимални цени на роуминга на едро означават и няколко други много важни неща: първо, те създават конкуренция между операторите и отварят пазарите към по-малките оператори, които имат нужда от нашата подкрепа, за да бъдат активна част от нашата икономика. Дават ни и възможност да ползваме повече интернет докато пътуваме, работим, пазаруваме.

Отпадането на таксите за роуминг съвпада и с междинната оценка на напредъка на стратегията за единен цифров пазар. Точно затова е важно е да надградим над постигнатото досега, като гарантираме преносимостта на онлайн съдържание и отпадането на неоправданото гео-блокиране.

От изключително значение е и активно да работим за свободното движение на данни в Съюза и по този начин да имаме още една победа за нашите потребители и бизнеси.

Вярвам, че с общи усилия ще осигурим подобаваща защита за онлайн дейностите на всички европейски граждани, администрации и бизнеси.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jak mówimy dzisiaj o znoszeniu dodatkowych opłat za połączenia w roamingu, to przypominam sobie niedawno wypowiedziane słowa Donalda Tuska o tym, że albo Unia Europejska będzie mocno zjednoczona, albo nie będzie jej wcale. I my jednoczyć się musimy bardzo konkretnymi działaniami, takimi działaniami jest właśnie znoszenie barier, które dzielą nasz wspólny rynek europejski na 28 różnych mniejszych rynków. Ten nasz wspólny rynek europejski, na którym wszyscy funkcjonujemy, działamy, pracujemy, kupujemy, sprzedajemy, uczymy się. I to długo oczekiwane uwolnienie nas od dodatkowych... uwolnienie się, bo to jest nasza wspólna decyzja – wszystkich, którzy przez wiele lat ciężko nad tym pracowali – uwolnienie się od dodatkowych opłat za roaming, to jest jak takie otwarcie bramy do tego, żeby znosić następne bariery na tym wspólnym rynku, głównie naszym wspólnym rynku cyfrowym, na którym z panem wiceprzewodniczącym Andrusem Ansipem tutaj staramy się właśnie zjednoczyć ten rynek.

I te następne bariery, które jeszcze przed nami są, to są i zakupy w internecie, i dostęp do dóbr kulturowych, i całe dobra cyfrowe, do których chcemy wszyscy mieć dostęp i dawać dostęp innym. Więc jeszcze raz tylko dziękuję wszystkim: począwszy od Viviane Reding, która zaczęła ten cały proces z roamingiem, aż dzisiaj do pani Natri. Gratuluję wszystkim i bardzo dziękuję, i w tym kierunku idźmy dalej!

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan parlamentin on syytä onnitella itseään ja ennen kaikkea kiittää kaikkia niitä esittelijöitä ja varjoesittelijöitä, jotka ovat tämän yli yhdeksän vuoden aikana tehneet työtä roaming-maksujen poistamiseksi Euroopan unionissa. Komissio on myös osoittanut tässä erittäin suurta selkärankaisuutta ja hyvää tahtotilaa yhteisen digitaalisen markkinan aikaansaamiseksi. Missään vaiheessa se ei ole ollut helppoa, ja kansallinen etu onkin ryöstetty monta kertaa operaattoreiden kyseenalaisen käytöksen perusteluksi ja sitä käytetty myös tässä väitteilyssä epäreiluna keinona.

Alkuvaiheessa on ollut lähes kartellinomaista käyttäytymistä operaattoreilta ja suoranaista toinen toisensa ryöstämistä myöhemmässä vaiheessa, kun roaming-maksuista on oltu siirtymässä eteenpäin. Tämä kaikki on estänyt ja hidastanut todellisen eurooppalaisen digiagendan, digiunionin ja kuluttajapalvelujen syntymistä.

Tämä on erinomainen esimerkki, miksi me tarvitsemme EU:ta. Erinomainen esimerkki siitä, miksi tarvitsemme markkinoiden valvontaa ja regulaatiota, ja erinomainen esimerkki siitä, miksi me tarvitsemme yhteisiä eurooppalaisia pelisääntöjä. En oikein parempaa löydä.

Ja lopuksi: kompromissiin on tyydyttävä niin kuin elämässä aina. Saamieni tietojen mukaan tukkuhinnat jäävät yhä edelleen melko reilusti todellisten kustannusten yläpuolelle, joten työtä niin parlamentilla kuin komissiollakin tässä asiassa tulee riittämään.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zniesienie opłat roamingowych jest bez wątpienia jasnym, namacalnym przykładem korzyści, jakie przynosi Unia Europejska naszym obywatelom. Dlatego cieszę się, że poprzez przyjęcie przepisów o hurtowych rynkach roamingu kończymy właśnie prace nad ostatnim elementem procesu zniesienia tych opłat. Z satysfakcją przyjąłem informację, że w wyniku nie negocjacji udało się uzyskać znaczne obniżenie pułapów cen hurtowych w stosunku do propozycji pierwotnej.

Jednocześnie chciałbym podkreślić znaczenie regularnego monitorowania przez Komisję Europejską zmian zachodzących na rynkach krajowych oraz skutków wprowadzonego rozporządzenia, aby odpowiednio wcześniej identyfikować ewentualne nieprawidłowości stanowiące obciążenie dla konsumentów.

Chciałbym złożyć wielkie gratulacje i podziękowania wszystkim osobom, które doprowadziły do tego sukcesu.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'abolizione delle tariffe di *roaming*, prevista per il prossimo 15 giugno, metterà fine agli abusi perpetrati nell'ultimo anno e mezzo da alcune compagnie telefoniche che hanno agito sfruttando le zone grigie del nuovo regolamento.

Esattamente un anno fa, in un'interrogazione scritta alla Commissione, denunciavo la pratica scorretta dell'attivazione automatica di piani tariffari *flat* per i servizi in *roaming*, che raggira l'applicazione delle nuove tariffe grazie alla scarsa trasparenza sul costo netto delle chiamate.

Per questo ritengo sia da rivedere la decisione del BEREC di inserire nelle nuove linee guida recentemente pubblicate la possibilità di una proroga di 12 mesi per l'eliminazione del *roaming*. E a poco servono le smentite delle *authority* nazionali di questi giorni, se tra le circostanze eccezionali figura quella della non sostenibilità economica – eccezione, tra l'altro, rinnovabile di anno in anno. A ben vedere è una questione piuttosto artificiosa, visto che l'abolizione del *roaming* è in discussione da circa dieci anni e gli operatori hanno avuto tutto il tempo necessario per predisporre le loro strategie commerciali.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, korištenje podatkovnog prometa sve je veće i u europskim i u globalnim okvirima. Jasno je da će se taj trend nastaviti, što je dobro za europsku ekonomiju, jer se otvaraju nove mogućnosti u sektoru usluga. Globalna se ekonomija transformira zahvaljujući novih tehnologijama i taj je proces neizbježan. Za Europu on može biti vrlo koristan ako iskoristimo sve mogućnosti koje se pružaju i ne ograničimo vlastiti rast pretjeranim regulatornim teretom.

Komisija svoj prijedlog gornje granice veleprodajne cijele podatkovnog prometa temelji na dosta konzervativnoj procjeni rasta korištenja podatkovnog prometa i nepromijenjenim cijenama na tržištu, iako nezavisne studije pokazuju da će korištenje podatkovnog prometa značajnije rasti, a tržišna cijena nastaviti padati. Još jedan dokaz da odnos ponude i potražnje mora biti glavni regulator cijene, a politika bi se u taj odnos trebala što manje miješati.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Pokalbių ir mobilaus interneto kainų sumažinimas tikrai prisidės prie patogesnio ir geresnio gyvenimo visoje Europos Sąjungoje. Šiandien sveikinome Ukrainą, užsitikrinusią bevizį režimą ir glaudesnius ryšius su Europa, tačiau mobiliojo ryšio minutės kainą su šia šalimi visi ES operatoriai per keletą pastarųjų metų išaugino beveik dvigubai. Todėl turime įdomų paradoksą: viena vertus, skatiname Europos integraciją jau sukurtoje Europos Sąjungoje, kita vertus, kasdieniais buitinais klausimais toliname nuo savęs Europos Sąjungai nepriklausančias šalis. Galime užsiduoti klausimą: o kokia bus mobiliojo ryšio kaina su Jungtine Karalyste po to, kai baigsime „Brexit“ procedūras?

Manau, kad, pasiekus ženklų mobiliojo ryšio kainų sumažėjimą ES viduje, turėtume atkreipti daugiau dėmesio į šios paslaugos reguliavimą bent jau su artimiausiomis kaimyninėmis šalimis.

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Odprava roaminga bo tako znižala stroške tistim, ki so v tujini, in poenotila digitalni trg. Ne samo poslovnežem, ki so veliko v tujini, ampak tudi mladim, ki študirajo v tujini, in vsem, ki kot turisti prihajamo v drugo državo članico.

Zelo verjetno pa bodo operaterji že pred junijem svoje naročniške pakete podražili in jih tudi seveda na novo prilagodili trgu. Vendar moramo na to še počakati in tudi budno bdeti nad tem.

Gostovanja v mobilnih omrežjih bodo z odpravo roaminga dokončno poenotena, saj so pribitke operaterji zaračunavali in tako ustvarili dodatne ovire za enoten digitalni trg.

Pozdravljam uspeh Evropske komisije in Evropskega parlamenta, saj je s tem zelo veliko osebam zagotovil cenejše telefoniranje.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, iată astăzi avem și o bucurie, pe lângă tristețea dezbaterii Brexit-ului: un lucru foarte așteptat, deși regulamentul prevedea din 2015 eliminarea tarifelor. Sperăm că e un fapt dacă mâine vom reuși să fim uniți să votăm acest raport.

Comisia are însă de elaborat și un mecanism de sustenabilitate, care trebuie pus în aplicare până sfârșitul anului pentru unele derogări excepționale și sunt convinsă că se va ocupa de acest lucru.

În sfârșit o normalitate pentru o comunicare la tariful de acasă cu familia, cu angajații din firmă, atunci când călătorim. Consumatorii, de fapt, nu au fost protejați, pentru că nu aveau cum să verifice ce preț li s-a pus la factură într-o oarecare țară. Dacă raportul va fi votat, vom intra într-o normalitate și o protecție a consumatorului adecvată și uniformă în piața internă. Piața va fi mai dinamică și toată lumea are de câștigat.

Felicit raportoarea, pe colega mea, colega noastră, Miapetra, și sper, domnule comisar, că se va continua cu monitorizarea și vom ajunge la o situație normală și la o piață unică și în acest domeniu.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ενιαία αγορά δεν μπορεί να λειτουργήσει χωρίς την ψηφιακή αγορά, χωρίς την ίδια την ψηφιακή οικονομία. Μόνο έτσι μπορεί να υπάρξει ανάπτυξη και ενίσχυση της απασχόλησης. Για να γίνει αυτό, θα πρέπει να καταργηθούν οι υπερβολικές χρεώσεις που επιβάλλει το *roaming*, δηλαδή δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει ανάπτυξη αν δεν καταργηθούν οι χρεώσεις της περιαγωγής.

Έτσι η κατάργηση του *roaming* αποτελεί θετική εξέλιξη τόσο για τους εμπορευόμενους χονδρικά όσο και για τους ίδιους τους πολίτες. Αρκεί, κύριε Πρόεδρε και κύριε Επίτροπε, να υλοποιηθεί πράγματι, να τεθεί σε ισχύ χωρίς αστερίσκους και εξαιρέσεις. Ενιαίες λοιπόν τιμές σε όλη την Ευρώπη για τους πολίτες που θα πρέπει να μην έχουν χρεώσεις περιαγωγής από όπου και αν τηλεφωνούν. Με τον τρόπο αυτό οι πολίτες θα μπορούν να κυκλοφορούν πράγματι ελεύθερα, χωρίς εμπόδια, να ενημερώνονται μέσω του κινητού τους, να κατεβάζουν δεδομένα. Επίσης θα ενισχυθούν έτσι και οι μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις με ελεύθερη ανταλλαγή δεδομένων.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα συμφωνήσω με τους προλαλήσαντες ότι η κατάργηση των εξόδων περιαγωγής είναι όντως ένα θετικό βήμα. Ωστόσο, κύριε Επίτροπε, το Συμβούλιο και η αρμόδια επιτροπή, όταν εξέτασαν την πρόταση της Επιτροπής, κατέληξαν σε κάποιες διαφοροποιήσεις. Αναφέρω συγκεκριμένα ως παράδειγμα την ανάγκη ενός μηχανισμού βιωσιμότητας. Δηλαδή, εάν υπάρχει σοβαρή απόκλιση των τιμών σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, να υπάρχει δυνατότητα διόρθωσης της ανώτατης τιμής, εάν υπάρχει ανάγκη. Ο μηχανισμός βιωσιμότητας δεν αποτελεί μέρος της συμφωνίας που έχουμε ενώπιόν μας. Ποιος μπορεί να εγγυηθεί και να εξηγήσει σε αυτά τα κράτη μέλη που έχουν αυτές τις ανησυχίες ότι ικανοποιούνται οι ανησυχίες τους ως προς την απουσία του συγκεκριμένου μηχανισμού;

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Én tényleg nagyra becsülöm az Ön rugalmasságát, hogy lehetőséget biztosít szinte – sőt minden – spontán felszólalásnak. Bár hogyha ezt a nagybecsülésemet én Önnek telefonon szeretném elmondani, és mondjuk itt, Strasbourgban a magyar telefonszámomról, magyar mobilszámomról Önt felhívom az Ön lengyel mobilszámán, akkor ez valóban nagyon kedvezményes költségekkel jár. De hogyha én ezt Budapestről szeretném megtenni, ugyanarról a saját mobiltelefonomról, ami magyar mobiltelefon, ez esetben én Önt csak nemzetközi hívás gyanánt tudnám hívni, konkrétan méregdrágán. No, ezt az ellentmondást még nem sikerült egyelőre elhárítanunk, úgyhogy kérem a Bizottság képviselőit, hogy fontolják meg, hogy ebben azért tegyünk valamit, mert nagyon drága saját mobilról, saját hazámból külföldet hívni, bár mindenhol máshol már olcsóbb.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Andrus Ansip, Vice President of the Commission. – Mr President, tomorrow will be a historic vote, as it will mark the final step of a long regulatory journey. This journey was a really long one. We started with this process in 2007, but in the beginning this process was not very rapid. But since last May we have been able to cut those roaming surcharges by 75%. Altogether, in comparison with 2009, we were able to cut roaming surcharges for SMS messages and voice minutes by 92% and for data by as much as 96%. At the same time, domestic prices in all our Member States decreased. This is my message to all those people who are worried about the increase in domestic prices.

Exorbitant roaming charges were an anomaly in a continent where people move freely across, and between, countries. Together the EU institutions are now putting an end to the roaming surcharges for our people. At last, people will be able to stop turning off the data on their phones when they cross an EU border. This is how it should be and how it should always have been. The Commission, in cooperation with national regulatory authorities, will continue its close monitoring to ensure that the new rules of today's deal are strictly observed by the operators.

The EU is often criticised for not delivering concrete results to Europeans. This is because the benefits of EU policies are sometimes difficult to grasp and identify in people's daily lives. Here is one well-identified and very concrete benefit. The Commission strongly urges the European Parliament to adopt the new regulation on wholesale roaming markets. We now need to come together and say with one voice that we delivered on our promise.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, esittelijä. – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitos kaikille kollegoille tämän päivän keskusteluista, vahvasta tuesta ja myös huolistanne. Oli kunnia parlamentin puolesta johtaa tätä neuvottelua. Viimeinen lainsäädännön palanen yhteisistä tukkumarkkinakattohinnoista saadaan valmiiksi huomenna äänestyksessä.

Euroopan parlamentti olisi ollut valmis jopa alempiin hintoihin, kuten täällä tuli esille, koska näemme, että mitä alemmat hintakatot, sitä parempi kuluttajalle. Mutta myös niille operaattoreille, jotka tänä päivänä jo tarjoavat rajatonta datan käyttöä halpaan hintaan, prosessissa saatiin kolme helpotusta. Ensinnäkin kattohinta saatiin paljon komission alkuperäistä esitystä alemmaksi, toiseksi nämä operaattorit voivat asettaa datan käytölle ulkomailla kattoja, ja kolmanneksi operaattorit voivat hakea silloin poikkeusta, jos tämä tulisi heille yhä vielä liian kalliiksi. Tässä kuitenkin uskon, että markkinat ja kilpailumarkkinat pelaavat ja kuluttajat pääsevät tämän lainsäädännön piiriin, niin että matkustaminen ja puhelimen käyttäminen ulkomaillakin on mahdollista.

En tiedä yhtään maata, jonka kuluttajien etu olisi kalliit kansalliset hinnat. Minun mielestäni on hyvä tavoite, jos tämä lainsäädäntö myös lisää avoimuutta, koska miksi ihmeessä me puolustaisimme sitä, että datan hinta voi olla toisessa maassa satakertainen toiseen maahan nähden tai kymmenkertaisia puheluhintoja. Minun mielestäni teidän kaikkien tulee mennä kotimaihinne ja kysyä, onko teknologia todella niin paljon kalliimpaa vai palkat vai mikä, koska maiden väliset erot ovat todella suuria. Tämä voi olla hyvä lisä, joka tästä saadaan aikaiseksi, kun saamme läpinäkyvyyttä.

Me todistamme tällä, että EU:ta tarvitaan, sääntelyä tarvitaan ja avoimuutta tarvitaan. Tarvitsemme myös lisäinvestointeja, koska jokainen lisäinvestointi alentaa yksikkökustannusta, ja näin eurooppalaiset saavat käyttöönsä enemmän mobiilidataa ja sillä tuotettavia palveluja.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 6 kwietnia 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Europäische Verbraucher werden zukünftig nicht mehr extra für die Nutzung ihres Mobiltelefons im Ausland zahlen müssen. Hohe Handy-Rechnungen für das Telefonieren im EU-Ausland gehören somit der Vergangenheit an. Europäisches Parlament und Rat fanden auf der Grundlage des Vorschlags der Kommission bereits im Juni 2016 eine politische Einigung über die neuen Vorschriften, die von den Betreibern auf dem Großkunden-Roamingmarkt ab Juni angewandt werden müssen. Bereits seit einigen Jahren sind die Vorleistungspreise für Datenroaming rückläufig. Die ansteigende Datennutzung ist einer der Hauptgründe für diesen Preisrückgang. Die gestiegene Datennutzung bringt klare wirtschaftliche Vorteile, da sich hier neue Dienstleistungsmöglichkeiten eröffnen. Daneben werden durch die erhöhte Datennutzung vermehrt Infrastrukturinvestitionen angestoßen, was dazu führt, dass Verbraucher noch mehr Daten nutzen können. Gerade für mein Heimatland Österreich sind Investitionen in die Breitbandinfrastruktur von größter Bedeutung, weil das Land im Bereich der Digitalisierung im Europa-Vergleich nur im schlechten Mittelfeld liegt. Laut dem Index für die digitale Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft (DESI) 2016 liegt Österreich beim Anteil an schnellem Breitband über 30 Mbit/s nur auf dem schlechten 20. Rang von insgesamt 29 untersuchten Ländern. Daher unterstütze ich das Ziel, Roamingentgelte für Endkunden in Europa abzuschaffen, da dies den Verbrauchern zugutekommt und dazu führt, dass die Telekommunikationsmärkte wettbewerbsgeprägt bleiben.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), în scris. – Dezbaterea privind „Roamingul cu ridicata” este firească în contextul în care Uniunea Europeană își propune eliminarea taxelor de roaming până la data de 15 iunie 2017. Noi, decidenții politici, trebuie să ținem seama în primul rând de interesele cetățenilor, iar în acest moment interesul cetățenilor europeni este de a avea costuri zero atunci când călătoresc în oricare stat membru. Cetățenii vor să vadă că Uniunea Europeană acordă mai mult interes și propune mai multe soluții concrete pentru problemele lor de zi cu zi, uneori chiar și în detrimentul interesului privat sau al celui național. Prin urmare, piețele naționale ale serviciilor de roaming cu ridicata trebuie să fie competitive și să propună tarife de roaming cu ridicata care le permit operatorilor să ofere servicii de roaming cu amănuntul în mod sustenabil, fără costuri suplimentare. Soluția pe care o propun este aceea de a reglementa tot ce ține de „roamingul cu ridicata” la nivel european, fie că păstrăm tarifele actuale, fie că decidem împreună reducerea lor substanțială, având ca scop principal eliminarea totală a costurilor pentru cetățenii simpli prin implementarea normelor „Roam Like At Home”

(RLAH).

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Le 15 juin 2017, le citoyen européen ne payera plus de frais supplémentaires en utilisant son téléphone portable en dehors de son pays. Cette victoire, que nous avons obtenue à la suite d'un long bras de fer avec les opérateurs, fera sensiblement baisser les factures de téléphone de millions de travailleurs transfrontaliers et de dizaines de millions de vacanciers européens. Cependant, pour garantir la disparition de ces coûts pour le particulier et faire en sorte que les opérateurs ne tentent pas de se rattraper ailleurs, il fallait aussi réduire les prix de gros de l'itinérance, c'est-à-dire le coût que les opérateurs télécoms se facturent mutuellement lorsque le client consulte internet à l'étranger. La décision votée aujourd'hui au Parlement européen va dans ce sens. Grâce à cet accord, le citoyen est doublement gagnant. D'une part, il est assuré de ne pas payer de frais supplémentaires en utilisant son téléphone portable en dehors de son pays (pour autant qu'il n'utilise pas le service de façon excessive, seuil encore à fixer). Mais ce n'est pas tout. Ces plafonds plus bas pour les transferts de données permettront aux consommateurs européens d'accéder à davantage de contenu audiovisuel lorsqu'ils voyagent en dehors de leurs frontières.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Pone Pirmininke, pranešimas, kurį šiandien aptarinėjame, turi labai didelę svarbą visiems Europos Sąjungos gyventojams, kadangi liečia lengvatas komunikacijoje. 2015 metais priimtas įsakas, kuris numatė tarptinklinių ryšių apmokestinimo panaikinimą nuo visų susisiekimo tipų, tame ir balso, ES teritorijoje. Kad tokia sistema galėtų įsigalioti yra reikalingas taisyklių įvedimas, reglamentuojantis tarptinklinio ryšio paslaugų didmeninės kainas. Tuo pačiu bus įmanoma panaikinti tarptinklinio ryšio Europoje mažmeninius mokesčius. Šitą sprendimą reikia įvesti kuo greičiau, kadangi jis neabejotinai yra vertingas visiems vartotojams, o ypač keliaujantiems po įvairias Europos šalis. Taip pat tai prisidės prie ryšių apmokestinimo sumažinimo, su sąlyga, kad bus užtikrinta „sąžiningo naudojimo politika“, grindžiama mokesčių nepriskaičiavimu už papildomas ryšio operatorių paslaugas ir duomenų perdavimą už šalies ribų, kur buvo nupirkta paslauga. Šiose aplinkybėse įgyvendinimo aktuose reikia atkreipti dėmesį į konkurencijos apsaugą telekomunikacijos rinkoje, nes tai yra būtina galimai žemų paslaugų kainų išsaugojimui. Būtinias kuo greičiausias nuostatas ir taisyklių įvedimas, panaikinančių tarptinklinių ryšių ES norint įtvirtinti ir palengvinti vienalytį skaitmeninį rinkos procesą Sąjungoje. Taip pat tai įtakos vartotojų mokesčių sumažinimą. Todėl pranešėjos pozicija, skatinanti Komisiją kuo greičiau imtis veiksmo šiuo klausimu, yra visiškai pagrįsta.

16. Tretje države, katerih državljani morajo imeti vizume ali so oproščeni te zahtevu: Ukrajina (razprava)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sprządzone przez Mariję Gabriel w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady zmieniającego rozporządzenie (WE) nr 539/2001 wymieniające państwa trzecie, których obywatele muszą posiadać wizy podczas przekraczania granic zewnętrznych, oraz te, których obywatele są zwolnieni z tego wymogu (Ukraina)

(COM(2016)0236 – C8-0150/2016) – 2016/0125(COD)) (A8-0274/2016)

Michał Boni, *deputising for the rapporteur*. – Mr President, on behalf of Mrs Mariya Gabriel, Rapporteur for the Report for the visa liberalisation for Ukrainian citizens, allow me to address some words.

First and foremost, the rapporteur would like to thank the Commission and the Council for the excellent collaboration that has existed all through the process. The rapporteur would like to highlight the remarkable work realised by the Slovak and Maltese Presidencies in order to achieve the completion of the visa liberalisation process so dear to the Ukrainian citizens.

The rapporteur would also like to thank the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian government for all their efforts, determination and patience. Indeed, on 28 February an agreement was reached between the European Parliament and the Council on the visa liberalisation process for Ukraine. This agreement was confirmed by the COREPER meeting two days later. On 9 March 2017, an overwhelming majority of MEPs on the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) voted in favour of the visa waiver for Ukrainian citizens, sending a strong message.

In the words of the rapporteur, Ukraine has achieved all the benchmark criteria set out by the EU and has even gone beyond expectations in terms of sustainable reforms. Important advancements have been realised in the areas of document security, border and migration management, public order and security, and external relations and fundamental rights.

For the rapporteur, it is these criteria and this methodology that are extremely important in the benefits that they produce. On the one hand, citizens benefit from the implementation of reforms that impact their daily lives. In fact, the visa waiver is a remarkable tool that allows to connect people and build bridges among populations. On the other hand, it is a strong message for the citizens that see their country engaged in a European path.

Given the commitment of Ukraine to pursue in the way of the reforms undertaken and the consolidation and sustainability of its compromises, the rapporteur calls on us to confirm today the principle that the European Parliament so heatedly defends: that every country that meets the criteria set out by the European Commission should benefit of the visa waiver for its citizens.

Finally, the rapporteur would like to stress that Ukraine is a key partner for the EU in the Eastern Partnership in the fight against organised crime and terrorism, the fight against human trafficking, and the fight against corruption. Our vote tomorrow, supporting the visa waiver for the Ukrainian citizens, would constitute in this sense the concrete realisation of their aspiration and engagement in favour of peace, stability and European ambition.

On her behalf, I thank you.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for all the efforts you have put in this important file. Very soon, Ukrainian citizens holding a biometric passport will be able to travel to the Schengen area for short stays of up to 90 days without a visa, and I am very pleased that we are nearing this important moment for Ukraine and its citizens, for its neighbourhood and for the European Union.

We are seeing the results of the hard work of the Ukrainian authorities over the past three years. It has been a long process, but we are reaching the end. Already in December 2015, the Commission confirmed that Ukraine had implemented all the benchmarks set out in its visa liberalisation action plan. Following this positive assessment and taking into account the overall EU-Ukraine relations, we proposed in early 2016 to lift the visa requirement for Ukrainian citizens holding a biometric passport. I am very pleased that we can now finally conclude this process. In parallel, the revised visa suspension mechanism just entered into force at the end of last month. The visa suspension mechanism will be an important tool to further enhance security for the EU but also to strengthen our visa liberalisation policy. Under the new mechanism, the Commission will monitor the continuous fulfilment by Ukraine and all visa-free countries of the visa liberalisation criteria, especially in the fight against organised crime and corruption.

Honourable Members, we are almost there. Visa liberalisation for Ukraine will be an essential contribution to strengthening cultural and economic ties between Ukraine and the EU for the Eastern Partnership and our neighbourhood in general. In times of rising nationalism and xenophobia, insular and exclusive thinking, this will be another signal that the EU remains open and connected to this, its neighbourhood.

Dear Members of the European Parliament, I call on you to demonstrate this openness and support the proposal on the table during the votes.

Michael Gahler, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten.* – Herr Präsident! Ich spreche heute als ständiger Berichterstatter des Europäischen Parlaments für die Ukraine. Ich habe diese Aufgabe von unserem Kollegen Saryusz-Wolski übernommen, der als Berichterstatter die Stellungnahme des Auswärtigen Ausschusses zu diesem Bericht verfasst hatte. Ich danke ihm für seine bisherige Arbeit und bin sicher, dass er meine Ausführungen teilt.

Wir beglückwünschen heute die Ukraine. Mit dem Beschluss des Europäischen Parlaments befreien wir die ukrainischen Staatsangehörigen vom Visazwang. Zugleich stärken wir die Verbindung der Europäischen Union mit diesem Land. Die Aufhebung der Visumpflicht wurde möglich durch die Arbeit der ukrainischen Regierung und der Werchowna Rada. Sie haben wichtige technische Voraussetzungen erfüllt. Sie haben auch den politischen Willen, ihr Land demokratisch und rechtsstaatlich zu modernisieren, das heißt in dem Zusammenhang, einen effizienten Rückübernahmemechanismus anzuwenden.

Ich sage heute aber auch kritisch an unsere eigene Adresse: Wir als EU haben diese Entscheidung viel zu lange verzögert. Die Kommissarin sagte, im Dezember 2015 war das Land bereits so weit. Die Ukrainer hatten eine viel frühere Entscheidung verdient. Denn wir müssen auch sehen: Diesen wichtigen Reformkurs steuert die Ukraine, während sie sich im Krieg befindet und Teile des Landes – die Krim, Donezk und Luhansk – besetzt sind. Der russische Präsident gönnt der Ukraine diese Erfolge nicht. Ich sage deshalb den Verantwortlichen in der Ukraine: Sie müssen den erreichten Fortschritt absichern, auch nachdem die Visumpflicht entfällt. Die jüngsten Versuche, die Arbeit von Antikorruptionsaktivisten zu erschweren, sehe ich daher mit Sorge.

Reisen in der EU ohne teure Visa und zeitraubende Verfahren wird die Ukrainer und EU-Bürger noch enger miteinander verbinden. Der ukrainische Pass wird nun zu den erstklassigen Dokumenten in Europa gehören. Anders als von russischen Besatzungsbehörden ausgestellte Dokumente öffnet er alle Türen. Diese Nachricht sollte auch im Donezbecken gehört werden.

Meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kollegen! Erinnern Sie sich? Zwölf Jahre sind vergangen, seitdem Präsident Juschtschenko die Visumpflicht für EU-Bürger in der Ukraine aufgehoben hat. Anlass war damals das Finale des Eurovision Song Contest in Kiew Anfang Mai 2005. Ich freue mich, dass die Ukraine in wenigen Wochen, vom 9. bis zum 13. Mai, wieder solch ein fröhliches und friedliches Fest für alle Europäer ausrichten wird.

Heidi Hautala, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs.* – Mr President, when Mr President Poroshenko was in the Eastern Partnership Summit in Riga two years ago, he was referring to demonstrators outside the window who had banners saying 'I was born visa-free', and he repeated those words, and I think it was excellent food for thought for us. So now, finally, we are approaching the day when Ukrainian citizens can make short-term visits without a visa to the European Union. I am speaking on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs, which has paid close attention to the developments in Ukraine: visiting the country and also organising a hearing, together with the Commission, with the EU Advisory Mission Ukraine and with the Council of Europe in Brussels, where we studied the state of the reforms in the judiciary. And while we are rejoicing with the Ukrainians that they finally have this visa-free access to the European Union, we should not give up reminding them that the reform of the judiciary and especially the measures against high-level corruption must continue, and we have with great concern read news that there would be a total misunderstanding that also those fighting corruption would have to be put on the same line with those who actually are in the position to conduct corruptive measures – that they would have to declare their assets and situation. I hope that it will be set right in Ukraine.

Dubravka Šuica, *u ime Kluba zastupnika PPE-a.* – Gospodine predsjedniče, bezvizni režim za Ukrajinke koji putuju u Europsku uniju samo je još jedan dokaz kontinuirane potpore Europskog parlamenta Ukrajini. Ovaj Parlament dosljedno pokazuje solidarnost i osuđuje ruski vojni angažman i ilegalnu aneksiju Krima, a potiče promicanje političkih i gospodarskih reformi u Ukrajini.

Posljednje dvije godine, Ukrajina je započela ambiciozan i sveobuhvatan proces reformi, čiji je stvarni cilj stvaranje istinskog demokratskog političkog sustava i gospodarstva koje pravilno funkcionira. Uspjeh svih reformi trebao bi Ukrajini omogućiti prijelaz iz postsovjetske u europsku državu. Ukrajina od 2014. godine poduzima nevidene napore u pogledu provedbe reformi i trenutna stopa odbijanja viza za Europsku uniju za ukrajinske građane iznosi manje od 2 %.

Ovo je prilika za pozvati ukrajinsku Vladu da bude i dalje odlučna u provođenju daljnjih reformi. Moraju pokazati odlučnost u provedbi i postići političku stabilnost, što je zajedno s podrškom naroda iznimno važno za njezin uspjeh. Činjenica je da je Ukrajina ispunila sve uvjete i isto tako da svi ovi uvjeti omogućuju da se dogodi suspenzija viza, ali omogućuju i stabilnost, sigurnost, prosperitet i osobno smatram da Ukrajina zaslužuje ovaj tretman i nadam se da ćemo sutra glasovati u tom smislu.

(Govornica je pristala odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 162. stavak 8. Poslovnika))

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI), ερώτηση γαλάζια κάρτα. – Κύριε συνάδελφε, ευχαριστώ που δέχεστε την ερώτησή μου. Ήθελα να ρωτήσω: πιστεύετε ότι η Ουκρανία είναι σε θέση να μας διαβεβαιώσει ότι δεν θα συμβεί με τα ουκρανικά διαβατήρια εκείνο που συνέβη με τα συριακά διαβατήρια που πλαστογραφήθηκαν σε πολλές χιλιάδες αντίτυπα και τα πήραν Αφγανοί, Πακιστανοί, υπήκοοι του Μπαγκλαντές; Επιπλέον, πώς θα είμαστε βέβαιοι ότι αυτά τα διαβατήρια δεν θα πέσουν στα χέρια ανθρώπων του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος, οι οποίοι θα τα χρησιμοποιήσουν για παράνομες ενέργειες;

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice. – Svugdje ima kriminala i može se to dogoditi i u europskim zemljama. Radi se o biometrijskim putovnicama i kao što sam rekla, Ukrajina je ispunila sve uvjete koji su se od nje tražili. Dugo godina je trajao proces i ovo je način da Ukrajini pomognemo da se polagano europski integriira i da se oslobodi ruskog utjecaja.

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Mehr als 1,3 Millionen ukrainische Staatsbürgerinnen und Staatsbürger haben im letzten Jahr ein Visum für den Schengen-Raum erhalten. Ukrainer, die ihre Familien in Europa besuchen, Touristen, Geschäftsreisende oder Praktikanten. Diese und alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger des Landes werden in Zukunft davon profitieren, wenn wir morgen grünes Licht für die Visafreiheit für ukrainische Staatsbürger geben. Ab diesem Sommer sind Aufenthalte für bis zu 90 Tage von der Visumpflicht befreit, wenn man über einen biometrischen Pass verfügt. Dies erleichtert die Kontakte der Zivilgesellschaft untereinander, sorgt für weniger Bürokratie und ist auch gut für die Wirtschaft sowohl in der Ukraine als auch in der EU.

Neben all diesen praktischen Vorteilen hat die Entscheidung meines Erachtens auch einen hohen symbolischen Wert für die Ukraine und die Europäische Union. Sie ist eine Anerkennung der Reformbemühungen im Land. Die Kommission hat bereits Ende 2015 festgestellt, dass die Ukraine alle Kriterien erfüllt hat, die für einen Wegfall der Visumpflicht notwendig sind. Unser Ja zur Visumfreiheit morgen sendet daher auch ein deutliches Signal: Die Ukraine kann in schwierigen Zeiten auf die EU als Partner zählen. Wir öffnen die Tür nach Europa ein ganzes Stück weiter.

(Die Rednerin lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Rübig nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Dwanaście lat asymetrii, można powiedzieć, oczywiście można tłumaczyć ten stan rzeczy, ale myślę, że ten obowiązek wizowy znosimy trochę za późno. Obiecaliśmy to wcześniej, parę miesięcy temu znieśliśmy wize dla Gruzynów, szkoda, że nie zrobiliśmy tego w tym samym czasie dla naszych wschodnich sąsiadów, którzy rzeczywiście przez te ostatnie lata wykonali wielki wysiłek, aby „zwesternizować”, „uzachodnić” swój kraj. Oczywiście możemy mówić o zaniedbaniach – one były wymieniane tutaj przez moich przedmówców, ale trzeba przede wszystkim zobaczyć nie tylko wysiłki władz, ale samego społeczeństwa ukraińskiego, które rzeczywiście chce być częścią Zachodu także w wymiarze kulturowo-cywilizacyjnym. Mówiono o zielonym świetle, wydaje mi się, że to światło czerwone, ale też pomarańczowe bardzo długo się świeciło. Chciałbym, aby ta decyzja była dopiero wstępem do strategicznej i bliskiej współpracy z Ukrainą, która kiedyś zakończy się wejściem tego państwa do naszej europejskiej rodziny.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *Kékkártyás kérdés.* – Tisztelt Képviselő Úr! Önnek is köszönöm, hogy elfogadja a kérdésemet. Valóban most a vízumkönnyítésről beszélünk, de azért nyilvánvalóan az Európai Parlament több más módszerrel, sőt az Európai Unió több más módszerrel is segíti Ukrainát, nem utolsósorban a kedvezményes kereskedelem eszközeivel, illetve – és itt muszáj mondanom – az oroszokkal szembeni embargóval is. Ön mit gondol azokról a hangokról itt, az Európai Parlamentben, akik esetleg az orosz embargónak az enyhítését célozzák?

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Bardzo dziękuję Panu Posłowi za to pytanie. Jest to pytanie od posła, który dobrze zna Wschód, wielokrotnie tam bywał i myślę, że jest jednym z naszych ekspertów w tej sprawie.

Myślę, że trzeba Ukrainie pomagać, także poprzez instrumenty ekonomiczne, ale nie jest to kwestia akcji charytatywnej czy naszego miłosierdzia. To jest kwestia naszego interesu gospodarczego i politycznego. Te mosty ekonomiczne trzeba budować, obserwując również działanie coraz mocniejszego lobby prorosyjskiego, i u nas na Zachodzie, i tam na Ukrainie.

Petr Ježek, *on behalf of the ALDE Group.* – Mr President, Ukraine fulfilled all the criteria for the visa-free travel of its citizens to European Union. It is perfectly sufficient for granting it. But besides that, Ukraine was dragged into a difficult situation, and it deserves our support.

Years ago, when Berlin was divided and also in a difficult situation, a great US President proudly declared himself a Berliner. The democratic countries stood by Berlin and the principles of the liberal world. Also thanks to that, Berlin made it; it is united, and Germany and Europe as well.

I see a similarity with the current situation in Ukraine. The people of Ukraine suffer, and key principles are also heavily present. Nowadays I would say that people, wherever they may live, who want a peaceful world and the rule of international law, are, in a way, Ukrainians. I am proud that the European Parliament and the European Union are leading efforts to support and encourage the people of Ukraine – for their future and for ours as well.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL.* – Pane předsedající, jsem jednoznačně pro odstranění vízové povinnosti u všech evropských států. Proto také souhlasím se zařazením Ukrajiny do přílohy II nařízení (ES) č. 539/2001. Z větších evropských států totiž v tomto nařízení nenajdete žádný. Zato je zde Brunej a třináct států Latinské Ameriky.

Nastal čas k zahájení intenzivních jednání se státy Evropy o usnadnění získávání víz. U každého z těchto států můžeme nalézt kontroverzní skutečnosti, konkrétně na Ukrajině se jedná o zabránění činnosti komunistické a socialistické straně, o fyzické násilí proti vedoucím funkcionářům těchto stran, o vypalování jejich kanceláří. V průběhu podle zpravodajky mírových demonstrací na Majdanu zahynuly a byly zraněny desítky lidí. Dodnes není vyšetřen masakr v Oděse. Zpravodajka zjevně neuznává výsledky referenda na Krymu a ve městě Sevastopol. Dosavadní režim ve vízové oblasti kladl pouze symbolické překážky kriminálním živlům v pronikání do Evropské unie. Je tedy správné, že režim uvolňujeme, toho využijí jistě ti, kteří chtějí pracovat, obchodovat a rozvíjet kulturní vztahy. Věřím, že brzy budou následovat i další evropské státy.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 162 odst. 8 jednacího řádu).)

Jaromír Štětina (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty.* – Vážený pane kolego, proč si myslíte, že je špatné, že Ukrajinci zakázali komunistickou stranu? Děkuji za odpověď.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), *odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty*. – Je to jednoduché. Předpokládáme-li, že na Ukrajině směřujeme k demokracii, pak není možné, abychom vylučovali levicové síly z demokratického spektra a znemožňovali jim, aby svobodně, v rámci konceptu politických sil, kandidovaly do Nejvyšší rady, to je Verchovna Rada. A toto se na Ukrajině bohužel stalo.

Ulrike Lunacek, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to say to the Commissioner that tomorrow will be a joyful day for Ukrainian citizens, when Parliament votes for visa-free travel for Ukrainian citizens for three months to the EU. This is something which my political group, Verts/ALE, has been fighting for for all the countries in the neighbourhood. It has taken some time, and I would like to thank the rapporteur for the very good cooperation and the Commission for its support. As Parliament, most of us would have preferred to have had that rule entering into force earlier. Council wanted to have the suspension mechanism, but finally we got it, and now there will be visa-free travel for Ukrainian citizens. So this is a really joyful day.

Nevertheless, I would like to make two criticisms about what is happening in Ukraine at the moment. One thing – which is not really a criticism – is that having the Eurovision Song Contest in Kiev in May is something that I fully support. Nevertheless, I personally do not think that it was a very wise decision not to let the Russian singer participate. The song contest should be something joyful for citizens from whichever country, and it should overcome the fears and the problems which exist in Ukraine with Russian warmongering, etc.

The other point is even more serious. It is about the draft law on e-declarations, where civil society organisations will be obliged to submit e-declarations on their financial interests and assets. This is something that should go, and is going, for politicians and public officials. Yes, we as elected people also have to very clearly declare our interests, salaries and assets. This has been happening in Ukraine, but now legislators are going against civil society organisations – people who really fight for equal rights, more democracy, media freedom, etc. So this requirement is seen – and has to be seen – as a matter of intimidation that needs to stop.

Let me make one final remark about another country that I am rapporteur for here – Kosovo – which still does not have visa liberalisation. I do hope that, as soon as the Kosovo Assembly votes for the two last requirements, that in Parliament and in Council we will have a fast move forward to give the green light to all of those citizens in our close neighbourhood.

Beatrix von Storch, *im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir reden jetzt also über die visafreie Einreise für Bürger der Ukraine in die Europäische Union. Die Ukraine hat anders als Polen oder das Baltikum keine demokratischen oder rechtsstaatlichen Reformen durchgeführt. Die Ukraine ist wirtschaftlich ungefähr so frei wie Ghana oder Burkina Faso. Das Armenhaus der Euro-Zone, Griechenland, hat eine fünfmal höhere Wirtschaftsleistung pro Kopf als die Ukraine. Es ist Bürgerkrieg im Land. Der Präsident ist ein milliardenschwerer Oligarch, seine Briefkastenfirmen sind durch die Panama-Papers jetzt öffentlich geworden. Und mit Journalisten steht er nicht auf gutem Fuß. Die lässt er lieber nicht einreisen, insbesondere diejenigen, die über Korruption berichten wollen. Die müssen dann ihre Vermögensverhältnisse offenbaren, die werden also in besonderer Weise drangsaliert.

Dass die Niederlande das Assoziierungsabkommen mit der Ukraine abgelehnt haben, scheint hier wieder niemanden zu interessieren, das wird einfach ignoriert. Die EU will die Ukraine immer mehr an sich binden und – das wurde hier auch schon gesagt – am Ende in die EU hineinbekommen, auch wenn die Ablehnung der Niederlande beispielsweise da ist. Und das geht Schritt für Schritt – Salamtaktik –, mit Geld und mit Visafreiheit.

Es fließen Milliardenbeträge an die Ukraine, aber der Europäische Rechnungshof hat festgestellt: Wir wissen nicht, wohin. Man weiß es einfach nicht. Das Geld ist weg. Das stört aber auch wieder niemanden, obwohl dieses Land – auch das wurde mehrfach gesagt – in einer Disziplin Weltmeister werden könnte: in der Korruption. Die Frage ist: An welchem Maßstab messen Sie Visafreiheit?

(Die Rednerin lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Gahler nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Auke Zijlstra, namens de ENF-Fractie. – De Europese Rekenkamer noemt Oekraïne het meest corrupte land van Europa. Oekraïne is een land dat in oorlog is. Het moet met miljarden aan hulp op de been worden gehouden, het heeft moeite met democratie en oligarchen maken er de dienst uit. Visa en paspoorten worden op grote schaal vervalst en je kunt er nu al langetermijnvisa, verblijfsvergunningen en zelfs hele EU-nationaliteiten kopen.

Als er dus één land is dat niet in aanmerking moet komen voor visumvrijstelling is het wel Oekraïne. Maar Brussel ziet Oekraïne als een toekomstige lidstaat, wil dus van deze feiten niet weten en gooit de grenzen wijd open, terwijl ieder normaal mens ziet dat je met zo'n land juist heel goed bewaakte grenzen moet hebben.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ουκρανία, πριν από δύο χρόνια, συντελέστηκε μια συνταγματική εκτροπή. Το κίνημα Μαϊντάν, υποκινούμενο και βοηθούμενο από εξωदेशικούς παράγοντες, ανέτρεψε τη νόμιμη εκλεγμένη κυβέρνηση του προέδρου Γιανουκόβιτς. Η αρπαγή της εξουσίας από ένα κατ' ουσίαν νεοαζιστικό κόμμα, που εκπροσωπεί ολιγάρχες και εξτρεμιστικές ομάδες, απέχει πολύ από ένα κράτος δικαίου.

Αυτή τη στιγμή η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, έχοντας ως στόχο να μειώσει την επιρροή της Ρωσίας, συνδιαλέγεται και συνάπτει συμφωνίες με μια κυβέρνηση η οποία προήλθε από πραξικόπημα. Μια ευθεία αντιδιαστολή με την υπεροχή του διεθνούς δικαίου ως βασική αρχή της Ένωσης. Παράλληλα στην Ουκρανία, η διαφθορά και η διαπλοκή καταγράφουν υψηλά ποσοστά. Ο πολιτικός κόσμος εμπλέκεται σε πλήθος σκανδάλων, η δικαιοσύνη εθελουφλεί και υπάρχει παντελής έλλειψη ευρωπαϊκών δομών.

Η Ένωση θα πρέπει να δείξει μεγάλη προσοχή στις σχέσεις της με μια χώρα η οποία δεν μπορεί να διατηρήσει την τάξη και στην οποία η μισαλλοδοξία, ο εξτρεμισμός, η ανομία και το χάος κυριαρχούν. Υπό αυτές προϋποθέσεις κάθε προσέγγιση με την τωρινή κυβέρνηση της Ουκρανίας χαρακτηρίζεται τουλάχιστον ατυχής. Νομίζω ότι στο θέμα της έκθεσης σας κατευθύνουν τα συμφέροντα και όχι η πραγματικότητα. Βέβαια αυτό συμβαίνει κατά κόρον σε αυτή την αίθουσα.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Dámy a pánové, někdy začátkem roku mne jedny ukrajinské noviny požádaly o rozhovor. První otázka, kterou mi redaktor položil, byla: „Proč jste nás vy – Evropská unie a Evropský parlament – hodili přes palubu?“ Když jsem zalpal po dechu, redaktor pokračoval: „Ukrajinci vám přestávají věřit. Pořád jen sliby a slova. Vždyť Ukrajina brání i vás. Lidí přitom umírají. A vy nejste schopni vyřešit už druhý rok ani tak prostou věc, jako je bezvízový styk.“

Dialog o vízové liberalizaci EU-Ukrajina začal už v roce 2008. Komise předložila Ukrajině akční plán liberalizace v roce 2010. V prosinci 2015 Komise usoudila, že Ukrajina splnila všechna kritéria pro bezvízový styk. Cesta k bezvízovému styku trvala osm let. Mezitím se odehrál Majdan, Rusko anektovalo Krym, vypukla válka na východě. Ani tyto otřesy nezahubily myšlenku, že Ukrajina patří do Evropy. V září 2014 náš Evropský parlament a ukrajinský parlament ratifikovaly asociační dohodu a zítra máme bezvízový styk pro Ukrajinu schválit.

Nejde jen o to, že ukrajinský občan může navštívit Evropskou unii na celých devadesát dní bez víza, ale zítřejší přijetí bude mít zásadní symbolický význam. Ukrajina patří do Evropy. Nebyla zapomenuta.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Dijalog o liberalizaciji viznog režima između Evropske unije i Ukrajine počeo je još prije devet godina. Komisija je objavila više pozitivnih izvješća o provedbi akcijskog plana za liberalizaciju viznog sustava, što dokazuje znatne pomake od 2014. uzmu li se u obzir unutarnje prilike i vanjski pritisci s kojima se ta zemlja suočava. U posljednjem izvješću Komisija zaključuje kako je Ukrajina ostvarila potreban napredak i zadovoljila sva mjerila utvrđena u akcijskom planu.

Ovu odluku ne treba komunicirati kao neki jednostrani ustupak Europske unije Ukrajini. Ukrajina je naš ključni partner u okviru Europske politike susjedstva i Istočnog partnerstva. Načelo reciprociteta liberalizacije viznog režima očituje se u uzajamnim pogodnostima i za europske i za ukrajinske građane. Doprinijet će širenju mreže kontakata, jačanju ekonomskih i kulturnih odnosa te poticanju političkog dijaloga o vitalnim pitanjima.

Zaključno, iznimno mi je drago da Europski parlament konačno glasuje o ovoj odluci koja predstavlja puno više od tehničkog aspekta naših odnosa. Ona je toliko očekivani simbolički, ali i vrlo konkretan čin potpore Europske unije Ukrajini i njezinim građanima. Nadam se da će i Vijeće ubrzo potvrditi ovu odluku jer, iako je jasno da uskoro neće doći do novog proširenja Europske unije, nikako ne smije zastati naša podrška Ukrajini da postupno, uz obveze ispunjavanja svih potrebnih standarda ostvari jedan od ključnih ciljeva, a to je svakako članstvo u Europskoj uniji.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Daleko stąd pisany jest scenariusz skłócania Polaków z Ukraińcami, odpowiadam wprost – popieram liberalizację wizową, walkę z agresją i trudne reformy. Jeżeli jednak słowo Polki, przyjaciela, osoby, która potrafi iść pod prąd, ma dla Ukraińców jakiegokolwiek znaczenie, chcę, żeby wiedzieli, że wspomnienie postaci Stefana Bandery budzi moje największe obawy. Wierzę jednak, że wspólnie pokonamy wszystkie przeszkody. Działając w dobrej woli, doprowadzimy do tego, że będziemy w jednej europejskiej rodzinie.

Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE). – Mr President, first, a correction: the Dutch Parliament, having two houses, is now in the process of ratification of the Association Agreement with Ukraine. I hope, because the House has passed it already, that it will also pass in the Senate soon, and then the Dutch will be part of the Association Agreement, and I favour that very, very much. Secondly, should we punish the people of Ukraine for the fact that their country is under threat of Russian aggression and that there is illegal annexation of the Crimea and illegal Russian intervention in Eastern Ukraine? Should we punish them for that? No, of course, and it means that tomorrow we will vote and I am sure we will vote in a positive manner for visa liberalisation, because the criteria have been met. There is this safeguard and the emergency brake in the biometric passport, so it is now time to say 'yes' to free people in a free country.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Po to, kai šiandien ryte aptarėme liūdną visai Europos Sąjungai klausimą – „Brexītą“, dabar turime galimybę padaryti vieną darbą, kuriuo prisidėsime prie didesnės ir geresnės Europos kūrimo – vizų panaikinimo Ukrainos piliečiams. Vizų panaikinimas ir teisė laisvai keliauti po Europos Sąjungą – vienas veiksmingiausių Europos Sąjungos išorės politikos instrumentų. Jį taikyti turime atsargiai ir pamatuotai, visų pirma, tų šalių, kurios nori būti europietiškomis, atžvilgiu. Ukraina jau seniai įrodė, jog yra nusipelnusi pasinaudoti šia Europos Sąjungos teikiama galimybe. Kartu tai bus geriausia mūsų dovana visoms proeuropietiškomis jėgoms Ukrainoje, aiški žinia, kad mainais už šalies europėjimą ji gali gauti ir daugiau.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la Commission propose d'exempter les Ukrainiens de l'obligation de visa pour entrer dans l'Union. Je suis résolument opposé à cette proposition, car la Commission la présente elle-même comme, je cite: «un développement de l'acquis de Schengen». Or, je suis contre Schengen, dont l'échec évident vient d'ailleurs d'être constaté par un rapport du Sénat français.

Je condamne, d'autre part, cet empressement de l'Union à collaborer avec le sinistre régime du président Poročenko. Le Conseil des droits de l'homme de l'ONU a révélé qu'il pratique la torture à l'encontre des personnes soupçonnées de séparatisme.

De façon plus générale, l'Ukraine ne respecte plus les normes européennes. Le droit y est mal respecté. Le procureur général Loutsenko a ainsi enregistré une hausse de 25 % de la criminalité dans le pays. Quant à la corruption, elle se porte mieux que jamais. Poročenko, président, donne hélas le mauvais exemple en passant des contrats avec Poročenko, chef d'entreprise, c'est-à-dire avec lui-même. D'après le magazine *Forbes*, sa fortune personnelle aurait augmenté de 320 millions de dollars en deux ans.

Dans ces conditions, il est inacceptable de décerner une telle récompense à l'Ukraine. L'Union doit se reprendre et arrêter de se laisser aveugler par sa haine de la Russie.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, we have just heard the infiltration of Putin in this European Parliament from my colleague in ENF. Finally, the people of Ukraine will be granted visa-free travel. It is about time. It is a concrete step to fulfil the Maidan dream. The aspiration of a Ukraine closer to Europe for the people, by the people. Ukraine has fulfilled all the criteria in record time; even more impressive, they made it while under attack by Russia, which is waging a proxy war. Let us be honest: few countries today pay such a high price for its democratic aspiration.

More than 10 000 Ukrainians have died defending our shared values of peace, democracy and freedom. More than 1.5 million are displaced, many of whom are children fleeing for their lives. With visa-free travel, finally the EU delivers visible results for the people, showing them that there is progress. Visa liberalisation is about people-to-people contacts, facilitating mutual understanding, respect and friendship.

Now a Ukrainian entrepreneur can meet his business partner in the EU without tiring paperwork. Tourists, young people, can travel to Europe without waiting in line in embassies, and parents can spontaneously go and meet their children living on the other side of the border. This exchange is in our common interest. It has strengthened our partnership and our economy, and the EU should now give the green light and implement the visa-free regime without delay. Ukraine has done its part; we have to do ours.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, en la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior en la que soy ponente del informe del Código sobre visados, me he mostrado siempre a favor de la facilitación de los visados y he votado a favor de la exención de visados para los ciudadanos ucranianos que dispongan de pasaporte biométrico, dado que Ucrania hace ya tiempo que concedió esa exención de visado a los ciudadanos europeos.

Ucrania ha superado los seis informes de situación que han sido necesarios para completar este expediente, el último en diciembre de 2015, en el marco del Acuerdo de Asociación que se firmó solemnemente aquí, en este Parlamento Europeo, y simultáneamente en la Verjovna Rada —el Parlamento ucraniano—, en septiembre de 2015.

Eso no significa que no haya problemas. Entre ellos, ese procedimiento legislativo que intenta imponer declaraciones electrónicas de intereses y de bienes a las asociaciones civiles que luchan contra la corrupción, como si tuvieran que tener el mismo tratamiento que los políticos, que tanto compromiso tienen que mostrar contra la corrupción en un país como Ucrania. Pero lo cierto es que este Parlamento tiene la obligación de hacer valer la regla del Estado de Derecho, como ha hecho cuando ha protestado por la anexión de Crimea o de Sebastopol por la Federación Rusa.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Wie mij kent, weet dat ik altijd verdediger ben geweest van een visumvrijstelling voor kort verblijf voor burgers van Oekraïne. Het actieplan voor visumliberalisering is de motor geweest voor ingrijpende hervormingen. Niet in het minst in de strijd tegen de corruptie.

Zelf stond ik eind 2013, begin 2014 meerdere keren op het Maidanplein in Kiev, naast een massa mensen die snakten naar een maatschappij zonder corruptie, naar respect voor de rechtsstaat. We moeten erkennen dat er heel veel inspanningen zijn geleverd, maar ook dat er nog een lange weg moet worden afgelegd. En uitgerekend met visa wordt jammer genoeg nog altijd gesjoemeld. In Kiev blijven schimmige bedrijfses actief die visa verkopen, die openlijk adverteren op het internet en de Schengenregels omzeilen. Ze verleggen met het oog op visumvrijstelling hun scope naar langetermijnvisa.

Ik roep onze Oekraïense vrienden op om echt snel werk te maken van de strijd tegen zulke malafide praktijken. Ook al onze lidstaten en de Europese Commissie moeten meewerken om de spelregels voor iedereen te doen eerbiedigen en om de fraude met visa een halt toe te roepen.

Kaja Kallas (ALDE). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Mul on väga hea meel, et läbirääkimised hakkavad lõpule jõudma ja Ukraina saab lõpuks kauaoodatud viisavabaduse. Hääletades homme viisavabaduse poolt, tunnustame me tegelikult Ukraina seniseid reforme, eriti kohtu- ja haldusreformi. Käivitatud on ka riigihangete e-platvorm ja võideldakse korruptsiooniga. Need arengud ei toimu mitte ainult tänu riigiametnikele, vaid väga suures osas tänu kodanikuühiskonnale.

Väga tihti öeldakse meile, et üks asi, mis toimib Ukrainas paremini kui mujal, on kodanikuühiskond – just inimeste endi aktiivsus ja vabatahtlikkus paneb ametnikud tegutsema.

Seepärast kurvastab mind segadus, mis on tekkinud e-deklaratsioonidega ja Ukraina hiljutise otsusega, mille kohaselt ka mittetulundusühingud ja kodanikuühendused peavad samade reeglite järgi avaldama kõik oma varad. Ma loodan, et Ukraina valitsus leiab lahenduse ja need ühingud vabastatakse sellest kohustusest.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, toujours plus, toujours plus de démagogie, toujours plus d'excès. Finalement, l'Union européenne ne nous apprend rien du tout. Tout ce qu'on peut dire, c'est qu'après l'élargissement à vingt-huit, bientôt à trente-quatre avec la Turquie et la libéralisation des visas, l'Union européenne est en fin de compte un endroit où l'on accepte tout le monde sans bien regarder la provenance.

En tout cas, notre groupe est tout à fait clair. Comme pour la Turquie, nous sommes contre, résolument contre la libéralisation des visas. Nous pensons que l'Ukraine n'est pas un ami de l'Europe. Nous ne pouvons pas accueillir tout le monde et nous ne pouvons pas payer pour tout le monde. En fait, Monsieur le rapporteur, ce que vous voulez dans votre rapport, c'est uniquement éloigner l'Ukraine de la Russie. Voilà ce que vous voulez faire. Vous ne voulez pas l'intégrer, mais l'éloigner de la Russie.

Nous continuons donc sur de mauvais chemins et, selon moi, l'Union européenne pâtira de cet excès de migrants et de la libéralisation des visas.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr. President, granting a visa-free regime is a very tangible act of support from the European Union to citizens of Ukraine. I would like to congratulate the rapporteur for her continuous efforts to make it happen. I closely monitor the current state of reforms, and I must say that the progress made in the past two or three years is truly unprecedented. Ukraine is on a very ambitious path to create a properly-functioning economy in a democratic political system with the ultimately aim to finish the transition from post-Soviet to European state. A lot of progress was made regarding the required reforms, especially in the field of judiciary, the fight against corruption, strengthening the democratic institutions, and the rule of law. There is a lot of work ahead for the full implementation of these reforms, especially considering a very difficult fight to regain full territorial integrity of the country. Therefore, I am very happy that this House is taking an important step to enable Ukrainian citizens to travel without visa. By this, we are showing to the Ukrainian people, but also to the outside world, that you want stronger connection and more shared experiences, and I firmly believe that it is going to be to the mutual benefit of us all.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I don't understand why we still use such atavism as visa regime for our European neighbours. What is the reason of keeping it? We have a lot of security lists of terror suspects, criminals and other persons that are for any reason denied entry to the EU. Border guards have access to these databases, and any people from these lists will not be allowed to cross the border. Other countries' citizens who wanted to travel to the EU without visas are required to have very well-protected biometric passports, which many of the European Union states' citizens do not have. Individuals may be asked to show documents proving purpose and conditions of stay; for example, tickets for further journeys and return tickets, reservation of accommodation and invitation letter, as well as evidence of sufficient means of subsistence. In case of doubt, the person could be not allowed to enter the EU. Now we have a special suspension mechanism, when the Commission can pause a visa-free regime for a concrete country if some migration criminal or some other concerns will appear. What additional options to this list of protection measures give with the regime? At the same time, millions of migrants come through the Mediterranean without any visas or documents from very problematic from the security point of view regions, but we are still afraid to grant a visa-free regime for such states as Georgia recently, Ukraine or Belarus in the future. It reminds us of a door with twenty locks, but there is still a huge gap in the wall nearby.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Ja, es wird viel über sogenannte Reformen in der Ukraine berichtet. Aber allein der dauernde Austausch von Regierungsmitgliedern spricht ja eine andere Sprache. Und allein die Tatsache, dass zirka ein Drittel der Ukrainer, nämlich 15 Millionen, offensichtlich ihr Land akut verlassen wollen, spricht ja offene Worte und offene Bände.

Mit dieser Visaliberalisierung – das sagt auch der vorliegende Bericht – sind klar die Weichen in die Richtung Vollmitgliedschaft in der Union gestellt. Das halte ich aus mehreren Gründen für sehr fehlerhaft. Abgesehen von den offenen Fragen wie Korruption, Vetternwirtschaft, Grundfreiheiten, Menschenrechte würden nämlich die notwendigen Entwicklungskosten für die Mitgliedstaaten und vor allem für die Nettozahler horrenden Milliardenbeträge ausmachen und eine zusätzliche Budgetbelastung bedeuten. Die Union ist daher gut beraten, die selbst gegebenen Kopenhagener Kriterien auch tatsächlich ernst zu nehmen und aus den Erweiterungsproblemen der letzten Jahre die Lehren zu ziehen.

Letztlich ist dieser Schritt nicht geeignet, die Beziehungen zu Russland zu verbessern. Im Gegenteil: Die Union riskiert, in den Dauerkonflikt zwischen Russland und der Ukraine als Partner auch voll mit hineingezogen zu werden.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Örülök, hogy holnap végre szavazatunkkal hozzájárulhatunk az ukrán állampolgárok Európai Unióba való vízummentes beutazásához. Ez egy hosszú folyamat sikeres befejezése lehet, sokat áldoztak és fáradoztak ezért az ukrán állampolgárok.

A vízummentességgel több százezer ember előtt nyílik meg formálisan a szabad utazás, a külföldi tanulás lehetősége. Egyszerűsödhet az Ukrajnában élő magyar, bolgár, román, szlovák, lengyel és más kisebbségi közösségek kapcsolattartása az anyaországgal. Azonban ennek vannak fizikai korlátai is: a határ menti infrastruktúra, az úthálózat és határátkelők elmaradott állapota vagy hiánya, így ha kézzel fogható segítséget szeretnénk nyújtani a polgároknak, az EU-nak hatékony tervet kell kidolgoznia, és finanszírozást kell biztosítani ezek fejlesztése érdekében is. Ezáltal megszűnhetne a határokon kialakult több órás várakozás, európai színvonalú beutazási körülményeket biztosíthatnánk.

Ukrajnát támogatni kell a szükséges reformok végrehajtásában, a kül- és belpolitikai, valamint gazdasági stabilizálódás útján. Az EU-nak egyértelmű jelzéseket kell adni Ukrajnának, hogy a demokratizálódást és az európai integráció törekvését nem elég deklarálni, hanem az intézkedések során szem előtt kell tartani. Így például megengedhetetlen, hogy az országban élő kisebbségek alkotmány által garantált nyelvi és oktatási jogait diszkriminatív módon szűkítsék, vagy teret engedjenek a szélsőséges csoportoknak, hogy feszültséget szítsanak a többség és a kisebbségek között. Ezért fontos szerepet kell betöltenie a törvényhozók munkájában a társadalmi konszolidáció és a kölcsönös tiszteleten alapuló békés együttélés, a jobbiztonság kialakításának a szempontja.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Het is goed nieuws dat de visumvrijstelling voor Oekraïne eindelijk wordt afgerond. Het land heeft moeilijke hervormingen doorgevoerd om te voldoen aan alle voorwaarden en dan is het ook niet meer dan logisch dat de EU ook haar kant van de afspraak nakomt.

Het zijn moeilijke tijden voor de Oekraïense bevolking. Een deel van het land is illegaal geannexeerd en in het oosten doet Rusland er alles aan om het land te ontwrichten. Dat Oekraïne zich op nauwere samenwerking met de EU blijft richten, draagt bij aan de democratische ontwikkeling in het land. Hopelijk motiveert dit akkoord de regering om door te gaan met de ingezette hervormingen op het gebied van de rechtsstaat en de nodige strijd tegen corruptie. De nieuwe wetgeving die anti-corruptie-activisten en journalisten het werk juist verder bemoeilijkt, moet dan ook van tafel.

Deze visumvrijstelling is geen cadeau aan Oekraïne, maar wel een tastbaar resultaat voor de bevolking van een land, waardoor de samenwerking met Europa verdergaat dan louter economische belangen. Met andere woorden: Europa is meer dan slechts een markt en kan met een doelgericht buitenlandbeleid wel degelijk zorgen voor positieve en democratische ontwikkelingen in de landen om ons heen.

Om al deze redenen wil ik graag de Oekraïners feliciteren met het feit dat ze straks eenvoudig naar de EU kunnen reizen om familie te bezoeken, een zakenreis te maken of om op vakantie te gaan, zonder dat ze daarbij een ellenlange en vaak denigrerende visumprocedure moeten doorstaan. Daarom zeg ik hier "Gefeliciteerd!", ook in het Oekraïens: "Vitajoe!".

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, l'Ukraine connaît de tels niveaux de misère et de corruption qu'une grande partie de la population en est arrivée à regretter le joug soviétique, c'est dire. Le fait que l'Ukraine se soit vu attribuer par l'Union européenne, en novembre dernier, plus de 300 millions d'euros et, cette semaine encore, un milliard de dollars par le FMI, n'est une chance que pour l'oligarchie, qui détourne 15 % du budget national.

La libéralisation des visas au prétexte ridicule d'approfondir les contacts entre les peuples – c'est dans le document de la Commission – ne saurait cacher une nouvelle manœuvre politicienne. Elle sera dévastatrice pour les travailleurs de l'Union, qui seront soumis à la concurrence accrue d'une main-d'œuvre exploitable illégalement, à n'importe quel prix, puisque le salaire moyen est là-bas de 180 euros par mois et les retraites de 64 euros. Elle sera dévastatrice pour les citoyens européens, proies idéales des bandes criminelles, dont les activités s'en trouveront facilitées. Enfin, elle sera dévastatrice pour l'Ukraine, qui finira de se vider de ses forces vives alors que le pays a déjà perdu plus de dix millions d'habitants.

Victor Boștinariu (S&D). – Mr President, Ukraine is a special partner for the EU, not only because it is a very important country in our Eastern Partnership, but also because of the way the Ukrainian people were outstandingly clear in showing their support for European values.

I have to say that many doubts could be cast on how the EU has actually reacted following the Euromaidan, but what matters today is the result. Better late than never, the moment has finally come to grant visa liberalisation to Ukrainian citizens. This is the minimum reward the EU can grant for their attachment and loyalty to the EU and European values. We need to praise Ukraine for managing to undertake the necessary reforms in an extremely difficult environment – I would say wartime – imposed by Russia, considering that it has to dedicate great efforts and resources to a conflict that is in fact a direct consequence of the European choice that the Ukrainian citizens have made.

Now that the time has come for the free visa regime, I hope that the next step can be the ratification by the Dutch senate of the EU-Ukrainian Association Agreement. We cannot allow such an important agreement – another sign of reciprocal commitment between the EU and Ukraine – to continue to remain under a big question mark. Ukraine desperately needs and deserves, first and foremost, our support to end the conflict in eastern Ukraine and to preserve its territorial integrity, which was not only challenged but destroyed by Russia. But they also need to advance reforms in several fields to enhance their economy, and it is evident that to do so they need clear and tangible signs from our side.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Ja nie tylko zastępuję dzisiaj Marię Gabriel, ale mam też swoje własne wystąpienie. To bardzo ważny dzień. Przypomnijmy sobie obywatelską odwagę i tragiczne bohaterstwo Majdanu, który stał się w 2014 roku prawdziwym sercem Europy, odnawiającym sens Unii Europejskiej w jej wolnościowym i gospodarczym wymiarze. I pamiętajmy o wyborze, jakiego naród ukraiński dokonał podczas tej Rewolucji Godności. To droga do Europy i razem z Europą.

Realizowane na Ukrainie reformy są trudne, ale ile już zrobiono dla walki z korupcją, dla przejrzystości sektora bankowego, decentralizacji państwa, rosnącej niezależności energetycznej, usług administracyjnych w cyfrowej formie, dla ożywienia gospodarczego, by z wyniku: -9 % PKB dojść do : + 2% PKB.

Jeszcze wiele trudnych zadań przed Ukrainą, ale musimy pamiętać o prostym fakcie. Ukraina zmienia się na lepsze w warunkach wojny. Rosja zabrała Krym i zajęła wschodnią część kraju. Prawie dwa miliony osób straciło swoje miejsce zamieszkania i wędruje po kraju. Który kraj dałby radę tak mądrze i sprawnie się zmieniać pod presją wojny? Które państwo dałoby radę w takich warunkach wypełnić wszystkie wymagania dotyczące liberalizacji wizowej? Dlatego cieszy nasza decyzja o liberalizacji wizowej dla Ukrainy. To nie jest prezent. To jest wyraz szacunku z naszej strony dla europejskiej drogi, jaką Ukraina wybrała. I to jest prawo dla ukraińskich obywateli wypracowane przez nich samych.

Catch-the-eye procedure

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, na última sessão plenária fiz uma intervenção nesta Casa sobre as constantes agressões a que a Ucrânia e os seus cidadãos estão sujeitos por parte dos seus vizinhos russos. Também aqui tive oportunidade de alertar para a ameaça expansionista da Rússia na Ucrânia, que naquele momento se revelava com o assassinato, na Ucrânia, do crítico do regime de Putin, Denis Voronenkov. Denis Voronenkov era, nada mais, nada menos, que uma das principais testemunhas da agressão russa contra a Ucrânia. Tive também a oportunidade de apelar à entrada imediata da liberalização dos vistos aos cidadãos ucranianos que há três anos atrás na Praça Maidan lutaram para que a Ucrânia se tornasse mais europeia.

Amanhã votaremos finalmente nesta Casa um instrumento que permitirá mais facilidade de movimentos, ou melhor, liberdade de circulação aos cidadãos ucranianos dentro do espaço da União Europeia.

Espero, assim, amanhã, e em nome dos milhares de ucranianos que escolheram o meu país para viver, Portugal, poder congratular os meus colegas nesta assembleia pela viabilização deste importante instrumento estratégico para uma vizinhança mais próspera, segura e estável.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, není to náhoda, že v dnešní debatě o liberalizaci víz vystupují už jako čtvrtá poslankyně z České republiky, protože Česká republika přijímá tisíce ukrajinských pracovníků. My s nimi máme zkušenosti a máme pro ně velké pochopení.

Myslím, že přidáním Ukrajiny na seznam zemí, jejichž obyvatelé jsou osvobozeni od vízové povinnosti, dáváme jasný signál, že s Ukrajinou počítáme, a je to také ocenění reformního úsilí, které Ukrajina musela splnit. Liberalizace víz není zadarmo, oni provedli reformu soudního systému, veřejné správy, opatření v boji proti korupci, legislativní změny, a to vše za velmi složité politické a hlavně bezpečnostní situace, protože na východě Ukrajiny se stále bojuje a není tam klid.

Já velmi přeji Ukrajině tento úspěch a je to také splnění přání mladé generace, která chce žít společně s Evropou.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prima di giungere alla liberalizzazione dei visti con l'Ucraina, i progressi compiuti dal paese dell'ex Unione Sovietica in materia di politica e civile ed il suo avvicinamento ai principi fondamentali dell'Unione europea sono stati oggetto di uno scrutinio costante da parte delle istituzioni europee.

Dall'avvio del dialogo, iniziato nell'ottobre 2008, la Commissione ha pubblicato 6 relazioni intermedie sui progressi compiuti nell'attuazione del piano e l'Ucraina ha intrapreso un percorso importante di trasformazione democratica dopo le elezioni presidenziali del 2014. Il paese ha fatto significativi passi in avanti in materia di controllo delle frontiere, di lotta contro la corruzione, contro il crimine organizzato e il riciclaggio di denaro e il supporto dell'Unione europea ha fatto da leva nell'affrontare problemi così gravi.

Il rilascio di passaporti biometrici realizzati secondo gli standard internazionali consentirà ai cittadini ucraini di entrare in Europa e viceversa, secondo il principio di reciprocità. L'Unione europea dovrà impegnarsi a garantire e a monitorare il rispetto delle condizioni di partenariato anche dopo la liberalizzazione, mantenendo una relazione solida e proficua con l'Ucraina.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, děkuji i za to Vaše gesto, protože to není zcela obvyklé, a moc Vám za to děkuji. Dovolte mi také říct pár slov k tomu, co zde dnes projednáváme.

Já si myslím, že bychom především měli myslet na bezpečnost našich občanů a občanů Evropské unie. A to, že papír snese vše, to je prostě faktem. Podívejme se na realitu na Ukrajině. Bez mezinárodní finanční pomoci by nebyla schopna obstát a zkrachovala by. Bez toho, že tam dnes platí různé bezpečnostní složky různí oligarchové, by tam žádné nefungovaly. Učitelé nedostávají platy, lékaři nedostávají platy a hlavně nikdo není schopen zajistit, že pasy, které budou vydávány údajně ukrajinským občanům, budou opravdu vydávány pouze ukrajinským občanům.

Já sice chápu to politické gesto, že chcete jakýmsi způsobem pomoci Ukrajině, ale já si nejsem jistá, jestli tohle je pomoc anebo spíš zlo pro samotnou Ukrajinu a pro bezpečnost evropských občanů. Vy pouze umožníte to, aby ukrajínští občané odešli z Ukrajiny, a ti, které bude Ukrajina jednou potřebovat, aby tam prostě nezůstali a byli v Evropě. A to ještě s bezpečnostním rizikem.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, from this interesting debate I dare to think that there is a large consensus in this House on the need to keep the promises we made to the Ukrainian citizens. This is also the recognition of the sustained and comprehensive reform efforts which have been carried out by the Ukrainian authorities, particularly in the field of border management, the fight against corruption and anti-discrimination. We will hereby fulfil a longstanding demand by Ukrainian citizens and also facilitate interpersonal contacts and cooperation. With the revised suspension mechanism in place, there is no need to delay this important file any further.

I therefore call on you all to proceed with the vote on Ms Gabriel's report and to bring us one step closer to the conclusion of the whole procedure to grant visa-free travel for Ukrainian citizens.

Michał Boni, deputising for the rapporteur. – Mr President, very briefly, thank you for the very comprehensive debate. It was focused on visa liberalisation for Ukraine, but many problems and topics were also raised relating to the future cooperation between the European Union and Ukraine. Those key topics are: implementation of the DCFTA; the next steps of their reforms; our common cooperation related to border solutions; and also the problem of war and Russian aggression. I think that it was very fruitful and we are thinking about further cooperation with Ukraine. Also, we are considering how to support Ukraine in taking some steps that are important for NGOs, civil society. I know the President established a special working group for solving the problem of this declaration of financial interest which was addressed also to civil society.

All of those issues are very serious, and I have talked about serious interventions during this debate – not the extreme propaganda which was also presented during this debate.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 6 April 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – Tisztelt Képviselő társaim! Napjainkban nagyon fontos hogy pozitív üzenetek közvetítsünk a polgárok felé az Unió határain belül, de azon kívül is. Mivel eredetileg Szerbiából származom, személyes tapasztalatom van vízumkényszer kapcsán. A 2000-es évek elején hosszú sorokban kígyóztunk az EU-s tagállamok konzulátusai és követségei előtt, hogy vízumhoz juthassanak. Legfőképp fiatalok, akik meg szerették volna ismerni „Európát”. Másodrangú európaiaknak éreztük magunkat, akiktől az EU fél és akikre úgy tekintetnek, mint veszélyforrásra. Ukrajnában hasonlóan, mint a Nyugat-Balkánon nagy szükség van az EU jelenlétére, és befolyásának a növelésére. Ha elmulasztjuk a lehetőséget, hogy megszilárdítsuk a pozícióinkat, mások fognak a helyünkbe lépni tovább növelve a potenciális veszélyforrásokat, amelyek kérdésessé tehetik Európa jövőjét. Ezért kérek mindenkit, hogy támogassa szavazatával a jelentést! Köszönöm, hogy meghallgattak.

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – W pełni popieram bezwarunkowe zniesienie ruchu wizowego dla Ukrainy, ponieważ stanowi to ważny sygnał potwierdzający proeuropejskie aspiracje tego kraju. Komisja Europejska regularnie monitorowała wypełnianie przez Ukrainę kryteriów liberalizacyjnych i stwierdziła, że Ukraina spełniła je wszystkie. W konsekwencji Komisja Europejska przedstawiła propozycję zmian do rozporządzenia 539 z 2001 r., tj. wpisanie Ukrainy do załącznika drugiego obejmującego państwa, których obywatele są zwolnieni z obowiązku posiadania wiz przy przekraczaniu granicy zewnętrznej strefy Schengen.

Po wejściu tego rozporządzenia w życie obywatele Ukrainy, którzy posiadają paszporty biometryczne, będą mogli wjechać na terytorium Unii Europejskiej bez wiz na okres 90 dni w ciągu pół roku w celach turystycznych. Liberalizacja wizowa dla Ukrainy to ważny krok, który pomoże obywatelom Ukrainy w reformach i zbliży ich do nas. Jestem przekonany, że w pełni zasługują oni na prawo swobodnego podróżowania do Unii Europejskiej.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Viisavabaduse otsus on suur samm ELi ja Ukraina suhete tihendamisel. Oleme seda kaua oodanud, sest Ukraina on ELi idapartnerlusprogrammi aktiivne liige ning viisavabadus ELi ja Ukraina vahel tugevdab ka suhteid inimeste ja kodanikuühiskondade vahel. Samuti vajavad Ukraina inimesed selget moraalset tuge seoses jätkuva sõjategevusega Ukraina idaosas ning viisavabaduse andmise otsus on lisaks poliitilisele ja praktilisele mõjule ka selge ELi moraalset toetust väljendus. Lisaks ei maksa unustada ka seda, et Ukraina kehtestas juba aastaid tagasi ühepoolset viisavabadust ELi kodanikele.

17. Sestava delegacij: glej zapisnik

18. Razmere v Venezueli (razprava)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the situation in Venezuela (2017/2651(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, almost a year ago, in May 2016, High Representative/Vice-President Federica Mogherini was here in this plenary discussing the worrying situation in Venezuela with you. Since then the political, social and economic situation in the country has not improved. The political polarisation and institutional confrontation has further escalated, the economic situation is dire, the shortage of food and medicines has increased, there are reports of alarming child malnutrition, and the insecurity is only getting worse.

I would therefore like to thank the Parliament for the continuous attention you have been paying to the situation in Venezuela. Today's discussion is timely as the dialogue between the government and the opposition has stalled and the country urgently needs to find a peaceful and democratic solution to this crisis. Important efforts by the Vatican and UNASUR facilitators to establish a dialogue between government and opposition have been taking place since May 2016. Unfortunately, although the first two sessions of the dialogue in October and November had encouraging results, the commitments were not respected. The establishment of an electoral calendar, respect for the National Assembly's

access to external assistance to address the most urgent needs of the population, and the release of political prisoners, remain key issues on which there has been little or no progress.

The EU has not been observing the situation passively. We have been providing political and diplomatic support with a view to a meaningful and effective dialogue that can bring lasting and democratic solutions within the constitutional framework and in full respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms. To this end, we continue our constant contacts with countries in the region and beyond, and with international and regional organisations from the United Nations to the OAS and UNASUR, to share views and coordinate actions wherever and whenever appropriate.

The EU has repeatedly been calling for respect for the Constitution, democratic principles, the rule of law and the separation and independence of powers which are crucial for the country to achieve a peaceful outcome to the current difficult situation. That is why we reacted immediately to the recent rulings of the Venezuelan Supreme Court suppressing the competences of the National Assembly and the immunity of parliamentarians, calling for full respect of the constitutional role of the National Assembly and for the immunity of its members.

For the democratic order to be guaranteed Venezuela needs to establish an electoral calendar, as foreseen in the Constitution, and to organise elections that are free, fair and inclusive. In 2017 the election of governors should be a priority. The EU remains ready to reinforce its support to help address the most urgent needs of the population, thus contributing to dealing with current humanitarian challenges. For the moment, our assistance remains limited due to difficulties of access to the country and it focuses on the distribution of food and medicines to the most vulnerable population, but other possibilities of support are also being explored.

Luis de Grandes Pascual, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente; gracias comisaria Jourová. De nuevo al Parlamento Europeo debe ocuparse de Venezuela. Constituye una obligación inexcusable y mientras lo hacemos, señorías, el pueblo venezolano con los líderes de la oposición al frente es gaseado en una represión brutal del régimen bolivariano.

Que el Tribunal Supremo despoje de sus poderes al Legislativo y asuma sus funciones describe fielmente el comportamiento totalitario que caracteriza a una dictadura. Lo ocurrido después fue patético si no fuera la prueba más palmaria de la ausencia de división de poderes. La fiscal general denuncia la ruptura del orden constitucional y restaura la situación anterior.

Desgraciadamente, señorías, todo parece que la misma mano mece la cuna. ¿Hasta cuándo, señor presidente Maduro, va abusar de la paciencia de un pueblo que es dueño de un país rico, que pasa hambre y miseria por la acción de un sátrapa que de nuevo acusará al Parlamento Europeo de injerencia?

Es la hora de decir alto y claro, con palabras del secretario general de la OEA, que no es intervencionista la defensa de la democracia; y, además, que «una parodia de democracia no es democracia».

Lo siguiente que procede es denunciar que la misión de los mediadores que intentaron de buena fe la vía del diálogo ha fracasado. Es la hora de exigir al régimen de Maduro la liberación inmediata de todos los presos políticos, el establecimiento de un canal para preservar la asistencia humanitaria, el retorno al orden constitucional, con pleno respeto de la Asamblea Nacional y de sus decisiones.

Finalmente, es también la hora inexcusable de que la Unión Europea y la alta representante hagan compatibles, señorías, las formas diplomáticas con una posición más firme en la que el pueblo venezolano se sienta alentado por la Unión Europea y recupere la esperanza de la libertad. Y además, señora comisaria, no hay que hacer elecciones de gobernadores, hay que hacer la elección del presidente de la República, que es lo que demanda el pueblo de Venezuela.

Francisco Assis, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, no dia 29 de março último o Supremo Tribunal de Justiça da Venezuela retirou as competências à Assembleia Nacional e assumiu as funções desta, pondo assim em causa o princípio da separação de poderes e ofendendo gravemente os principais princípios democráticos. Dias depois, no meio de enormes pressões internacionais, o Supremo Tribunal fez marcha atrás, tentando convencer os venezuelanos de que tudo não teria passado, no fundo, de uma espécie de mal-entendido.

De forma cínica, de resto, Nicolás Maduro procurou aparecer como um árbitro virtuoso que teria resolvido o assunto de forma expedita e eficaz. A verdade porém é outra. A verdade é que o regime autocrático nunca aceitou o resultado das eleições de dezembro de 2015. Não podemos esquecer que logo, a 11 de janeiro de 2016, o Supremo Tribunal de Justiça – que o regime manipula como lhe convém – decretou que a Assembleia Nacional se encontrava em desacato, sendo por isso nulos todos os atos que dela emanassem. E já nessa altura o mesmo tribunal ameaçou recorrer à Constituição e substituir-se ao Parlamento.

O que aconteceu não foi, por isso, um mero desvario. Mas alguma coisa estará a mudar na Venezuela. A reviravolta de Nicolás Maduro revela que a sua estratégia de hostilização da oposição atingiu, aparentemente, o limite. A reviravolta de Maduro mostra que, afinal, há uma linha vermelha. Essa linha vermelha foi traçada – ou começa a ser traçada, e acreditamos nisso – no interior do próprio *oficialismo*. Isso foi abertamente feito pela Procuradora-Geral da Venezuela, Luísa Ortega Díaz, que falou em rutura da ordem constitucional, mas também de forma invisível, aparentemente, por algumas hierarquias militares. Isso é um dado positivo. Significa que há segmentos na esfera de influência do *oficialismo* que não aderem completamente a estratégia seguida até agora e que, apesar de tudo, não estão dispostos a abdicar de alguns princípios constitucionais básicos.

O clima de polarização política que hoje se vive na Venezuela chegou a tal ponto que só poderá ser clarificado através de eleições. No entanto, a crise económica, social e humanitária da Venezuela exige a promoção de um diálogo entre o executivo e o legislativo. Cremos que é esse o caminho que deve ser seguido. Mas, entretanto, temos que fazer, uma vez mais, um apelo muito forte e muito claro para que se promova a libertação dos presos políticos que estão encarcerados nas cadeias da Venezuela e para que se proceda à marcação das eleições regionais que já se deveriam ter realizado.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, it is almost a year since we last discussed Venezuela in this House. Given that at the time we had just witnessed the assassination of the opposition leader Mavare, it is difficult to believe that a year on from that situation, the situation in Venezuela is actually worse. National Assembly elections held in December 2015 saw President Maduro's party lose to the opposition. However, this has led to little change, given Maduro's and his government's efforts to block all of the National Assembly's initiatives. Having initially been achieved by means of using the Supreme Court to strip the assembly of its power, Maduro is now reverting to the far more conventional dictatorial tactics of arresting opposition politicians and sheer brutality. Continuing to cling on to power in these circumstances is concerning, given the situation on the streets, and it is difficult to see that the current situation is tenable until the scheduled Presidential elections in October of 2017. As Venezuela's economic model collapses, food shortages and street riots are becoming more frequent parts of everyday life. So therefore, early free and fair elections are clearly a must, and we should do all we can in the European Union to support the democratic process before it becomes a total dictatorship.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente; gracias, comisaria Jourová, por traernos el mensaje de la señora Mogherini.

Hugo Chávez llegó al poder con un discurso populista de izquierdas, prometiendo poco menos que el paraíso. Hoy, Venezuela es una cárcel en lo político y una catástrofe en lo social. Aprendamos la lección.

El populismo es el camino hacia la dictadura: las instituciones han sido asaltadas y sometidas; el crimen ha tomado las calles y los despachos. La corrupción del chavismo es total: no hay justicia independiente, no queda rastro del Estado de Derecho. La democracia, finalmente, ha saltado por los aires.

La Unión Europea debe apoyar sin fisuras a la Organización de los Estados Americanos en su exigencia de que se restaure el orden constitucional en Venezuela. El proceso de diálogo ha fracasado.

Señora Mogherini, quien se niega a reconocer que Leopoldo López es un preso político se descalifica como mediador, y estoy hablando de José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero.

Europa debe enviar un mensaje inequívoco al régimen de Maduro: todos los presos políticos deben ser liberados, las elecciones deben celebrarse ya y la ayuda humanitaria tiene que llegar a la gente que lo necesita.

La autodenominada izquierda europea, la de Podemos e Izquierda Unida, trató de impedir este debate. No quieren que les recordemos su vinculación y connivencia con el chavismo. Denuncien la narcocorrupción del régimen venezolano, reconozcan la crisis humanitaria que asola el país, exijan el fin de la brutal represión política, o no se atrevan a volver a darnos una sola lección de democracia.

Javier Couso Permuy, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, mientras en México asesinaban al enésimo periodista y se encontraba otra fosa común, mientras en Paraguay se producían violentas manifestaciones contra el presidente, se quemaba el Parlamento y se asesinaba a opositores, la OEA, ese ministerio de colonias, se dedicaba a mirar hacia otro lado y a seguir con la obsesión desestabilizadora de su incendiario mayor, el señor Almagro.

Frente al diálogo, la confrontación; frente a los mecanismos constitucionales, la injerencia; frente a la verdad, la mentira, acompañada de protestas violentas. ¿Por qué la OEA no denuncia el desacato de la Asamblea Nacional, que incorpora a diputados que compraron votos, que sin competencias constitucionales trata de destituir a un presidente electo y que desobedece sentencias judiciales?

Ante este desconocimiento reiterado del orden constitucional, se produjo un conflicto entre los poderes públicos que fue resuelto constitucionalmente por la vía pacífica y del diálogo. En vez de celebrar y apuntalar el diálogo, la OEA convocó al Consejo Permanente, desconociendo que la presidencia de Bolivia suspendió la convocatoria porque no se le había comunicado.

Ni aun así, violando su propio Reglamento, consiguieron la mayoría para seguir con su plan contra un poder electo. Hay que dejar las aventuras injerencistas, porque desestabilizar Venezuela es desestabilizar América Latina.

La UE no debe apoyar opciones violentas: debe acompañar el diálogo de Unasur y el Vaticano. Le corresponde a Venezuela resolver sus problemas, y a la Unión Europea, respetar la soberanía y el Derecho internacional. Lo contrario es una gran hipocresía.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, un debate más sobre Venezuela.

Yo creo que, evidentemente, la decisión del Tribunal Supremo de otorgarse las competencias de la Asamblea fue un gravísimo error, y creo que debemos celebrar que ese gravísimo error fuera corregido. Y sería necesario y sería más pertinente que pudiera restablecerse un funcionamiento normal de la Asamblea, resolviendo también la disputa que hay sobre esos tres diputados que son, en estos momentos, un elemento evidente de preocupación.

En estos momentos existe —y nuestro Grupo la comparte— una preocupación por la espiral confrontativa que puede venir, por la confrontación política que se intuye y que puede degradar la situación en el país.

Por eso es necesario, en estos momentos —y queremos hacer un llamamiento a mantener la calma —, buscar y ayudar al máximo a tener los mecanismos de distensión necesarios. Las dinámicas de atrincheramiento entre instituciones no ayudan —alejan una solución— y hace falta que podamos ayudar a buscar mecanismos de funcionamiento constitucional normales mutuamente aceptados por todo el mundo.

Por ello, nosotros creemos que es el momento de redoblar los esfuerzos diplomáticos internacionales para la mediación, en especial de las organizaciones latinoamericanas, en especial de la labor que puede hacer Unasur y también de la labor —que creo y consideramos que están haciendo muy bien— de los tres expresidentes —el señor Zapatero, el señor Trujillo y el señor Fernández— para poder encontrar una solución dialogada y pactada y para distender un poco la situación.

Y sí invitaría —aunque estos llamamientos que hacemos desde mi Grupo habitualmente son desoídos— a que intentemos, en abril II, presentar una resolución que ayude al diálogo y a distender, y no una resolución que, al contrario, encienda aún más la situación.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame le Commissaire, la situation chaotique que connaît le Venezuela doit appeler de notre part une réponse mesurée.

La fin de la manne pétrolière a certes révélé les insuffisances du système politique et économique bâti par le Président Chávez. Les interminables files d'attente pour des biens de première nécessité rappellent la déliquescence finale d'autres régimes fondés sur des principes économiques relevant du collectivisme. Cette crise sociale se double d'une instabilité politique dont l'obstination du Président Maduro semble être le principal moteur. Une immixtion de l'Union européenne n'est pas pour autant justifiée. Gardons-nous de cautionner des mouvements d'opposition dont nous ne connaissons ni les tenants ni les aboutissants.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señorías, ayer el presidente de Alemania hizo en este mismo Hemiciclo una intervención realmente admirable. Dijo que quien socava la acción de los parlamentos socava la democracia.

El Gobierno de Venezuela no tiene ya ninguna legitimidad, suspendido en el Mercosur, condenado por la OEA, es realmente un Gobierno que viola la Constitución, encarcela a los disidentes, cierra los medios de comunicación como el canal NTN24 y ha llevado a un país riquísimo la ruina económica.

Señora comisaria, habla de una solución pacífica. La cara partida ayer de los diputados de la oposición Juan Requesens, María Corina Machado y otros es una metáfora de lo que está pasando hoy con la democracia en Venezuela: golpeada, maltratada y ensangrentada, se mantiene de pie gracias a unos hombres y mujeres valerosos que en la cárcel, en la calle y en el Parlamento luchan pacíficamente por su libertad y por su dignidad y por tener una cosa muy básica que son unas elecciones libres en Venezuela.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente, es evidente que ante la grave crisis que sufre Venezuela, nosotros tenemos que condenar los abusos de poder, sin duda ninguna. Pero creo que no podemos quedarnos en eso. Si queremos ayudar al querido pueblo venezolano, creo que tenemos que hacer algo más.

También es evidente que cercenando la independencia de la Asamblea Nacional se ha infringido una herida nueva a la democracia venezolana, que es lo que tenemos que rescatar. El paso atrás que se ha dado también justifica —creo yo— que demos un voto de confianza a los esfuerzos de mediación que están en marcha.

Creo que la Unión Europea sí debe seguir apoyando los esfuerzos que buscan una solución al conflicto venezolano basada en el Derecho, basada en el diálogo y basada en la reconciliación.

Precisamente por el alto nivel de confrontación que hay en este momento, le decimos al Gobierno, les decimos a las instituciones que tienen que cumplir la Constitución, que la Constitución está para eso, para cumplirla, y que es la democracia lo que hay que hacer funcionar. Democracia, ¿para qué? Democracia para reforzar las instituciones, democracia para el ejercicio libre de la política y democracia también para la reconciliación.

Para todo eso, el Gobierno de Venezuela tiene que dar pasos; para todo eso, necesitamos, desde la Unión Europea, reforzar los esfuerzos que existen para que la mediación lleve a una verdadera reconciliación, porque no sé cuál es la otra solución. La otra solución es la confrontación en las calles, probablemente, y entonces nosotros podremos hacer bien poco. Hoy todavía tenemos que llamar a un intento de diálogo y de reconciliación.

Dita Charanzová (ALDE). – Señor presidente, lo que vimos la semana pasada en Venezuela no es sorprendente: es la continuación de lo que Nicolás Maduro ha venido haciendo desde hace años, silenciando la voz del pueblo, socavando la democracia para consolidar su poder; en esencia, dando todos los pasos para convertir Venezuela en una verdadera dictadura.

Durante dos años he estado pidiendo más acción por parte de la Unión Europea. Junto a mi colega Teresa Jiménez Becerril escribí una carta a la alta representante, pidiendo un cambio de enfoque respecto a Venezuela. Estoy muy contenta de haber recibido una respuesta afirmativa la semana pasada.

La señora Mogherini reconoció con acierto que no se puede seguir como antes y que hay que considerar todas las opciones disponibles. Espero que las palabras se conviertan en hechos y que podamos apoyar firmemente al pueblo venezolano.

Pido de nuevo que nuestra posición sea firme y que, además, se considere la opción de sanciones selectivas.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, no tempo dos factos alternativos, eis os factos reais que a maioria deste Parlamento teima em esconder. Entre 99 e 2006, o desemprego caiu na Venezuela mais de dez pontos percentuais. No final de 2015, a Venezuela tinha um desemprego mais baixo do que a União Europeia ou o Canadá. Os níveis de pobreza e a pobreza extrema caíram significativamente e de forma mais acentuada do que a média da América Latina. Diminuiu significativamente o número de famílias com necessidades básicas por satisfazer. A Venezuela subiu vários lugares no índice de desenvolvimento humano das Nações Unidas. Os indicadores de desigualdade social diminuíram. Segundo a FAO, a Venezuela reduziu a subnutrição infantil e é hoje um país livre de fome. O número de inscritos no ensino universitário mais do que triplicou. Esta é a realidade que faz alguns destilarem raiva e ódio sobre a Venezuela e que os faz apoiar, sem reservas e sem vergonha, o boicote, a violência e a desestabilização económica, social e política.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Kot smo slišali nekatere predhodnike in seveda tudi zadnjega, očitno o Venezueli prejemamo različne informacije, kaj se torej dejansko dogaja v tej državi.

Po eni strani dobivamo informacije, da je država na resnem preizkusu, tudi humanitarne krize, tudi politične. Po drugi strani nekateri opozarjajo, da pa stanje vendarle ni tako strašljivo, kot se prikazuje.

Vsekakor se zdi pomembno, da je v teh razmerah tudi dolžnost Evropskega parlamenta, da dobi realno sliko o situaciji v državi in da seveda ne podlegamo zgolj samo provokacijam morda, ki ne odražajo realnega stanja.

Vsekakor mora torej Evropski parlament podpreti vse tiste akcije, ki pospešujejo in torej omogočajo tudi demokracijo, predvsem pa mislim, da mora Evropski parlament vedno iti v smeri podpore miru in stabilnosti v tretjih državah in torej spodbujanja tudi razvoja in pa pomoči v primeru humanitarne ali pa gospodarske krize, v kateri se lahko znajdejo te države.

Naj spomnim, da so razmere v Venezueli zelo pomembne za stabilnost in mir celotne regije Latinske Amerike, in kakršni koli konflikti, oboroženi spori na tem področju seveda se lahko kot plamen razširijo tudi na druga področja, zato je pomembno, da tudi Evropski parlament pri tem igra pomembno vlogo, zlasti za to, da podpre, kot sem že dejal, tudi misije, ki bodo izkazale, kakšno je resnično stanje in kaj se dogaja v tej državi.

Vsekakor je vsaki državi, ki se znajde v težavah in v ekonomsko nevzdržnih razmerah, potrebno pomagati in nuditi ustrezno podporo. Pri tem pa ne smemo seveda pozabiti, da so pogledi na demokracijo lahko različni, lahko seveda tudi povsem različno razložljivi, res pa je, da na koncu vedno kot največji spomenik in pa seveda tudi dejstvo demokracije odločajo oziroma so volitve, v katerih odločajo prebivalci te posamezne države, in to velja tudi v primeru Venezuele.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, twenty years of Chavez and Maduro's Bolivarian Socialism has led a potentially rich country to the implosion of both democracy and economy. This must be the end phase of Leftist populism, which as a rule results in economic impotence, cynical disregard of citizens and authoritarian exercise of power. The latest attack on the independence of the Parliament by a judiciary which has lost independence could well become the last straw. Since Maduro took power, almost 7 000 citizens have been detained; there are now 114 political prisoners. The European Commission's reaction to the suppression of the last vestiges of democracy must be more forceful and determined. Today we must send a very clear signal that the European Parliament stands unconditionally together with Venezuelan citizens, for their dignity and rights.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo comparto con muchos de ustedes que la democracia está en peligro en Venezuela. Yo lo comparto; inclusive podría sumarme a casi todas las condenas que se están haciendo.

Pero atención, señorías, porque lo que también está en peligro es la paz ciudadana en Venezuela; atención, porque allí hay dos poderes legítimos —más allá de que se haya deslegitimado en el ejercicio del poder el Gobierno—, dos poderes legítimos de origen, enfrentados. Dos pueblos que empiezan a enfrentarse peligrosamente y dos proyectos políticos que están odiándose el uno al otro.

Lo que está en riesgo es el futuro de ese país y, como queremos a Venezuela y queremos la paz en Venezuela, lo que tenemos que establecer es exactamente nuestra función. Y, señorías, yo no me atrevo a dar por muerto el diálogo. Sé que puede estar muy mal, pero quienes dan por muerto el diálogo, ¿qué me ofrecen? ¿Qué les ofrecemos los europeos a Venezuela? ¿Qué les damos? Porque condenar al Gobierno, ya lo hemos hecho; apoyar la oposición, ya lo hacemos. Pero ¿qué más hacemos, señorías?

Solo un acuerdo político, democrático y apoyado por la comunidad internacional entre esos dos poderes dará solución al futuro de Venezuela. Solo un proceso democrático, pero pacífico, que pueda ser acordado y apoyado por la comunidad internacional.

¿Por qué no han dejado de apoyar el diálogo el Vaticano, los Estados Unidos y la propia Unión Europea? ¡Porque es necesario, señorías! Trabajemos en eso.

Javier Nart (ALDE). – Señor presidente, Iberoamérica ha sufrido la tragedia de pasar de oligarquías cleptocráticas a cleptocracias copopulistas travestidas de revolucionarias.

A Venezuela, el chavomadurismo lo ha empobrecido. Al país quizás de mayor renta de América del Sur, un país que nada en la abundancia por su renta petrolera. Y un país que empobrece a su pueblo es profundamente reaccionario. Pero es que, además, hablamos de un poder reaccionario y dictatorial. Porque hablar de confrontación entre el Ejecutivo y el Legislativo es una aberración, en principio, dado que el Legislativo tiene sus propias atribuciones, pero es que en Venezuela el Poder Judicial es un espantajo en manos del Gobierno, el Poder Legislativo está castrado y lo único que impera es el Poder Ejecutivo.

También se habla de que hay que evitar la confrontación. La confrontación no nos gusta, pero ya existe y existe en forma no solamente de represión, sino de milicias armadas: las milicias bolivarianas, las milicias chavistas. Es preciso que esta Cámara adopte unas decisiones que signifiquen elecciones libres, liberación de presos y ayuda humanitaria.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, en el marco constitucional, las Fuerzas Armadas de Venezuela deben defender y proteger a su pueblo o serán responsables ante la justicia y la historia.

Venezuela necesita más que nunca nuestro compromiso político, nuestra solidaridad y nuestra ayuda. La dictadura chavista en su versión más dura y cruel, opresora de su pueblo y que ha empobrecido a su noble pueblo, ya no tiene discurso ni recursos para sostener un narcorrégimen corrupto y liberticida. Europa, la OEA, las Naciones Unidas y todos los Gobiernos libres del planeta claman contra los opresores.

Hablamos de un Legislativo maniatado, un Poder Judicial domesticado y mostrenco, un poder electoral dependiente y parcial, y un Ejecutivo que encarcela a los mejores.

Deben exiliarse pacíficamente ya en un paraíso cercano y dejar que los venezolanos recuperen su destino democrático. Sí, exilio para la dirigencia chavista en espera de la justicia internacional, y paz y sosiego para Venezuela. Democracia, pan, medicamentos y seguridad. Los ciudadanos no deben sufrir más.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a Venezuela, um país irmão que acolhe mais de um milhão de portugueses e luso-descendentes vive uma tragédia. Faltam medicamentos, falta comida, falta o pão, falta a luz e falta água, falta o respeito. Quem se opõe é espancado e preso por delito de opinião. A criminalidade está descontrolada. Caracas é já a cidade mais perigosa do mundo. Com Maduro, o Natal é no primeiro de novembro. Acredita que Chávez lhe aparece na forma de um passarinho pequenino e decidiu que na função pública só se trabalha em dois dias por semana.

A decisão do Supremo Tribunal foi só mais um passo num percurso alucinado de um regime à deriva. Cem anos depois da revolução bolchevique Maduro mostra ao mundo que, de cada vez que o marxismo-leninismo é poder, os recursos nacionais são transformados em miséria e os povos empobrecem.

A extrema-esquerda, aqui, fica do lado das derivas ditatoriais, em vez de defender a democracia. Nós, não! Força e esperança para os democratas venezuelanos. *No se callen, nunca!* Acreditem na vossa luta porque a vossa luta é justa. Um abraço dos democratas portugueses.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, el proceso de deterioro en Venezuela se ha agudizado profundamente. Deterioro del clima político institucional, en especial deterioro de la situación en la Asamblea Nacional, sometida a permanente acoso desde diciembre de 2015 y, como hemos visto este propio fin de semana, objeto de una decisión disparatada del Tribunal Supremo, luego corregida también de forma sorprendente. Grave deterioro en la situación económica y social, grave crisis alimentaria y sanitaria y violencia rampante. Y continúan sin libertad más de un centenar de presos políticos.

Mi mensaje, señora comisaria, a la señora Mogherini, es que la Unión Europea y ella misma deben involucrarse más en la búsqueda de una solución a esta grave situación. Yo no comprendo bien su extremada contención y el mantenimiento de una línea que no ha dado fruto alguno. Contrasta ampliamente con la posición mucho más activa de la OEA y del propio Mercosur.

Son muchos los principios que unen a los europeos con los pueblos americanos. El pueblo venezolano pide lo mismo que nosotros tenemos: respeto del Estado de Derecho y democracia y respeto de los derechos fundamentales. No podemos estar callados ni inactivos. La señora Mogherini tiene que ser más activa.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a Venezuela atravessa uma delicada situação económica, com repercussões em termos políticos, sociais e de segurança, que não nos pode deixar indiferentes.

A comunidade portuguesa, os luso-descendentes, os meus conterrâneos madeirenses fazem-me chegar relatos desoladores, de um cenário de insegurança, de pobreza extrema, de prejuízos nas atividades empresariais que afetam portugueses e venezuelanos.

Manifesto, pois, toda a minha solidariedade à população venezuelana, com o ensejo que no vosso país se exerça o mais absoluto respeito pela democracia, num combate velado à criminalidade, ao desemprego e à pobreza.

Reitero, nesta mensagem, um apelo à União Europeia, aos governos nacionais de um apoio ativo, com medidas que minorizem este estado de emergência social e económica e que não abram mão de fazer chegar todo e qualquer apoio a todos quantos dele necessitam na Venezuela. Nenhum de nós pode ficar indiferente, sob pena de vermos sucumbir a democracia e o princípio do respeito e da dignidade pela pessoa humana.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já chci podpořit kolegy, kteří tady jasně odsuzují současnou situaci ve Venezuele. Chci pouze zopakovat, že jsme nedávno, před několika týdny, respektive před půl rokem, debatovali o situaci v této zemi a ta situace se zase zhoršila.

Čím jiným než ústavním pučem je to, jak rozhodl Nejvyšší soud, kdy převzal na sebe, zcela absurdně, zákonodárnou pravomoc. Je to jasný další útok prezidenta Madura a jemu podřízených mocenských složek státu ve snaze demontovat a úplně zlikvidovat právní stát a demokracii v této zemi.

Takže já si myslím stejně jako moji kolegové, paní komisařko, že evropská exekutiva musí být mnohem aktivnější v tlaku na Venezuelu, ale také ve snaze Venezuele jako takové pomoci. Dnes a denně čteme články o tom, jak ve Venezuele chybí léky, jak tam hrozí humanitární katastrofa, jak tam chybí potraviny. My tedy na jedné straně musíme vyvinout větší mezinárodní tlak, ale také pomoci obyčejným Venezuelanům, kteří trpí pod současnou diktátorskou vládou.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Zopet govorimo o nesrečni Venezueli, državi, ki ji je desetletja vladal režim Huga Chaveza, levičarski režim, ki je v nekem trenutku imel celo srečo, da so bile cene energenta zelo visoke, in je tudi navzven dajal občutek, da ustvarja neko sodobno državo.

Resnica je prišla kaj kmalu na plano in sedaj, ko je na vladi režim avtoritarnega vodja, gospoda Madure, vidimo, kaj se v resnici v Venezueli dogaja: politična nestabilnost, revščina, humanitarna kriza, socialna in humanitarna kriza, moč narkokatelov, korupcija, se pravi vse, čemur se ne more reči demokracija.

Nam v Evropskem parlamentu ne ostane nič drugega kot to, da stopimo na stran tistih, ki jih spodbujamo k demokraciji, in se skupaj, če hočete, z Vatikanom in z Združenimi narodi borimo za ljudi, ki so nesrečni v Venezueli.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Pare-se a balela de que o que se passa na Venezuela tem o que quer que seja a ver com socialismo. É totalitarismo, estupidez e narco-corrupção do regime do Presidente Maduro, que parece muito verde mas está, de facto, podre. O povo da Venezuela é que paga os custos no seu duro quotidiano.

Tendo em conta as fortes ligações do povo da Venezuela a povos europeus – Espanha e Portugal, designadamente -, é inacreditável que a União Europeia e este Parlamento não se impliquem mais na libertação dos presos políticos e na procura de uma solução pacífica negociada e democrática para o perigoso impasse a que o sectarismo e a cegueira conduziram aquele país cheio de recursos, mas agora a viver na miséria e, porventura, à beira de uma guerra civil. A Venezuela não precisa de golpe de Estado como o tentado há dias. Precisa sim, urgentemente, de eleições livres e justas sob supervisão internacional.

Georgi Pirinski (S&D). – Mr President, I believe that we should pay full attention to three people who are on the spot and have been trying to help dialogue for a year: ex-Premier Zapatero and Presidents Fernandez and Torrijos.

As they point out, what is in question is a deep political and social antagonism dating back over 20 years. They point out five concrete steps to overcome this situation: first, an election schedule; second, a consensual commission for the truth; third, institutional respect on the basis of the Constitution; fourth, cooperation on social and economic issues, and respect for national sovereignty on the basis of international support. And they point out that this is possible only with caution, discretion, persistence, trust and the will for dialogue. We should listen to these people who are on the spot and who, with all their wisdom, are showing us the right way to solve this tragic situation.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, isto seria para o Sr. João Ferreira mas, não está aqui. Recebi agora da Venezuela a seguinte mensagem que vou passar a ler:

«Venezuela, hoy día, necesita más del mundo. La gente, muerta de hambre, come de la basura. Los policías te roban, los ladrones te matan a diario. La gente pelea por una sola ración de harina por semana; a veces no tienen qué comer y tienen que comer así sea papas hervidas en agua. Eso u otro tipo de situaciones inhumanas que se viven en Venezuela y que solo el que vive aquí lo entiende a la perfección».

— A dura realidade, caros Colegas, é que os cidadãos na Venezuela – onde constam cerca de um milhão e meio de portugueses e luso-descendentes – vivem oprimidos. O poder judicial e o poder eleitoral continuam sujeitos aos interesses do poder executivo. A Assembleia Nacional permanece asfixiada por sentenças que usurpam as suas funções e os cidadãos privados de exercer os direitos que a constituição lhes garante, como é o caso do referendo revogatório, ou sequer de cumprir os mandatos para os quais foram legitimamente eleitos, como ilustra bem a situação do meu amigo António Ladesma, preso há mais dois anos. Na verdade, o que há na Venezuela é um povo inteiro de presos políticos. Defender a democracia sem recurso a eufemismos é uma obrigação de todos os democratas.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me thank all the honourable Members for their interventions. I believe that Venezuela needs to re-establish its democratic stability through peaceful and constitutional solutions to address the many challenges that its people are facing. We must keep on encouraging all political forces to follow this agenda. I know that I also can count on this Parliament; you have been an important ally in calling for a peaceful and constitutional outcome to the crisis of Venezuela, and I encourage you to continue doing so.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on next part-session.

Written statements (Rule 162)

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), por escrito. – Hace unos días el Tribunal Supremo de Venezuela anulaba los poderes de la Asamblea Nacional —donde la oposición es mayoría— y eliminaba la inmunidad parlamentaria de sus diputados. No podemos olvidar que el Parlamento representa a la ciudadanía, es el centro de la democracia por excelencia. Estas sentencias suponen un atentado a la democracia, que podemos decir inexistente en un país donde queda claro que no se respeta la división de poderes. El poder Judicial está en manos de aquellos que son fieles al Presidente, quien demuestra que es capaz de todo para aferrarse al poder. Por desgracia son los ciudadanos venezolanos los que sufren las consecuencias de sus actos, los que tienen que vivir en un país sumido en el caos, la incerteza y la pobreza. Me preocupa, además, la enorme influencia que ejercen estados totalitarios de la región sobre Venezuela como es el caso de Cuba. Maduro permite la extensión de los tentáculos cubanos en sus notarías públicas y registros civiles, los ministerios, los programas sociales, la petrolera estatal y el ejército. Asesores cubanos manejan al gobierno venezolano y

cualquier parecido en Venezuela con la forma en que se reprime en Cuba no es casualidad.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – La democracia está en peligro en Venezuela. Es preciso denunciar esa situación, pero hay que ir más lejos, porque la paz está en peligro. En Venezuela hay dos poderes, el ejecutivo y el legislativo, ambos con legitimidad de origen, que representan proyectos políticos contradictorios, y cuyo radical enfrentamiento pone en riesgo el futuro del país. Desde Europa no debemos atizar esa llama limitándonos a condenar la situación sin aportar solución alguna. No debemos dar por muerto el diálogo, porque sólo un proceso democrático, que conduzca a un acuerdo político consensuado entre las partes, proporcionará una solución pacífica a los venezolanos y una esperanza de cara al futuro. Esa es la razón por la que el Vaticano, la ONU y la Alta Representante Sra. Mogherini siguen apostando por el diálogo, y por eso mismo debe hacerlo también el Parlamento Europeo.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – La democracia está en peligro en Venezuela. Es preciso denunciar esa situación, pero hay que ir más lejos, porque la paz está en peligro. En Venezuela hay dos poderes, el ejecutivo y el legislativo, ambos con legitimidad de origen, que representan proyectos políticos contradictorios, y cuyo radical enfrentamiento pone en riesgo el futuro del país. Desde Europa no debemos atizar esa llama limitándonos a condenar la situación sin aportar solución alguna. No debemos dar por muerto el diálogo, porque sólo un proceso democrático, que conduzca a un acuerdo político consensuado entre las partes, proporcionará una solución pacífica a los venezolanos y una esperanza de cara al futuro. Esa es la razón por la que el Vaticano, la ONU y la Alta Representante Sra. Mogherini siguen apostando por el diálogo, y por eso mismo debe hacerlo también el Parlamento Europeo.

19. Ustreznost varstva, ki ga zagotavlja zasebnostni ščit EU-ZDA (razprava)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the adequacy of the protection afforded by the EU-US Privacy Shield (2016/3018(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me first of all thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today and to update you on the state of implementation of the privacy shield and our plans for the upcoming first annual review. Today's discussion is very timely, as I have just returned from Washington and can inform you of the latest state of play. As you rightly note in the motion for today's resolution, the privacy shield has attracted a lot of interest, with more than 1 900 companies that have been certified under this framework. This shows the importance of the instrument for our trans-Atlantic relationship. It also means that an increasing volume of the personal data that is transferred across the Atlantic benefits from the many protections that the privacy shield offers for individuals.

I know that some of you had hoped for more, and I too would one day like to see a fully fledged comprehensive data protection law in the United States, but in the meantime, our assessment is that the privacy issue of framework lives up to the requirements of our data protection laws, as interpreted by our highest court. Our highest court has clarified: adequacy does not mean that the rules in the third country have to be an exact photocopy of our rules. Rather, what the Commission has to assess is if that third country offers in law and practice an essentially equivalent level of protection to that guaranteed in the EU legal order.

Clearly the privacy shield is a substantial improvement when compared to the old safe harbour. This is the view of our data protection authorities, and I am glad to see that your motion contains the same clear statement. However, putting in place the privacy shield framework, the privacy principles, together with the commitments and assurances by the United States' government, was only part of the work. It is equally important that these rules also fully apply in practice. This is why our focus since the adoption of the decision has been on the effective implementation of this new framework. This involves several actors, and I am happy to report that our data protection authorities and the United States authorities have cooperated closely in working out procedures to ensure a robust oversight and enforcement of these new rules.

Representatives from the Ombudsperson's office as well as the Federal Trade Commission and Department of Commerce have come to Brussels on several occasions to discuss with the Commission and the Article 29 Working Party the details of this cooperation, and to report on their implementation work. During my visit to Washington last week, I put a particular emphasis on some of the key foundations on which the privacy shield is built. This concerns in particular the limitations and safeguards that apply in the area of government access for national security purposes. A central element of this is Presidential Policy Directive number 28, which specifically addresses the privacy protections afforded to foreigners. Another key element is the Ombudsperson mechanism, which ensures that Europeans have a possibility to obtain an individual review if they believe that intelligence authorities have broken the law when accessing their personal data. A third one is the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. For the sustainability of the privacy shield it is essential that these elements are part of it.

We will closely monitor any relevant developments in the United States with a possible impact on the privacy shield, including the upcoming debates around a possible reform or prolongation of Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which expires at the end of this year. This is the message we have been sending since the start of the new administration. I have repeated this message during my recent visit to Washington and my meetings with the White House, the Commerce Secretary, the Attorney General State Department as well as Congress, and I received assurances that this message is well understood by our US counterparts, both as to the value of the privacy shield and the need to keep all of its elements in place.

Let me make this point very clear: If we are faced with any developments that could negatively affect the level of protection afforded under the Privacy Shield, the Commission will take its responsibilities and use all available mechanisms, be it review, suspension, revocation or repeal, to promptly react. My focus is now on the first annual joint review. This will be a crucial moment: a moment of truth where we take stock of how the privacy shield functions in practice and to see whether there are things that need to be improved. I have agreed with the US Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross that the first annual joint review meeting will take place in Washington in September.

All the various elements that are relevant for the functioning of the EU-US privacy shield will be covered by this review, inter alia: first, how US companies comply with their data protection obligations and the mechanisms they have put in place to ensure a speedy handling of complaints. Second, how the Department of Commerce and Federal Trade Commission certify companies, monitor compliance and cooperate with our data protection authorities in the enforcement. Third, the operation of the rules regarding access by public authorities and the rules and procedures to ensure that the Ombudsperson mechanism functions well. Fourth, in addition, in the issues identified already in the Commission's adequacy decision, such as the dialogue on automated decision-making, as well as any developments in the United States law that might raise questions concerning the EU-US privacy shield and its operation, will have to be discussed. As partners in this review, we will of course discuss the precise parameters of the review with the Article 29 Working Party. The input from business and from civil society will also be of crucial importance. I met both sides in Washington, and they are committed to contribute. On the US side, we expect the joint review to involve the Department of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission, but also the Ombudsperson and representatives from the intelligence community. Directly after the joint review we will report our findings to you and to the Member States in the Council. This will allow you and us to assess and discuss where we are on this and also discuss the next necessary steps.

Honourable Members, thank you again for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today, and of course I stand ready to address any questions you might have.

Elnökváltás: GÁLL–PELCZ ILDIKÓ*alelnök*

Axel Voss, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Es ist wichtig, dass wir unseren Unternehmen, KMU und Startups etc., Rechtssicherheit geben, auch eine konkrete Rechtsgrundlage zur Verfügung stellen für den transatlantischen Datenaustausch bei gleichzeitiger Absicherung des Datenschutzes. Und beides vereint meines Erachtens auch der Datenschutzschild. Die Kommission hat in all diesen ganzen Jahren, der letzten Zeit, einerseits was Datenschutz betrifft, andererseits eben auch hinsichtlich des Datenschutzschildes auch viel erreicht.

Wir werden diese 100 % nie bekommen können, die andere Fraktionen in diesem Haus immer gerne hätten, aber es gibt eben auch keinen Grund dafür, zurzeit so negativ über diesen Datenschutzschild zu sprechen. Wir haben selbst im Parlament hier im Juni 2016 bereits einen Entschließungsantrag zum freien Datenverkehr angenommen, wo wir auch den Datenschutzschild positiv bewerten. Aber nun gibt es eigentlich keinen Grund, auch mittendrin – es läuft seit Juni oder Juli letzten Jahres, und jetzt haben wir eigentlich mal abzuwarten, bis im September der neue Bericht kommt, und dann hätte es vielleicht einen Grund gegeben, das mal zu bewerten. So haben wir weder die praktischen Erfahrungen, die wir jetzt bewerten können, und theoretisch lässt sich das hier eben einfach auch nicht so ohne Weiteres durchdringen. Sie haben die positiven Elemente alle auch herausgestellt, und im Vergleich zum Safe-Harbour-Abkommen ist das ein riesengroßer Schritt, den wir so an sich nicht haben erwarten können.

Insbesondere haben Sie mehr erreicht als das, was wir selber in unseren eigenen Mitgliedstaaten zu geben bereit sind, und deshalb ist das gut. Diese Schnittstelle zur nationalen Sicherheit wird immer schwierig zu überkommen sein, aber ich glaube, von diesen transatlantischen Datenströmen profitieren am Ende beide Seiten, und es ist auch eine unverzichtbare Chance für beide Seiten, hier auf dem Weg weiterzugehen.

Claude Moraes, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, to be very clear, the purpose of this resolution is because we have a September evaluation. I really believe that the members of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs – and indeed other Members who have expertise and interest in this extremely important topic – need to give their views to the Commissioner. I do not see any problem with this. In fact, I think this is a positive and important part of our work.

I want to begin with what you said about your trip to the United States. I think it is very important, Commissioner, particularly for the Civil Liberties Committee, that we have an interaction with you before we go to the United States in September. Why are we doing this? Why are we proposing this resolution? We are not doing it because there have not been significant and key improvements on Safe Harbor thanks to Privacy Shield, but because we want to ensure in Parliament that Privacy Shield stands the test of time and that it does not have weaknesses that would be difficult for the future.

We know that Privacy Shield protects the fundamental rights of anyone in the EU whose personal data is transferred to the United States, as well as bringing legal clarity for businesses relying on trans-Atlantic data transfers, and we cannot allow that to fail. So the resolution acknowledges that the final agreement on the Privacy Shield, adopted in July 2016, has taken a number of Parliament's concerns into consideration. We know that key improvements have been made compared to the former Safe Harbor. We note also that the agreement will facilitate data transfers from the EU to the US, particularly from SMEs and business in the EU, and that the EU Data Protection Authority's supervisory powers remain unaffected by the adequacy decision, including the power of suspending or banning data transfers to US companies that are members of the Privacy Shield. We also take note of the clarifications and interpretations of the US Administration, in particular as regards the processing of personal data by security agencies.

However, several issues must be resolved. The resolution highlights issues of concern that remain unclear, particularly, for example, those made by the Article 29 Working Party, which – as we all know – is deeply involved in these matters. These include concerns regarding the principle of data retention, the bulk collection of personal data for national security purposes, the need for sufficient judicial redress, and the effect of independent oversight, as well as several law enforcement issues. If these concerns are not taken into account, the Privacy Shield risks not achieving its purpose and could face further challenge in the courts. This is one of our deepest concerns. Both citizens and businesses relying

on transatlantic data flows need that certainty of a robust legal framework, and this text calls on the Commission to conduct that proper assessment. It does not doubt that that will happen, but we are doing our job in ensuring that every part of this detail is covered.

We will raise these concerns during our LIBE delegation with our US counterparts, and we are now experienced in these negotiations. The Parliament has consistently called for a stronger agreement, following the invalidation of Safe Harbor in October 2015, and we now want the protection of personal data which meets the requirements of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the data protection legal framework.

Commissioner, today we are calling on you to conduct a proper assessment to ensure this legal certainty is provided for citizens and business alike. We in the Parliament simply want to do our job. That is what the resolution is saying today.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Ik betreur allereerst dat bepaalde politieke fracties niet wilden wachten op de eerste evaluatie door de Commissie. Dit gezegd zijnde ben ik ook helemaal niet gelukkig met de inhoud van de resolutie van rapporteur Moraes. Ik heb daarom samengewerkt met de EVP-Fractie om een positiever alternatief te bieden. Laat mij hieruit enkele zaken benadrukken.

Ten eerste is de trans-Atlantische gegevensoverdracht van essentieel belang voor onze economie, handel en veiligheid. Niemand kan dit ontkennen en laten we dit dan ook alstublieft niet terzijde schuiven in dit debat. Wie op een schorsing van het privacyschild aanstuurt, moet nadenken over de gevolgen van de juridische onzekerheid die dit met zich meebrengt.

Ten tweede realiseerden we met het privacyschild een nooit eerder bereikt hoog niveau van gegevensbescherming. Er werd een gigantische stap in de goede richting gezet. De rechten en de rechtsbescherming van EU-burgers bij gegevensoverdracht naar de VS gaan er enorm op vooruit.

Uiteraard vind ook ik dat de Commissie steeds moet blijven streven naar de hoogst mogelijke standaard voor gegevensbescherming, maar sommige politieke fracties en parlementsleden blijven echter vinden dat alleen een kopie van de Europese regels kan volstaan. De Verenigde Staten zijn echter een onafhankelijke natie. Hoewel het land een belangrijke strategische bondgenoot is van de EU, mogen we echter niet vergeten dat het geen lid is van de Unie. Ik en mijn delegatie geloven sterk dat het zowel voor onze bedrijven, de Europese economie als de privacy van de EU-burgers het beste is om een operationeel privacyschild te hebben.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, in reply to Mrs Stevens, we are not actually calling for the suspension of the Privacy Shield, but we do expect the Commission to defend the interests of EU citizens and monitor, extremely critically, what is happening. We had already expressed very serious concerns under the Obama administration and, for some reason, the changes that have been made by the Trump administration do not alleviate my concerns. I do not know why, it is probably me.

Indeed we do not expect the US law to be identical, but we do expect it to be essentially equivalent, because that is what the judges have said. So that is not a party political request but an obligation for the EU institutions, and the Commission is responsible here.

I do not need to outline all the questions that we have put in the resolution. I am actually a little bit disappointed. The resolution has been available in the public domain for some time now. I would have expected the Commission to have already responded to the questions which are in there. What about the privacy and civil liberties oversight board, which is under quota? What about the Ombudsmen, who has not been replaced? What about the impact of Section 14 of the Privacy Act? What about the legal status of the assurances? What about the definition of bulk transfers? What about the interpretation of PPD-28? The Commission could have addressed all these things in its statement.

I would really urge the Commission not just to repeat what should be done, but actually to be on top of things. That is the way the Americans would do it, so why do we not do it on behalf of our citizens?

Two final issues, because this is not about party politics, Mrs Stevens; there is a legal challenge before the ECJ. There is also the other issue, namely that national DPAs may actually decide to suspend the transfers and then we have legal uncertainty. It is not by asking critical questions that we create legal uncertainty; it is by not asking the Americans critical questions. So I would say to the Commissioner, please make privacy great again.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Genau so ist es. Nein, mit dem *privacy shield* können wir keinen Frieden schließen. Wir finden, dass das auch keine angemessene Antwort auf das Schrems-Urteil und auf das zu Fall gebrachte *Safe-Harbour*-Abkommen ist, weil es eben keinen gleichen Datenschutz für alle bietet, weil die Massenüberwachung zum Zwecke der Strafverfolgung weiterhin pauschal und anderswo stattfinden soll, weil riesige Datenmengen – wie wir alle wissen – weiter fröhlich frei Haus ohne richterliche Ermächtigung an 16 US-Behörden geliefert werden, weil der vom US-Außenministerium eingesetzte Ombudsmann ein Feigenblatt ist, wie wir alle wissen, weil viele US-Organisationen, die beim *privacy shield* mitmachen wollen, noch nicht mal eine Datenschutzbehörde haben und weil US-Präsident Trump immerhin ein Dekret unterzeichnet hat, das Nicht-US-Bürger vom Datenschutz ausnehmen will. Wer da noch von Schutzschild redet, der ist ein Träumer. Der *privacy shield*, von dem hier gesprochen wird, ist ein offenes Scheunentor für Willkür zulasten der Grundrechte.

Und es kann noch viel ärger kommen, wenn es nämlich so ist, dass der US-Senat und das Repräsentantenhaus ein Verbot faktisch gekippt haben, dass das Verbot der Telekomaufsicht FCC praktisch gekippt wurde, sodass Internetprovider danach praktisch ohne Zustimmung ihrer Kunden private Daten sammeln und verkaufen können.

So. Stimmt Donald Trump dem noch zu, dann ist der US-amerikanische Datenschutz Spaß – so sage ich das mal. Wir teilen daher in allen Punkten die kritische Sicht der Entschließung voll und ganz, weil die Probleme in keiner Weise behoben sind.

Judith Sargentini, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – We leven niet onder een steen en de Groenen begrijpen heel goed dat het mogelijk moet blijven om persoonlijke data voor commerciële doeleinden naar de Verenigde Staten te blijven sturen. Facebook is leuk, whatsappen is eigenlijk niet meer weg te denken, maar het versturen van onze persoonlijke gegevens mag niet ten koste van alles gaan. Onze grondrechten verdienen bescherming en ik maak me daarom zorgen over het privacy schild in zijn huidige vorm, want de bescherming van onze persoonsgegevens is aan de andere kant van de oceaan niet gegarandeerd.

Wanneer de Amerikanen claimen dat de nationale veiligheid in het geding is, blijft analyse van bulkgegevens mogelijk. Laat mij dat nog een keer herhalen en onderstrepen: onder het privacy schild mogen bulkgegevens nog steeds geanalyseerd worden. Dat op zich is voldoende om het privacy schild te verwerpen. Het Europees Hof was toch helder? Opslag en analyse van bulkgegevens is verboden. We kunnen er dus de klok op gelijkzetten: het privacy schild zal net zoals *Safe Harbour* sneuvelen in Luxemburg.

De resolutie waarover we morgen stemmen, herhaalt dus nog een keer wat we allemaal weten: onder het privacy schild blijven onze rechten in de VS substantieel lager dan hier in de Europese Unie. Niet equivalent, neen, lager. Wat doen we dus? Zijn we hardleers en wachten we tot Max Schrems en zijn kompanen van Ierland naar Luxemburg zijn gereisd en het Hof ons op de vingers tikt? Of gaat de Europese Commissie nu heronderhandelen met de Amerikanen?

Ik zie bovendien dat de belangen van de Amerikaanse commercie uitstekend worden behartigd door de EVP en de ECR. Zij hebben een alternatieve resolutie die kiest voor de bedrijven en tegen de grondrechten van onze burgers. Maar, vrienden aan de rechterkant, een verdrag dat ieder moment door het Hof nietig kan worden verklaard, is niet goed voor business. Het maakt business onbetrouwbaar. Ook de commercie heeft baat bij heronderhandelingen, en dus vraag ik u om onze amendementen die vragen om heronderhandeling te steunen.

Viviane Reding (PPE). – Madam President, my question is simply: is the Privacy Shield stillborn? Vault 7 revealed that the CIA tapped directly into our smartphones; Microsoft and Apple court cases exposed the FBI tendency to bypass existing legal frameworks to access data; the Congressional Review Act allowed Comcast, AT&T and Verizon to use people's data without their consent and Trump's Muslim ban ordered agencies to exclude non-American citizens, not only Muslims, from their privacy policies.

Now all this has taken place after the adoption of the new framework and all eyes are now riveted on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Section 702. I would like to ask the Commissioner, does she really feel assured? The Article 29 Working Group does not because yes, the Privacy Shield has improved Safe Harbour but, no, it did not assuage many of our concerns.

The problem is, and always has been, the use of national security as a blanket exemption and this is one of the numerous questions that need answers, most of all during the upcoming review. Concrete evidence must prevail over alternative facts, legal obligations over written commitments, MEPs' demands over Congressmen's promises.

We must build a transatlantic digital bridge on a rock-solid privacy pillar and unfortunately, I have the feeling that the shield might already have turned into a smokescreen.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Erst nachdem der Europäische Gerichtshof das Safe-Harbour-Regime für nichtig erklärte, hat sich die Kommission bemüht, bessere Regeln zum Datentransfer in die USA zu schaffen. Doch trotz einiger Fortschritte kann mich das Ergebnis in seiner Gesamtheit nicht überzeugen. Es ist nach wie vor schwierig, sich rechtlich gegen den Missbrauch seiner Daten zu wehren. Die Ombudsperson in den USA ist nicht unabhängig genug. US-Firmen sind nicht verpflichtet, persönliche Daten zu löschen, wenn sie nicht mehr notwendig sind. Das größte Problem ist jedoch, dass auch der neue Datenschutzschild Massenüberwachung nicht ausschließt. Der Europäische Gerichtshof hat in seinem Urteil zur Aufhebung des Vorgängers „Safe Harbour“ jedoch klargemacht: Der generelle Zugriff auf Inhalte elektronischer Kommunikation verletzt den Wesensgehalt, den Kern des Grundrechts auf Achtung des Privatlebens.

Demnächst steht die erste Überprüfung des *privacy shield* an. Uns Sozialdemokraten ist wichtig, dass die erwähnten Kritikpunkte dort ausreichend Beachtung finden und Rechtssicherheit geschaffen wird. Das Parlament kann den *privacy shield* nicht aussetzen, die Kommission schon, sofern die Mängel im Grundrechtsschutz zu groß sind. Ich bedaure es sehr, dass die Konservativen im Innenausschuss unsere gemeinsam ausgehandelte EntschlieÙung nicht unterstützen wollten. Scheinbar sind ihnen schnelle Scheinlösungen für Unternehmen wichtiger als nachhaltige, grundrechtsfreundliche Ansätze, die auch mehr Rechtsschutz für die betroffenen Unternehmen bieten.

Ich hoffe daher, dass wir im Plenum eine Mehrheit für diese EntschlieÙung finden werden. So können wir ein Signal an die Kommission senden. Das Europäische Parlament wird das Funktionieren des *privacy shield* in der Praxis äußerst kritisch verfolgen. Wenn die Überprüfung ergibt, dass der *privacy shield* nicht mit der EU-Grundrechtecharta und den neuen EU-Datenschutzregeln im Einklang steht, muss die Kommission ihn aussetzen. Sonst riskiert sie die Blamage, dass auch dieser Schutzschild erneut vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof scheitert.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, last year some of us stood here and warned that the Commission's EU-US Privacy Shield agreement would not protect citizens' privacy rights; and how right we were. The so-called 'shield' is an insult to citizens across Europe whose privacy has been further undermined.

The agreement allows the US intelligence to carry out mass surveillance and collect huge amounts of private data and bulk information indiscriminately. It allows US companies to collect data on individual citizens every time they go online, with no effective legal protection, and it is only voluntary. It only applies to companies that have signed up. The rest can run fancy free with our information. So this shambles breaches our fundamental privacy rights and it needs to be fixed.

It needs to be fixed urgently with a robust, effective and enforceable system that protects the privacy rights of citizens, not the interest of spooks and big business. I would call on the Commissioner to fix it before the European Court of Justice forces you to do so for a second time.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, como frisamos na resolução sobre *big data* e direitos fundamentais que redigi e que foi aprovada por este Parlamento, no mês passado, nesta era digital é de extrema importância reforçar a confiança dos cidadãos no uso das novas tecnologias da comunicação e assegurar a segurança dos dados pessoais recolhidos *online* e por todo o tipo de aparelhos eletrónicos.

Estes princípios aplicam-se necessariamente às transferências transatlânticas de dados para garantir segurança jurídica a empresas e cidadãos, num quadro legal, robusto em regimes de proteção de dados equivalentes e menos vulneráveis à utilização criminosa e indevida. Esta resolução do Parlamento Europeu reconhece que o escudo de proteção da privacidade entre a União Europeia e os Estados Unidos contém melhorias significativas no que diz respeito à clareza das normas, em comparação com o antigo regime, dito de *porto seguro*, em resultado dos esforços da Comissão Europeia para solucionar as insuficiências suscitadas pelo Tribunal de Justiça, o grupo de trabalho do artigo 29 e pelo Parlamento Europeu, entre outros.

Ainda assim, o Parlamento aponta várias reservas, estando em causa quer os aspetos comerciais quer o acesso por parte das autoridades públicas dos Estados Unidos aos dados transferidos da União Europeia. E numero apenas algumas, como a ausência de regras específicas em matéria de decisões automatizadas e a aplicação dos princípios do escudo a subcontratantes.

A ausência de um direito geral de oposição por parte dos cidadãos, a necessidade de garantias sobre a independência e os poderes do mecanismo de mediação e a ausência de garantias sobre a não realização de uma recolha maciça indiscriminada de dados pessoais que é proibida pela Carta Europeia dos Direitos Fundamentais.

Todas estas preocupações podem conduzir a uma contestação deste regime junto dos tribunais. Para além disso, a situação política nos Estados Unidos é hoje claramente diferente. Não podemos ignorar, Senhora Comissária, o impacto da eleição de Donald Trump no cumprimento do acordo e das garantias dadas pela administração Obama. Trump já demonstrou completo desprezo por acordos celebrados pela anterior administração. Ainda esta semana o Presidente promulgou uma lei que dá às operadoras da Internet nos Estados Unidos a liberdade de venda dos dados dos seus clientes, tais como histórico de navegação e restante informação privada, ao mercado publicitário, sem o consentimento das pessoas em causa, o que demonstra o desprezo da nova administração pelas garantias mínimas de proteção da privacidade e de dados pessoais que existiam anteriormente.

É por isso que, por ocasião da primeira reapreciação conjunta anual, a Comissão deve proceder a uma análise aprofundada de todas as lacunas e deficiências que estão referidas nesta resolução e tem que verificar a compatibilidade das novas leis e ordens executivas de Trump com os compromissos assumidos no quadro do escudo de proteção da privacidade, bem como o seu impacto ao nível da proteção dos dados...

(A Presidente retira a palavra à oradora.)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I said at the beginning that I very much appreciate the opportunity to take part in the discussion here today, to answer your questions and to hear your views because I think the period between the moment when we started the full functioning of Privacy Shield and the first annual report, which will come out as late as September, is very important. I am grateful for hearing your views, including the critical voices, because we take all of them very seriously and share many of them. That is why – as I also said at the beginning – we are closely monitoring the situation in the United States. It is not true that we only say what should be done. I am informing you about the things we are doing. This is something I want to emphasise very strongly.

I am aware of the fact – as Mr Moraes, Mr Voss and some others clearly said – that at the moment we still do not have a full assessment of the functioning of Privacy Shield, because this is just the beginning. It is also for this reason that I am glad about the idea which we discussed today with the Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, namely that I could come in the first half of this year to give full information about how we see and assess the functioning of Privacy Shield. This is my commitment which I would like to repeat here in the plenary.

When I say that the first annual review will be the moment of truth, I mean it very seriously. This must not be just another report. I want to give an honest and true reflection of the situation. That is why I want to use all possible channels to have this fully-fledged review which will reflect how Privacy Shield protects the privacy of Europeans and whether it fully protects according our requirement, the requirement of European law, and the requirement of the court ruling.

That is why I want to take all the inputs from the State Administration, from the Article 29 Working Party on the European side and the Federal Trade Commission on the American side. I want to take on board all the critical comments from the NGOs. I spoke to NGOs on both the European and American sides. They are very critical and share some of the concerns which you voiced here today. I want to create a precise and detailed questionnaire which will be sent to the certified companies – the companies which have been certified under Privacy Shield – so that we receive information from them about the number of requests from the intelligence services and security bodies on the American side, and much other detailed information. I also want to use the media reports about the atmosphere, tendencies and trends in the United States to capture something which I call a real feel for how to look at the situation in the United States.

We must focus on three main things: the legal environment in the United States; the capacities which the United States partners invest in the full functioning of Privacy Shield; the way Privacy Shield is used and respected by the certified companies; and the way Privacy Shield is used by the citizens themselves, because, as you know, an important part of the Privacy Shield mechanism is offering new ways of redress for EU citizens. These are the things which we are going to fully focus and reflect on through the first annual review.

Mrs in 't Veld asked for a specific answers to some questions. I will try to answer them now but, as I said, we are ready to give you more detailed responses whenever you ask. On the Ombudsperson, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) and the Federal Trade Commission, what I said before is relevant, namely that we are focusing on the United States institutions to be fully equipped as regards the capacities and the responsible leadership to keep Privacy Shield running. We shared our concerns in Washington about the fact that we do not see any persons nominated or appointed to these positions. We now have to face the reality that the new American Administration still has to appoint about 5 000 people to senior positions in the State Administration, out of which 1 000 must also be also endorsed and authorised by the Senate. The Ombudsperson, for instance, is one of them so we will now have to negotiate with and monitor the work of the acting Ombudsperson. My colleague has spoken to this person, so we are in contact and they understand how important this is for us. As for the Ombudsperson, I will rely for the review on the information from the Ombudsperson's office because there should not only be information about the complaints he or she received, but also information about how many requests were sent from the intelligence services to the companies. I will push hard to get such information because we also want the Ombudsperson to act as the relevant source of trustworthy information for us.

On PCLOB the situation is similar. We urge the American side to have the full capacity of the Federal Trade Commission. I spoke to its acting Chair, and we made it very clear that we are waiting for the official new representation. On PPD-28, we have been assured that no changes are foreseen, but we will of course keep monitoring this. We also have strong allies in the Congress and among the experts who are monitoring the situation on this piece of legislation, which I made absolutely clear to our American partners is the main pillar, as it is for the American legislation, for keeping Privacy Shield running. This is what we need to see in place and fully functioning.

Regarding Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), still no information can be received on whether there will be amendments or whether it will continue in the same way as it is in force now. We have to follow all the information we receive in the months to come, but I am rather sceptical about whether before the review we will have anything more concrete about whether there will be any changes. I made it very clear that, if there are changes to the detriment of the situation for the protection of Europeans' private data, we will have to act because this is an absolutely crucial piece of legislation for Privacy Shield.

The situation on the executive order is different, according to our legal analysis, because the protections of Privacy Shield are not based on the US Privacy Act. Therefore the executive order which you mentioned has no impact on this. This is the executive order on enhancing public safety. In Section 14 this concerns protections under the US Privacy Act of 1974. The Privacy Act only applies to US citizens and permanent residents. The Obama Administration had instructed federal agencies to use their discretion also to apply these protections to others in the context of migration databases and this policy has now been reversed. But let us be clear: as I indicated, the Privacy Act never granted any rights to Europeans. That is why we had to negotiate new arrangements, notably the umbrella agreement and the accompanying Judicial Redress Act, to ensure the necessary protection for Europeans and these remain unaffec-

ted by the executive order. This has also been confirmed in writing by the United States.

Let me conclude by saying that for us the main message to take to Washington was that we can see that security is a very high priority in the United States. I made it absolutely clear that for us the protection of Europeans' private data is a very high priority and a fundamental right which must also be protected in the transfer of data to the United States. I think that this was well understood by all our key American partners. I would say that the protection of private data must remain great, not be made great again. This was our message to our American partners.

Elnök asszony. – Köszönöm szépen Biztos asszonynak a tényleg kimerítő és átfogó válaszát, csak remélni tudjuk, hogy ez az adatvédelmi pajzs által biztosított védelem is ilyen jól fog működni.

Kettő állásfoglalásra irányuló indítványt juttattak el hozzám, melyeket az eljárási szabályzat 123. cikkének (2) bekezdésével összhangban nyújtottak be. A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra holnap kerül sor.

20. Sestava delegacij: gl. zapisnik

21. Poročilo o nekdanji jugoslovanski republiki Makedoniji za leto 2016

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont az Ivo Vajgl által a Külügyi Bizottság nevében készített, a Macedónia Volt Jugoszláv Köztársaságról szóló 2016. évi jelentésről folytatott vita (2016/231(INI)) (A8-0055/2017).

Ivo Vajgl, poročevalec. – Poročilo, o katerem bomo danes pozno v noč, očitno, razpravljali, se nanaša na poročilo Evropske komisije o napredku bivše jugoslovanske republike Makedonije za leto 2016 in še ni zaključeno. Sklepne besede bomo zapisali, ko bo v Makedoniji prišlo do pričakovanega premika v krizi.

Ob angažiranem sodelovanju vseh poročevalcev v senci in po vsestranski obravnavi in podpori v Odboru za zunanje zadeve Evropskega parlamenta je nastal dokument, ki pomeni jasno podporo vključevanju Makedonije v Evropsko unijo in evro-atlantske integracije pod pogojem, da se konča dolgotrajna politična kriza, hitro oblikuje nova vlada, ki bo upoštevala rezultate volitev 11. decembra lani in na njih temelječa razmerja in možnosti koalicijskega sodelovanja v parlamentu.

Danes lahko samo ugotovimo, da se kriza nadaljuje, da je delo parlamenta praktično onemogočeno, da se ne upoštevajo osnovna pravila parlamentarne demokracije in da namesto zavezanosti dolgoročnim interesom države v političnem soočanju strank prevladujejo toni, ki stopnjujejo medsebojno razklanost.

Namesto da omogočijo državi napredovanje po začrtani evropski poti, nujnih in globokih reform, usmerjajo nezadovoljni politiki množice svojih pristašev v ulične proteste, ki vzpodbujajo medetnično nezaupanje in nestrpnost.

Skoraj štiri mesece po izrednih parlamentarnih volitvah, ki so potekale v skladu z demokratičnimi standardi, tako smo ugotavljali, do konstituiranja parlamenta in oblikovanja vlade ne more priti zaradi sistematične obstrukcije procesa s strani najmočnejše politične stranke VMRO, ki ji ni uspelo sestaviti potrebne večine, in zaradi zavračanja predsednika države, da v skladu s pravili in prakso demokratičnih držav zaupa mandat za sestavo vlade tistemu voditelju, ki mu je dal potrebna zagotovila, da ima večinsko podporo parlamenta.

Do ravnanja predsednika države Gjorgja Ivanova so se jasno in kritično opredelili najvišji predstavniki Evropske unije, Nata in voditelji številnih evropskih držav. Vsi so pozvali predsednika, naj uporabi svoja pooblastila tako, da omogoči normalno funkcioniranje parlamenta in oblikovanje vlade na osnovi izdatne večine, s katero razpolaga potencialna vladajoča koalicija.

Predsednik Ivanov vztraja na stališču, ki razkriva predvsem njegovo strankarsko afiliacijo in podaljšuje krizo. Še je čas, da svoje stališče spremeni in uskladi z zahtevo in načeli parlamentarne demokracije, vrne vsem državljanom svoje države mir in upanje na boljše življenje v miru in medsebojnem spoštovanju.

Spoštovani kolegi, poročilo, katerega vsebino sem kot poročevalec pripravljaj v konstruktivnem sodelovanju z vami, s Komisijo, kolegi v timu mediatorjev v imenu Evropskega parlamenta in v tesnem vsebinskem sodelovanju s komisarjem Johannesom Hahnem in njegovim kabinetom, bomo morali dopolniti v skladu z razpletanjem krize v Makedoniji, preden ga damo na glasovanje.

Prepričan sem, da si Makedonija zasluži več vzpodbude kot kritike. Predolgo čaka na začetek pogajanj zaradi anahroničnega spora o imenu države.

Poročilo vsebuje stališče, da bilateralna vprašanja in spori ne smejo biti ovira za napredek države v smeri evro-atlantskih integracij. Priporočilo za začetek pogajanj o pristopu, pogojeno z rešitvijo politične krize in pospešenim delom na reformah, utemeljenih na sporazumu Pržino in dokumentu o nujnih reformskih prioritetah, bi pomenilo vzpodbudo za napredek in nujno potrebno sodelovanje vseh političnih strank na nacionalni prioriteti, to je na integraciji v EU.

Makedonija in regija okoli nje potrebuje stabilnost in mir. V tem trenutku potrebuje tudi pomiritev in spravo kot pogoj za drugačno, inkluzivno politiko. (*Še en stavek, prosim.*)

Makedonski politiki naj svoje odnose rešujejo na demokratičen način. Pri tem lahko računajo na podporo Evropskega parlamenta in Evropske unije in njenih institucij v celoti.

Ian Borg, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for the opportunity to discuss with you the Commission's annual report on the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. On 9 March 2017, the European Council discussed the situation in the Western Balkans. It stressed the EU's commitment to the region and reaffirmed its unequivocal support for the European perspective of the Western Balkans. President Tusk visited the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia earlier this week and confirmed this commitment. On behalf of the Presidency I wish to reiterate our commitment to advancing the enlargement process in full respect of the basic principles of conditionality and on merit.

The early parliamentary elections finally took place on 11 December 2016, after having been postponed twice. We take good note that the OSCE considers that the elections were competitive, but that they took place in an environment characterised by widespread public mistrust in the institutions and the political establishment. Unfortunately, the government has not been formed to date, and we are concerned at the current political impasse. We look forward to the formation of the new government without further delay in line with democratic principles and the constitution.

In Skopje on Monday, President Tusk called for statesmanship and unity in order to find a way out of the current deadlock. We also remain worried about the continuation of the political crisis and the partial implementation of the Pržino Agreement. We share your view that political will is necessary to ensure its full, tangible and sustainable implementation. The country continues to suffer from a very divisive political environment, polarisation and the lack of a culture of compromise, with backsliding in important areas such as the functioning of the judiciary, which should be allowed to work independently.

Let me also reiterate the importance of a thorough and independent investigation, without hindrance, of the allegations of wrongdoing brought to the fore by the wiretaps and the related failures of oversight. In this respect, I would like to recall the importance of the mandate and the work of both the Special Prosecutor and the parliamentary committee of inquiry to look respectively into legal and also political responsibility. It is also important to restore trust in the national institutions.

We also back your call on all parties, including those forming the future government, to take ownership and to honour the undertaking to implement the urgent reform priorities, and also to address systematic rule of law issues, including in relation to breaches of fundamental rights, judicial independence, media freedom, elections, corruption, politicisation of state institutions, state or party blurring, and failures of oversight.

We also welcome the Commission's intention to continue the close monitoring in order to assess systematic failures in the areas of justice, corruption, fundamental rights and human affairs, as reflected also in the urgent reform priorities. We expect the new government to urgently, as a first priority, address overdue reforms, including the one I just referred to – the urgent reform priorities – for the benefit of the country and its citizens, and also in order to return the country to its European path.

The Council also acknowledges and encourages the constructive role played by civil society in supporting and improving democratic processes. I would also like to stress the importance of good inter-ethnic relations. The review of the Ohrid Framework Agreement needs to be completed by the new government as soon as possible in an inclusive and transparent manner, and its recommendations implemented.

Let me finally underline that maintaining of good neighbourly relations, including a negotiated and mutually accepted solution to the name issue, under the auspices of the United Nations remains essential. We all agree that there is a need to bring the longstanding discussions on the name issue to a definitive conclusion without delay. Let me welcome the fact that the confidence-building measures have started to produce tangible results. Actions and statements which negatively impact on good neighbourly relations should also be avoided, and we note the continued high level and expert contacts with Bulgaria aimed at strengthening good neighbourly relations. We look forward to their timely translation into concrete results. We also welcome the fact that the Commission is prepared to extend these recommendations to open accession negotiations, conditional on progress with the implementation of the Pržino Agreement, and substantial progress in the implementation of the urgent reform priorities.

The Presidency is ready to revert, when appropriate, to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, including on the basis of an update from the Commission once sufficient progress has been made on these issues and in line with the previous Council conclusions and established conditionality. The political leaders now have the responsibility to take the necessary steps and put their country back on the Euro-Atlantic path. The European Union stands ready to support them in these endeavours.

Neven Mimica, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank the Parliament, and in particular the rapporteur, Ivo Vajgl, for the report which is before you today for discussion. We find it balanced and in line with the main findings of our 2016 report on the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

As you all know, the political situation in the country is of very serious concern. The Commission, therefore, greatly appreciates the work of this House, and in particular the efforts of honourable Members, Ivo Vajgl, Mr Fleckenstein and Mr Kukan, and, before that, Richard Howitt. In very close coordination with Commissioner Hahn, they send common messages to the political leaders during their recent visit to Skopje. President Tusk was also in the country on Monday.

More than ever, we need to continue speaking with one voice. The early parliamentary elections last December were a key part of the political agreement which the country's leaders signed in 2015. But they were only a start.

We are all deeply concerned about the latest developments and the continued refusal of President Ivanov to give a mandate to a coalition which is clearly supported by the majority in the assembly. This risks undermining the stability of the country and its credibility.

We are also gravely concerned about the emergence of inter-ethnic inflammatory rhetoric by some actors. Such rhetoric means playing with fire. It could have broader regional implications and must, therefore, stop immediately.

I therefore strongly encourage all political leaders in the country, including the president, to respect the results of the elections and the clear parliamentary majority. We expect the president to let democracy proceed and a new government to be formed.

I know that, especially, this House feels strongly about the central role of national parliaments, and we expect all political leaders to stop fuelling inter-ethnic tensions. The rapid formation of the new government will, however, not to be sufficient in itself to return to business as usual. We will continue to insist on the implementation of all parts of the 2015 Pržino agreement, including key reforms on the rule of law.

We need to see a clear and firm political will to tackle these issues. Substantial progress is not only needed in the implementation of the so-called urgent reform priorities, which address the serious rule of law issues in the country. This also means that the special prosecutor's office should be given time and resources to complete its work.

Let me at this point also emphasise the crucial importance of empowered civil society and good neighbourly relations. We are concerned about the criticism and attacks faced by civil society organisations. An empowered civil society is a crucial component of any democratic system, and should be recognised and treated as such by state institutions and politicians.

Good neighbourly relations are also essential for the country. Resolving bilateral issues with the neighbours is crucial and finding a solution to the main issue remains a priority. We should all come together to support this goal.

Last but not least, the country was also at the front line of an unprecedented migration crisis in 2015 and 2016. It has received very considerable support from the EU and from individual Member States. The Commission remains committed to continue helping with this challenge, despite the situation being much calmer now.

Let me, however, also say that our good cooperation on migration issues does not mean at all that we will close an eye to the aforementioned democratic and rule of law issues. That would be extremely short-sighted, and I know this is not how this House sees enlargement.

In short, the European Council has just reaffirmed the accession perspective of the entire Western Balkans region. It is now up to the countries in the region to use this momentum, with our help. This is a long, complex process so there is no time to waste. This is particularly true for this country.

I now look forward to the debate.

Tunne Kelam, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I very much appreciate the constructive approach by Mr Vajgl. We are still optimistic about this very complicated programme and on behalf of the EPP Group I can say that I fully support his stand.

I think the key word was provided by President Tusk a few days ago when he said that Macedonia can count on EU support once the domestic political crisis is solved, based on democratic principles, decency and common sense. I think we can interpret this as meaning that the EU wants Macedonia to move towards the EU and NATO membership. The internal situation remains extremely complicated but we must understand that it is our shared worry and shared responsibility.

The EU has a responsibility, especially now, to play a stronger role in the region or, as we know, there will be other powers to fill the void. The external influences have already fuelled internal divisions in Macedonia. If we are hesitant or slow to bring Western Balkan countries closer to the EU others will not hesitate to drift them away from us.

The major problem remains national reconciliation, which means serious efforts to develop inclusiveness and mutual trust. To advance this, the EU too has to offer a credible European perspective to Macedonia.

Knut Fleckenstein, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich auch bei Herrn Vajgl bedanken für seinen guten Bericht, auch wenn wir ihn heute nicht abstimmen können. Wir können nicht abstimmen, obwohl er, Eduard Kukan und mein Vorgänger Richard Howitt sich alle Mühe gegeben haben, mit den Parteien zusammen eine Lösung zu finden, um die Krise in Mazedonien zu beenden.

Und diese Lösung hieß demokratische Wahlen, die hinterher auch anerkannt werden. Und diese Wahlen haben stattgefunden, und sie haben auch in einem Umfeld stattgefunden, dass man sagen konnte: Die Arbeit hat sich gelohnt. Aber die Arbeit hat sich nicht gelohnt, wenn Demokratie nur funktioniert, wenn die jeweilige eigene Partei gewinnt. Deshalb sage ich ganz deutlich: Das Ergebnis ist klar, 67 Abgeordnete haben eine Koalition gebildet, und wir erwarten von denen, die abgewählt worden sind, dass sie ihre Büros verlassen, eine ordentliche Oppositionsarbeit machen und vielleicht in vier Jahren dann zurückkehren, wenn diese Regierung, die jetzt ins Amt kommt, schlechte Arbeit geleistet hat.

Aber was nicht geht, ist, ein ganzes Land in Geiselhaft zu nehmen, nur weil die eigenen Machtansprüche eben so sind, wie sie sind. Und da braucht man auch nicht vornehm herumzureden – man muss ganz klar sagen : Wenn ihr so weitermacht, ist der Weg nach Europa irgendwann zu. Eine Empfehlung für irgendwelche Formen von Verhandlungen kann es nicht geben, wenn in einem Land die größte Partei der Meinung ist, dass Demokratie nur funktioniert, wenn sie gewinnt.

Und lassen Sie mich noch eins dazu sagen: Die Menschen auf der Straße, die Angst haben vor Identitätsverlust in ihrem Land, die muss man ernst nehmen, mit denen muss man sich unterhalten. Das ist übrigens auch die Aufgabe der 67, ihnen die Angst zu nehmen. Denn die albanische Plattform ist ja, wenn man sie sich in Ruhe durchliest, etwas, was nichts Schwieriges darstellt. Dass sie in Tirana offiziell verabschiedet worden ist, ist wenig hilfreich, und das sollte allen Akteuren, auch dem Premierminister Albanien, mittlerweile bekannt sein.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τα Σκόπια, κατά παράβαση της διεθνούς νομιμότητας, έχουν κλείσει εδώ και καιρό παράνομα τα σύνορά τους για τους πρόσφυγες. Η ενέργειά τους αυτή καταδικάστηκε και από τον πρώην Γενικό Γραμματέα του ΟΗΕ, κύριο Ban Ki-moon. Κλείνοντας τον νόμιμο βαλκανικό διάδρομο, τα Σκόπια εγκλωβίσαν στην Ελλάδα χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες. Και αντί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να τους ανακαλέσει στην τάξη, ο ίδιος ο κύριος Tusk μόλις προχθές στα Σκόπια επιβράβευσε τη στάση τους. Επιβράβευσε τους Σκοπιανούς οι οποίοι, κατά παράβαση του διεθνούς δικαίου, χτύπησαν στα σύνορα με την Ελλάδα, στην Ειδομένη, χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και έριξαν παράνομα εντός του ελληνικού εδάφους χειροβομβίδες κρότου λάμψης και δακρυγόνα κατά των χιλιάδων εγκλωβισμένων στην Ειδομένη προσφύγων.

Για όσο, λοιπόν, διάστημα τα Σκόπια κρατούν παράνομα κλειστά τα σύνορά τους για τους χιλιάδες εγκλωβισμένους πρόσφυγες στην Ελλάδα, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση οφείλει να επιβάλει πλήρες οικονομικό εμπάργκο στο κρατικό μάρφωμα των Σκοπίων, για το οποίο πρέπει να επισημανθεί επιπλέον ότι συνεχίζει την προκλητική του στάση απέναντι στην Ελλάδα. Ο αλυτρωτισμός των Σκοπίων εκφράζεται με την παραχάραξη της Ιστορίας και την καπηλεία του ονόματος της Μακεδονίας μας, πρακτική που δέχθηκε πριν από λίγο και ο ίδιος ο εισηγητής, που αποκάλεσε τα Σκόπια «Μακεδονία» αντί για «FYROM».

Τα Σκόπια, λοιπόν, πρέπει να καταλάβουν ότι ο ελληνικός λαός δεν πρόκειται να δεχτεί την καπηλεία του ονόματος της Μακεδονίας μας. Επίσης, ο ελληνικός λαός δεν πρόκειται να δεχθεί για το όνομα των Σκοπίων σύνθετη ονομασία με οποιοδήποτε γεωγραφικό προσδιορισμό. Είμαι αντίθετος σε οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη των Σκοπίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Jozo Radoš, *u ime Kluba zastupnika ALDE-a*. – Gospođo predsjednice, gospodine povjereniče, od niza vrlo sporih razvoja i kriza koje se događaju na prostoru zapadnog Balkana, Makedonija je najduže u zastoju i može se reći da je tamo napredak potpuno izostao zadnjih godina. Može se možda čak tvrditi da je Makedonija danas u lošijem stanju u pogledu perspektive pristupanja Europskoj uniji nego što je bila prije deset godina. Zemlja koja ide iz krize u krizu.

Primjer Makedonije pokazuje kako mlade zemlje, mlade demokracije mogu zastati u svome razvoju i kako se ti krhki demokratski procesi mogu okrenuti prema natrag. To je naravno moguće, to se događa i u razvijenim demokratskim državama, ali nas bi trebalo zanimati ono što je uloga Europskog parlamenta, odnosno Europske unije u tom procesu. Zemlja je ostavljena bez perspektive. Na neki je način ponižena zadnjih deset godina i taj osjećaj napuštenosti sigurno je još pojačao negativne tendencije koje se događaju u Makedoniji. Zemlja se nalazi u vrlo osjetljivom području. Prijeti se da socijalni unutrašnji politički sukobi prerastu u etničke i međudržavne sukobe u tom širem prostoru, a znamo da je prostor ionako sam po sebi nestabilan.

Znam da Europska unija nema velike, snažne mehanizme, ali osim apela i poziva i potpore trebalo je imati jasnu, promišljenu politiku, jasne planove i veću prisutnost Europskog parlamenta i Europske unije u Makedoniji.

Σοφία Σακοράφα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, υποστηρίζετε ότι εργάζεστε ώστε η χώρα να ξεπεράσει το αδιέξοδο της σημερινής πολιτικής κρίσης και να βρει τον ευρωπαϊκό της βηματισμό. Υποστηρίζετε ότι η πολιτική σας να αγνοείτε, να ωραιοποιείτε και να επιβραβεύετε το συστημικό έλλειμμα που υπάρχει σε κρίσιμους τομείς της χώρας και φυσικά στα πολιτικά κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης βοηθάει προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση. Υποστηρίζετε ότι η υποβάθμιση όλων αυτών των αρνητικών στοιχείων που συνθέτουν τη σημερινή τραγική κατάσταση της χώρας μπορεί να δημιουργήσει θετικό κλίμα συναίνεσης και συνεργασιών. Έχω τονίσει επανειλημμένα ότι η πολιτική αυτή μόνο ανασταλτικά θα μπορούσε να λειτουργήσει για την πρόοδο της χώρας και του λαού της. Και, δυστυχώς, οι εξελίξεις το επιβεβαιώνουν.

Αγνοήσατε την ανάπτυξη του εθνικισμού στη χώρα. Επικροτήσατε την επινόηση της παράδοσης στην οποία επένδυσαν οι πολιτικοί της. Αγνοήσατε τη ρητορική μίσους και ξενοφοβισμού που αναπτυσσόταν. Εθίσατε τους πολιτικούς της χώρας στο να αποποιούνται τις ευθύνες τους. Καμία αυτοκριτική, κανένας σεβασμός στο κράτος δικαίου και τις θεμελιώδεις αρχές της διεθνούς έννομης τάξης, καμία διάθεση συμβιβασμών και καμία πολιτική υπευθυνότητα. Χθες για το αδιέξοδο και την έλλειψη πολιτικής βούλησης στη χώρα έφταιγε η Ελλάδα και η Βουλγαρία, σήμερα η Αλβανία και περιμένουμε να δούμε ποιος θα φταίει αύριο. Αυτά είναι τα αποτελέσματα της πολιτικής σας.

Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, οποιαδήποτε συζήτηση για το άνοιγμα των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων, πριν εκπληρωθούν τα πολιτικά κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης, διασφαλιστούν οι σχέσεις καλής γειτονίας και υπάρξει ουσιαστική πρόοδος στο ονοματολογικό, θα είναι εκτός τόπου και χρόνου.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μια ακόμα έκθεση για την Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβική Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας – αυτό είναι το επίσημο όνομά της, που πολλοί παραβλέπουν ενισχύοντας αλυτρωτισμούς μέσω μιας επικίνδυνης αδιέξοδης ονοματολογίας – έκθεση που προωθεί την ενσωμάτωση και αυτής της χώρας αλλά και συνολικά των Δυτικών Βαλκανίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και στο NATO για τα συμφέροντα των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων, για να ελεγχθούν οι δρόμοι μεταφορών ενέργειας και άλλων προϊόντων προς την Ευρώπη, σε ανταγωνισμό με την καπιταλιστική Ρωσία, να ανακοπούν, σύμφωνα με το συνολικό ευρωενωσιακό σχέδιο, οι προσφυγικές ροές των πολέμων, του NATO και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Οι λαοί της Ευρώπης, μετά τον νατοϊκό, ευρωενωσιακό πόλεμο διάλυσης της Γιουγκοσλαβίας, εμπλέκονται πάλι από τις κυβερνήσεις τους και την πολιτική «διαίρει και βασίλευε» της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε ανταγωνισμούς και κινδύνους γενικότερης ανάφλεξης. Ο ιμπεριαλισμός επανέρχεται στην επαναχάραξη των συνόρων στη βάση εθνοτισμών, αλυτρωτισμών, μεγαλοϊδεατισμών που ο ίδιος καλλιεργεί. Οι σημερινές εξελίξεις σχετίζονται με όλα αυτά. Η ένταξη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σημαίνει για τους λαούς σε όλες τις χώρες ανεργία, φτώχεια, αντιλαϊκές μεταρρυθμίσεις, χτύπημα εργατικών λαϊκών δικαιωμάτων για την κερδοφορία των επιχειρηματικών ομίλων. Απαραίτητο συμπλήρωμα ο χυδαίος αντικομμουνισμός που αποπνέει και αυτή η έκθεση.

Το ΚΚΕ αντιτίθεται στην ένταξη της Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για τους ίδιους λόγους όπως και για την Ελλάδα. Η ειρηνική συμβίωση των λαών της περιοχής επί σοσιαλισμού διακόπηκε από την ιμπεριαλιστική επέμβαση. Οι λαοί έχουν τη δύναμη, αποτινάσσοντας τα δεσμά του NATO και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των αστικών κυβερνήσεων, να ζήσουν ειρηνικά για τη δικιά τους ευημερία και όχι για τα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the rapporteur for his good work.

We have been dealing with the political crisis in Macedonia for the past two years. I would really like to see the light at the end of the tunnel, yet democracy in Macedonia is still politically paralysed and the victims are the citizens of the country and hence the integration process itself. Let me say this clearly: it is in our utmost interest to see a strong and democratic Macedonia coming onto the EU path.

We do appreciate the positive role that the country has played and can play in the region, yet democratic development and political stability are the key pillars on which it needs to be built. I am concerned at the deepening of the political crisis. Like many others, I would also like to call on the President of the country to fulfil his responsibility in the process of forming a new government composed of political parties with a real majority in the parliament. In addition, the parliament should itself start working according to the normal procedures.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospođa predsjednice, gospodine povjereniče, bez obzira na okolnosti, čestitam kolegi Vajglu na kvalitetnom dokumentu jer rezolucija obuhvaća sve činjenice i procese relevantne za Makedoniju tokom 2016. Ono što svakako nije dobro je slijed događaja nakon izvanrednih izbora održanih u prosincu. Suočeni s gubitkom vlasti dotadašnja dugogodišnja vladajuća stranka, njen lider i predsjednik Republike iz njenih redova doveli su zemlju u tešku situaciju.

Nakon što je predsjednik države višestruko odbio dati mandat za formiranje nove Vlade lideru koji je uspio osigurati većinu zastupnika izabranih na izborima, Makedonija se opet vratila u razdoblje unutarnjih sukobljavanja. Poticanje protesta na ulicama, neargumentirane optužbe kako će nova Vlada ugroziti jedinstvo zemlje, ignoriranje dužnosnika Europske unije koji savjetuju poštivanje Ustava, postaju instrumenti održavanja napetosti i forsiranja novih izbora.

Usporedno s tim, bivša stranka na vlasti blokira i funkcioniranje novog parlamenta tako da nisu raspisani ni redovni lokalni izbori predviđeni za svibanj. Ono što mi se čini ključnim jest da linije podjela koje produbljuje bivši premijer i njegova stranka ne ostave traga na zajedničkom pristupu Europske unije krizi u Makedoniji. Takav pristup Europske unije i međunarodne zajednice već je više puta dao dobre rezultate.

Raspravljajući o dugotrajnoj i sve ozbiljnijoj krizi u Makedoniji, mi zapravo odgovaramo na rastuću dilemu kakva politička uređenja želimo u državama na zapadnom Balkanu. Jer ovisno o jasnoći naših stajališta i ustrajanju na dosljednom poštivanju demokratskih standarda mi ćemo poslati poruku svim protagonistima kršenja istih.

Nitko ne osporava rezultate izvanrednih parlamentarnih izbora nedavno održanih u Makedoniji. To mogu reći i kao neposredni promatrač tih izbora. Izbori nisu dali apsolutnog nego relativnog pobjednika. Pobjednika koji nije uspio u pokušaju da obnovi koaliciju sa dotadašnjim partnerima. Ali ta ista stranka se nakon toga usprotivila koaliciji bivših partnera i neposrednih suparnika.

Političke zajednice mogu upadati u krize jer je takva priroda odnosa u društvima. Međutim nije svejedno kako neka politička zajednica prepoznaje krizu i kako iz nje izlazi. Ne zaboravimo da su stranački sukobi u Makedoniji neodvojivi od etničkih napetosti. Srećom zasada aktualni prijepori nisu izazvali prelijevanje krize na širi prostor ionako osjetljive regije. Zato naša reakcija mora biti dosljedna i pravovremena.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich kann nicht nachvollziehen, wie man sich im 21. Jahrhundert derart über den Namen eines Landes zerstreiten kann, den dieses mit einer benachbarten Region eines anderen Landes teilt. Doch bei genauerer Betrachtung der Jahrhunderte, fast Jahrtausende alten Geschichte der Region wird es klar. Trotzdem: Ein Namensstreit darf nicht zur Blockadehaltung führen.

Ansonsten begrüße ich die Bemühungen Mazedoniens auf dem Weg in Richtung EU. Ich erkenne die Leistungen bei der Umsetzung des gemeinsamen Besitzstandes an. Ich habe Hochachtung vor dem, was das kleine Land zur Schließung der Balkanroute unternommen hat. Ich bedaure, dass dies nicht deutlicher die dankbare Unterstützung durch die EU erfährt.

Ich sehe aber auch die aktuellen Probleme des Landes und verbinde das mit einem klaren Appell an EVP und S&D in diesem Haus: Es sind Ihre Mitgliedsparteien, die aktuell eine stabile Entwicklung durch bockiges Verhalten blockieren. Es läge auch an den Herren Weber und Pittella, hier etwas zu bewegen. Dann können die Bemühungen der Bürger in Mazedonien auch belohnt werden. Dann heißt es „Daumen hoch“ für die Beitrittsverhandlungen. Wir haben bald viel Platz hier im Haus.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Dovolite, da se tudi sam v začetku najprej zahvalim in čestitam kolegu Ivu Vajglu za odlično obširno poročilo, kakršni so tudi problemi v nekdanji jugoslovanski republikli Makedoniji.

Ta država je že vse od konca leta 2005 kandidatka za vstop v Evropsko unijo. Naletela je na blokade s strani sosednje Grčije zaradi dolgoletnih sporov glede imena. In v tem času, ko je Evropa tudi pomagala Makedoniji na tej poti, je bil dosežen določen gospodarski napredek, izvedene so bile reforme. Država je reševala tudi v kriznih trenutkih probleme migrantske krize.

Zašla pa je v globoko notranjepolitično krizo. Ta kriza je tako globoka, da je privedla, tudi po zapletih najprej z izvedbo volitev, do blokade vzpostavitve vlade. Zato mislim, da je prav, da Evropski parlament, Evropska unija še naprej podpira Makedonijo na evropski poti, da ji pomaga pri razrešitvi tega spora. Na voditelje teh političnih strank pa apeliram k zavedanju velike zgodovinske odgovornosti, ki jo imajo v tem trenutku v republiki Makedoniji.

Jens Nilsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Tack till föredraganden för ett väldigt bra resolutionsförslag, mycket bra. Jag, tillsammans med andra kollegor, var valövervakare i december, när valet skedde. Ett val som, i den uppgörelse som fanns, var kanske det viktigaste steget: att kunna genomföra demokratiska val och rättvisa val. Alla valövervakare sa också att det här gick till på ett bra sätt, så nu måste alla respektera valresultatet. Ett val som gick till på precis samma sätt som alla andra demokratiska val. Partierna går till val på sina program. Efter valet samlas man för att se om man kan hitta en majoritet. Och just nu finns det en majoritet som skulle kunna fungera, utse talman, utse regering. Men det finns krafter som motarbetar det. Vad vi behöver nu är en ny regering som bygger på valresultatet, och vi behöver ge den regeringen en chans, för Makedoniens folks skull.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il relatore per questa ottima relazione. La politica di allargamento dell'Unione rappresenta un investimento in termini di pace, sicurezza e opportunità economiche, a mutuo vantaggio dell'Unione europea e dei paesi che aspirano ad aderirvi. Bisogna però garantire che i futuri Stati membri attuino riforme profonde in ogni settore, dai trasporti alla politica interna ed estera. Le connessioni transfrontaliere devono essere rafforzate, i procedimenti doganali uniformati e i risultati richiesti dalla COP 21 condivisi.

Sono fiduciosa che l'accordo di Pržino porti ad un governo stabile in vista dell'adesione all'Unione europea. Mi auguro inoltre che si trovi un compromesso sia con la Grecia, con cui è in corso la controversia sul nome ufficiale del paese, sia con la Bulgaria per il miglioramento dei rapporti reciproci. Ribadisco dunque la necessità di moltiplicare gli sforzi in ogni settore per un processo di integrazione condiviso che porti vantaggi ai cittadini macedoni ed europei.

„Catch the eye”

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci pochválit tuto zprávu, kterou zpracoval pan zpravodaj. Jsem přesvědčen, že je nutné k Makedonii přistupovat pozitivně a přes všechny problémy jí ukazovat cestu do evropských struktur a do NATO.

Ta zpráva je podle mého názoru velmi vyvážená, jasně popisuje politické problémy, které v tuto chvíli tuto zemi sužují. Ostatně většina řečníků o tom také hovořila. Mě jako člověka, který se celý život zabývá reformami justice ve východní Evropě, těší to, že nemalá část této zprávy je velmi podrobně věnována stavu justice v této zemi, stavu státního zastupitelství a stavu boje proti organizovanému zločinu a proti korupci.

Je zřejmé, že samotné reformy justice v Makedonii nestačí. Zřízení jednotlivých úřadů, jako je třeba Úřad zvláštní státní zástupkyně, není dostatečné, pokud tento úřad nemá šanci vykonávat nezávislé vyšetřování a svoji činnost. Zprávu podporuji.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση είναι άτοπη, άκαιρη, εκπρόθεσμη και άκρως ουτοπική. Δεν έχει προκύψει δημοκρατικά νομιμοποιημένη κυβέρνηση μέσω εκλογών και επί του παρόντος διεξάγεται μια πολιτική διαπραγμάτευση. Τα τέσσερα κόμματα της αλβανικής μειονότητας συνεδριάζουν στα Τίρανα, ενώ παράλληλα διενεργούν υπόγειες συζητήσεις με άλλα κόμματα στην Αλβανία και στο Κόσοβο. Μεγάλο μέρος του διεθνούς παράγοντα διαβλέπει τη διάλυση του κρατιδίου και τη μόνιμη απειλή για τη σταθερότητα της ευρύτερης περιοχής.

Η έκθεση αποτελεί προβοκάτσια εις βάρος της πραγματικότητας. Προωθείται μια πλαστή λύση πραγματώνοντας τον εφιάλτη της μεγάλης Αλβανίας στο μαλακό υπογάστριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η μοναδική δόκιμη λύση είναι μία και αποτελεί μονόδρομο: να αποδεχτούν την ιστορική πραγματικότητα ότι δεν υπάρχει μακεδονικό έθνος και ότι δεν έχουν το οποιοδήποτε έρεισμα επί του ονόματος «Μακεδονία». Μόνο τότε θα επιλυθεί το ζήτημα της ονομασίας ώστε να ανοίξουν τα εμπορεύματα και ταυτόχρονα η πορεία προς τη σταθερότητα.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η λειτουργία της δημοκρατίας είναι απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση για να συνεχιστεί η πορεία της Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση –διότι αυτό είναι το επίσημο όνομα της χώρας και σε αυτό τον θεσμό και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Προφανώς η αιτία που τα Σκόπια δεν έχουν πάρει ακόμη ημερομηνία έναρξης διαπραγματεύσεων δεν είναι η διαφορά με την Ελλάδα, όπως λανθασμένα προκύπτει από την έκθεση, η διαφορά για το όνομα που αποτελεί αντικείμενο διαπραγματεύσεων υπό την αιγίδα του Οργανισμού Ηνωμένων Εθνών, έως ότου βρεθεί μια αμοιβαία αποδεκτή λύση έναντι όλων. Η αιτία βρίσκεται στην αδυναμία του πολιτικού συστήματος των Σκοπίων να αποδεχθούν τους κανόνες της ανεξαρτησίας, της δικαιοσύνης, της ελευθερίας του λόγου, των δικαιωμάτων των μειονοτήτων και, εν τέλει, να αποδεχτούν το αποτέλεσμα των εκλογών.

Εξαιτίας αυτών, οι εθνικές εντάσεις έχουν ανέβει επικίνδυνα. Οφείλουμε να απενεργοποιήσουμε άμεσα, με παρέμβαση του συνόλου της διεθνούς κοινότητας, αυτή τη βόμβα που μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε ανεξέλεγκτη ανάφλεξη στην περιοχή. Καταλαβαίνω ότι εδώ στο Στρασβούργο είμαστε μακριά. Όμως στην Ελλάδα, στη Μακεδονία, στη Θεσσαλονίκη γειτονούμε με τη βόμβα και οποιαδήποτε αρνητική εξέλιξη στα Σκόπια θα θέσει σε κίνδυνο τη σταθερότητα της περιοχής και οι επιπτώσεις της θα βαρύνουν άμεσα την ήδη επιβαρυνόμενη από την κρίση Ελλάδα.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όπως αναφέρεται και στην έκθεση, αυτή τη στιγμή στα Σκόπια επικρατούν συνθήκες οι οποίες εμποδίζουν την πρόοδο της εντάξεως της χώρας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και στο NATO: πολιτική διαφθορά, διχασμός, οργανωμένο έγκλημα και χειραγώγηση της Δικαιοσύνης. Παρόλα αυτά υπάρχουν κάποιοι οι οποίοι ισχυρίζονται ότι η Ελλάδα ευθύνεται για την καθυστέρηση της προόδου των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων και μάλιστα ισχυρίζονται ότι δεν πρέπει οι διμερείς διαμάχες να εμποδίσουν αυτή την πρόοδο.

Κατ' αρχάς, το θέμα των Σκοπίων με την Ελλάδα, δηλαδή το θέμα της ονομασίας, δεν είναι διμερές. Είναι διεθνές. Αλλά, ας υποθέσουμε κάποια στιγμή ότι σήμερα επιλύεται αυτό το πρόβλημα του ονόματος. Πιστεύει κανείς ότι αυτό θα συμβάλει στην αντιμετώπιση των προβλημάτων των Σκοπίων; Θα επέλθει ενότητα στη χώρα; Η Αλβανία θα πάψει να διεκδικεί τα εδάφη της στα πλαίσια της δημιουργίας Μεγάλης Αλβανίας; Η Βουλγαρία θα πάψει να λέει στα Σκόπια ότι δεν πρέπει να λέγεστε «Μακεδονία» αλλά «Vardaska»;

Ας είμαστε, λοιπόν, ειλικρινείς και ας προσπαθήσουμε να βάλουμε τα πράγματα στη σωστή τους διάσταση. Εάν τα Σκόπια δεν συμμορφωθούν με τη διεθνή νομιμότητα, δεν έχουν ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, ja sam zabrinuta zbog situacije u Makedoniji u kojoj politička kriza traje predugo, a sve zbog miješanja i utjecaja drugih država u unutrašnje političke stvari Makedonije. Toj krizi se, nažalost, ne nazire kraj. I dok Amerika i Albanija jasno pokazuju svoj utjecaj u tom dijelu Europe, institucije Europske unije su izuzetno pasivne premda ih smatram najodgovornijima za situaciju u Makedoniji jer su dozvolile blokadu Grčke i Makedonija se već 12 godina nepravedno drži ispred vrata Europske unije i NATO-a.

Već 38. dan građani Makedonije prosvjeduju na ulici jer ne žele da se Makedonijom upravlja na temelju Tiranske platforme sastavljene u drugoj državi. Ja razumijem nezadovoljstvo makedonskog naroda jer osobno ne bih voljela da se uspostava hrvatske Vlade dogovara u nekoj drugoj državi. Pozivam sve političke aktore u Makedoniji na poštivanje Ustava, a prije svega na poštivanje volje vlastitog naroda koji je najveća žrtva ove političke krize i koji nije glasovao za Tiransku platformu.

Pozivam Europsku uniju da Makedoniji otvori pregovore i tako pošalje poruku da podržava europsku budućnost Makedonije i da joj je stalo do stabilnosti na zapadnom Balkanu.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Nagyon fontos jelzésnek tartom, hogy a jelentés felhívja rá a figyelmet: konkrét intézkedésekre van szükség Macedóniában a különböző etnikai, nemzeti és vallási közösségek közti társadalmi kohézió megteremtése érdekében. Gyakori hiba, hogy a nemzeti közösségek közötti vitákat értetlenül figyelik a nemzetközi szervezetek, és arra várnak, hogy maguktól csökkenjenek a feszültségek.

Ehhez képest a helyes megközelítés az, amit a jelentés kimond: szükség lenne a történelemmel és oktatással foglalkozó közös szakértői bizottságok felállítása a szomszédos országokkal, amelyek hozzájárulnának a történelem objektív, tényeken alapuló értelmezéséhez. A gond csak az, hogy Európában, főleg annak keleti felén, az egyes nemzetek mást és mást értenek objektív történelmi tények alatt. Lehet ezt a jelenséget bírálni, de tény. Az a történelmi megbékélés, ami a kontinens nyugati felében végbement a második világháború után, a volt szocialista országokban még várat magára. Ennek pedig következményei vannak az egész Európai Unióra.

(„Catch the eye vége”)

Neven Mimica, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the political leaders of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia now have the urgent responsibility to take the necessary steps to put their country back on the EU track. This is what the vast majority of their citizens want. Too much time has been lost.

The continued crisis is already taking a heavy economic and financial toll. A government must be formed now. All parties must implement their own political agreement and tackle the urgent reform priorities as agreed.

The Commission remains highly committed to the European perspective of the country but let me be clear, the key to this EU perspective is in the hands of the President and local leaders. Only they can put the country back on the path to Europe. We cannot and will not do their job for them.

Thank you very much for your attention and for this constructive and forward-looking debate on the report.

Ian Borg, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, let me first express my sincere gratitude also for the excellent work and commitment of the rapporteur, and also his important recent efforts with Mr Fleckenstein and Mr Kukan.

The Council, as I stated in my introduction, attaches great importance to moving forward with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. However, we remain seriously concerned as to the fragile domestic political situation, which was also highlighted by many of the speakers in tonight’s debate. The need for a constructive dialogue extends to all parts of the political scene, most notably to the main political parties.

In this regard, we count on the continued support of the European Parliament in calling on all the leaders to cooperate in good faith and to overcome the current impasse and to put the country back on the reform track. I thank you once again for the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Ivo Vajgl, *Poročevalec*. – Potrdili smo v tej razpravi, da je Makedonija komplicirana država s težkimi problemi, ki jih komajda lahko rešuje brez naklonjenosti in sodelovanja sosednjih držav. Pomembno je to, da sosednje države razumejo probleme te komplicirane multinacionalne države in da ne otežujejo položaja z vmešavanjem v njene notranje zadeve, ki smo mu bili priča v zadnjem času pogosto.

Makedonijo čakajo težke naloge na njeni poti približevanja Evropski uniji. Danes smo ponovno potrdili, da napredek Makedonije proti članstvu v Evropski uniji ni samo v interesu države, ampak Evropske unije v celoti in stabilnosti v regiji. Pričakujem da bo kriza doživela svoj konec, da se bo vlada konstituirala in da bo zaživel normalno parlamentarno življenje v Makedoniji.

Pomembno je tudi, da se vse stranke zavedajo pomena nacionalne sprave, rekonziliacije in pa načrtovanja inkluzivne politike. Nihče se ne sme čutiti, da je izgubil. Velik nacionalni projekt je pred vsemi in vsi se morajo tega zavedati, da delujejo v interesu države in prebivalcev Makedonije.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra a májusi első ülésen kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), *в писмена форма*. – Благодаря на колегите за конструктивната работа по изготвянето на доклада. Категоричен съм, че както аз, така и групата на ЕКР, подкрепяме стремежа на Македония към членството в Европейския съюз.

За съжаление изборите не разрешиха проблема и страната изпадна в още по-тежка политическа криза – на ръба на етнически конфликт. Липсата на правителство възпира процеса на присъединяване и дърпа страната назад. Всички политически партии трябва да признаят резултата от изборите, но създаването на правителство не може да стане на всяка цена. Така наречената Албанска Платформа е явно чуждо вмешателство във вътрешните работи на суверенна държава. Политическата криза, от която е обхваната нашата съседка, може да бъде преодоляна само с подкрепата на България и ЕС.

Смятам, че Република Македония първо трябва да гарантира правата на българите в Македония чрез законодателни промени и чак след това да поглежда към „Албанската платформа“, защото към момента албанската общност е призната от властите и дори е представена чрез двете етнически партии ДСИ и ДПА, а българите нямат свое представителство и не са признати от нито един държавен орган. Пътят на Република Македония към ЕС минава през добрите отношения със София, същото смятам и за преодоляването на политическата криза.

22. Priporočilo Svetu o Komisiji za položaj žensk (razprava)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont a Vilija Blinkevičiūtė által a Nőjogi és Esélyegyenlőségi Bizottság nevében a Tanácshoz intézett Ajánlás a Tanácsnak a Nők Helyzetével Foglalkozó Bizottságról (CSW) szóló szóbeli választ igénylő kérdésről folytatott vita (O-000027/2017 – B8-0214/2017) (2017/2544(RSP)).

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Autorė. – Moterų ir vyrų lygybė yra pagrindinis Europos Sąjungos principas, kuris yra įtvirtintas Europos Sąjungos sutartyje. Ir mūsų Europos Sąjunga, vykdydama išorės veiksmus, taip pat vadovaujasi šiuo principu, nes moterų teisės ir lyčių lygybė – tai ne tik pagrindinės žmogaus teisės, bet kartu ir būtinos vystymosi skatinimo ir skurdo mažinimo priemonės bei taikaus, klestinčio ir tvaraus pasaulio pagrindas. Europos Parlamentas vasario mėn. priėmė savo rekomendacijas Tarybai dėl ES prioritetų, susijusių su šių metų kovo mėn. Niujorke vykusia 61-ąją Jungtinių Tautų Moterų padėties komisijos sesija, kuri buvo skirta moterų ekonominės galios stiprinimui.

Europos Parlamento prioritetai apėmė penkias pagrindines sritis. Pirma, tai bendrosios sąlygos moterų ir mergaičių įgalėjimui stiprinti, kuris reiškia, kad moterims suteikiamos tokios būtinos priemonės, kad jos taptų ekonomiškai nepriklausomos, vienodai atstovaujamos ir lygiateisės visose gyvenimo srityse, įgytų daugiau galios viešajame gyvenime ir kontroliuotų visus sprendimus, darančius poveikį jų gyvenimui. Antra, tai moterų ekonominės galios stiprinimas ir kliūčių darbo rinkoje šalinimas. Ir čia yra labai svarbios tokios priemonės kaip darbo ir šeimos gyvenimo suderinimas, atlyginimų ir pensijų skirtumo naikinimas. Trečia, lygiateisis moterų dalyvavimas visų lygių sprendimų priėmimo. Ketvirta, labiausiai pažeidžiamų moterų poreikiai ir problemų sprendimas, ir tai yra neįgalios moterys, pabėgėlės moterys, kaimo vietovėse ar skurde gyvenančios moterys. Pagaliau penkta ir labai svarbu: visiems šiems klausimams ir visoms šioms problemoms spręsti turi būti skirtas pakankamas biudžetas, pakankamos lėšos.

Taigi dabar kreipiuosi tiesiogiai į Tarybą. Ar Taryba galėtų atsakyti į šiuos klausimus: kaip Taryba, rengdama Europos Sąjungos poziciją, atsižvelgė į Parlamento rekomendacijoje išdėstytus prioritetus ir kuriems punkтам valstybės narės nepritarė? Jeigu nepritarė, tai kodėl? Kokie buvo pagrindiniai Europos Sąjungos laimėjimai derantis dėl Moterų padėties komisijos išvadų ir kokių mastu Europos Sąjungos prioritetus buvo įmanoma perkelti į suderintą išvadų tekstą? Pagaliau, ar Europos Sąjunga pasiekia kokių nors rezultatų visuotinių išpareigojimų moterų sveikatos srityje klausimu, o ypač veiksmų siekiant kovoti su neigiamu vadinamosios visuotinio nutildymo taisyklės poveikiu moterims klausimu?

Kaip turbūt žinote, naujoji JAV administracija paskelbė nutraukianti finansavimą Jungtinių Tautų Populiacijos fondui, t. y. tai agentūrai, kuri remia šeimos planavimo politiką visame pasaulyje. Žinant, kad JAV finansinis indėlis šiai programai yra ypač reikšmingas, tokios žinios šiuo atveju iš tikrųjų neramina, nes Jungtinių Tautų Populiacijos fondas savo veikla išgelbėjo gyvybes dešimtims tūkstančių moterų visame pasaulyje, teikdamas prieigą prie šeimos planavimo paslaugų, užkirsdamas kelią nesaugiems abortams, remdamas motinų ir kūdikių sveikatą. Taigi kaip Taryba vertina tokią žinią ir kaip vertina Europos Sąjungos vaidmens sustiprinimo galimybes šioje srityje? Akivaizdu, kad Jungtinėms Amerikos Valstijoms pasitraukus iš tokių svarbių programų finansavimo, Europos Sąjunga turi tapti lydere šioje srityje.

Dar vienas klausimas, į kurį reikia atsakymo. Parlamentas pritarė siūlymui parengti Tarptautinės darbo organizacijos konvenciją siekiant nustatyti tarptautinį standartą, kuriuo vadovaujantis būtų sprendžiama smurto dėl lyties darbo vietoje problema, kuri iš tikrųjų yra labai aktuali. Taigi, ar ateityje yra planuojama imtis kokių nors su šia konvencija susijusių veiksmų, kad tokia konvencija atsiras?

Ir pabaigai. Pone Borgai, aš iš anksto dėkoju už atsakymus ir, žinoma, dėkoju už bendradarbiavimą su Taryba. Tik taip pat noriu pabrėžti ir paprašyti, kad ateityje mes tikrai turime stiprinti institucinį bendradarbiavimą ir veiklos koordinavimą, nes mes turime vieną bendrą tikslą – moterų teisių ir lyčių lygybės užtikrinimą.

Ian Borg, *President fil-Kariga tal-Kunsill*. – Grazzi tal-mistoqsijiet li saru lill-Kunsill u se naghti nittama l-ahjar risposta fisem ovvjament l-istituzzjoni li jiena nirrapprezenta, u li tghin ghad-dibattitu li ghandkom hawnhekk.

L-Unjoni Ewropea hija impenjata bis-shih lejn is-sistema tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem tan-Nazzjonijiet Magħquda u tqis id-drittijiet tal-bniedem bhala *stand-alone* u kwistjoni trasversali. B'mod partikolari, l-Unjoni Ewropea hija impenjata li tippromwovi l-ugwaljanza bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel, inkluż is-suq tax-xogħol kif ukoll f'termini ta' indipendenza ekonomika tan-nisa u l-*empowerment*, f'dak is-sens, li kienu ukoll it-tema prijoritarja tas-Sessjoni 61 tal-Kummissjoni dwar l-Istat tan-Nisa.

Il-valuri u l-prinċipji għall-azzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea fil-qasam tal-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi li l-Kunsill afferma mill-ġdid f'diversi okkażjonijiet u r-rakkomandazzjonijiet tal-Parlament Ewropew dwar il-prijoritajiet tal-Unjoni Ewropea għall-istess sessjoni tal-Kummissjoni huma konsistenti ma' xulxin. Ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet tagħkom servew ukoll bhala għodda utli għat-tim tan-negożjati Ewropej matul in-negożjati tal-konklużjonijiet maqbuli.

Il-Kunsill – notevolment fil-COHOM – ma kellux l-opportunità li jagħmel l-evalwazzjoni tagħha [tas-sessjoni]. Izda għalkemm din ghadha pendenti xorta nistghu nsemmu llum ftit elementi.

L-ewwel nett, il-Presidenza kienet pjuttost attiva fi New York, permezz tal-kollega tiegħi l-Ministru Helena Dalli, li għandi nifhem li intom ukoll ltaqtu magħha matul din is-sessjoni. Hija wkoll, flimkien ma' Membri oħra ta' diversi Stati Membri pparteċipaw f'diversi avvenimenti sekondarji. U naf ukoll illi d-delegazzjoni tagħkom, immexxija minnek, Onorevoli Blinkevičūtė, kienet partikolarment attiva, billi organizzat avveniment li r-Rappreżentant Permanenti ta' Malta għall-NU wkoll ipparteċipa fih.

Il-Ministru Dalli b'mod partikolari tenniet l-importanza tal-emanċipazzjoni ekonomika għan-nisa u l-bniet u l-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi, li huma wkoll prerekwiziti biex jinkisbu l-għanijiet stabbiliti fl-Aġenda tal-2030 għall-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli.

Hija fakkret ukoll kif l-Unjoni Ewropea baqgħet impenjata għall-implimentazzjoni shiha u effettiva tal-Pjattaforma għall-Azzjoni ta' Beijing. Hija wkoll iddikjarat kif l-Unjoni Ewropea tinkoraġġixxi bis-sahha kollha r-ratifika universali tal-Konvenzjoni dwar l-Eliminazzjoni ta' Kull Forma ta' Diskriminazzjoni kontra n-Nisa u l-Protokolli Fakultattivi tagħha.

Il-Presidenza enfasizzat ukoll li huwa d-dmir tal-Istati Membri li jiżguraw li d-drittijiet indaqs bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel fl-isferi kollha tal-hajja huma minquxa fil-leġiżlazzjoni u jsiru realtà u jiġu implimentati. F'dan il-kuntest, l-Unjoni Ewropea appellat lill-pajjiżi kollha li għadhom m'għamlux dan sabiex jiffirmaw, jirratifikaw u jimplementaw bis-shih anki l-Konvenzjonijiet rilevanti tal-ILO.

Il-Presidenza saħqet ukoll fuq l-importanza tal-ġlieda kontra l-isterjotipi tas-sessi bhala mezz biex tintlaħaq ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi u l-emanċipazzjoni tan-nisa. Barra minn hekk ukoll, fi New York, l-Unjoni Ewropea sejhet għal azzjoni biex tagħlaq kemm tista' l-firda diġitali globali tas-sessi fl-aċċess tat-teknoloġija, l-użu, l-edukazzjoni u anki t-tahriġ illi jippermettu lin-nisa u bniet jibbenefikaw minn żviluppi teknoloġiċi u diġitali.

Il-Presidenza kkundannat wkoll kull forma ta' vjolenza kontra n-nisa u l-bniet, u enfasizzat kif l-indipendenza finanzjarja u ekonomika tan-nisa hija essenzjali biex in-nisa jkunu jistgħu johorgu minn relazzjonijiet abbużivi.

Kif għedt, Onorevoli Membri, il-valutazzjoni shiha għadha pendenti, izda bhala reazzjoni inizjali wara s-sessjoni, inhasset li hafna mill-paragrafi li kienu miftiehma fil-konklużjonijiet finali maqbuli kienu r-riżultat tal-kontribut minn diversi delegazzjonijiet u serva wkoll bhala eżerċizzju ta' impenn kostruttiv.

Madankollu element ta' diżappunt kien il-fatt li r-risultat tal-prodott finali fil-parti kbira kien pjuttost interpretazzjoni milli riflessjoni ta' rizultat innegożjat. Speċjalment, huwa wkoll ta' diżappunt illi r-rabta bejn id-drittijiet tal-bniedem, l-emanċipazzjoni ekonomika tan-nisa, is-sahha sesswali u riproduttiva u d-drittijiet, ma setgħetx issir aktar b'sahhitha. L-insistenza kontinwa għal lingwa fuq l-ispazju politiku nazzjonali – in-*national policy space* – hija thassib iehor li qed jillimitaw bla bżonn l-ambizzjoni tal-Kummissjoni, bl-istess mod il-fatt li r-referenzi għas-soċjetà civili kienu limitati u ma laħqux l-ambizzjonijiet tas-snin preċedenti.

Minkejja dan, l-Unjoni Ewropea ser tkompli tistinka u taħdem ma' shab oħrajn sabiex jinbena kunsens dwar dawn u kwistjonijiet oħrajn, u leali lejn l-impenn tagħha għall-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi, id-drittijiet tal-bniedem għan-nisa kollha u t-tfajliet, u anki l-emanċipazzjoni tagħhom.

B'mod partikolari nixtieq nenfasizza wkoll il-htieġa għal approċċ ambizzjuż u trasformattiv biex jiġu indirizzati l-kawżi fundamentali u fatturi ta' riskju tal-inugwaljanza bejn is-sessi, id-diskriminazzjoni u l-vjolenza kontra tagħhom.

Ġiet enfasizzata l-importanza wkoll għall-investment biex jiżgura l-aċċess għan-nisa u l-bniet għall-ksib ekwu ta' kwalità fl-edukazzjoni primarja, sekondarja u terzjarja, u ġie enfasizzat ukoll l-importanza tal-promozzjoni tal-partecipazzjoni shiha tan-nisa; it-tmexxija fil-livelli kollha tat-tehid tad-deċiżjonijiet, fil-hajja politika, ekonomika, pubblika, kif ukoll dik privata.

Nixtieq inqajjem ukoll it-thassib fuq il- *Global Gag Rule*, illi intom iddiskutejtu fl- aħhar sessjoni plenarja u li intom semmejtu wkoll fid-domanda tagħkom. Il-Kunsill huwa mħasseb dwar ir-*reinstating* tal-*Global Gag Rule*, u l-implikazzjonijiet tiegħu fuq il-mira li jintlaħqu l-koperturi universali fis-servizzi tas-sahha u s-sahha riproduttiva, u eventwalment fuq il-miri fi hdan l-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli – *Sustainable Development Goals* – sabiex titnaqqas il-mortalità materna u jagħtu s-setgħa, l-*empowerment*, lin-nisa.

It-theddida tad-differenza finanzjarja hija realtà. L-ammont fit-tnaqqis finanzjarju u x'għandu jkun l-aħjar approċċ għall-gejjieni, għadu qed jiġu eżaminat. Il-Ministri tal-Iżvilupp indirizzaw din il-kwistjoni fil-laqqha informali li kellhom fis-16 ta' Marzu, ukoll fid-dawl tad-deċiżjoni minn għadd ta' Stati Membri li kienu ddecidew li jikkompensaw għat-telf ta' fondi bl-inizjattiva tal-ġbir tal-finanzjament *She Decides*.

Il-Kunsill ifakkar ukoll li se jkollna biss impatt jekk ahna nirrispondu u nservu flimkien b'mod qawwi u bhala Unjoni Ewropea. Irridu nghidu li l-Istati Uniti jibqà' wkoll sieheb importanti tal-Unjoni Ewropea fil-politika tal-kooperazzjoni u l-iżvilupp internazzjonali u nenfasizzaw li huwa biss billi naħdmu flimkien anki mal-Istati Uniti nistgħu nibqgħu naghmlu impatt sinifikanti.

Fl-aħharnett, fuq il- kwistjoni partikolarment importanti: il-vjolenza kontra n-nisa. Sfortunatament, il-vjolenza hija problema mifruxa fis-soċjetajiet kollha tagħna u tabilhaqq hija wahda dinjija. Irridu naghmlu iżjed – hafna aktar – biex din tiġi eradikata. Il-Kunsill dejjem enfasizza l-importanza ta' din il-kwistjoni; pereżempju anki fil-Konklużjonijiet li adotta f'Diċembru, għal darb'ohra l-Kunsill stieden lill-Istati Membri u lill-Kummissjoni biex "Iżżid l-azzjonijiet biex tiġi miġ-ġielda l-vjolenza kontra n-nisa ...".

Il-Kunsill ma hax pożizzjoni fuq l-Istandard Prospettiv tal-ILO fuq il-vjolenza kontra n-nisa fid-dinja tax-xogħol. Madankollu, l-Unjoni Ewropea appoġġat dan fl-ILO. Naħseb li kollha bil-herqa nixtiequ nisimghu aktar dwar l-evoluzzjoni ta' dan ix-xogħol importanti hafna, fejn l-Unjoni Ewropea żgur li se jkollha sehem qawwi.

Il-vjolenza bbażata fuq is-sessi hija pjaga li thassar il-hajja tal-vittmi tagħha. Il-kwistjoni hija wahda wiesgħa hafna u jehtieġ li tiġi indirizzati fuq diversi fronti. Naf li dan huwa sugġett li fuqu l-istituzzjonijiet kollha jaqblu, u allura li ntemmu l-vjolenza hija r-responsabbiltà komuni tagħna. Ejja nkompli naħdmu fil-fora differenti sabiex dan l-għan jintlaħaq u allura nkunu qegħdin verament naraw illi l-politika Ewropea tkun wahda effettiva f'dan ir-riġward ukoll.

Agneszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sesja ONZ na temat praw kobiet z roku na rok zyskuje na znaczeniu, angażując coraz więcej i coraz bardziej znaczących instytucji i osób. Wiąże się to z faktem coraz szerszego zrozumienia, jak ważna społecznie i ekonomicznie jest kwestia praw kobiet i równouprawnienia.

Tegoroczna sesja była poświęcona ekonomicznemu wzmocnieniu kobiet i wszyscy mieliśmy nadzieję, że głos Parlamentu Europejskiego, który specjalnie na potrzeby sesji przyjął wspólne rekomendacje, będzie odpowiednio słyszalny. Trudno znaleźć w świecie instytucję, która może się pochwalić dłuższym doświadczeniem w skutecznym promowaniu praw kobiet niż Unia Europejska, szczególnie w kwestii dostępu do edukacji i rynku pracy.

Pomimo tak silnej legitymacji nie jesteśmy pewni, jaki był nasz wkład w ostateczne konkluzje 61. sesji, w której uczestniczyliśmy jako oficjalna delegacja Parlamentu. Pytanie o efekty negocjacji jest ważne w kontekście zjawiska *backlashu*, który obserwujemy w skali całego świata w odniesieniu do praw kobiet. *Backlash* stanowi ogromne zagrożenie dla dalszych postępów, ale także dla wdrażania już uzgodnionych decyzji.

Szanowni Państwo! Jeśli chodzi o negocjacje, szczególnie interesują mnie efekty tych rozmów na temat dostępu do wysokiej jakości edukacji. Z europejskiego doświadczenia wiemy, że sama edukacja nie wystarczy. Kobiety kończą studia częściej niż mężczyźni, ale pracują w niższych zawodach i na niższych stanowiskach. Im atrakcyjniejszy sektor, im wyższe stanowisko – tym mniej kobiet. Te luki są widoczne szczególnie w sektorze ICT, który jest podstawą gospodarki przyszłości. Tylko 3 % start-upów technicznych jest prowadzone przez kobiety. Kobiety rzadziej używają internetu i usług internetowych, rzadziej bankują, kupują i sprzedają przez internet, rzadziej pracują i uczą się online. Internet i wysokie technologie, które są potencjalnym narzędziem zmiany w dziedzinie równouprawnienia, które mogłyby ułatwić wyrównywanie szans, stają się kolejną przyczyną wykluczenia kobiet. Ten problem można rozwiązać tylko przez odpowiednią jakość edukacji, przez odpowiednie programy i polityki w tym zakresie, o czym piszemy w rekomendacjach. Dlatego tak istotna jest informacja na temat efektów negocjacji: co z postulatów prezydencji znalazło się w konkluzjach w tym obszarze?

Anna Hedh, för S&D-gruppen. – Fru talman! Ofta, flera gånger per session, brukar vi diskutera kvinnors situation och jämställdhet i den här kammaren, i kväll på temat kvinnors ekonomiska självbestämmande.

Jag är föredragande för jämställdhetsutskottets kommande betänkande på samma tema, och jag deltog i Europaparlamentets delegation till New York och FN:s kvinnokommissions 61:a toppmöte tidigare i mars. Europaparlamentet har den senaste tiden ökat sina ansträngningar för jämställdhet trots massivt motstånd, inte minst som reaktion på bland annat USA:s senaste försök att inskränka kvinnors rätt till sina egna kroppar.

Kvinnors ekonomiska självbestämmande är i grund och botten en frihetsfråga för kvinnor. Det handlar om rätten till individuell ekonomisk frihet. För mig är ekonomiskt självbestämmande en central fråga i jämställdhetsarbetet, men det finns också andra faktorer som idag hindrar kvinnor från att åtnjuta samma rättigheter som män. Det faktum att rätten till den egna kroppen, och rätten att bestämma över den, inte alltid gäller för kvinnor är för mig obegripligt. Sedan Donald Trump återinförde "global gag rules" beräknas det innebära ett ekonomiskt underskott om ungefär tio miljarder dollar, och nu senast drog USA tillbaka sina pengar till FN:s befolkningsfond, ungefär 32 miljoner dollar. Den här utvecklingen vi ser, inte bara på andra sidan Atlanten, innebär att kvinnor faktiskt kommer att dö. Kvinnor som inte får den medicinska hjälp de behöver faller nu offer för den politik som förs. Borg nämnde att vissa medlemsländer har valt att kompensera USA:s inskränkningar i rätten till SRHR, men frågan är om rådet kommer att arbeta för att fler medlemsländer gör det och att EU kommer att göra det.

Branislav Škripek, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, I will focus on one question, and that is global abortion funding. The de-funding of the UN Population Fund is a very positive outcome from the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. I am happy that the US is no longer funding forced abortion and involuntary sterilisation in China. The blood of Chinese women and babies will no longer be on their hands.

This does not deny anyone maternal health care, as abortion-choice stakeholders in this House claim. Rather, it protects women from suffering the horrific ordeal of having their young baby torn limb from limb from the womb. These barbaric acts should cause an outcry, but not against me as the messenger, but against anyone cruel enough to support this gendercide. Feminists should be particularly outraged, as it is baby girls who are more often killed in the womb than boys. This is cruel, illegal discrimination.

Let me be clear, abortion is not health care. There are no medical benefits. The EU should stay out of women's uterus.

Eleonora Forenza, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 14 febbraio di quest'anno la commissione FEMM, di cui faccio parte, ha approvato una raccomandazione destinata al Consiglio, indicando alcune priorità oggetto di discussione nella 61a CSW.

Vorrei sottolineare che esiste un movimento globale, che lo scorso 8 marzo ha riempito le piazze di oltre 50 paesi in tutto il mondo per denunciare, come anche fa la raccomandazione della commissione FEMM, che la violenza maschile sulle donne è la violazione più diffusa dei diritti umani in tutto il mondo, che è indipendente da tutti i fattori di età, classe sociale o condizione economica e che danneggia intere comunità, ha dei notevoli costi economici e sociali e limita e compromette la crescita sociale. Questo movimento globale si chiama «Non una di meno». In Italia la sua declinazione principale è attualmente l'elaborazione di un piano antiviolenza femminista che verrà presentato prima dell'estate.

Dico questo perché penso che un avanzamento come questo in Italia rappresenti un avanzamento europeo e globale, perché può contribuire a risanare i diritti umani violati. La Commissione sulla condizione delle donne del 2017 ha avuto come tema centrale «Women's economic empowerment in the changing world of work». La violenza sulle donne, come sottolinea la convenzione di Istanbul, che ancora non è stata ratificata da 14 Stati membri dell'Unione, non è soltanto violenza fisica, ma è anche violenza psicologica, lavoro domestico non retribuito, divario salariale.

Ecco, io credo che occorra dare più forza alle raccomandazioni espresse da questo Parlamento. Credo che ad esempio il lavoro del *gender mainstreaming network* dovrebbe essere reso effettivo nel passaggio dal Parlamento europeo al Consiglio e, a cascata, a tutti i governi degli Stati membri.

Daniela Aiuto, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tra le maggiori priorità di questa edizione della Commissione sulla condizione delle donne, alla quale ho partecipato insieme alla delegazione della commissione FEMM, vi sono state l'emancipazione economica delle donne, le sfide e gli obiettivi nel raggiungimento dello sviluppo sostenibile per le donne e per le ragazze e l'emancipazione delle donne indigene. Durante i quattro giorni di missione è stata rimarcata la necessità per l'Unione europea di aderire alla convenzione di Istanbul e di consolidare la cooperazione con le Nazioni Unite per la lotta contro la violenza sulle donne e per il raggiungimento della parità di trattamento tra uomini e donne.

Tuttavia, una delle problematiche che potrebbero sorgere è legata alla mancanza di trasparenza e di corretta informazione nei confronti di tutti gli attori della comunità internazionale, a partire dai cittadini. Credo che una volta trovate le soluzioni opportune sia doveroso promuoverle in via istituzionale e soprattutto mediatica, per coinvolgere tutti in modo proattivo e per poter permettere a tutti di offrire il loro contributo.

Inoltre, come ho espresso personalmente al Segretario generale delle Nazioni Unite, c'è l'urgenza di affiancare alle politiche attuali degli strumenti concreti che possano spingere gli Stati membri ad implementare le norme esistenti e a monitorare i cambiamenti nel tempo, soprattutto in riferimento alle norme relative alla lotta contro la violenza sulle donne. Soltanto con l'adozione di un approccio olistico e trasversale, che includa anche l'istruzione, l'educazione e la cultura, si potrà assistere all'emancipazione della donna e al raggiungimento dell'uguaglianza di genere.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem velmi rád, že se zde snažíme po zasedání komise vyhodnotit výsledky jednání tohoto významného orgánu a říci si, jaké závěry jednání tohoto orgánu by měly být pro politiku Evropské unie.

Musím říci, že jsem zklamán z toho, jak zástupce Rady přistoupil k dnešnímu jednání, protože jsem opravdu čekal už vyhodnocené závěry z jednání a odpověď zástupce Rady byla taková, že víceméně závěry ještě vyhodnoceny nejsou. Těžko se tedy dá debatovat o závěrech ve chvíli, kdy zkrátka závěry nejsou vyhodnoceny, a proto zůstáváme u obecných tezí. Mrzí mě to, protože téma postavení žen a rovnosti žen a mužů považuji sám za mimořádně důležité, a to nejen na území Evropské unie, ale právě ve třetím světě. A je třeba si říci, co tedy my můžeme udělat, aby se postavení žen ve třetím světě zlepšovalo.

To téma ženy a jejich ekonomická pozice je velmi důležité a je třeba si jasně říci, co do budoucna uděláme pro to, aby se srovnalo odměňování mužů a žen za stejnou práci, abychom na území Evropské unie lépe usnadnili vstup ženám-matkám poté, co ukončí mateřskou dovolenou, zpět do jejich zaměstnání. Co udělat pro to, aby tyto ženy neztratily svou odbornou kvalifikaci a mohly po ukončení mateřské dovolené pokračovat ve své kariéře? A je to celá řada konkrétních věcí, o kterých, doufám, budeme v budoucnosti ještě hovořit.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli anni che verranno saranno sempre più fondamentali per riaffermare il ruolo dell'Unione europea in difesa delle donne, e la riunione dello scorso marzo della Commissione dell'ONU sulla condizione delle donne ne è stato un primo fondamentale passaggio.

Sempre di più l'Unione europea diventa un attore globale fondamentale per difendere il ruolo della donna, per difendere, certo, la sua indipendenza, la sua emancipazione, ma indipendenza ed emancipazione non solo economica, come è stato già detto. Io credo che noi dovremmo sempre di più contrastare quegli attacchi sistematici che vengono fatti, per esempio, ai diritti sessuali e riproduttivi che costituiscono, colleghi e colleghe, la base del rispetto della donna in quanto soggetto indipendente nelle sue scelte. E i risultati raggiunti fino ad oggi non possono e non devono essere messi in discussione.

Questo è quello che dovremmo fare sulla scena mondiale. Auspichiamo che il Consiglio e la Commissione portino avanti queste battaglie.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl nejprve úvodem vyjádřit lítost nad tím, že nám problematika žen zbyla jako obvykle až na samý závěr našeho jednání. Myslím si, že by se občas slušelo, aby se postavení žen dostalo třeba i na dřívější zasedání.

Pokud jde o stávající řešenou problematiku, já musím souhlasit s kolegou Pospíšilem, že nemáme vyhodnocené závěry, tudíž budeme opět předkládat jen obecné teze. Prioritou zasedání Komise OSN pro postavení žen bylo právě ekonomické postavení žen a překonávání překážek na pracovním trhu a také otevření debaty o posílení postavení takzvaných domorodých žen.

Evropský parlament přijal právě doporučení, která byla směřována v únoru letošního roku na ekonomické postavení žen a překonávání překážek na pracovním trhu, zajištění rovného podílu žen na všech úrovních rozhodování a řešení potřeb nejvíce marginalizovaných žen. Toto byla doporučení. Jak jsem slyšel, promítla se i do závěrů právě tohoto šedesátého prvního zasedání Komise OSN pro postavení žen.

Já si myslím, že bychom se měli zaměřit zejména pro to budoucí období na získání celosvětové politické podpory pro koncept rovnosti, zejména právě v tom třetím světě a na analýzu dopadu současných změn na trhu práce na rovnost žen a mužů. Protože skutečně trh práce je doslova zavalen novými změnami a myslím si, že by se měly promítnout i do postavení žen a jejich ochrany.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, women's rights and gender equality are under attack around the world, so now more than ever we must push to strengthen international cooperation on women's rights and empowerment, including our reproductive rights. The EU has always been a crucial promoter of gender equality in Europe, and on the world stage, and we must redouble our efforts for the sake of those who come after us at home and abroad.

The UN Commission on the Status of Women has been a key international forum for the promotion of gender equality and for mainstreaming a gender perspective across policy fields. At this moment in history, with misogynists like President Trump normalising sexual harassment and limiting women's reproductive rights, the movement for gender equality must become unashamedly intersectional, in order to tackle the gravest forms of discrimination, exploitation and abuse that women face. We must be specific in tailoring policies that tackle the problems faced by different groups, be they refugees, migrants, young girls looking for an education, women with disabilities, or older women facing poverty.

We must be able to give a voice to those who have been denied one and we must make our voices heard in the corridors of power. We must ask men to step aside and give women a seat at the decision-making tables, particularly in policy areas such as defence and security, where we can offer an alternative to patriarchal warmongering and remind the world that it is always women and their children who pay the highest price when conflict ensues. The role of women in peace-building and conflict prevention is therefore crucial and both the UN and the EU have a key role to play in this respect.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, žene diljem svijeta suočene su s raznim oblicima diskriminacije, staklenim stropom, kršenjem njihovih ljudskih i građanskih prava, što često stavljamo u drugi plan. Doprinos humanitarnoj pomoći je važan i Europska unija ima obavezu sudjelovati, no praznina za koju se tvrdi da je nastala kao posljedica pravila globalnog blokiranja ne postoji.

Amerika izdvaja 10,3 milijarde američkih dolara za humanitarnu pomoć. Najveći dio ovog novca, čak 70 % ide na prevenciju i liječenje HIV-a. Nije točno da je smanjen novac namijenjen u ovu svrhu. Također nije točno da su ukinuta sredstva za lijekove, trudničku i postporodajnu njegu, kontracepciju. Netočno je da su ograničena sredstva za pobačaj u slučaju kada je majčin život u opasnosti te u slučaju silovanja ili incesta. Točno je da je novac preusmjeren prema organizacijama koje ne promiču pobačaj kao metodu planiranja obitelji, što je u skladu s međunarodnim konvencijama.

Kada govorimo o Fondu za populaciju Ujedinjenih naroda, on doista ističe u svom programu da ne promiče pobačaj kao metodu planiranja obitelji, ali dobavlja lijek pod nazivom „misoprostol“ koji se koristi i za induciranje pobačaja. Zanima me zašto takozvane organizacije za planiranje obitelji u središte svog djelovanja stavljaju promociju pobačaja, umjesto da pomognu milijunima žena koje žele imati djecu, a to ne mogu.

„Catch the eye”

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chtěla bych říci, že posílení ekonomického postavení žen bylo předmětem letošního jedenašedesátého zasedání, ale bylo také tématem mnoha parlamentních zpráv, kterými jsme se zabývali v uplynulých dvou letech, jako je zpráva o chudobě žen, o sladování rodinného a pracovního života, o podpoře žen v podmínkách v podnikání a na venkově.

Proto mne zajímalo, jakou pozici Rada hájí a jak je s jejími výsledky spokojena. Já bych chtěla zástupci Rady říci, že je nás tady víc a slyšeli jste vystoupení předřečníků, kteří nesouhlasí s tím, aby Evropská unie financovala rozšíření potratů jako formu plánovaného rodičovství. To není opatření, které může ženám pomoci.

Jako členky Výboru pro práva žen a rovnost pohlaví se mě tento týden zeptal jeden student, jak je to s vyrovnaným zastoupením žen a mužů v tomto výboru. Musela jsem se stydět, když jsem řekla, že je v něm z 36 členů jen 5 mužů. To tedy není vyrovnané zastoupení u řádného členství. Myslím, že pokud chceme radit druhým, například Spojeným státům americkým, pak bychom si měli nejprve s vyváženým zastoupením žen a mužů poradit sami.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι δεδομένο ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχει σημαντικές θέσεις και για την προώθηση της ισότητας ανδρών και γυναικών και για τη χειραφέτηση των γυναικών και για την ισότητα των αμοιβών. Και οι απόψεις αυτές έχουν εκφραστεί από την πλευρά του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Δεν είναι, όμως, βέβαιο ότι τις απόψεις αυτές τις ασπάζονται όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Και νομίζω ότι εκεί είναι το ζήτημα. Διότι, όπως ειπώθηκε και από την Προεδρία, ναι μεν έγιναν προσπάθειες, αλλά, επί του πρακτέου, έχουμε 14 κράτη μέλη τα οποία δεν έχουν επικυρώσει τη Συνθήκη της Κωνσταντινούπολης και πηγαίνουμε ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στον ΟΗΕ να κάνουμε μαθήματα στους άλλους. Άρα, λοιπόν, υπάρχουν σοβαρές αντιφάσεις μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, οι οποίες πρέπει να ξεπεραστούν. Και νομίζω ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δίνει τον τόνο.

Θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ τους συναδέλφους που υπέβαλαν την ερώτηση, διότι αναδεικνύουν τα θέματα και τις αντιφάσεις. Εμείς, ως Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, παλεύουμε. Το θέμα είναι τι κάνουν τα κράτη μέλη.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Madam President, regarding the 61st session of the UN, I would just concentrate on a few points. The Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality criticised the US Government for how it spends its money on foreign aid and the new conditions it puts on its aid. The US is a sovereign country and only accountable to its own citizens. We, as the EU, also do not want to be criticised by others when we put conditions on the aid we give. I think the EU should rather attend to the aid it gives itself.

The 79 ACP countries that welcome EU aid sometimes find the conditions we ask on our aid to be socially oppressive. We are in no position to criticise the foreign-aid practices of other countries.

According to the UN regulations and regarding the wording, I think the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality should always remember one thing – abortion is no form of reproductive health or family planning.

Under this emphasis I would kindly ask Mr Borg to analyse the negative effects on women, especially mothers, of the global gag rule. We should by no means develop an own method of discrimination against mothers.

(„Catch the eye vége”)

Ian Borg, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I thank you all for your input into this discussion, and for organising it as well. The Council, notably the Working Party on Human Rights, has not yet the opportunity to carry out its assessment. We will continue, as holders of the Presidency, to follow it closely and also keep Parliament abreast of the developments there.

We have had a very useful debate that also clearly demonstrates the high degree of convergence between the European Parliament's and the Council's views on this matter. It is also clear that we cannot reach sustainable development goals without the active participation of women, and investing in women is the way forward.

Therefore, the Council will work intensely in this direction. Once again, I would like to thank you for your debate and the invitation to participate.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE), *в писмена форма*. – Присъединявам се към призива за постигане на по-добри резултати от страна на ЕС по отношение на ангажиментите към здравето на жените, като приоритет на ЕС по време на 61-вата сесия на Комисията на ООН за положението на жените.

Смятам, че гарантирането на здравето на глобално равнище действително трябва да бъде сред основните акценти за световните лидери, включително в посока към целенасочено съдействие по отношение на репродуктивното здраве, здравното образование и възпитание на младите жени. Тези теми имат съществено отношение към демографските проблеми и демографската политика на държавите и би следвало да се разработват и прилагат диференцирано, чрез реципрочни действия със специфичните обстоятелства на демографските процеси в света.

Надявам се Съветът да продължи да настоява пред международните ни партньори за повече сътрудничество и насочване на вниманието към тази сфера.

23. Nadaljnje obravnavanje stališč in resolucij Parlamenta: glej zapisnik

24. Predložitev dokumentov: glej zapisnik

25. Prerazporeditev sredstev: glej zapisnik

26. Dnevni red naslednje seje: gl. zapisnik**27. Zaključek seje**

(Az ülést 23.25-kor rekesztik be.)

Uporabljeni znaki

*	Postopek posvetovanja
***	Postopek odobritve
***I	Redni zakonodajni postopek (prva obravnava)
***II	Redni zakonodajni postopek (druga obravnava)
***III	Redni zakonodajni postopek (tretja obravnava)

(Vrsta postopka je odvisna od pravne podlage, ki je predlagana v osnutku akta.)

Kratice imen parlamentarnih odborov

AFET	Odbor za zunanje zadeve
DEVE	Odbor za razvoj
INTA	Odbor za mednarodno trgovino
BUDG	Odbor za proračun
CONT	Odbor za proračunski nadzor
ECON	Odbor za ekonomske in monetarne zadeve
EMPL	Odbor za zaposlovanje in socialne zadeve
ENVI	Odbor za okolje, javno zdravje in varnost hrane
ITRE	Odbor za industrijo, raziskave in energetiko
IMCO	Odbor za notranji trg in varstvo potrošnikov
TRAN	Odbor za promet in turizem
REGI	Odbor za regionalni razvoj
AGRI	Odbor za kmetijstvo in razvoj podeželja
PECH	Odbor za ribištvo
CULT	Odbor za kulturo in izobraževanje
JURI	Odbor za pravne zadeve
LIBE	Odbor za državljanske svoboščine, pravosodje in notranje zadeve
AFCO	Odbor za ustavne zadeve
FEMM	Odbor za pravice žensk in enakost spolov
PETI	Odbor za peticije
DROI	Pododbor za človekove pravice
SEDE	Pododbor za varnost in obrambo

Kratice imen političnih skupin

PPE	Skupina Evropske ljudske stranke (Krščanskih demokratov)
S&D	Skupina naprednega zavezništva socialistov in demokratov v Evropskem parlamentu
ECR	Skupina Evropskih konzervativcev in reformistov
ALDE	Skupina Zavezništva liberalcev in demokratov za Evropo
GUE/NGL	Konfederalna skupina Evropske združene leve - Zelene nordijske leve
Verts/ALE	Skupina Zelenih/Evropske svobodne zveze
EFDD	Skupina Evropa svobode in neposredne demokracije
ENF	Skupina Evropa narodov in svobode
NI	Samostojni poslanci