



C/2024/3002

2.5.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 6 LIPCA 2017 R.

(C/2024/3002)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2017-2018

Posiedzenia od 3 do 6 lipca 2017 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	4
3. Petycje: patrz protokół	4
4. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	4
5. Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	4
6. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem – Transgraniczna wymiana między Unią a państwami trzecimi kopii utworów w formacie umożliwiającym dostęp osobom niepełnosprawnym do określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną, z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, słabowidzących lub z innymi niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (debata)	4
7. Polowania na wieloryby w Norwegii (debata)	12
8. Debaty nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i praworządności (debata)	18
8.1. Sprawy laureata Nagrody Nobla Liu Xiaobo oraz Lee Miong-che	18
8.2. Erytrea, a w szczególności sprawa Abune Antoniosa i Dawita Isaaka	24
8.3. Burundi	30
9. Skład Parlamentu: Patrz protokół	35

Spis treści	Strona
10. Skład komisji i delegacji	35
11. Głosowanie	36
11.1. Sprawozdanie za 2016 r. dotyczące Turcji (A8-0234/2017 - Kati Piri) (głosowanie)	36
11.2. Powołanie komisji specjalnej ds. terroryzmu oraz zakres jej kompetencji, jej liczebność i okres sprawowania przez nią mandatu (B8-0477/2017) (głosowanie)	37
11.3. Sprawy laureata Nagrody Nobla Liu Xiaobo oraz Lee Miong-che (RC-B8-0459/2017, B8-0459/2017, B8-0460/2017, B8-0461/2017, B8-0462/2017, B8-0463/2017) (głosowanie) ..	37
11.4. Erytrea, a w szczególności sprawy Abune Antoniosa i Dawita Isaaka (RC-B8-0464/2017, B8-0464/2017, B8-0466/2017, B8-0467/2017, B8-0470/2017, B8-0472/2017, B8-0473/2017) (głosowanie)	37
11.5. Burundi (RC-B8-0465/2017, B8-0465/2017, B8-0468/2017, B8-0469/2017, B8-0471/2017, B8-0474/2017, B8-0475/2017, B8-0476/2017) (głosowanie)	37
11.6. Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju (EFZR) oraz ustanowienie gwarancji EFZR i funduszu gwarancyjnego EFZR (A8-0170/2017 - Eduard Kukan, Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (głosowanie)	37
11.7. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznawanie się z drukiem (A8-0097/2017 - Max Andersson) (głosowanie)	37
11.8. Transgraniczna wymiana między Unią a państwami trzecimi kopii utworów w formie umożliwiającym dostęp osobom niepełnosprawnym do określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną, z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, słabowidzących lub z innymi niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznawanie się z drukiem (A8-0102/2017 - Max Andersson) (głosowanie)	37
11.9. Mechanizmy rozstrzygania sporów dotyczących podwójnego opodatkowania w UE (A8-0225/2017 - Michael Theurer) (głosowanie)	37
11.10. Działania UE na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju (A8-0239/2017 - Seb Dance) (głosowanie) ..	38
11.11. Wspieranie spójności i rozwoju w regionach najbardziej oddalonych UE (A8-0226/2017 - Younous Omarjee) (głosowanie)	38
12. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	38
12.1. Sprawozdanie za 2016 r. dotyczące Turcji (A8-0234/2017 - Kati Piri)	38
12.2. Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju (EFZR) oraz ustanowienie gwarancji EFZR i funduszu gwarancyjnego EFZR (A8-0170/2017 - Eduard Kukan, Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial)	39
12.3. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznawanie się z drukiem (A8-0097/2017 - Max Andersson)	40
12.4. Działania UE na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju (A8-0239/2017 - Seb Dance)	40
12.5. Wspieranie spójności i rozwoju w regionach najbardziej oddalonych UE (A8-0226/2017 - Younous Omarjee)	42
13. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół	42
14. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	42

Spis treści	Strona
15. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130c Regulaminu) (debata)	42
15.1. O-000029/2017: Skutki skandalu dotyczącego przywozu mięsa z Brazylii	42
15.2. O-000044/2017: Armia UE	50
16. Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół	54
17. Przekazanie tekstów przyjętych w trakcie obecnego posiedzenia : patrz protokół	54
18. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół	54
19. Przerwa w obradach	54

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 6 LIPCA 2017 R.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 9.00)

2. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

3. Petycje: patrz protokół

4. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

5. Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

6. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem – Transgraniczna wymiana między Unią a państwami trzecimi kopii utworów w formie umożliwiającym dostęp osobom niepełnosprawnym do określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną, z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, słabowidzących lub z innymi niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest wspólna debata nad:

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Maxa Anderssona w imieniu Komisji Prawnej w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie określonych dozwolonych sposobów korzystania z utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem, oraz zmieniającej dyrektywę 2001/29/WE w sprawie harmonizacji niektórych aspektów praw autorskich i pokrewnych w społeczeństwie informacyjnym (COM(2016)0596 – C8-0381/2016 – 2016/0278(COD)) (A8-0097/2017) oraz

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Maxa Anderssona w imieniu Komisji Prawnej w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie transgranicznej wymiany między Unią a państwami trzecimi kopii utworów w formie umożliwiającym dostęp osobom niepełnosprawnym do określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną, z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, słabowidzących lub z innymi niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (COM(2016)0595 – C8-0380/2016 – 2016/0279(COD)) (A8-0102/2017).

Max Andersson, rapporteur. – Mr President, there are 285 million blind and visually impaired people in the world. Most of them have very little access to books that they can read. Today we can take a major step to change that. Today's debate is about the implementation of the Marrakech Treaty. This is a Treaty that the Greens, and indeed the whole European Parliament, have been fighting for for years. It creates a copyright exemption in international copyright law for the benefit of blind and visually impaired people so that they can have greater access to books. That is a great thing.

The Marrakech Treaty is an international WIPO treaty, but 30 countries have already joined. What problems does it solve? Today, when you make a copy of a book into a format that blind people can read by, for example, reading it into a computer, you are not allowed to send that book across a border, because of copyright law. The Marrakech Treaty changes that by removing those barriers which prevent libraries and organisations for the blind from sharing books across borders. Why is this important? Most of the 285 million blind and visually impaired people in the world live in countries where there are very few books made accessible in a format that they can read. Most of the books that have been made accessible are in rich countries such as EU countries. By removing the borders, the barriers that prevent the sharing of books, we make books available across the world and we take a major step towards giving blind people much better access to books.

This will be of benefit in EU countries, but the vast improvement will be in countries in Latin America and then Africa and other places where many people speak a European language. This will enable the sharing of books from one country to another and create much better access.

So why has this not been done before? Well, parts of the publishing industry were worried that this copyright exemption might cost them money, so there has been significant lobbying pressure, and the Council was for a very long time unable to decide how to proceed, but now we have finally got there. As Parliament's negotiator, I am very glad that we have reached a compromise that enables the removal of barriers to the sharing of books across countries.

For many of us, reading books is one of the most important things that we do, and blind people in the world can now have greater access to books. This will make it easier to find a new favourite book.

I would like to thank all the people who have been working for this and I am calling on the European Parliament to vote in favour of the implementation of the Marrakech Treaty because blind people deserve better access to books.

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, as Mr Andersson has already underlined, the directive and the regulation that we are discussing today jointly implement in EU law the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled, which was adopted by the World Intellectual Property Organisation four years ago. This is a very important step for the European Union, one that responds to very concrete needs and one of which we should be very proud.

The significance of improving access to books and other printed texts for persons who have disabilities that prevent them from reading in the same way as persons without those disabilities should not be underestimated. So I warmly thank the rapporteur, Mr Andersson, as well as all the shadow rapporteurs and rapporteurs for opinion, for their effort and determination in reaching a meaningful outcome in the few months since the adoption of the Commission's proposals.

I am also glad that these proposals have been part of the Commission's effort to achieve a digital single market in all its dimensions and for all our citizens. They are also the first proposals of our copyright modernisation package from September 2016 to be adopted by Parliament.

Still today, too little print material can be accessed by people with print disabilities worldwide. Addressing this problem is fundamental for social inclusion and societal advancement. Doing so will benefit people with print disabilities and it will benefit everybody else.

In line with the Marrakesh Treaty, these two pieces of EU legislation will allow the production of copies of works in accessible formats by means of a mandatory exception to copyright, harmonised across the EU. They will also permit the exchange of these copies across borders, within the European Union and with third countries that are parties to the treaty. This possibility for cross-border exchange is very important. It reduces the unnecessary duplication of efforts and costs. It also allows persons with print disabilities to have faster access to a broader range of works than is possible today.

I also welcome the fact that the outcome of the negotiations by Parliament and the Council ensures transparency and keeps the burden and complications for beneficiaries to a minimum, for example when it comes to compensation schemes. I trust that we will also be celebrating soon the ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty by the European Union, which, together with these proposals, will finally make the treaty a reality for people with print disabilities.

Helga Stevens, *Rap avis EMPL*. – De EU neemt vandaag een van de laatste horden in het ratificatieproces van het Verdrag van Marrakesh. Personen die blind zijn, een visuele beperking of een leeshandicap hebben, krijgen nog altijd zeer moeilijk of geen toegang tot boeken en ander gedrukt materiaal. De noodzaak om meer werken en ander beschermd materiaal in toegankelijke vormen zoals Braille, luisterboeken en grote letterdruk beschikbaar te stellen is groot.

Met de voorstellen die op tafel liggen, wordt in het EU-recht een nieuwe verplichte uitzondering op het auteursrecht ingevoerd in overeenstemming met het Verdrag van Marrakesh. Hierdoor zullen begunstigde personen en organisaties kopieën van werken in toegankelijke vorm kunnen maken en kunnen verspreiden in de EU en derde landen die partij zijn bij het Verdrag. Het Verdrag van Marrakesh is van kapitaal belang omdat in de hele EU meer dan 30 miljoen mensen met een visuele beperking eindelijk gelijkwaardig toegang krijgen tot het gedrukte woord. Een kleine stap voor de mensheid, een gigantische stap vooruit voor blinde en slechtziende personen!

Helga Trüpel, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung*. – Herr Präsident! Dieser Vertrag von Marrakesch ist ein großer Fortschritt für Blinde und Sehbehinderte, die auf andere Weise nicht in der Lage sind, Druckerzeugnisse zu lesen. Wir haben jahrelang eine Situation gehabt, dass für Blinde und Sehbehinderte der Hunger nach Büchern nicht befriedigt werden konnte. Dieser Marrakesch-Vertrag soll das jetzt endlich beenden. Der Markt ist so klein, dass es sich für Verlage nicht richtig gelohnt hat. Darum sind Verlage jetzt von dieser Schranke, die verpflichtend gemacht wird, auch nicht wirklich bedroht, aber für Blinde und Sehbehinderte ist diese Möglichkeit ein ganz großer Schritt nach vorne.

Ich bin urheberfreundlich – ich gehöre nicht zu denjenigen, die das Urheberrecht abschaffen oder deutlich einschränken wollen –, aber in diesem Fall finde ich, dass diese Schranke absolut gerechtfertigt ist. Es kann vielleicht zu kleinen Einschränkungen für Verlage kommen. Aber für Blinde und Sehbehinderte ist es ein solcher Vorteil, dass sie endlich an Bücher, an andere Werke kommen können, das in Europa austauschen können und auch noch international. Also das ist wirklich eine humanitäre Aktion, und es ist eine deutliche Aktion für kulturelle Vielfalt – auch für Menschen mit Behinderung.

Deswegen sind wir so entschieden für diesen Vertrag und möchten, dass er jetzt ganz schnell ratifiziert wird.

Ангел Джамбазки, *докладчик по становището на комисията по култура и образование*. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, както и много от моите колеги в залата също ще се изкажа в подкрепа на Маракешкия договор и на постигнатото споразумение между трите институции и ще подчертая ползите, които този договор и неговото приложение ще донесе за лицата с увредено зрение и други увреждания. Става дума за над 30 милиона души с увредено зрение, които живеят в държавите – членки на Европейския съюз, и техните права и възможности за достъп до информация.

Предложението на Комисията за приложение на този договор идва навреме, след като в Съвета имаше известно неразбиране за това кой и кога трябва да ратифицира договора, имайки предвид, че е подписан през 2013 г. от над 60 държави. Благодаря на колегите, с които работихме успешно по становището, което изработи комисията по култура и образование, както и за успешното сътрудничество с Европейския съюз на слепите лица.

Допълнително искам да подчертая, че България вече работи по редица инициативи за по-нататъшно подобряване на достъпа и съм сигурен, че тази кауза ще бъде подкрепена още по-енергично по време на предстоящото ни председателство на Съвета.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Peticiones*. – Señor presidente, es un día grande. Hoy este Parlamento da ya el visto bueno al Tratado de Marrakech, que se firmó en el año 2013.

Supone facilitar el acceso a las obras publicadas para las personas que tienen alguna discapacidad visual severa. Permite —lo han dicho aquí— el intercambio transfronterizo de los libros y de otros materiales en formatos accesibles. Eso significa cualquier tipo de formato: puede ser braille, puede ser macrotipo, puede ser audio.

Hemos de decir que solamente aproximadamente un 5 % de obras eran accesibles en este momento y, por lo tanto, había muchísimo material, hambre de lectura, que no era accesible a las personas ciegas. Eso generaba una discriminación y conculcaba los valores de los que somos referentes hoy en este Parlamento. Y por eso es un día grande, porque hoy somos merecedores del premio de la concordia. Hoy somos merecedores del premio de la paz que nos otorgaron hace unos años, porque hoy consolidamos el principio de no discriminación, el principio de igualdad de oportunidades, la accesibilidad, la participación y la inclusión efectiva en nuestra sociedad. Hoy damos un paso para que se pueda gozar del derecho a la educación. Damos también un paso para que todas esas personas puedan recibir y también, de alguna manera, difundir información; puedan, como todas las otras personas también, llevar a cabo investigaciones.

Está claro que teníamos que hacer un equilibrio entre la protección eficaz de los derechos de autor, pero también teníamos que servir al interés general. Se trataba de un tema de derechos humanos. De hecho, es el primer tratado de derechos de autor en clave de derechos humanos, y por eso es muy importante, porque conecta con la Convención de Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad y también con la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos.

Los beneficios son innumerables. En primer lugar, ayuda a sensibilizar de manera valiente a toda la sociedad en cuanto a los retos y objetivos que tienen las personas con discapacidad, especialmente las personas ciegas. Siempre estamos diciendo, desde los colectivos de discapacidad, que es necesario que se visualice la diversidad de manera positiva, porque eso hará que la sociedad tenga valores.

Hay un segundo beneficio, y es el acceso a educación. La educación es realmente lo que nos hace libres. La educación nos hace iguales en las oportunidades, y por eso también damos un gran paso. Se mejora la participación social y la integración social, y también se alivia la pobreza, porque en el momento en que se produzca esto habrá, sin ninguna duda, un aumento de todas las contribuciones a la economía nacional. Estamos de enhorabuena y hoy hemos hecho gala y nos hemos hecho merecedores de ese premio por la concordia.

Margrete Auken, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Udvalget for Andragender*. – Hr. Formand! Tak til alle her, til Parlamentet, til Max Andersson og til Kommissionen. Det er mange års indsats, som nu forhåbentligt krones med virkelig held. Jeg vil benytte min korte taletid til alligevel at advare om, hvor det kan gå galt. Rettighedshaverne har været ekstremt aktive i lobbyismen, og min egen regering har bestemt ikke klarer sig særligt pynteligt. Den har tværtimod været foregangsland for at sikre, at man beskyttede rettighedshaverne foran de blinde og svagtseende.

Derfor vil jeg opfordre Kommissionen til at holde et skarpt øje med, hvad der foregår, hvordan direktivet implementeres og sikre, at de kompensationsordninger, der findes, kommer til at fungere uden besvær for de blinde. Det skal også sikres, at den formulering, vi har i forliget, nemlig at minimale tab ikke skal kompenseres, kommer til at virke på en måde, så det virkelig skal dokumenteres og bevises, at der er tale om mere end minimale tab. Det får rettighedshaverne nemlig vældig svært ved. Vi har tillid til Kommissionen og vi vil have tillid til Domstolen til at sikre, at denne lov bliver implementeret i overensstemmelse med ånden i Marrakesh.

Tadeusz Zwiefka, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! To ogromna przyjemność brać udział w debacie ze świadomością, że decyzje, które dzisiaj podejmujemy, są tak bardzo oczekiwane przez miliony naszych obywateli. Wiemy doskonale, jak lubimy czytać, co daje nam czytanie: rozwija wyobraźnię, empatię, pozwala ćwiczyć myślenie syntetyczne, opóźnia procesy demencji. To są wszystko ważne rzeczy, ale przecież te najważniejsze to poznawanie świata, naszych bohaterów, naszej przeszłości, ale także i samych siebie.

Do tej pory oferta książek i pism dla osób niewidzących i słabowidzących była naprawdę bardzo ograniczona, dlatego ogromnie się cieszę, że udało nam się wynegocjować i przygotować wdrożenie Traktatu z Marrakeszu, dzięki czemu miliony naszych obywateli, w tym prawie dwa miliony moich rodaków w Polsce, już w niedługim czasie będą mogli skorzystać z o wiele szerszej oferty. Ten wyjątek od prawa autorskiego jest w pełni zrozumiały i w pełni akceptowalny. Sam mam już problemy ze wzrokiem, małe litery już naprawdę nie są dla mnie. Dlatego oczekuję tej nowej oferty, która pozwoli korzystać z formatu czy to książki audio, czy dużej litery, czy alfabetu Braille'a, by móc czytać. Panie Przewodniczący, mam jeden apel do państw członkowskich, aby jak najszybciej, w porozumieniu z organizacjami osób niewidzących i słabowidzących oraz wydawcami, wdrożyły te ułatwienia w swoich krajach.

Julie Ward, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, it is the right of everyone to fully participate in culture. Yet people who are blind, visually impaired or otherwise print disabled continue to face many barriers in accessing books and other print material which is protected by copyright and related rights. The Marrakech Treaty, which allows for copyright exceptions to facilitate the creation of accessible versions of books and other copyrighted works for visually impaired people, was a landmark move to enable visually impaired people to access books with the same ease as sighted readers.

The Marrakech Treaty was adopted in 2013, but the EU has delayed ratifying it, despite its obvious and much-needed benefits for visually impaired people. Whilst working on this subject, I consulted with a cross section of stakeholders – disability experts, NGOs working on disability issues and representatives from the author and publisher fields – and all were largely in agreement with each other and stressed the importance of the speedy ratification of the Treaty. Culture is a human right and equal access to culture is paramount. I would like to thank Luigi Morgano for his help and hard work on this subject.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, jednání o přijetí Marrákešské smlouvy byla neúměrně zdlouhavá a já jsem velmi rád, že jsme dnes na konci tohoto procesu a můžeme ukázat konkrétní výsledky naší práce těm, kteří ji opravdu nejvíce potřebují.

Více než 300 milionů nevidomých osob, osob se zrakovým postižením a trpících poruchou čtení díky této smlouvě získá přístup ke knihám a jiným tištěným materiálům, což jim dodnes komplikovalo autorské právo. Ve formátech dostupných osobám se zrakovým postižením je dnes vydáváno pouze 5 % knih a v některých zemích ještě méně.

Pro osoby se zrakovým postižením je přitom základní překážkou z hlediska přístupnosti ke vzdělání. Nejvyšší počet těchto osob žije v rozvojových a méně rozvinutých zemích. Přijetím této smlouvy získají zrakově postižení lepší přístup ke knihám i díky tomu, že řada organizací bude moci rozesílat kopie děl do dalších zemí.

Považoval bych za ostudné, kdyby smlouva vstoupila v platnost bez účasti Evropské unie. Pevně věřím, že se nám podaří dosáhnout stejného úspěchu i u tzv. Aktu o přístupnosti, který budeme zde na plénu projednávat po letních prázdninách, a že tak dokážeme 80 milionům Evropanů se zdravotním postižením, že jim opravdu chceme pomoci! Děkuji za pozornost.

Isabella Adinolfi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il trattato di Marrakech rappresenta sicuramente un passo importante per tutte quelle persone che sono affette da disabilità visive. Non si tratta di un semplice trattato, si tratta dell'implementazione dei diritti fondamentali per i disabili che stanno aspettando da tanto tempo, dal 2013. La direttiva e il regolamento che ci apprestiamo a votare sicuramente sono un passo fondamentale per la ratifica del trattato da parte dell'Unione europea. Ratifica che a questo punto spero avvenga nei tempi più brevi possibili e senza ulteriori tentennamenti. Abbiamo il dovere, soprattutto noi che facciamo parte della commissione per la cultura e l'istruzione, di porre rimedio alla carenza di testi accessibili.

Certo, a mio avviso si sarebbe potuto evitare lo schema di compensazione a favore dei titolari dei diritti d'autore, perché questo danno derivante dalla pubblicazione di testi accessibili è tutto da dimostrare. E, a questo proposito, abbiamo un compito ulteriore: quello di verificare a livello nazionale che questi schemi di compensazione non vengano applicati soltanto per la tutela del profitto economico e a danno dei diritti delle persone. Tutela che, mi preme sottolinearlo, ha la precedenza sul profitto economico e non deve essere soltanto sbandierata a parole, come purtroppo spesso avviene.

Marie-Christine Boutonnet, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, ces projets de textes pris en application du traité de Marrakech vont permettre d'aider à réduire ce qu'on appelle la «famine du livre», dont souffrent les aveugles et déficients visuels ainsi que les personnes ayant des difficultés à la lecture des textes imprimés.

Je vous rappelle qu'actuellement, entre 1 et 7 % seulement des œuvres publiées dans le monde sont disponibles sous des formats accessibles. C'est inacceptable. En effet, en Europe, près de 30 millions de personnes sont concernées. Qu'il me soit permis, ici, de saluer les initiatives préexistantes, telles que le projet Tigar, devenu le Service mondial d'échange de livres de l'ABC, et auquel les éditeurs français ont participé en nombre.

Les deux textes issus des négociations en trilogue vont dans le bon sens, avec notamment l'ajout du livre électronique dans leur champ d'application et d'un système de compensation limité des titulaires de droits. Je peux néanmoins regretter que certains aménagements existants dans le traité de Marrakech et dans certains États membres n'aient pas été repris.

Bien que je dénie toute compétence à l'Union européenne pour conclure de tels traités, l'objet de ces textes dépasse bien évidemment toute autre considération.

En tant que Française, d'un pays éminemment littéraire, je ne peux qu'être heureuse de cette avancée en faveur de toutes ces personnes qui pourront enfin avoir accès à une plus grande partie de notre patrimoine.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Συνθήκη του Μαρακές προβλέπει ευνοϊκές διατάξεις για τους τυφλούς, τους αμβλύωπες ή τα άτομα με αντιληπτικές ή αναγνωστικές αναπηρίες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της δυσλεξίας και άλλων μαθησιακών δυσκολιών που εμποδίζουν τα άτομα αυτά όσον αφορά την ανάγνωση εντύπων με την ίδια ευκολία που έχουν τα άτομα χωρίς αναπηρία. Η παρούσα οδηγία έρχεται, αφενός, για να καλύψει κάποια κενά στις προβλέψεις για τους συνανθρώπους μας που αντιμετωπίζουν αυτές τις δυσκολίες και, αφετέρου, για να καθιερώσει υποχρεωτική εξαίρεση για ορισμένα δικαιώματα κατόχων δικαιωμάτων τα οποία έχουν εναρμονιστεί από το δίκαιο της Ένωσης.

Πρέπει να προσέξουμε ιδιαίτερα ότι η διανομή, η παρουσίαση ή η διάθεση αντιγράφων προσβάσιμων σε τυφλούς, αμβλύωπες ή άτομα με άλλα προβλήματα ανάγνωσης εντύπων ή σε εξουσιοδοτημένες οντότητες τρίτης χώρας θα πρέπει να πραγματοποιείται αποκλειστικά σε μη κερδοσκοπική βάση, από σημεία διάθεσης εγκατεστημένα στην Ένωση. Τέλος, πρέπει να διασφαλιστεί ότι τα συμβαλλόμενα μέρη θα παρέχουν οικονομικούς πόρους και ανθρώπινο δυναμικό για τη διευκόλυνση της διεθνούς συνεργασίας μεταξύ εξουσιοδοτημένων οντοτήτων και θα εξασφαλίζουν την επαρκή διαθεσιμότητα αντιγράφων σε προσβάσιμο μορφότυπο και τη διασυνοριακή ανταλλαγή των αντιγράφων αυτών.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, най-накрая правото на Европейския съюз ще бъде приведено съгласно международните изисквания на договора от Маракеш. Най-накрая ще бъде улеснен достъпът до книги и други печатни материали, защитени от авторското право и сродните му права за слепите хора, хората с нарушено зрение, дислексия или с други увреждания, които не им позволяват четенето на печатни материали.

Радвам се, че тези законодателни актове ще бъдат приети и ще улеснят живота на милиони европейски граждани. Ще се подобрят също така и техните възможности за образование. С приемането на това законодателство ще се подобри и обменът на аудиокниги и други печатни материали, достъпни за хора с нарушено зрение. Оттук нататък е важно държавите членки да започнат инициативи за популяризиране на целите на Маракешкия договор, за да могат нашите граждани да се възползват максимално от предоставената им възможност.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die Umsetzung des Vertrags von Marrakesch ist lange überfällig, und heute ist es endlich so weit. Der Zugang zu veröffentlichten Werken für blinde, sehbehinderte oder lesebehinderte Menschen wird in der Europäischen Union erleichtert und damit kulturelle Teilhabe gesichert. Wir erleichtern sowohl den unionsinternen Zugang als auch den grenzüberschreitenden Austausch, und ich hoffe, dass die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Umsetzung und bei der Anwendung zügig handeln werden.

Wichtig war uns als S&D-Fraktion insbesondere, dass wir eine kurze Umsetzungsfrist haben, und mit zwölf Monaten können wir leben. Gut ist auch, dass es keinen *commercial availability check* geben wird. Dieser Test hätte die Verfügbarkeit und die Zugänglichmachung der Werke deutlich reduziert. Und erfreulich ist schließlich, dass die Gesetzgebung auch digitale Formate umfassen und damit zukunftsfest sein wird. Zudem werden wir mit großer Aufmerksamkeit den Bericht der Kommission über eine mögliche Ausweitung des Anwendungsbereichs verfolgen, um dann eventuell noch weitere Werke mit aufnehmen zu können.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το δικαίωμα στο διάβασμα και στη γνώση είναι δικαίωμα πολιτισμού. Έχουμε τεχνολογική ανάπτυξη που μας δίνει τεράστιες δυνατότητες. Μέχρι τότε οι άνθρωποι με προβλήματα όρασης θα πρέπει να αισθάνονται διπλά αποκλεισμένοι, λόγω της αναπηρίας τους αρχικά, αλλά και λόγω της αδιαφορίας της σημερινής κοινωνίας να τους δώσει τα δικαιώματα που απολαμβάνουν οι αρτιμελείς συμπολίτες τους; Γι' αυτό η στήριξη της Συνθήκης του Μαρακές για ενσωμάτωσή της στο ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο είναι ζήτημα κοινωνικής δικαιοσύνης.

Κυρίες και κύριοι, δεν είχα πάντοτε προβλήματα όρασης και καταλαβαίνω τη διαφορά. Έτσι, ξέρω πόσο ωφέλιμο θα ήταν για όλους εμάς να μπορούμε να διαβάζουμε και να ξεπερνάμε το σκοτάδι της όρασης μέσα από το φως της ανάγνωσης.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la lecture est indispensable à l'acquisition d'une culture approfondie et, par conséquent, à l'épanouissement de la personne humaine. Il faut donc prévoir des dispositifs spécifiques pour permettre aux aveugles et aux malvoyants d'y accéder eux aussi. C'est bien le sens de la directive et du règlement présentés aujourd'hui. J'adhère donc à leur philosophie générale.

L'Union européenne doit toutefois rester modeste, car c'est le traité de Marrakech de 2013, dont les deux textes ne sont qu'une transposition, qui a constitué une avancée majeure pour les aveugles, en accordant aux livres qui leur sont destinés des exonérations ou exceptions au droit d'auteur. Il faut donc se féliciter du progrès réalisé, tout en soulignant qu'il est dû à l'Organisation mondiale de la propriété intellectuelle, inspiratrice du traité, et non à l'Union.

Le traité de Marrakech représente une victoire de la solidarité sur les groupes de pression financiers. C'est suffisamment rare pour mériter d'être souligné.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – A marrákesi szerződés rendelkezésére vonatkozó irányelv egy újabb lépés lesz abba az irányba, hogy az Európai Unió minden egyes állampolgárának igényére választ adjon. A vakok és látássérültek számára óriási dolog, ha a szerzői jogok által védett művek szabadon hozzáférhetőek lesznek, határookra való tekintet nélkül. Ez egy olyan terület, ahol nem a kereskedelmi érdekeknek, hanem a méltányosság elvének figyelembevételével kell dönten.

Ezért is állok értetlenül a megállapodásnak azon része előtt, amely anyagi kompenzáció fizetésének lehetőségét veti fel, amelyet a látássérült szervezetek és könyvtárak kellene kifizessenek. Tekintettel a látássérültek számára készült speciális kiadványok előállításának magas költségeire, egy ilyen járulékos adó további vak és látássérült polgárokat foszthat meg a könyvekhez való hozzáféréstől, elsősorban a szegény tagállamokban. Mivel tagállami hatáskör lesz ennek az anyagi kompenzációnak az alkalmazása, ezért az EU helyett a kormányoknak kell méltányosnak és bölcsnek lenniük e kérdésben.

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che con questi due provvedimenti i diritti culturali, che fanno parte integrante dei diritti umani, entrino a far parte formalmente, in modo più ampio, dell'*acquis communautaire*, ora che finalmente l'Europa, l'Unione europea in quanto tale, che aveva firmato il trattato di Marrakech nel 2013, lo adotta a distanza di qualche anno. È stata una grande vittoria delle associazioni, ma anche di un Parlamento che è stato veramente impegnato accanto alla Commissione per ottenere questo passo avanti.

Penso che sia importante anche il fatto che non soltanto i non vedenti, ma anche le persone con disturbi come la dislessia o disturbi della lettura e dell'apprendimento, rientrino in questo accesso. Ma sappiamo anche che, perché le eccezioni al diritto d'autore siano pienamente funzionanti, è necessario che ci sia un rapporto di collaborazione, di fiducia, tra le organizzazioni autorizzate a effettuare copie in formato accessibile di opere letterarie e gli editori, perché queste siano, appunto, autorizzate e riconosciute dallo Stato membro di stabilimento. Noi abbiamo creato quindi le condizioni perché questo diventi realmente effettivo e non soltanto un auspicio.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχουμε συζητήσει επανειλημμένα στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών την αναγκαιότητα εφαρμογής της Συνθήκης του Μαρακές, καθώς έχουμε δεχθεί εκατοντάδες αναφορές από συμπολίτες μας. Επίσης, και εδώ στην ολομέλεια έχουμε ασχοληθεί με το ζήτημα αυτό και είναι σημαντική η πρόοδος που επιτελείται σήμερα, διότι ορισμένα κράτη μέλη δεν ήθελαν να προχωρήσουν στην επικύρωση της Συνθήκης του Μαρακές και μεταχειρίστηκαν διάφορα τρικ. Πρόκειται για μια Συνθήκη σημαντική, η οποία πραγματικά παρέχει υπηρεσία σε όσους συμπολίτες μας είναι τυφλοί ή έχουν προβλήματα όρασης ή μαθησιακές ανάγκες.

Θα είναι πλέον δυνατόν αυτοί οι άνθρωποι να έχουν πρόσβαση σε κείμενα στα οποία δεν θα μπορούσαν να έχουν, κι έτσι θα ενισχυθεί το δικαίωμά τους στην εκπαίδευση και στα πολιτιστικά αγαθά. Πρέπει να προσέξουμε όμως τις διάφορες τρικλοποδιές που βάζουν ορισμένα λόμπι που επιθυμούν να διατηρήσουν δικαιώματα σε σχέση με τα θέματα που αφορούν τα πνευματικά δικαιώματα. Αυτό είναι σημαντικό και πρέπει να το προσέξουμε, διότι απαιτείται η πρόσβαση να είναι άμεση και χωρίς περιορισμούς.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, só damos as intenções consagradas nas propostas em discussão que vão no caminho de garantir o acesso a pessoas cegas ou com deficiência visual a textos impressos, nomeadamente integrando a perspetiva de acesso a textos e obras disponibilizadas em formato digital ou sonoro. Trata-se de um fator de justiça social e de equidade no acesso à informação, cultura e conhecimento a que milhões de pessoas têm hoje dificuldades diversas em aceder.

Não podemos, contudo, desligar a matéria em apreço e a realidade que se descreve das consequências das políticas de austeridade, das políticas de ataque aos serviços públicos, do ataque aos direitos sociais e laborais e nas muitas restrições que se impuseram e ampliaram em muitos países, como em Portugal, nos direitos das pessoas portadoras de deficiência, grupo populacional particularmente vulnerável à pobreza e à exclusão social. Só através de políticas de serviço público se poderá garantir o acesso e a participação em igualdade nas dimensões social, económica, cultural ou desportiva da vida.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, as pessoas invisuais, com deficiência visual ou com outras dificuldades de acesso a textos impressos continuam a enfrentar muitos obstáculos para aceder a material impresso. A necessidade de tornar o número muito mais vasto de obras em formatos acessíveis inteiramente disponíveis para estas pessoas e de melhorar a sua circulação foi reconhecida pelo Tratado de Marraquexe, como aqui já foi dito. A adesão da União Europeia ao Tratado de Marraquexe é desde há muito aguardada.

No entanto, e não obstante a sua assinatura por parte da União Europeia em 2014, a verdade é que a sua retificação continua atrasada por uma questão meramente jurídica. A verdade é que se trata de um assunto de enorme importância, na medida em que garante um direito humano básico a mais de 30 milhões de pessoas com deficiência visual em todo o território da União Europeia e melhora a acessibilidade aos livros nos países em vias de desenvolvimento. O resultado deste atraso é que estes cidadãos continuam a enfrentar muitos obstáculos para acederem a livros e a material impresso e tudo o que isto implica em termos de exclusão social.

Caros Colegas, gostaria de notar que este projeto de resolução constitui um triunfo para um modelo social de deficiência, representa uma solução internacional adequada para o problema global da fome de livros. Por tudo isto, entendo ser necessário tomar todas as medidas necessárias para assegurar a aplicação rápida e apropriada do tratado que comporta uma enorme dimensão cultural, humanitária e de desenvolvimento social.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le persone non vedenti, ipovedenti o con altre difficoltà nella lettura continuano tutt'oggi ad incontrare seri problemi nell'accesso ai libri e ad altro materiale protetto dal diritto d'autore. Queste persone devono vedersi riconosciuto lo stesso diritto di chiunque altro di accedere alle informazioni e partecipare alla vita culturale, economica e sociale.

È importante che l'Europa si adoperi per aumentare la disponibilità di opere tradotte in formati accessibili ai non vedenti, cominciando innanzitutto col migliorare la circolazione di quelle disponibili nel mercato interno. Qualche passo avanti è già stato fatto con il trattato di Marrakech, ma tanto resta ancora da fare, soprattutto facendo un ricorso intelligente alle nuove tecnologie, che possono rivelarsi decisive per l'accesso all'istruzione e per l'inclusione sociale di queste persone.

L'inclusione sociale dei non vedenti è parte integrante della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite, ma è anche un obbligo morale e civile della nostra società, cui non possiamo sottrarci. L'Unione europea e gli Stati membri devono procedere rapidamente al riconoscimento di questi diritti.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, there is no doubt that today is a big day. It is an enormous step and this discussion demonstrates that Parliament shares the Commission's view that the active inclusion and full participation of people with disabilities in society is not only worth pursuing but is imperative.

The proposals we are discussing today are indeed one piece of the broader action that the European Union is taking in this area, including the recent Web Accessibility Directive, the Commission's proposal for a European Accessibility Act, as mentioned by some honourable Members, and its broader European Disability Strategy.

With regard to speeding up the ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty, we agree that the EU should proceed rapidly to ratification. The Commission proposed a decision of the Council to that effect more than one-and-a-half years ago. We encourage the Council to adopt a decision as soon as possible. A recent Court of Justice opinion has removed any doubt about the exclusive competence of the Union to ratify it, so there is therefore no good reason for further delaying the ratification of the treaty.

I would like to answer some questions and make some remarks about Member State compensation schemes. The Commission is ready to support Member States in the transposition of this legislation into their national law. As with all new legislation, the Commission will also monitor its correct transposition in its application to make sure that its overall implementation is faithful to the principles contained in the directive. This also applies to the provision that allows Member States to have compensation schemes, as politically agreed during the negotiation of this directive, and to the clear limits to those schemes set out in the directive itself.

In summary, I am glad to witness that the common objective of Parliament, the Council and the Commission to proceed to a fast and smooth adoption of this proposal has been achieved. Once again I want to thank Parliament for these important results. I would like to thank the rapporteur and others for your contribution in this enormous step.

Max Andersson, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I am very glad to hear that there is so much unity about something that is this important. I have just one substantial thing to add and that is that I will be sure to agree with the Commissioner when he calls for the Council to ratify this quickly. However, quickly in the European Union is not always fast. It will take at least a year for the Member States to implement this before we can ratify and start sharing books for blind people across borders. I want to emphasise that the Council, which I know is working on this issue, needs to act quickly. For blind people all over the world this will give greater and better access to books and it is now up to the Council to deliver.

I would like once again to thank the Commission for its very serious and good approach. It has really been a positive influence. I would also like to thank the Maltese Presidency for helping to find a good compromise. Most importantly, I would like to thank the European Blind Union, which has been an immense asset in this work. It is one of the driving forces behind the Marrakech Treaty. I would, of course, like to thank once again all the colleagues who have been working on this for years. Blind people should have better access to books.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 6 lipca 2017 r.

7. Polowania na wieloryby w Norwegii (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Sirpę Pietikäinen, Renatę Briano, Marka Demesmaekera, Catherine Bearder, Anję Hazekamp, Keitha Taylora, Eleonorę Evi w imieniu Komisji Ochrony Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności w sprawie polowań na wieloryby w Norwegii (O-000058/2017 – 2017/2712(RSP) – B8-0324/2017).

Sirpa Pietikäinen, *author*. – Mr President, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) put in place a worldwide moratorium on commercial whaling in 1986. Nevertheless, Norway continued whaling and fully resumed commercial whaling activities in 1993, using a formal objection to the moratorium, as well as reservations to CITES listings. Norway establishes its own catch limits. For this year's whaling season it increased the quota of North Atlantic minke whales to 999, up from 880 last year. Norway's exports of whale meat have increased sharply in recent years. Some of these exports are shipped through EU ports. For example, according to animal welfare institutes, in October last year alone almost 3 000 kilos of Norwegian whale products were exported to Japan, having transited through at least three EU ports. The transit of whale meat through EU ports is permitted provided that shipments are accompanied by valid CITES documentation on the Council's regulation.

What action has the Commission taken so far to persuade Norway to halt its whale hunting and adhere to the IWC moratorium? Will the Commission use its influence at upcoming CITES and IWC meetings to urge contracting governments to adopt a common position urging Norway to put an immediate stop to all whaling activities? Can the Commission provide data on the quantities of whale meat shipments transported through EU ports, their destinations and whether they are accompanied by valid CITES documentation? What measures is the Commission taking to ensure that this documentation obligation is strictly enforced? Does the Commission agree that, by allowing the transit of whale meat through its ports, the EU is facilitating trade in whale species which are protected by multiple EU laws and whose hunting contravenes the current international ban on commercial whaling? What does the Commission believe can be done to prohibit such shipments at both EU and Member State level? If no agreement is reached with Norway, will the Commission recommend a ban on whale meat transit through EU ports as an exceptional measure?

I hope that the Commission can give very clear answers and also take prompt action because whale hunting – the hunting of endangered species – is inhumane and breaches international legislation. That is something which is not acceptable, so hopefully we can act together to end Norway's unacceptable practices.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I shall try to answer all these questions on behalf of my colleague Commissioner Vella.

The European Union is fully committed to the conservation of all cetaceans and is equipped with environmental legislation to pursue this objective. Commercial whaling is not allowed in the Member States' waters or by ships under the jurisdiction of a Member State. All whale species are protected from deliberate disturbance, capture or killing under the Habitats Directive. In addition, imports to and exports from the EU of cetaceans for primarily commercial purpose are banned under our wildlife regulations.

The European Union has consistently supported in the International Whaling Commission (IWC) the global moratorium on commercial whaling. It has also clearly positioned itself against trade in whale products in CITES meetings. It is therefore problematic that Norway, a European country, not only continues to take whales for commercial purpose but has also become the most prolific world whaler, killing more whales in the past two years than Japan and Iceland combined. Norway's practice of exporting whale products via EU Member States' ports also threatens the consistency of EU policies in relation to whales and other cetaceans.

The EU has made its position clear to Norway. Firstly, at the last International Whaling Commission meeting in October 2016, the Union invited Norway to cease its whaling activities. The EU also called on Norway to stop its trade in whale products – a call which it also addressed to Iceland and Japan – and to reconsider its reservations on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) listing of large whales.

In November 2016, my colleague Commissioner Vella discussed this issue with the Norwegian Minister for Environment, Vidar Helgesen, who confirmed the Norwegian position, referring to the fact that 'only' 17 Norwegian vessels catch minke whales. Still, these 17 vessels killed 1 251 minke whales during 2015 and 2016!

In December 2016, the Council adopted new and stronger conclusions on EU relations with the non-EU Western European countries, calling on Norway and Iceland to respect the internationally agreed moratorium on commercial whaling and to withdraw reservations under CITES. Given its reservation on the CITES listing of large whales, Norway can, however, trade whale products with other countries which have the same reservations, provided that such products have valid CITES export permits. The transit of such shipments via EU Member States is also legal under international law, provided that the authorities in the Member States can check that the shipments are accompanied by valid CITES permits.

I need to say that the EU Member State authorities are fully aware of their obligations to control shipments transiting through their ports. The Commission has discussed this transit issue with them on several occasions. We do not have statistics on the extent of this transit but, at the same time, we are not aware of shipments of whale meat which would have gone through EU territory without the required documentation.

The Commission will continue to take a strong position on this subject and to work with its international partners to engage with Norway towards reaching decisions more consistent with the EU approach and leading to better conservation of whales worldwide.

Paul Rübiger, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich bin Mitglied der SINEEA-Delegation und der Delegation für den Europäischen Wirtschaftsraum. Für uns ist klar, dass Norwegen beim internationalen Übereinkommen zum Walfang Einspruch gegen das Moratorium angemeldet hat und daher völkerrechtlich nicht an dieses Moratorium gebunden ist.

Als Österreicher ist mir aber vor allem die tiergerechte Fischfangmethode wichtig. Ich glaube, dass es entscheidend ist, dass für die kleinen und mittleren Fischer neue Ausbildungsmethoden gefunden werden müssen. Wir wissen, dass es ungefähr 100 000 Minkwale gibt; ein Prozent unterliegt derzeit der Fischerei und wird gefangen. Natürlich ist es so, dass in Norwegen Walfisch sehr traditionell als Lebensmittel verwendet wird und hier auch die naturschutzrechtlichen Bestimmungen eingehalten werden müssen.

Renata Briano, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, circa un anno fa eravamo qui in plenaria a chiedere di fermare la mattanza delle balene portata avanti dal Giappone. Oggi ci troviamo di nuovo qui per la stessa ragione, ma per un paese diverso.

La Norvegia ha sistematicamente cacciato a fini commerciali le balene dagli anni Trenta e, nonostante la moratoria internazionale entrata in vigore nel 1987 — direi nel lontano 1987 — non ha mai smesso di uccidere e commerciare questi cetacei, sulla base di presunti scopi scientifici. Dico «presunti» perché, come avevo detto per il Giappone, queste «prove scientifiche» spesso finiscono negli scaffali dei supermercati o nei piatti di un ristorante.

In questi ultimi anni il *business* è addirittura cresciuto, tanto che i norvegesi hanno cacciato nel 2014 e nel 2015 più balene di Giappone e Islanda messi insieme, guadagnandosi il triste ruolo di leader mondiale nel campo di questa odiosa pratica. Un dato: la quota norvegese relativa alle balenottere è passata dagli 880 esemplari del 2016 ai 999 di quest'anno.

Oggi ci stiamo rendendo complici della mattanza norvegese, poiché attualmente la legislazione UE permette il transito di carne di balena se accompagnata dalla documentazione CITES. Per fare un esempio, da gennaio a ottobre 2016 circa tre tonnellate sono passate attraverso porti dell'Unione, senza pensare a tutta la carne commercializzata per altre vie.

Chiediamo quindi che la Commissione intervenga in modo deciso, risoluto, e che lo stretto rapporto naturale che c'è tra Norvegia e Unione europea non diventi uno scudo dietro cui non esporsi, ma che anzi sia sfruttato come canale diretto per influenzare le decisioni norvegesi.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Al ruim 30 jaar is commerciële walvisvangst wereldwijd verboden en toch blijken landen als Noorwegen hardleers. Noorwegen hervatte in 1993 de commerciële walvisvangst. Het land stelt zijn eigen vangstquota op en die gaan in stijgende lijn. Dit jaar zullen nagenoeg 1 000 Noord-Atlantische dwergvinissen worden gevangen en gedood en ook de uitvoer van walvisvlees neemt toe.

Ik nam mee het initiatief om dit onderwerp op de agenda te plaatsen, want we moeten deze gruwelijke praktijken blijven aankampen. De walvis is een iconisch en geliefd dier, dat onze bescherming verdient. Walvisvangst ondermijnt niet alleen de bescherming van de biodiversiteit en marine ecosystemen. Het is ook in strijd met internationaal recht. Er is bovendien geen maatschappelijk draagvlak voor.

Mijnheer de commissaris, ik dank u alvast voor uw antwoord en ik begrijp dat u onze bezorgdheid deelt. Wij staan, denk ik, aan dezelfde kant en onze boodschap moet dan ook zijn dat we u verder aanmoedigen om alles in het werk te stellen om Noorwegen ertoe te bewegen het wereldwijde moratorium te respecteren. Onze havens mogen niet als het ware medeplichtig worden aan illegale verscheping. Ik begrijp uit uw antwoord dat we daar nog meer gegevens en cijfers over nodig hebben, dat we meer controle nodig hebben. Ik moedig u aan om daar ook aan te werken.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Het heeft wat moeite gekost, maar het is dan toch gelukt om de Noorse walvisjacht hier in het Europees Parlement te bespreken. En dat is hard nodig, want Noorwegen lapt al meer dan 30 jaar het internationale verbod op commerciële walvisvaart aan zijn laars.

Sinds het verbod inging, heeft Noorwegen al meer dan 13 000 walvissen gedood en op dit moment is de jacht in volle gang op bijna 1 000 walvissen, waaronder zwangere dieren. Dat is een grote schande. Bedreigde dieren moet je beschermen en niet uitmoorden met harpoenen. Omdat de meeste Noren allang geen walvisvlees meer eten, wordt een deel van het walvisvlees gebruikt als veevoer voor de dieren in de bontindustrie. De rest van het walvisvlees dat Noorwegen overhoudt aan haar barbaarse walvisjacht, wordt verscheept naar Japan via Europese havens. Europa werkt op die manier mee aan de handel in walvisvlees. Dat moet echt stoppen!

We vragen de Europese Commissie om niet langer mee te werken aan het transport van illegaal gedode walvissen. Voorzitter, deze *legal opinion* laat zien dat de Europese Commissie de mogelijkheden heeft om het transport van walvisvlees via de Europese havens te stoppen, óók met Cites-papieren. Je zou het in de woorden van de heer Juncker ridicuul kunnen noemen dat de verantwoordelijke commissaris niet de moeite heeft genomen om hier vandaag aanwezig te zijn. Maar ik heb er alle vertrouwen in dat commissaris Stylianides uitlegt hoe de Commissie en de lidstaten zo snel mogelijk de Europese havens sluiten voor walvisvlees.

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

Keith Taylor, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, over the past few years Norwegian whalers have hunted more whales than Iceland and Japan combined. In 2016 alone, 591 minke whales were killed, and for 2017 the quota has been set for 990 whales. Yet in Norway, as was previously said, the domestic demand for whale meat has fallen to the point that unwanted whale meat is now being sent to fur farms to be used as feed. What a doubly grotesque state of affairs that is.

This decline in demand should not come as any surprise, given the very high levels of toxic contaminants found in whale products, including PCBs, hormone-disrupting chemicals and mercury. Sadly, as large mammals, whales are greatly at risk from persistent organic pollutants because of bio-accumulation in the food chain. In fact, the Japanese Government itself has rejected imports of Norwegian whale meat after tests revealed pesticide levels double the amount Japan permits in imports, making the meat unfit for human consumption, so that it simply has to be destroyed.

Despite this, Norway has sharply increased its exports to Japan. However, as there is no direct shipping route to Asia, EU ports offer a convenient stopping off point for the ships.

In the European Union our legislation could not be any clearer: all cetacean species are strictly protected and any incidental capture, killing or sale by EU Members is prohibited. Under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), international trade in whale products is also specifically prohibited.

It simply beggars belief that the EU is assisting another country that holds the polar opposite views and values on this issue to transport whale meat via its ports. This clearly goes against our conservation laws designed to protect these magnificent creatures.

I would like the Commission to give Parliament all the data available on these exports, to use its influence in CITES and in the International Whaling Commission to encourage Norway to end its cruel and unnecessary practice of whaling. If this does not result in the desired outcome, I call on the Commission to recommend a ban on whale-meat transiting through EU ports, as an exceptional measure.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'augmentation des captures de baleines par la Norvège est particulièrement préoccupante, surtout quand il s'agit de femelles en gestation.

Or, la Norvège, qui n'est pas membre de l'Union européenne, avait fait le choix de s'opposer au moratoire mondial de 1986 sur les captures de baleines. Aussi, pour parvenir à convaincre ce pays d'appliquer ce moratoire, les marges de manœuvre de la Commission européenne sont particulièrement faibles.

Un embargo ou des interdictions de transit de la viande de baleine dans les ports européens constitueraient des sanctions punitives, mais non constructives. Le monde ne se résumant pas à l'Union européenne, la viande de baleine continuerait d'ailleurs de circuler dans les ports des pays tiers.

Traitions donc le problème à la source dans le cadre de la convention CITES et de la Commission baleinière internationale, deux organisations dont la Norvège fait partie. Laissons les États agir de concert sur un sujet aussi délicat.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, le agradezco... ayer estaba aquí, tarde por la noche; hoy nos encontramos por la mañana...

Mucho ha llovido desde la prohibición de la caza de ballenas en Noruega a principios del siglo XX, una actividad que, de hecho, se remonta al siglo VII, pero, con el tiempo, el interés y la demanda interna de productos balleneros en Noruega ha ido decreciendo.

A pesar de la moratoria que nos dimos entre todos en 1986 a través de la Comisión Ballenera Internacional, en bien de la preservación, Noruega no llegó a aplicarla totalmente nunca y en 1993 retomó la caza de cetáceos con fines comerciales, llegando a capturar —se ha dicho ya esta mañana, en varias ocasiones— en estos últimos años más ejemplares que Japón e Islandia juntos.

Quiero recordar —ayer debatíamos sobre ello— el objetivo 14 de la Agenda 2030: conservar y utilizar de forma sostenible los océanos, mares y recursos marinos para el desarrollo sostenible. La Unión debe liderar la consecución de dichos objetivos y, por tanto, también debe ser capaz de controlar que las mercancías que llegan a sus puertos cumplen con todos los requisitos legales.

Marco Affronte (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è la prima volta che parliamo di baleneria in quest'Aula: mi ricordo almeno tre o quattro discussioni negli ultimi due anni, anche se di solito l'imputato sul banco era il Giappone e non la Norvegia. Ogni volta finiamo con due considerazioni: la prima è che tutta l'Aula condanna questa pratica, che ormai non ha più ragione di essere, che è una pratica del passato e che è inumana, e il secondo punto che emerge sempre è la frustrazione per non avere nessuna possibilità, concretamente, di fare qualcosa per fermare questo tipo di caccia alla balena, da parte sia del Giappone che della Norvegia.

Questa volta, in questi giorni, abbiamo invece la possibilità di fare qualcosa di un po' più concreto, finalmente, sotto due punti di vista. Il primo è questo passaggio di carne di balena nei porti europei: non ci basta che la Commissione dica che hanno tutti i documenti a posto, possiamo effettivamente fare qualcosa per cercare di fermarla. E la seconda cosa: stiamo trattando in questi giorni il trattato commerciale con il Giappone; perché non ricordarsi anche all'interno di quel trattato che noi non vogliamo che il Giappone continui a cacciare le balene?

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, não obstante em 1986 a comissão baleeira internacional ter imposto uma moratória mundial sobre a atividade baleeira comercial, a verdade é que a Noruega continua a caça à baleia e a estabelecer os seus próprios limites de captura. O facto é que a Noruega chegou até a aumentar em 2017 a quota de baleias anãs capturadas no Atlântico Norte para 999, em comparação com as 880 de 2016, e entre 2014 e 2015 matou mais baleias do que o Japão e a Islândia juntos, como disse o Sr. Comissário há pouco.

Sr. Comissário, a maioria das baleias mortas são fêmeas grávidas, é o que mostra o documentário «batalha da agonia» com imagens terríveis da indústria baleeira norueguesa, incluindo uma sangrenta cena durante a qual um pescador corta uma baleia grávida.

Caros Colegas, a caça de baleias é agora mais inaceitável do que nunca. Sr. Comissário, a Comissão tem que tomar medidas urgentes para adotar uma posição comum para exortar a Noruega a pôr imediatamente fim a todas as atividades baleeiras no quadro da Convenção Internacional para a regulação da atividade baleeira. Os produtos derivados das baleias são exportados da Noruega para o Japão e termino, Sr. Presidente, dizendo que atravessando pelo menos três portos da União Europeia. A União Europeia não pode permitir isto. Sr. Comissário. Apelo para que ponha um ponto final a esta situação de uma vez por todas. É inadmissível, neste momento, continuarmos a assistir às cenas sangrentas que vimos.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, rendez-vous compte, 1 250 baleines capturées par les baleiniers norvégiens entre 2015 et 2017 malgré le moratoire international de 1987, ce n'est pas tolérable. L'Union européenne doit mettre en œuvre tous les moyens possibles pour que la Norvège mette fin à ces pratiques.

Il faut d'abord convaincre les chasseurs de baleines norvégiens eux-mêmes qu'à ce rythme, ils n'auront bientôt plus rien à chasser. Ensuite, il faut agir politiquement auprès du gouvernement norvégien, partenaire de l'Union européenne, pour qu'il prenne ses responsabilités, mais – me semble-t-il – le moyen le plus fort dont dispose l'Union européenne est celui du contrôle commercial. Assurer la transparence par le contrôle des documents CITES dans les ports, c'est sans doute une lourde charge, mais elle est nécessaire pour se faire respecter.

Au moment – et cela a été dit par plusieurs collègues – où nous négocions un traité commercial avec le Japon, consommateur de viande de baleine, nous aurions intérêt à ce que cette question soit abordée dans les documents officiels.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η φαλαινοθηρία για εμπορικούς σκοπούς έχει απαγορευθεί παγκοσμίως, μέσω του μορατόριουμ που επιβλήθηκε από τη Διεθνή Επιτροπή Φαλαινοθηρίας. Βλέπουμε, όμως, ότι χώρες όπως η Ιαπωνία και η Νορβηγία παρανομούν συνεχώς και παραβιάζουν τις αποφάσεις της διεθνούς κοινότητας. Έτσι, η Νορβηγία από το 1993 συνεχίζει τη φαλαινοθηρία, παραβιάζοντας το μορατόριουμ και τον κατάλογο της CITES. Για το 2017, η Νορβηγία αύξησε την ποσόστωση όσον αφορά τη φαλαινοθηρία, από 880 σε 999 ρυγχοφάλαινες. Μάλιστα η Νορβηγία χρησιμοποιεί λιμάνια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για την εξαγωγή προϊόντων φάλαινας στην Ιαπωνία.

Πώς επιτρέπει η Ένωση τη διαμετακόμιση κρέατος φάλαινας μέσω των λιμανιών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τη στιγμή που για να γίνει αυτό απαιτείται τα φορτία να συνοδεύονται από έγκυρα έγγραφα της CITES; Ποιος χορηγεί αυτά τα έγγραφα; Ή μήπως γίνεται τελικά διακίνηση του κρέατος της φάλαινας χωρίς τα έγγραφα αυτά, οπότε έχουμε παραβίαση του κανονισμού 338/1997 του Συμβουλίου;

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i mari artici sono già oggi quelli a maggiore rischio e quelli dove si stanno manifestando in maniera più evidente gli effetti dei cambiamenti climatici. Purtroppo c'è chi nella fusione dei ghiacci artici vede solo delle grandi opportunità di guadagno: dall'estrazione di combustibili fossili alle attività minerarie e all'apertura di nuove zone di pesca e di rotte di navigazione.

Questo è uno scenario allarmante. È uno scenario allarmante nel quale noi dobbiamo fare del nostro meglio affinché si possa evitare che al degrado globale si aggiunga la dannosa ed inutile caccia alle balene. Caccia che la Norvegia ha aumentato nel corso degli ultimi anni, anche a fini commerciali. Dobbiamo fare di tutto, usare tutti gli strumenti di pressione che abbiamo, affinché la Norvegia rispetti la moratoria del 1986 e affinché i porti dell'Unione europea facciano gli adeguati controlli e non siano complici di questo traffico illecito e di questa assurda pratica che ancora oggi, nel 2017, ha luogo.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ζούμε σε μία περίοδο όπου η καταστροφή του πλανήτη και του περιβάλλοντος τείνει να γίνει μη αναστρέψιμη. Τόσο οι επιστήμονες όσο και οι περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις προειδοποιούν. Τις επιπτώσεις τις βιώνουμε όλοι στην καθημερινότητά μας με την κλιματική αλλαγή και την αύξηση της θερμοκρασίας του πλανήτη. Σε αυτή την καταστροφή έρχεται να προστεθεί και η απληστία των ανθρώπων, που μπροστά στο κέρδος δεν σέβονται τίποτα. Οι φάλαινες είναι θηλαστικά που ζουν εδώ και εκατομμύρια χρόνια στον πλανήτη και είναι γνωστό ότι κινδυνεύουν με αφανισμό λόγω της μόλυνσης των θαλασσών, αλλά και λόγω της υπεραλίευσης.

Η Νορβηγία ξεκινά και φέτος το πιο φρικτό έθιμο· την ετήσια σφαγή εκατοντάδων εγκύων φαλαινών. Κάθε χρόνο κομματιάζουν εγκύους φάλαινες για να φτιάξουν καλλυντικά και ζωοτροφές. Θεωρούν την εγκυμοσύνη των θηλυκών φαλαινών δείγμα καλής υγείας. Η Νορβηγία είναι ο νούμερο 1 δολοφόνος φαλαινών. Φέτος η κυβέρνηση ανακοίνωσε ότι προτίθεται να διπλασιάσει τον αριθμό των φαλαινών που σκοτώνει. Στη συνέχεια, εξάγουν το κρέας στο εξωτερικό μέσω των ευρωπαϊκών λιμανιών. Η Νορβηγία δεν έχει δεχθεί κυρώσεις για τις μαζικές δολοφονίες που διαπράττει. Σήμερα, λοιπόν, όλοι μαζί πρέπει να στείλουμε ένα ηχηρό μήνυμα προς τη Νορβηγία, αλλά και να αφυπνίσουμε όσους δεν γνωρίζουν για το έγκλημα αυτό.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the speakers for their constructive comments. I have already underlined some steps that have been taken by my colleague Commissioner Vella to put pressure on Norway to stop whale hunting, and I would like to answer the question: why does the Commission not have information about the quantities and destinations of whale meat transported via EU ports?

From my homework on the subject, it is clear that the Commission does not have statistics on the quantities of whale meat transiting through ports of EU Member States, as there is no obligation under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) to report the volume of CITES-listed products transiting through the territories of CITES states parties. The authorities in the EU Member States are, however, fully aware of their obligations to control shipments of CITES-listed products transiting through their ports. The Commission has discussed this issue with EU Member States on several occasions.

As I stated before, the Commission intends to make sure that the EU continues to take an active position on whaling and works with its international partners to press for decisions consistent with the EU approach and leading to better conservation of whales worldwide. For that reason, the Commission will present in September a proposal for a Council decision establishing the position to be adopted on behalf of the European Union at the next three meetings of the International Whaling Commission, including related inter-sessional meetings and actions. This proposal might also be the basis for further EU bilateral action vis-à-vis whaling countries.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wrześniu.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Marlene Mizzi (S&D), *in writing*. – The EU has consistently supported in the International Whaling Commission (IWC) the global moratorium on commercial whaling. It has also clearly positioned itself against trade in whale products in CITES meetings. It is therefore problematic that Norway not only continues to take whales for commercial purposes but has also become the most prolific world whaler, killing more whales in the past two years than Japan and Iceland combined. Norway's practice of exporting whale products via EU Member States' ports also threatens the consistency of EU policies in relation to whales and other cetaceans. Animals are sentient beings. Whether they are wild, farm or domestic, animals should be treated with dignity and respect. Animals have no voice or vote to protest against the atrocious behaviour of humans. We have to show how civil and caring we are by giving voice to these beings – which at times are more civil and loving than man. Therefore, it is extremely important that the EU continue to take its strong position and necessary measures, together with its international partners, to engage with Norway towards reaching decisions more consistent with the EU approach and leading to better conservation of whales worldwide.

8. Debaty nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i praworządności (debata)

8.1. Sprawy laureata Nagrody Nobla Liu Xiaobo oraz Lee Miong-che

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie laureata Nagrody Nobla Liu Xiaobo oraz Lee Miong-che (2017/2754(RSP)).

Helga Trüpel, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident! Meine Damen und Herren, die Menschenrechtssituation in China hat sich in den letzten Jahren leider wieder verschärft, gerade auch, nachdem Xi Jinping Staatspräsident geworden ist. Liu Xiaobo hat den Friedensnobelpreis für sein Eintreten für Menschenrechte, für Gewaltenteilung, für Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Minderheitenschutz bekommen. Seine Verhaftung und die lange Haftstrafe von elf Jahren waren immer falsch – genauso wie der Hausarrest für seine Frau immer falsch gewesen ist – und eine reine Schikane durch die chinesische Regierung.

Jetzt ist Liu Xiaobo schwer erkrankt. Wir fordern seine sofortige Freilassung aus der Haft – freigelassen ist er nämlich noch nicht, er ist nur in ein Krankenhaus verlegt worden. Wir verlangen, dass er seine Freunde und Anwälte treffen kann und dass er reisen kann und dass er frei entscheiden kann, wo er sich behandeln lassen will.

Das ist eine klare politische Aufforderung an die chinesische Regierung, und es ist eine klare humanitäre Verpflichtung, einen so schwer kranken Menschen nicht weiter dieser schrecklichen Haft zu unterziehen. Ich verlange auch, dass diese Frage Thema beim G20-Gipfel in Hamburg wird.

Soraya Post, *author*. – Mr President, we stand with those who fight for human rights and freedom of expression across the world. Liu Xiaobo and Lee Ming-che have experienced the deprivation of their liberty and basic human rights for too long. Their cases are not isolated. While we welcome the news that Liu Xiaobo has been released from prison on medical parole, this is ultimately too little and too late. Taiwanese activist Lee Ming-che remains detained without clear or credible allegations proved against him. Activists who are simply doing their job are being repressed and imprisoned. All activists imprisoned for legitimate activities must be immediately and unconditionally released.

Hilde Vautmans, *Auteur*. – Elf jaar heeft Liu Xiaobo in gevangenschap doorgebracht, zonder eerlijk proces, zonder contact met zijn familie, in slechte omstandigheden en tot een ernstige leverkanker niet meer te negeren viel. En ook bij de uitreiking van zijn Nobelprijs bleef zijn stoel leeg.

Deze man is één van de meest bewonderenswaardige mensen op de wereld. Hij heeft voor zijn activisme zijn vrijheid opgegeven. Hetzelfde geldt voor Lee Ming-che. Ook hij is het slachtoffer van China's repressieve beleid. Ook hij is een activist die zijn vrijheid heeft opgegeven voor de strijd voor de mensenrechten. Eigenlijk wordt het hoog tijd dat wij vanuit Europa aan China een duidelijk signaal geven: laat de mensenrechtenactivisten onmiddellijk vrij. Zij horen niet thuis in gevangenschap.

Twee, geef hen natuurlijk de nodige medische hulp, ook dat is menswaardig. En drie, en dat is iets wat ik de Europese Unie steeds opnieuw vraag: we moeten overal ter wereld blijven strijden voor mensenrechten.

Deze twee mannen hebben met hun scherpe pennen en vredelievende inzet al heel veel levens gered. Nu is het aan ons om voor hen hetzelfde te doen.

Charles Tannock, *author*. – Mr President, the cases of Liu Xiaobo and Lee Ming-che are very concerning, but sadly unsurprising and, in fact, predictable, given the severe lack of freedom of speech and expression that we are now all too familiar with in the People's Republic of China. They form part of a systematic crackdown on civil society and opposition to the one-party politics of the PRC. Therefore I echo the calls in the resolution of this House to see the release of both the individuals in question and hope that Xiaobo and his wife will be given permission to leave the country, if desired, in view of Xiaobo's ongoing serious medical needs.

Meanwhile, the situation in Tibet, the plight of the Falun Gong in Hong Kong, the fate of democracy in the two systems, one country policy, and the issues of media and internet freedom are all areas of major concern to the European Union. China is a global power that we are unable to ignore, but this should not mean that we shy away from highlighting areas of concern where we see them, nor deny the importance that we place upon fundamental and universal human rights.

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK*Vizepräsidentin*

Michaela Šojdrová, author. – Madam President, the case of Liu Xiaobo and Lee Ming-che are different from each other but are both attributable to similar reasons. We strongly condemn the long-term persecution of this most famous Chinese dissident who got inspiration from Václav Havel. Liu Xiaobo is seriously ill and near death.

A different case is a young men from Thailand, Lee Ming-che who came to China to talk about human rights and was arrested without any evidence. His case also points to the absence of rule of law in China.

He is In fact, a citizen of another country which China treats as its territory. There are many persecuted people in China. We cannot name them all, but we have therefore symbolically added a reference to the recently arrested Catholic Bishop Peter Shao Zhumin.

We should strengthen our human rights dialogue with China regardless of our economic interests. Thank you, colleagues, for your support.

Cristian Dan Preda, au nom du groupe PPE. – Madame la Présidente, le destin de Liu Xiaobo, prix Nobel de la paix, montre ce que la répression brutale exercée par les autorités chinoises sur des dissidents représente.

Le seul crime de Liu Xiaobo, arbitrairement condamné à onze ans de prison, a été de demander des réformes constitutionnelles et le respect de la démocratie et des droits de l'homme. En mettant Liu Xiaobo derrière les barreaux, la Chine n'a pas seulement emprisonné un homme, elle a enfermé l'espoir démocratique de toute une nation.

Les autorités chinoises ont attendu que son cancer soit en phase terminale avant de lui accorder une liberté conditionnelle. Elles n'ont même pas la décence de le laisser choisir d'être traité ailleurs que dans un pays qui le persécute.

Tout comme Liu Xiaobo, le défenseur des droits de l'homme taïwanais, Lee Ming-che, a été arrêté pour subversion. Les lois liberticides chinoises sur la sécurité nationale donnent au régime un pouvoir absolu afin de museler les ONG et la société civile.

Pour Liu Xiaobo et Lee Ming-che, nous réclamons une libération immédiate et inconditionnelle.

Josef Weidenholzer, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn unsere Beziehungen zu China langfristig funktionieren sollen, dann muss man auch aufrichtig miteinander umgehen. Daher müssen wir über Menschenrechte reden. Zwei Fälle beschäftigen uns heute – zwei von vielen wohlgemerkt. Fälle, die im Widerspruch zu allen internationalen Konventionen stehen, denen auch die Volksrepublik China beigetreten ist.

Der Fall von Lee Ming-che steht zudem auch im Widerspruch zum bilateralen Rechtshilfeabkommen zwischen Taiwan und China. Demnach hätten die chinesischen Behörden Taiwan unverzüglich von der am 19. März erfolgten Festnahme informieren müssen. Seit diesem Zeitpunkt gibt es keine befriedigenden Informationen über seinen Aufenthalt und die Umstände, unter denen er festgehalten wird.

Wir fordern daher eine umgehende Information über den Sachverhalt, das Recht auf Rechtsbeistand und medizinische Versorgung und eine unverzügliche Freilassung, sollten sich die Vorwürfe als unbegründet erweisen.

Bas Belder, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Een groot man in een groot land: Nobelprijswinnaar, wetenschapper, publicist Liu Xiaobo. In deze droeve tijden van ernstige ziekte leeft het Europees Parlement met hem en zijn echtgenote intens mee.

Liu Xiaobo heeft een indringende boodschap voor ons, ik citeer: “*Tyranny is not terrifying; what is really scary is submission, silence, and even praise for tyranny. As soon as people decide to oppose it to the bitter end, even the most vicious tyranny will be short-lived.*”

Liu Xiaobo pleitte in zijn rechtszaak van 2009 tegen de “psychologie van de haat” die een werkelijke modernisering en democratisering van China blokkeert. Hij paste dit principe persoonlijk toe door zijn bewaker Liu Zheng te loven voor diens houding van “respect en empathie”.

Liu Xiaobo: een groot man in een groot land!

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, un prix Nobel de la paix s'éteint doucement en Chine, libéré de prison pour faire taire le tollé, caché quelque part maintenant dans un hôpital du nord du pays, loin des tumultes et de la protestation du monde.

Liu Xiaobo se meurt. Son cancer du foie s'est généralisé et Pékin, pourtant, continue de refuser la demande de sa famille: être soigné à l'étranger. Mais, qu'on se rassure, des médecins étrangers viennent d'être invités à se rendre sur place au chevet du militant de la paix et, bien sûr, la participation, dès demain, du président Xi Jinping au G20 de Hambourg n'a rien à y voir. Cynisme infini des autorités chinoises qui refuseront jusqu'au bout de laisser mourir dans la dignité à laquelle il a droit le parrain du Printemps de Pékin.

Pas de clémence non plus pour Lee Ming-che, arrêté à Taïwan, en mars dernier. L'activiste paie le prix de la détérioration des relations entre la Chine et Taïwan. Un prix très lourd. Sa famille est sans nouvelles de lui et craint des actes de torture et la prison à vie. Défendre la démocratie sur les réseaux sociaux est un péché aux yeux de Pékin.

Alors quand les Vingt les plus puissants de la planète se verront, demain, à Hambourg, pour parler finance, pour parler économie et pour parler interconnexion, il appartiendra à Angela Merkel, à Emmanuel Macron, à Justin Trudeau et à tous les autres de rappeler que nos yeux aussi sont braqués sur le sort qui sera réservé à Lee, à Liu et à tous les autres.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Liu Xiaobo, der Friedensnobelpreisträger, ist zu elf Jahren Haft verurteilt worden, weil er seine Auffassungen frei gesagt hat – aus keinem anderen Grund. Seine Frau Liu Xia, die zu nichts verurteilt worden ist, wird trotzdem seit Jahren unter Hausarrest festgehalten. Liu Xiaobo und Liu Xia wollen jetzt, wo er Leberkrebs im Endstadium hat, das Land verlassen dürfen, um – die letzten Monate vielleicht – in ihrer eigenen Kontrolle für ihre Gesundheit sorgen zu können. Wir alle appellieren an die chinesische Führung, das zuzulassen. Die Unversöhnlichkeit und die Gnadenlosigkeit muss eine Grenze haben!

Margot Parker, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, this debate concerning Chinese provocations of citizens of both their own state and Taiwan is well timed. As it is the 20th anniversary of the takeover/handover of Hong Kong to the Chinese, I would like to focus my speech on Chinese actions there. One country, two systems was supposed to guarantee the Hong Kong way of life for 50 years, but already Chinese authorities are exerting undue influence on the political, legal and social life of Hong Kong. China must respect the terms of the Sino-British Joint Declaration as a legally binding document lodged with the United Nations. It must respect human rights and release its political prisoners. Similarly, the British Government must do more to uphold our end of the bargain and guarantee the freedoms Hong Kong enjoys under the existing terms of the agreement.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι γεγονός ότι στην Κίνα παραβιάζονται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Χαρακτηριστική περίπτωση είναι η φυλάκιση, με αόριστες και γενικόλογες κατηγορίες, δύο ακτιβιστών για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τη δημοκρατία, του Κινέζου Liú Xiǎobō, που έχει τιμηθεί και με βραβείο Νόμπελ, και του Ταϊβανού Li Ming-Che. Μάλιστα, ο πρώτος πάσχει από καρκίνο του ήπατος σε προχωρημένο στάδιο και δεν του επιτρέπεται να βγει από τη φυλακή ούτε για να πάει στο σπίτι του ούτε σε νοσοκομείο άλλης χώρας για θεραπεία. Τον προηγούμενο μήνα, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεν υπέγραψε επιστολή της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προς το Συμβούλιο Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων του ΟΗΕ, με την οποία καταδικάζονται η Κίνα για καταστολή των αντιπροσούντων και των ακτιβιστών, με αποτέλεσμα η επιστολή αυτή να μη δοθεί. Η συμπεριφορά αυτή της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης δεν με παραξένησε. Πρόσφατα, με αφορμή ένα ασημαντό περιστατικό, ο Πρόεδρος της Βουλής απαγόρευσε σε όλους τους βουλευτές του κόμματός μου, της Χρυσής Αυγής, τρίτης πολιτικής δύναμης της χώρας, να συμμετάσχουν στις εθνικές αντιπροσωπείες της Βουλής. Με τον τρόπο αυτόν η ελληνική κυβέρνηση απέδειξε ότι διακατέχεται από ολοκληρωτική νοοτροπία, υιοθετεί την απαράδεκτη αρχή της συλλογικής ευθύνης και σκοτώνει τη δημοκρατία στη χώρα στην οποία γεννήθηκε. Είμαι βέβαιος ότι καταδικάζετε και εσείς τη στάση της κυβέρνησης της Κίνας στην περίπτωση των δύο ακτιβιστών. Για τη στάση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης βρίσκετε κάποιο ελαφρυντικό;

László Tórkés (PPE). – Madam President, 'I have no enemies and no hatred' wrote Liu Xiaobo in his Nobel lecture in absentia in 2010, while serving his 11-year prison sentence for inciting subversion of state power. Today the words of the Nobel laureate and the empty chair at the ceremony resonate strongly. Diagnosed as terminally ill, he is now on medical parole but remains under tight control, and his wish to get medical treatment abroad has been rejected. For Beijing, China's best known political prisoner and civil rights campaigner is simply a criminal, but for Chinese civil society and human rights defenders he has been the greatest source of inspiration in their peaceful struggle for democratic reform in Communist China. He continues to be a source of inspiration for all of us who have embraced human rights, the rule of law and democracy and rejected every form of totalitarianism. This is the only path we can follow as partners of the Chinese Government and the only path that can guarantee the protection of human dignity.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Wielokrotne i wieloletnie przetrzymywanie wybitnego pisarza i dysydenta Liu Xiaobo jest niebywałym skandalem i mam nadzieję, że głos tej Izby dotrze do Pekinu i pozwoli zmienić tragiczną sytuację tego wybitnego człowieka. Sytuacja Lee Ming-che jest emanacją nie tylko polityki Chin, która wielokrotnie narusza prawa człowieka, lecz również polityki tego kraju wobec Tajwanu. Lee Min-che został zatrzymany pod całkowicie sfabrykowanymi zarzutami i te zarzuty działalności wyrotkowej przypominają mi najgorsze czasy stalinizmu w Polsce i stanu wojennego. Powinni zostać natychmiast uwolnieni.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru Formand! Kina er et stort land, en stor magt og en stor økonomi, som vi i Europa gensidigt er ved at åbne op overfor. Men det er vigtigt, at vi som stort handelsområde i EU i forbindelse med denne åbning mod Kina også sørger for at varetage menneskerettighedssituationen i landet. Selvom der har været store økonomiske og sociale åbninger, er situationen for de individuelle menneskerettigheder stadig på et alt for lavt stadie i Kina. Derfor er det vigtigt, at Europa-Parlamentet bliver ved med at lægge pres på, for at vi skal forbedre menneskerettighedssituationen, både for kinesere, der lever på fastlandet, men også sikre Taiwans sikkerhed i forhold til, at Kina ikke skal kunne presse sin demokratiske lillebror ud i en yderligere tilspidset situation. Derfor er det vigtigt, at vi i vores tilgang til Kina både er pragmatiske på det økonomiske område, og at vi også altid husker, at vi skal fremme menneskerettighederne, når Kina nu har en interesse i at handle med et stort marked som EU.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Liu Xiaobo e Lee Ming-che têm percursos de vida muito distintos. Liu Xiaobo é o mais célebre dissidente chinês, Prémio Nobel da Paz em 2010. Lee Ming-che foi até há pouco um discreto professor voluntário numa ONG local taiwanesa. Uma característica comum, a defesa dos direitos humanos aproximou os seus destinos. Ambos foram acusados de subversão e condenados a penas de prisão pelo regime chinês. Lee Ming-che está preso desde março em parte incerta e o Nobel da Paz, condenado em 2009 a 11 anos de prisão, foi libertado por razões médicas meses depois de lhe ter sido diagnosticado um cancro do fígado em fase terminal e está neste momento impedido pelas autoridades chinesas de receber tratamento médico no estrangeiro, como é de sua vontade.

Caros Colegas, no ano em que se celebra o 28º aniversário do massacre de Tiananmen, a União Europeia deve condenar de forma clara a intensificação da repressão da liberdade de expressão e de religião que desde 2011 se verifica na China, exigir a libertação imediata de todos os presos de consciência naquele país e pedir às autoridades chinesas que permitam que o histórico ativista Liu Xiaobo receba onde bem entender o tratamento urgente de que tanto necessita.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, «Je n'ai pas d'ennemis, je n'ai pas de haine» disait Liu Xiaobo, lors de sa grève de la faim, pendant le mouvement de Tiananmen, en 1989, et ceci 21 ans avant de se voir attribuer le prix Nobel de la paix. Un prix qu'il n'a jamais pu récupérer à Oslo car il a été emprisonné pendant 11 ans pour, je cite: «incitation à la subversion de l'État».

«Je n'ai pas d'ennemis, je n'ai pas de haine», aurait pu dire Lee Ming-che, cet éducateur et militant taiwanais, enlevé par la République populaire chinoise, car soupçonné, je cite encore: «d'activités mettant en danger la sécurité de l'État».

«Elle a des ennemis et tant de haine», pourrait-on dire de la Chine, lorsque l'on voit le nombre de dissidents politiques qui, année après année, continuent d'être arrêtés et emprisonnés.

Quand l'Union européenne sortira-t-elle de sa timidité diplomatique et aura-t-elle, enfin, le courage de dénoncer unanimement ces violations des droits de l'homme par la Chine, qui met sous les verrous des hommes dont le seul «vice» est de s'être librement exprimés?

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Hihetetlen, hogy az emberi jogok kérdését hányszor írja felül a politika és a gazdasági szükség-szerűség. Az Unió valóban határozottabban kiállhatna az emberi jogok védelméért. És ezt legfőképpen akkor tehetné, ha példát mutatna az emberi jogok kérdésében, védelmében az Unión belül is. Csak egy inkluzív, szociálisan érzékeny, igazságos, ugyanakkor fenntartható gazdálkodás mellett folyamatosan emelkedő életszínvonalat és biztonságot adó gazdasági és társadalmi rendszer lehet vonzó a világ többi része számára. Tegyünk azért, hogy ez realitás legyen az Unión belül is, és akkor már mindjárt könnyebb dolgunk lesz meggyőzni a kínaiakat, hogy nekik is ezt az utat kell követniük. Hihetetlen, hogy csak gondoljunk arra, a dalai lámát hogyan fogadják vagy nem fogadják egyes politikai vezetők, azért, mert félnek és rettegnek Kínától. Hol van az emberi tartása az Uniónak? Hol van az emberi jogok védelme? Erre figyeljünk!

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem rád podepsal návrh usnesení k tomuto bodu a chtěl bych se rovněž zastat těch dvou, kteří jsou jmenováni v tomto návrhu usnesení.

Dovolil bych si náš zrak možná upřít ještě k další okolnosti. Čína podepsala skutečně řadu lidskoprávních smluv v období minulých vlastně 70 let od konce druhé světové války a v zásadě je bezostyšně porušuje. Já si myslím, že my musíme vest s Čínou dialog, musíme mluvit, protože my můžeme. A je fakt, že řada lidí, kteří v Číně jsou, mluvit nemůžou. Mám nic nehrozí a vysíláme do Číny řadu delegací za instituce Evropské unie, myslím si, že bychom měli opravdu každé takové příležitosti využít a na každé takové delegaci o závažném porušování lidských práv mluvit. My, když můžeme, bychom skutečně vést dialog měli a máme tu povinnost.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, since the detention and conviction of Mr Liu Xiaobo in 2009, the European Union has been following his case closely and advocating that he be released. This has been done both through bilateral meetings with the Chinese authorities and of course through public statements.

We are extremely saddened at the recent news about Mr Liu's health and I want to underline that we stand ready to provide all necessary assistance for Mr Liu and his wife, if they wish to receive medical care in the European Union. According to our information, Mr Liu and his wife cannot move or communicate freely and are not being allowed to receive medical care at a place of their choice, whether in China or overseas.

We are continuing to urge China to allow Mr Liu and his family to meet, and receive visits from, anyone they wish and to communicate freely with the outside world. We have also been concerned about the videos which appear to show Mr Liu receiving medical treatment and his family expressing gratitude for the medical care that he has received. We do not believe that any individual should be videotaped or otherwise recorded without their express consent.

A word about Mr Lee Ming-che. The European Union has been following Mr Lee's case since he disappeared last March. Mr Lee was detained by the Chinese authorities for exercising his right of freedom of expression and opinion, which should be guaranteed under China's Constitution and its international human rights commitments. We also have reason to believe that Mr Lee is being held at an undisclosed location under what is called residential surveillance at a designated location, which is provided for by China's criminal procedure law.

In its December 2015 review of China's conduct, the UN Committee Against Torture recommended that such residential surveillance should be repealed 'as a matter of urgency', as it could increase the risk of mistreatment. Mr Lee should be held in a recognised state facility. The Chinese authorities should clarify his place of detention immediately and allow him access to his family and a lawyer of his own choosing.

Regarding the fact that there was No EU item for a statement at the June session of the UN Human Rights Council, the EU continues to advocate addressing country situations of concern at the Human Rights Council by leaving several country-specific resolutions under individual items and actively intervening in the Council's general debates and interactive dialogue under the relevant agenda items. The global human rights agenda is, frankly, best served when the European Union speaks with one voice. We will continue our work to bring all 28 together and to align positions for the next Human Rights Council in order to stand strong and united on these important issues.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet im Anschluss an die Aussprache statt.

8.2. Erytrea, a w szczególności sprawy Abune Antoniosa i Dawita Isaaka

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zu Eritrea, insbesondere die Fälle von Abune Antonios und Dawit Isaak (2017/2755(RSP)).

Bodil Valero, författare. – Fru talman! Jag väljer att tala om den svenska medborgaren Dawit Isaak som sitter fängslad utan rättegång i Eritrea.

I skuggan av terrorattackerna i USA den 11 september 2001 passade Eritreas president på att sätta stopp för all kritik av landets ledning. Den oberoende pressen stängdes, politiker, statstjänstemän och minst 11 journalister fängslades utan rättegång, bland dem Dawit Isaak.

Brotten mot de mänskliga rättigheterna i Eritrea upphör inte trots alla påtryckningar från omvärlden.

Engagemanget för Dawits frigivning är starkt i Sverige. Enligt ett reportage i Dagens Nyheter 2010 levde Dawit som fånge nr 36 i ett odsligt beläget fängelse, kedjad under jord. Cellerna uppges vara fuktiga, överfulla och hälsovådliga. Fångarna har dålig tillgång till vatten och svälter men det viktigaste i artikeln kan ändå sägas vara att det från trovärdiga källor bekräftades att Dawit Isaak då ännu var vid liv.

Samma år uttalade en företrädare för den eritreanska regimen att Dawit Isaak inte någonsin kan påräkna rättegång, eftersom han av regimen tillsammans med andra fångar påstås utgöra ett hot mot nationen Eritreas existens.

Dawit familj lever i total ovisshet, så också vi andra. Därför är den här resolutionen så viktig idag.

Soraya Post, author. – Madam President, the S&D Group is committed to working for the observance of all fundamental human rights. That is why we initiated this resolution. We are seeing an increase in violence directed against journalists and democracy and human-rights activists across the world.

Sixteen years have passed – that is how long Dawit Isaak and other journalists and democracy activists have been imprisoned in Eritrea. Dawit has become a symbol for the struggle for human rights and press freedom. But for many people he is more than a symbol. Back home in Sweden, where he has his loved ones, he is dearly missed, as are the other imprisoned journalists.

Sixteen years have passed, and this is our message to the Eritrean Government: at least let us hear from him!

Our message to the Commission is: hear us! This Parliament has repeatedly stated that no development cooperation can be pursued with the Eritrean Government as long as they do not respect human rights and set Dawit Isaak and others free. Yet major aid to Eritrea under the European Development Fund has been resumed and a EUR 200 million National Indicative Programme has been signed off.

Our resolution denounces this renewal of business as usual. This money cannot go to the Eritrean Government. It must be used to promote democracy and human rights, in the hands of civil society, with not a single cent to the regime.

We will not forget about Dawit Isaak and others. We will not let them down.

Cecilia Wikström, *författare*. – Fru talman! Han är en svensk och eritreansk journalist som varit fängslad i mer än 15 år utan vare sig advokat eller rättegång. Helt avskuren från sin familj. Han är EU:s ende samvetsfånge. Han heter Dawit Isaak.

Dawit visade ett fantastiskt mod som journalist. Med fara för sitt eget liv vågade han stå upp för sina medmänniskor och berätta deras historier och livsöden. Pennan var det som var hans vapen när han stred för yttrandefrihet och andra mänskliga rättigheter. Idag är han fängslad.

Eritreas brott mot mänskligheten får inte fortgå ostört. Det är hög tid nu för den svenska regeringen och för EU-kommissionen att äntligen använda kännbara påtryckningsmedel mot Eritrea.

Vi måste införa reseförbud till EU för ledande personer i Eritreas regim. Vi måste stoppa den illegala skatteindrivningen av EU-medborgare med eritreansk ursprung som pågår i medlemsländerna och ställa krav på att mänskliga rättigheter äntligen ska respekteras i Eritrea.

Att stå upp och försvara demokrati och mänskliga fri- och rättigheter är vårt viktigaste uppdrag i EU. På hemmaplan och i hela världen. Tillsammans kan vi bryta ner de mäktigaste väggarna av förtryck och motstånd.

Dawit Isaaks modiga kamp mot diktatur förtjänar att tilldelas Sacharovpriset det här året, och det tänker jag nominera honom för.

Nu är det vårt ansvar att använda vår röst, den röst som Dawit Isaak har berövats.

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

Ana Gomes (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Ms Wikström, you said that Dawit Isaak was Europe's only prisoner of conscience. That is not true, you know, because elsewhere there are other such cases – for instance in Ethiopia, where the British Ethiopian citizen Andy Tsege has been kidnapped and is in prison. No matter how much solidarity I have with you on the fate of Dawit Isaak, it is incorrect to say that he is the only one.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – I don't think we should quarrel about this. Dawit Isaak has been a prisoner of conscience for a very long time – more than 15, almost 16 years – and if there is now another one, then it is even worse. So let us join forces and fight for both of them. If there are any more prisoners of conscience, it is only proof that we have not done enough.

Charles Tannock, *author*. – Madam President, given the brutal regime of President Afwerki in Eritrea and his role in ruining that country's prospects, following its independence from Ethiopia in 1991, we often focus on the wider diplomatic picture. But today we are focusing on two individuals, Abune Antonios and Dawit Isaak.

Antonios, the Patriarch of the Eritrean Orthodox Church, has been under house arrest for the past decade. Isaak, a naturalised Swede and a journalist, has been in jail for more than 15 years and has not been seen since 2005. Jailed for his reporting of the corruption and injustices of the Afwerki regime, his case is emblematic of the totalitarian dictatorship that we now see in Eritrea, a regime that sees thousands of young men fleeing conscription and the brutalities of daily life. With 416 000 Eritrean refugees worldwide, this makes it the ninth largest country of origin for refugees, a staggering figure for a country with a population of only 6 million people.

Therefore I now call on Parliament and the Commission to consider consultation under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement. I actually called for this almost 18 years ago for the first time and I am calling for it again.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *auteure*. – Madame la Présidente, oui, Dawit Isaak est un symbole. Journaliste suédo-érythréen, il a été arrêté en septembre 2001 parmi des dizaines d'autres, au moment où le pays a sombré dans la dictature. En Érythrée, il n'existe plus aucune presse libre depuis cette date.

Abune Antonios, ancien patriarche de l'Église orthodoxe, est un autre symbole. Il a été emprisonné en 2016 pour avoir refusé d'excommunier 3 000 de ses paroissiens qui s'opposaient au régime.

Depuis quelques mois, les choses semblent s'aggraver.

(La présidente interrompt l'oratrice)

President. – What is the problem?

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Madam President, there is no interpretation into Czech, so I do not know if the system is functioning.

President. – It is working now. Ms Vergiat, you get another 20 to 30 seconds.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *auteure*. – Madame la Présidente, au moins 30 secondes parce que c'était à peine à 30 quand j'ai été interrompue. Il faut que je retrouve où j'en suis, d'ailleurs. Je recommence une phrase, je suis désolée, soyez indulgente.

Depuis quelques mois, les choses semblent s'aggraver. La rapporteure spéciale de l'ONU parle de violations systématiques et généralisées pouvant constituer des crimes contre l'humanité. C'est ce moment que choisit l'Union européenne pour faire de l'Érythrée un partenaire du projet «Better Migration Management» et lui octroyer 46 millions d'euros, plus 5 millions via le programme ROCK destiné à la formation de policiers et de garde-frontières.

On nous dit que le gouvernement érythréen ne profitera pas directement de ces fonds. Permettez-moi d'être sceptique, c'est simplement impossible dans ce pays de faire quoi que ce soit sans passer par le gouvernement. Quelle sera la prochaine étape? L'expulsion d'Érythréens vers leur pays d'origine? L'Union ne peut continuer à cautionner les régimes qui sont à l'origine même des migrations.

Lars Adaktusson, *author*. – Madam President, Eritrea is one of the most ruthless dictatorships in the world. President Isaias Afwerki has imposed a rule of fear through extreme abuses against his own people. The evil acts of Afwerki amount to crimes against humanity. He has jailed at least 10 000 political prisoners.

Today we are focusing on two of these prisoners – two innocent individuals whose lives have been destroyed by Afwerki. Let us never give up the struggle for Dawit Isaak and Abune Antonios. Let us never forget their remarkable courage.

Right now three measures are crucial: aid to Eritrea has to be strictly conditional; the illegal diaspora tax has to be halted in all EU Member States; and Afwerki and his patrons should be prosecuted for crimes against humanity.

The brave people of Eritrea deserve to live in freedom. We have a responsibility to assist them towards a brighter future.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl říct, že situace v Eritreji je dlouhodobě vážná. Odstrašující je především politický stav země, která nedodrží žádné mezinárodní smlouvy. Neexistuje systém národních voleb, nezávislého soudního systému či právního státu, což je pro mě jednoznačným důkazem toho, že to je největší autoritářský režim na světě. Proto naprosto souhlasím s přístupem Evropské unie a jsem přesvědčen, že je zapotřebí zavést ještě silnější opatření.

Jytte Guteland, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Den här klockan visar den stulna tiden från Dawit Isaak. Det är nära 16 år av fångenskap, nära 16 år av ovisshet och oro för hans nära och kära.

Europaparlamentet enas här idag för att sätta press på Eritreas regering att agera. Vi har sagt det förr, och vi säger det igen. Vi uppmanar Eritrea att omedelbart bekräfta Dawit Isaaks välbefinnande. Frige honom. Sätt honom i samband med juridiska ombud och framförallt med hans familj.

Ord och löften räcker inte. Nu krävs det handling. Vi måste få veta att han lever och mår bra. Vi kräver också att frihetsberövanden av opposition, journalister och oskyldiga civila upphör. Här, fru talman, 5764 dagar, 23 timmar, elva minuter och nu också 6 sekunder. Så här länge har Dawit Isaaks tid stulits från honom. Det räcker nu.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já chci podpořit toto usnesení, které dnes přijímáme. Týká se dvou vězňů svědomí, pana Antoniose a pana Isaaka, ale je třeba říci, že celkově režim v Eritreji patří dnes k nejhorším na světě. Je to režim, který porušuje vůbec základní lidská práva, víceméně vůči občanům se chová stylem, že občané jsou vnímáni jako otroci, kteří musí povinně nastoupit do armády bez uvedení doby, po kterou musí v armádě sloužit. Jsou tam katastrofické podmínky likvidace politické opozice, novinářů, představitelů duchovní sféry a je dobře, že to usnesení, které dnes přijímáme, se zabývá myšlenkou, že bychom opravdu měli zrušit ekonomickou podporu této země, protože peníze, které tam posíláme, stejně ukradne korupční vláda, korupční prezident a mezi obyvatelé se nedostanou. Takže to usnesení vítám a jsem rád, že vedle osudu dvou vězňů, který tu byl podrobně popsán, hodnotíme celkově situaci v této nešťastné zemi.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – O jornalista eritreu-sueco Dawit Isaak é um dos milhares de prisioneiros na Eritreia sobre os quais nada sabemos. O venerado patriarca Antonios ousou protestar contra prisões arbitrárias e foi destituído e feito desaparecer. O regime de Isaias Afwerki submete há anos o povo eritreu a um regime de terror, com tortura, detenções arbitrárias, desaparecimentos, recrutamento militar indefinido, trabalho forçado, etc... Não admira que tantos eritreus arrisquem a vida em perigosas travessias em busca de refúgio.

Em vez de trabalhar estrategicamente com outros parceiros para aliviar o sofrimento dos eritreus e acolher os que fogem, a União Europeia negociou com o Governo de Isaias Afwerki 200 milhões de euros do FED para investimentos sem condicionalidade para travar o surto de refugiados. Esta política não é apenas um desperdício de dinheiro público, é uma traição aos valores que deviam nortear a nossa política externa e de desenvolvimento para fazer a diferença pelos eritreus e isso implica promover a transformação democrática na Eritreia.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση στην Ερυθραία είναι πλέον εκτός ελέγχου λόγω των πολιτικών διώξεων στις οποίες προβαίνει το καθεστώς, αλλά και λόγω της απερίοριστης αναγκαστικής στρατιωτικής θητείας. Έτσι, πάνω από 400.000 άτομα, ήτοι το 9% του πληθυσμού της χώρας, έχουν φύγει άρον-άρον από την Ερυθραία, αυξάνοντας τις προσφυγικές ροές προς την Ευρώπη. Η σεξουαλική βία, όχι μόνο κατά των γυναικών αλλά και στα στρατόπεδα εκπαίδευσης, είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη. Ταυτόχρονα, το καθεστώς ολοκληρώνει τον έλεγχό του κατά του πληθυσμού, επιβάλλοντας φόρο εισοδήματος ομογενών 2%.

Θύματα του καθεστώτος είναι ο Abune Antonios, ο πατριάρχης της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας της Ερυθραίας, της μεγαλύτερης θρησκευτικής κοινότητας, ο οποίος έχει τεθεί υπό κράτηση εδώ και δέκα χρόνια, από το 2007, επειδή αρνήθηκε να αφορίσει 3.000 μέλη της ενορίας του, που αντιτάχθηκαν στην κυβέρνηση. Επίσης, ο ακτιβιστής Dawit Isaak είναι και αυτός υπό κράτηση. Άμεση απελευθέρωση όλων των πολιτικών κρατουμένων!

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, is í an Eiritré an tír is measa ar domhan ó thaobh cearta daonna de agus tá sé ag éirí níos measa de réir na bliana. Tá gach saghas éagóir ar siúl ann, go háirithe le mná agus leanaí agus ní nach ionadh go bhfuil daoine ag teitheadh ón dtír. Tá 400,000 duine tar éis an tír a fhágáil. Freisin, maidir le Dawit Isaak, gabhadh é in 2001. An bhfuil sé beo? Níl a fhios againn, ach tá sé de dhualgas ar an rialtas insint dá chlann agus do chuile dhuine mar gheall air. Freisin mar gheall ar an Patrarc Antonios. Tá sé i bpríosún ó 2007 in áit anaithnid agus deirtear nach bhfuil cóir leighis ar fáil aige.

Dá bhrí sin is dóigh liom gur cheart dúinne gan aon airgead a thabhairt don Eiritré. Táimid ag tabhairt €200 milliún dóibh agus is dóigh liom gur cheart cosc a chur air sin go dtí go bhfaighimid freagra ar na ceisteanna seo.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, regretfully we do not see any improvement with regard to human rights violations in Eritrea. A huge number of Eritrean people, including children, are still being arrested for various unjustifiable reasons and held in extremely harsh conditions.

Dawit Isaak's incarceration has become an international symbol for the struggle for freedom of the press in Eritrea. He should be immediately and unconditionally released, together with all prisoners of conscience.

In addition, Abune Antonios should be allowed to return to his position as Patriarch. Freedom of religion is a fundamental right, and any violence or discrimination on the grounds of religion must be condemned.

Commissioner, as you know, as chair of Working Group A of the Committee on Development, I oppose the granting of money under the National Indicative Programme for Eritrea until these issues are resolved: until the prisoners are released, the Patriarch is reinstated and this autocratic dictatorship, which is not acceptable, has come to an end.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci podotknout, že souhlasím se všemi svými předřečníky a nebudu popisovat tu situaci v Eritreji tak, jak už byla řečena.

Eritrea je jeden z nejmladších států, ale ta, která se potýká s nejhroším porušováním lidských práv, s masivním, různým porušováním lidských práv. Myslím si, že ten návrh, který padl a je obsažen v usnesení, aby ta pomoc byla podmíněně zastavena, ten si myslím, že je velmi, velmi pádný.

My bychom měli chtít, aby za peníze, které poskytuje Evropská unie, byly konkrétně měřitelné efekty v určitých krocích. Není možné posílat peníze za situace, kdy nedostáváme odpovědi na naše otázky. A to usnesení, které se týká pouze dvou lidí, samozřejmě ti jsou těmi, kteří jsou takto navíceni, ale je dalších bezejmenných tisíce a tisíce lidí, kteří trpí pod režimem, jehož jedinou hlavní silou je naverbovat desetinu svých občanů do své armády. To si myslím, že by mělo být zásadní memento pro nás.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, la population érythréenne vit un calvaire depuis trop longtemps. Dans le huis clos de ce pays qui a récemment acquis son indépendance se joue un drame humain et politique.

Dawit Isaak est devenu un symbole international, mais beaucoup d'autres citoyens, notamment des femmes, souffrent de la privation de leurs droits fondamentaux et subissent des violences.

Il n'y a pas d'autre terme que celui d'«esclavagisme» pour décrire ce que subissent les 400 000 personnes actuellement enrôlées d'office dans ce que les autorités locales appellent pudiquement «service national».

L'Union européenne accompagne de façon significative l'Érythrée – avec un financement autour de 200 millions d'euros – et a le droit, me semble-t-il, mais aussi le devoir, d'agir, en subordonnant son aide au respect minimum des droits de l'homme.

J'invite, par ailleurs, les États membres à accueillir les Érythréens demandeurs d'asile, qui seraient condamnés à l'enfer en cas de retour dans leur pays.

Brian Hayes (PPE). – Madam President, the issue of human-rights violations in Eritrea is a serious issue, but it is no more serious than the situation in a whole host of countries in Africa that we continue to support. I think it is very important that, in this motion, we once again send a clear message to the Eritrean Government in relation to those human-rights violations.

Unlike other colleagues, I still believe that engagement with Eritrea is important. It is a country caught in a time warp. It is a country that needs to understand the obligations under international law that we, as EU citizens, demand. That is why I went to Eritrea last year. I suspect that I am the only member of this assembly speaking here today who has actually been to Eritrea in the past 12 months. I would ask other colleagues to do the same because it is only through engagement that we can actually change policy in Eritrea. It is only through reaching out that we can change policy in Eritrea.

I want to put on the record that the EU funds that have come through the development budget have made a big difference to the lives of ordinary people – ordinary Eritreans – in terms of solar power, electricity connectivity, building capacity within the judicial system and in other systems of government. It is important that we remain committed to funding Eritrea and that we have a more balanced approach in this whole debate.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, there is no doubt that I share the honourable Members' frustration about the situation in Eritrea, and maybe if I still had my former position as an MEP I would say that enough is enough, but now I am on the other side in this plenary.

The European Union is concerned over continued human-rights violations in Eritrea and, in particular, about the cases of His Holiness Abune Antonios and Dawit Isaak. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is, for all of us, a core value of the European Union and a key priority in EU internal and external policy. It therefore features regularly in our political dialogue with the Eritrean authorities.

The case of Dawit Isaak has been of major concern since his arbitrary arrest in September 2001. His continued detention since then, without charges, trial or legal counsel, represents a serious violation of international obligations by Eritrea. The same applies in respect of the other 10 independent journalists, and honourable Members have already focused on this. We are also worried about the situation of His Holiness Abune Antonios, Patriarch of the Eritrean Orthodox Church, who marks his tenth year of incommunicado house arrest in an unknown location, although he has never been charged with any offence.

We regularly address these issues at the highest level of the Government of Eritrea and draw attention to them in international forums, including the United Nations Human Rights Council. Since 2001, the EU has regularly issued statements calling for the immediate and unconditional release of political prisoners in Eritrea. The Union also regularly asks the Eritrean authorities to take all necessary steps to comply with their international commitments, including on freedom of religion or belief and freedom of expression, association and assembly.

In line with the resolution of the UN Human Rights Council on the human-rights situation in Eritrea which was adopted in June this year, the EU continues to engage with Eritrea with a view to improving the human-rights situation on the ground. The EU will support the full implementation of the recommendations made to Eritrea under the UN-led Universal Periodic Review. The EU will continue to press for an improvement in the human-rights situation in Eritrea and urge the Government of Eritrea to release the political prisoners, including Dawit Isaak.

Moreover, the EU shall request that all information on the whereabouts of these prisoners is made public and that they have access to their families and lawyers, not least on humanitarian grounds. At the same time, the EU will continue to promote freedom of religion or belief – a right that should be exercised everywhere by all – on the basis of the principles of universality, equality and non-discrimination.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet im Anschluss an die Aussprache statt.

Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais faire remarquer à Monsieur le Commissaire que nous avons été nombreux à l'interroger sur la question des fonds alloués par l'Union européenne et que nous n'avons obtenu aucune réponse en la matière. Je trouve cela dommage.

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Kommissar! Haben Sie noch eine Antwort auf die Frage der Finanzierung, die Madame Vergiat jetzt noch mal angesprochen hat?

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am not ready to answer these questions today. I can, of course, respect this request but it is difficult to give an immediate answer. I would like to give a written answer.

President. – Thank you. We will expect your answer.

8.3. Burundi

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Aussprache über sieben Entschließungsanträge zu Burundi (2017/2756 (RSP)).

Judith Sargentini, Auteur. – Na een debat over Eritrea nog een heel erg donker hoofdstuk. In april 2015 wilde de president van Burundi, president Nkurunziza, een derde ambtstermijn. En nu, juli 2017, zijn er 400 000 mensen gevlucht, 200 000 mensen binnenlands gevlucht, 3 miljoen mensen in nood, tweeënhalf miljoen mensen die niet zeker weten of ze morgen nog te eten hebben en 700 000 mensen die acuut voedselhulp nodig hebben. En dat vanwege een man die vier tot vijf jaar langer wilde regeren. Nkurunziza is ook bezig met etnische zuiveringen in zijn leger, waarbij het hele onderscheid tussen Hutu's en Tutsi's weer terugkeert en de repercussies hiervan op de regio kunnen we verwachten.

Het destabiliseren van Burundi leidt tot het destabiliseren van de landen eromheen en ik maak mij zorgen dat wij een burgeroorlog tegemoet gaan zien die opnieuw al die landen raakt.

Charles Tannock, author. – Madam President, the re-election of President Nkurunziza in 2015 was highly controversial, given the questions surrounding the legitimacy of his eligibility for a third term, and in fact Article 96 consultation was invoked. The boycott of that election by the opposition and his subsequent re-election has provoked increasing tension. Recent speculation that Nkurunziza is seeking to amend the law so as to allow him to run again in 2020 for a fourth term is concerning. Meanwhile, the resulting human rights situation is also very worrying. Nkurunziza's party's youth wing and quasi-militia, the Imbonerakure, is held responsible for the intimidation, rape, attack and forced disappearances of a number of opposition figures and supporters.

Given the fragility and conflict in Burundi's neighbouring states, finding a way through the impasse is vital. There are reports of an increasingly ethnic dimension – between Hutus and Tutsis – to the violence, and this has the potential to significantly worsen and protract the problem. Therefore we must all now seek action before the situation reaches that terrible point.

Maria Arena, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, le Burundi est un pays aujourd'hui ravagé. Depuis avril 2015, après la décision de Nkurunziza de ne pas respecter la Constitution, le pays est rentré dans un cycle infernal de répression. En deux ans, 1 200 tués, entre 400 et 900 victimes de disparitions, des milliers d'arrestations arbitraires, plus de 40 000 - Burundais déplacés, et cela dans une situation socio-économique désastreuse qui pèse sur l'ensemble de la population burundaise.

Les violences sont commises par les services de sécurité burundais et par des milices qui agissent également sur leurs ordres. Un paysage politique avec un parti unique, un paysage médiatique réduit à néant, une justice totalement au service du régime et, comme si ce tableau ne suffisait pas, Nkurunziza tente de changer la Constitution pour pouvoir instaurer une dictature au-delà de 2020.

En arrière-fond, nous vivons également des discriminations ethniques qui deviennent une réalité quotidienne. Nkurunziza instrumentalise la crise politique en la transformant en une crise ethnique.

Nous demandons plusieurs choses dans la résolution: la première, la lutte contre l'impunité; la deuxième, subordonner toute relation avec le pays à une amélioration de la situation des droits de l'homme; la troisième, le soutien des Nations unies. Nous demandons également de soutenir les efforts de la Communauté de l'Afrique de l'Est et d'avoir une transparence des financements des soldats burundais par rapport à la milice en Somalie.

Dita Charanzová, author. – Madam President, this is not the first time that we have discussed the situation in Burundi. Since April 2015, there has been an alarming deterioration of human rights and a severe humanitarian crisis in the country. Those opposing the President's legitimate re-election are facing a massive clampdown and violations of their rights. Respect for the opposition, free and fair elections and freedom of speech are fundamental to any democracy. We must condemn these acts of violence and other human rights abuses in Burundi. We must be clear that we cannot allow the situation to continue. We must ensure that the EU targeted sanctions are fully implemented, effective and further extended until we see real reform in the country. The EU Member States and the Union should speak with one voice on Burundi and do all that they can to finally bring about peaceful coexistence among the nations of the Great Lakes region, working together with the UN and the African Union. Burundi has come a long way since its independence. We must take action now to help bring peace to this region.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, autore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa è la quinta risoluzione sul Burundi che scriviamo dall'inizio di questa legislatura. Mi addolora enormemente constatare come, a distanza di due anni da quando condannavamo le violenze nel paese e la volontà di Nkurunziza di partecipare nuovamente alle elezioni, in violazione della Costituzione del paese e degli accordi di Arusha, la situazione non abbia fatto altro che peggiorare, per non dire precipitare. Le forze di sicurezza governative, le autorità e le milizie continuano a violare i più basilari diritti umani. L'Imbonerakure, la temibile milizia giovanile, va oltre, incitando pubblicamente a violentare le mogli degli oppositori politici, reclutando e plagiando i giovani studenti, mentre il paese sprofonda in una crisi economica e sociale devastante.

Chiediamo dunque all'Alto rappresentante di estendere le sanzioni europee, di utilizzare tutti gli strumenti a sua disposizione per tentare di disinnescare una pericolosa *escalation*, e in particolare l'ulteriore etnicizzazione della crisi, preludio di un punto di non ritorno per la popolazione. Come diceva Eliezer Wiesel, vincitore di un premio Nobel per la pace, «Never again» deve essere più di uno slogan, deve essere una preghiera, una promessa, un giuramento, un invito a tutti noi in quest'Aula e a tutta la comunità internazionale a non tollerare che le atrocità del passato si possano ripetere di nuovo.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, depuis le printemps 2015, le Burundi s'enfonce dans la crise. Le président Nkurunziza veut garder le pouvoir pour un troisième et même, désormais, un quatrième mandat, remettant en cause les accords d'Arusha et faisant resurgir le spectre de la guerre civile.

Des milliers d'opposants sont réduits au silence, y compris à l'intérieur du parti unique du président. La répression se fait de plus en plus violente, militarisée aux mains de milices, notamment des Imbonerakure, la ligue des jeunes du parti du président.

La question ethnique est instrumentalisée et l'ONU elle-même parle de risque de génocide. On craint le pire dans ce pays voisin du Rwanda, car toute la région risque d'être déstabilisée.

La communauté internationale a tardé à réagir. Des sanctions ciblées ont cependant été prises, notamment par l'Union européenne.

Au sein du groupe GUE/NGL, nous sommes sceptiques sur l'envoi de forces militaires et considérons qu'il faut privilégier les solutions politiques. Mais là, elles sont loin d'être évidentes.

Alors, oui, il faut aider les réfugiés burundais, y compris en facilitant leur arrivée sur le sol de l'Union européenne.

Joachim Zeller, Verfasser. – Herr Präsident! Seit Präsident Pierre Nkurunziza im April 2015 bekanntgab, dass er eine weitere Amtszeit anstrebt, was die Verfassung von Burundi ausschließt, versinkt Burundi in einer Spirale von Gewalt und Missachtung der Bürger- und Menschenrechte. Die Opposition wird brutal unterdrückt, Tausende Menschen wurden bereits ermordet, Zehntausende mussten im Land untertauchen, und mehr als 400 000 Einwohner Burundis sind in die Nachbarländer geflohen, was die Stabilität in der Region bedroht.

Die Machthaber von Burundi verweigern sich einem Dialog sowohl mit der internationalen Gemeinschaft als auch mit den gesellschaftlichen Kräften im eigenen Land. Im Gegenteil: Die unabhängige internationale Untersuchungskommission der Vereinten Nationen in Burundi stellte fest, dass es zahlreiche Beweise für umfangreiche Verletzungen der Menschenrechte und Machtmissbrauch in Burundi gebe, verübt besonders durch die Jugendorganisation der Partei des Präsidenten, Imbonerakure, aber auch durch das Militär Burundis, was umso schwerer wiegt, als auch die EU burundische Soldaten im Rahmen der Mission der Afrikanischen Union in Somalia bezahlt. Es sind alle Maßnahmen – auch weitere Sanktionen – zu ergreifen, um den Druck auf Präsident Nkurunziza und die Machthaber in Burundi zu verstär-

ken, sich endlich einem Dialog zu öffnen.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I must say that I am deeply concerned to learn of the growing conflict in Burundi following the unconstitutional re-election of President Pierre Nkurunziza in 2015 and his intention to be re-elected again in 2020 and probably ad infinitum.

The deplorable human-rights situation and the authorities' continued violation of fundamental rights are totally unacceptable. I therefore strongly support calls for the Burundian authorities to address these violations and to conduct an independent inquiry so that the perpetrators can be held accountable. Furthermore, Burundi must revoke its move to withdraw from the International Criminal Court and must extend full support to the office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights so as to ensure fundamental rights for all its citizens, because the abuses of fundamental rights – the murder, rape, abduction, etcetera – in Burundi are absolutely chronic and must be stopped.

David Martin, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, in 2015, in Burundi, I witnessed at first hand Government troops blowing up a radio antenna in order to stop independent radio stations broadcasting, I met families who had been burnt out of their houses because they were of the wrong ethnicity, and I saw political rallies brutally broken up by government-backed militia.

When I raised all of these issues at the recent meeting of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) in Malta, the Burundian representative admitted – what else could he do, I had seen it with my own eyes – that all of these events had happened, but said that things were much better now in the country.

Well, I am afraid things are not much better in the country, and what we hear from the international community and the international organisations based in Burundi is that, in fact, things are getting worse. This is a time for us to intensify our sanctions on Burundi, to make sure we keep the pressure up on the current Burundian Government, and to ask the East African Community to act to defend their neighbour's citizens.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Zoals velen van ons hier al gezegd hebben: de situatie in Burundi is schokkend. En terwijl in de regio nogal wat presidenten de revue passeren die naar een derde ambtstermijn streven, gaat de president van Burundi zelfs nog een stapje verder. Hij zou wel naar een vierde ambtstermijn willen gaan. Dat wordt dan nu de standaard.

Om dat te doen, om die absolute macht te behouden, zijn hij en zijn achterban bereid heel ver te gaan. We hebben hier al heel veel dingen gehoord: hulpkonvooien mogen niet meer binnen, internationale waarnemers worden geweerd. Wat mij vooral heel erg verontrust, is dat er nu ook etnische zuiveringen aan de gang zijn. Meer dan 100 Tutsi militairen zijn gedood!

Ik ben samen met Louis Michel en Guy Verhofstadt indertijd in Rwanda geweest. We hebben daar kisten met schedels gezien, kisten met handen en kisten met voeten. Etnische zuiveringen zijn afschuwelijk en als je nu voelt dat dat naar Burundi gaat overslaan, dan verontrust mij dat. We moeten alles op alles zetten om het land wederom de rust te gunnen die het verdient. Afrika heeft onze steun nodig en dus moeten we ingrijpen als mensenrechten overtreden en geschonden worden.

Dus laten we pleiten voor een internationaal onderzoek. Laten we zorgen dat de Burundezen de bescherming krijgen die ze verdienen.

Tim Aker, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, this report highlights worrying developments in Burundi, one of Africa's poorest countries. Since 2015, 1 200 people have been killed and between 400 and 900 have disappeared. The use of torture has been widespread. More than 10 000 people have been detained without trial and nearly half a million have fled to neighbouring countries. Burundi has plunged into crisis. With reports of ethnic cleansing in the military, the world and all global institutions must be ready to intervene and prevent another genocide. There cannot be a repeat of Rwanda.

Too often the West has been ready to intervene when the cause has not warranted it – the disaster in Libya being one example – but when there is a call on our resources, too many also look the other way. A strong message from all quarters must go out across the world that the rights to life, liberty and political expression are unbreakable. And all those who believe in that message must have the force, in every sense of the word, to back it up.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Burundi, będąc jednym z najbardziej niebezpiecznych państw na świecie, doświadcza również kryzysu politycznego oraz poważnych naruszeń praw człowieka. W moim przekonaniu zatem decyzja o wstrzymaniu pomocy bezpośredniej dla rządu Burundi była słuszna i stan ten musi utrzymać się do czasu, aż Burundi zacznie przestrzegać artykułu 96 porozumienia z Kotonu. Jednocześnie jednak Unia Europejska nie może odwrócić się od ludności Burundi. Dlatego należy kontynuować działania na rzecz społeczności lokalnej i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, jak również zintensyfikować pomoc dla uchodźców z Burundi oraz osób wewnętrznie przesiedlonych. Szczególnie ważne jest też zapewnienie, by obozy dla uchodźców były miejscami bezpiecznymi, jak również, aby unikać przeprowadzania powrotów wbrew woli uchodźców.

Cécile Kashiye Kyenge (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, pendant que le Burundi traverse l'une de ses pires crises sécuritaires, les autorités primaires et secondaires du pays s'obstinent à vouloir nier l'évidence, comme cela a été le cas à Malte, à l'Assemblée paritaire ACP-UE.

Pourtant, sur les plans politique, social et culturel, le Burundi s'est détourné du droit chemin en 2015, lorsque, Pierre Nkurunziza ayant décidé de briguer un troisième mandat anticonstitutionnel, des assassinats et des vagues d'exil forcé se sont ensuivis.

Nous exigeons des engagements concrets de la part du Burundi, en l'occurrence sur la démocratie et les droits de l'homme. Sur ces points, nous sommes prêts à sanctionner encore plus sévèrement les responsables burundais. Naturellement, l'Union européenne doit rester ouverte à un dialogue avec le gouvernement burundais s'il se montre respectueux des principes sur lesquels nous avons insisté pour le bien de la population.

Favoriser les différentes missions d'observation internationales évoquées dans la résolution devient alors un impératif, car elles seules pourront certifier d'éventuelles avancées. Face au totalitarisme, nous devons rester intransigeants.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já podporuji, všechno to, co bylo řečeno mými kolegy o tom, jak tragická situace je v tuto chvíli v Burundi. Platí také teze, že jsme několikrát v tomto volebním období situaci v Burundi projednávali a psali jsme několik usnesení, a ta bohužel nemají valného dopadu.

Rád si poslechnu vyjádření pana komisaře, jestli má nějaký nápad, jak zofenzivnit diplomacii Evropské unie vůči Burundi tak, aby tamní prezident, který si svévolně a opakovaně prodlužuje svůj mandát, alespoň trochu vnímal hlas demokratického mezinárodního společenství a alespoň trochu respektoval lidská práva a udělal něco pro to, aby v Burundi nenastal v budoucnu válečný konflikt. Situace je tam opravdu tragická, hrozí tam vážný etnický konflikt. Je dobře, že o tom tady vedeme debatu, ale na druhou stranu vyjadřuji určitou skepsi. Pokud prezident alespoň trochu nebude ochoten naslouchat a trochu vést dialog s demokratickým mezinárodním společenstvím, pak se obávám, že může dojít k nejhoršímu. Usnesení podpořím, ale prosím Komisi o vyjádření, co se teď dá ještě dělat.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, let me start by expressing my concern about the political and security situation in Burundi, which is characterised by ongoing violence, killings, sexual violence and human rights abuses. I am confident that Burundi will resume cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in order to comply with its international human rights obligations. Economic relations can be upgraded only if a sustained political solution is reached.

The EU should continue its full financial support for the people of Burundi, including humanitarian support provided through direct channels, not through the Government. The EU and Burundi should therefore keep up a dialogue in order to encourage progress in fulfilling the conditions set by the European Union. Finally, I would like to welcome the decision of the African Union's Peace and Security Council authorising the deployment of an African prevention and protection mission in Burundi to pave the way for a political solution.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είμαστε ξανά στο ίδιο έργο θεατές για το Μπουρούντι. Τα τελευταία δύο χρόνια έχουμε ασχοληθεί τουλάχιστον πέντε φορές με την παράνομη δράση του προέδρου του Μπουρούντι, Nkurunziza, ο οποίος έχει κυριολεκτικά αγκιστρωθεί στην εξουσία. Διώκει τους πολιτικούς του αντιπάλους -σύμφωνα με καταγγελίες, 1.200 άτομα έχουν σκοτωθεί και πάνω από 10.000 άτομα έχουν βασανιστεί, ενώ οι συλλήψεις δημοσιογράφων, δικηγόρων και ακτιβιστών είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη. Πάνω από 400.000 άτομα εγκατέλειψαν το Μπουρούντι, 3 εκατομμύρια συνάνθρωποι μας χρειάζονται ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια και όλα αυτά γιατί ο Nkurunziza παραβιάζει τη συμφωνία του Κοτονού, παραβιάζει το Σύνταγμα και τώρα θέλει να αλλάξει το Σύνταγμα και να εξασφαλίσει και τέταρτη θητεία ως πρόεδρος του Μπουρούντι, κάτι το οποίο βεβαίως δεν γίνεται αποδεκτό από τους πολίτες του Μπουρούντι. Πρέπει λοιπόν να ληφθούν μέτρα και κυρώσεις κατά του Nkurunziza και της παρέας του.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caros Colegas, na República do Burundi a radicalização do regime que se seguiu ao anúncio da candidatura do Presidente Pierre Nkurunziza a um terceiro mandato, em violação da Constituição do país, polarizou o conflito político e as duras represálias do governo e das suas milícias condenaram os opositores à sua reeleição, ao exílio ou a serem vítimas de tortura e execuções extrajudiciais, detenções arbitrarias e desaparecimentos forçados. Esta crise política e a deterioração da economia causaram uma dramática crise humanitária no país onde, neste momento, segundo as estimativas da ONU, três milhões de pessoas necessitam de ajuda e 2,6 milhões estão expostas à insegurança alimentar extrema.

Face a esta situação, a União Europeia deve instar as autoridades do Burundi a cumprirem as obrigações internacionais que assumiram em matéria de direitos humanos e a levarem a julgamento os responsáveis pelas atrocidades cometidas. A União tem também o dever de apoiar todos os esforços de negociação entre o governo e a oposição que permitam pôr fim à escalada das tensões étnicas e encontrar uma solução pacífica e sustentável para aquele país.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I share your frustration. To the frustration of many, the situation in Burundi is essentially unchanged, with no improvement in any of the key areas that would allow a return to normality, in particular as regards human rights, civil society, the media, disarmament, and justice. In May, the Council therefore agreed that there was currently no basis for changing the Article 96 decision. At the same time, we are continuing to receive reports of serious abuses and violence by security services and militias. More than 400 000 people have sought refuge in neighbouring countries. The Government remains in denial about the state of the country and is not letting United Nations human rights investigators have access, despite the fact that Burundi is itself a member of the UN Human Rights Council.

It is possible that the situation in Burundi might become even more polarised unless the authorities open up to a genuinely inclusive dialogue, observing the principles of the Arusha Agreement, and take practical steps to reduce tension. The European Union will continue to reach out to encourage heads of state in the region to bring their influence to bear, as a matter of urgency, with a view to speeding up the mediation process. This should help to create the necessary conditions, in particular in the areas of human rights and political space, for elections to be held in 2020, thus fully complying with the Arusha Peace Agreement and the Constitution. The European Union has repeatedly stated that it is ready to respond to progress reached in President Mkapa's mediation, acting under the Article 96 decision. The absence of the rule of law and the resulting adverse impact on human rights and freedoms – as well as on the already very poor economic and social indicators – have led to an alarming deterioration in the living conditions of the population.

The European Union will continue to alleviate the population's plight through direct support, with a focus on building resilience by supporting basic livelihoods (agriculture and nutrition actions) and improving access to basic social services such as health care. An additional package of EUR 95 million has recently been approved. In addition, the EU supports – through the African Peace Facility – the African Union human rights observers and military experts in Burundi and we will be seeking to enhance their role on the ground.

Last but not least, we also support the needs of the thousands of Burundian refugees in the region. Uganda, for example, is hosting around 35 000 Burundian refugees, among others. I was in Uganda to represent the European Union at the Solidarity Summit convened by UN Secretary-General António Guterres and there I announced EU emergency assistance of EUR 85 million for the whole refugee and IDP package.

(Applause)

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet im Anschluss an die Aussprache statt.

(Die Sitzung wird bis zum Beginn der Abstimmungsstunde unterbrochen.)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

9. Skład Parlamentu: Patrz protokól

10. Skład komisji i delegacji

Der Präsident. – Der Präsident hat von der S&D-Fraktion die folgenden Änderungen und Benennungen erhalten:

Haushaltsausschuss: John Howarth anstelle von Clare Moody

Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung: Wajid Khan

Unterausschuss für Sicherheit und Verteidigung: Brando Benifei anstelle von Goffredo Maria Bettini

Delegation für die Beziehungen zur Arabischen Halbinsel: Wajid Khan

Delegation im Parlamentarischen Ausschuss Cariforum-EU: John Howarth anstelle von David Martin

Gibt es dazu Bemerkungen?

Das ist nicht der Fall. Die Benennungen sind damit bestätigt.

Herr Kollege Fox, zur Geschäftsordnung?

Ashley Fox (ECR). – Mr President, yesterday afternoon we had a lively debate, under Rule 153, on the subject of a single seat for this Parliament. Unfortunately, under that rule, it was not possible to have a resolution, but it was the clear will of this House that we bring forward a report to propose a treaty change. So, as Mr Weber and Mr Pittella are in their seats, could they please take note of the view of this House and, when the matter comes to the Conference of Presidents, could they please authorise that report?

(Applause)

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Fox, auch wenn das haarscharf neben der Geschäftsordnung war.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE). – Señor presidente, quiero pedir paciencia a mis colegas, un minuto para que juntos condenemos los sangrientos acontecimientos de ayer en la Asamblea venezolana.

Compañeros nuestros, diputados, fueron violentados en su legítima tarea de representación popular por turbas incontroladas próximas al régimen chavista. Pido a todos nuestros colegas no cerrar los ojos, los oídos y la boca ante tan execrable acción: recordemos que, en tres meses, 91 personas han fallecido en las calles de Venezuela.

Y quiero añadir esto: las imágenes terribles que hemos visto ahora mismo de los diputados ensangrentados en la Asamblea... tal vez sea la hora de plantearse una clara acción y pedir, de una vez, sanciones contra el régimen venezolano para que se entienda, lo entiendan de una vez, que aquí en Europa estamos por la libertad, la democracia y nuestros compañeros de la Asamblea venezolana.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege López-Istúriz White! Auch hier wäre ich dankbar gewesen, wenn man mir geholfen hätte, die entsprechende Geschäftsordnungsbestimmung für dieses wichtige Anliegen zu finden.

11. Głosowanie

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Abstimmungsstunde.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

11.1. Sprawozdanie za 2016 r. dotyczące Turcji (A8-0234/2017 - Kati Piri) (głosowanie)

— *Vor der Abstimmung:*

Kati Piri, rapporteur. – Mr President, ahead of the vote on Turkey, I would like to draw your attention to what happened last night when eight human-rights defenders, including the director of Amnesty International in Turkey, were detained in Istanbul. One German and one Swedish national are also currently being detained. It is not clear where they are being held and they do not have access to their lawyers. This is the moment for this Parliament to call on the Turkish authorities for the immediate release of these human-rights defenders in Turkey.

(Applause)

— *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 16:*

Renate Sommer (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die EVP hat einen mündlichen Änderungsantrag eingereicht zu Ziffer 16. Am Ende der Ziffer heißt es: „is concerned about the recent seizure of the churches in the region of Diyarbakir“, und wir möchten nachfolgend ergänzen: „urges the government to return them to their rightful owners“.

Dieser mündliche Änderungsantrag ist mit der Berichterstatterin Kati Piri abgesprochen, und sie ist einverstanden mit diesem mündlichen Änderungsantrag. Ich bitte also um Zustimmung.

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

- 11.2. Powołanie komisji specjalnej ds. terroryzmu oraz zakres jej kompetencji, jej liczebność i okres sprawowania przez nią mandatu (B8-0477/2017) (głosowanie)
- 11.3. Sprawy laureata Nagrody Nobla Liu Xiaobo oraz Lee Miong-che (RC-B8-0459/2017, B8-0459/2017, B8-0460/2017, B8-0461/2017, B8-0462/2017, B8-0463/2017) (głosowanie)
- 11.4. Erytrea, a w szczególności sprawy Abune Antoniosa i Dawita Isaaka (RC-B8-0464/2017, B8-0464/2017, B8-0466/2017, B8-0467/2017, B8-0470/2017, B8-0472/2017, B8-0473/2017) (głosowanie)
- 11.5. Burundi (RC-B8-0465/2017, B8-0465/2017, B8-0468/2017, B8-0469/2017, B8-0471/2017, B8-0474/2017, B8-0475/2017, B8-0476/2017) (głosowanie)
- 11.6. Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju (EFZR) oraz ustanowienie gwarancji EFZR i funduszu gwarancyjnego EFZR (A8-0170/2017 - Eduard Kukan, Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (głosowanie)
- 11.7. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (A8-0097/2017 - Max Andersson) (głosowanie)
- 11.8. Transgraniczna wymiana między Unią a państwami trzecimi kopii utworów w formie umożliwiającej dostęp osobom niepełnosprawnym do określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną, z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, słabowidzących lub z innymi niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (A8-0102/2017 - Max Andersson) (głosowanie)
- 11.9. Mechanizmy rozstrzygania sporów dotyczących podwójnego opodatkowania w UE (A8-0225/2017 - Michael Theurer) (głosowanie)

— Nach der Abstimmung über Ziffer 64:

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Mr President, it is a point of order. It is about the way that you are conducting the vote. What I am getting through my headphones is 'for, against, abstain, for, against, abstain, for, against, abstain'. It is impossible to vote if we are going at that speed.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Batten! Nochmals zum Mitschreiben: Die Abstimmung war eröffnet. Da erteile ich kein Wort zur Geschäftsordnung. Dann habe ich die Abstimmung geschlossen, und dann habe ich Ihnen das Wort erteilt. Das ist die gängige Praxis. Ich habe jetzt leider keine Möglichkeit, über Ihre Wortmeldung abstimmen zu lassen. Aber ich glaube, die Reaktion des Hauses hat gezeigt, dass jedenfalls die allermeisten mitkommen.

(Beifall)

— Vor der Abstimmung über Änderungsantrag 10:

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, sauf erreur de ma part, je pense que nous n'avons pas voté sur l'amendement 74. C'était un vote par appel nominal.

Peut-être est-il caduc?

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Tarabella! Die Dienste sagen mir, dass mit der Annahme des Änderungsantrags 64 der Änderungsantrag 74 erledigt ist.

11.10. Działania UE na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju (A8-0239/2017 - Seb Dance) (głosowanie)

— *Nach der Abstimmung:*

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, the other day, during the visit of the Maltese Prime Minister, President Juncker said that this Parliament was ridiculous, or pointless or a farce, or something to that effect. The obscene speed at which these votes are being conducted most certainly gives weight to President Juncker's view.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Coburn! Vielen Dank für diesen bedeutenden Beitrag.

11.11. Wspieranie spójności i rozwoju w regionach najbardziej oddalonych UE (A8-0226/2017 - Younous Omarjee) (głosowanie)

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

12. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

12.1. Sprawozdanie za 2016 r. dotyczące Turcji (A8-0234/2017 - Kati Piri)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this report and I would like to note that we have already adopted one resolution on Turkey in relation to the failed military coup in July 2016. In that resolution, despite highlighting that Turkey remains a strategic partner of the EU, we expressed serious concern about the multiple incompatibilities with progress towards accession, and called for a temporary freeze of Turkey's EU accession talks.

However, it seems that, since then, the situation has only got worse and that the one-man rule is being strengthened. We have seen continuous arrests, a referendum to authorise undemocratic constitutional changes, and far-reaching censorship of the media. I believe that the situation in Turkey can no longer be ignored. If the constitutional reforms package is implemented as it stands now, the EU must stop its accession talks with Turkey immediately, as well as the pre-accession assistance funding.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, in retrospect, the European Union's approach to Turkey has not worked out terribly well. We could, at the outset, have said 'Membership is not on the agenda: let's find a different way of working together', or we could have embraced them, but what we did instead was to hold out a promise of membership which we had absolutely no intention of fulfilling. Understandably, a sense of rejection contributed to some political breakdown in that country.

Of course, I am not saying it was all the fault of the European Union. That would be absurd. It is mainly about internal dynamics within Turkey. But I wonder whether we might not be wiser now to try to find a more sustainable and permanent deal, whereby we recognise Turkey as a strategic partner and ally, and recognise the value of a free market with Turkey, but drop the idea of political integration. And if we could set up such a status successfully for a state as important and as large as Turkey, perhaps it could become the model for relations with other nearby neighbouring countries.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, искам да поздравя още веднъж докладчика Пири за общия тон на доклада, който е заслужено критичен към днешното ръководство на Република Турция. Това несъмнено е стъпка в правилната посока на политиката на Европейския съюз спрямо процесите в страната. Гласувах за отхвърляне на доклада, обаче, тъй като има няколко изключително проблемни точки.

Никъде не се засяга засилващият се процес на трансформация на кемалийската секуларна република в религиозна ислямистка диктатура. Това не е съвместимо с ценностите, които твърдим, че защитаваме тук. И въпреки критиката относно нарушаването на човешките права в доклада липсва назоваването на конкретния проблем, а именно Ердоган и ислямизацията на страната.

Още повече, тази година станахме свидетели на безпрецедентна и нагла намеса от страна на Република Турция във вътрешните работи на страни както в Западна Европа, така и в моята родина – България. Това не бива да се допуска и част по-скоро преговорите за присъединяване трябва да бъдат не просто замразени, а спрени окончателно. Една кемалийска Турция, която залага на секуларни ценности, е добър партньор на Съюза, може да бъде съюзник. Същото не може да се каже за ислямизираща се диктатура.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Pán předsedající, sůhlasím s dvomi pozmeňujícími návrhy, které podali poslanci zo skupiny ENF. Turecko by malo uznať arménsku genocídu. Rovnako si myslím, že v záujme dobrého spolunažívania kresťanov a moslimov by mal pôvodne kresťanský chrám Hagia Sofia v Istanbule zostať múzeom a nie byť opätovne využívaný ako mešita. Napriek tomu som tieto návrhy nemohla podporiť. Situácia v Turecku ma totiž naplňa obavami. Cítim, že najdôležitejší je dnes dialóg, a preto treba začať najprv s témami, ktoré vnímame ako kľúčové pre vzájomné vzťahy medzi Tureckom a Európskou úniou. Toto uznesenie má v prvom rade pripomenúť tureckej vláde jej záväzky a platné zmluvy. Až potom, po znovunastolení dobrej vôle a zlepšení vzťahov, môžeme skúsiť znovu hovoriť aj o citlivejších témach.

12.2. Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Zrównoważonego Rozwoju (EFZR) oraz ustanowienie gwarancji EFZR i funduszu gwarancyjnego EFZR (A8-0170/2017 - Eduard Kukan, Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this revised European external investment plan proposed by the Commission. Despite being convinced that official development assistance should remain the main source of support to developing countries, I am happy to see that private investment will be used in Africa and the in the EU Eastern and Southern Neighbourhoods as part of a broader strategy to keep migration at bay.

It is essential to address the root causes of migration by creating jobs, supporting the development of small and medium-sized businesses and facilitating inclusive growth. The main advantage of the plan is the newly designed instrument, the European Fund for Sustainable Development Fund, and its Guarantee which, with the contributions of the European Investment Bank, will be employed to attract public and private investment and manage risks. I believe this approach will help to produce a sufficient investment-generation process through the instrument we supported, and by providing viable technical assistance to all countries in need.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, he votado a favor y quería intervenir, especialmente, en relación con la creación de este nuevo Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Sostenible, porque sin duda va a acometer el problema de la inmigración, de la injusticia y de la pobreza. Va a ir destinado —44 millones de euros— a las inversiones en África y en los países de su vecindad. Por fin —insisto— vamos a acometer el problema de fondo que hay en África y la situación de muchas injusticias.

Hay algunos logros que me gustaría destacar porque me parecen especialmente esenciales en este Fondo: la referencia a la eficacia del desarrollo, la resiliencia, la creación de empleo decente y los objetivos de erradicación de la pobreza; la inclusión del Acuerdo de París y la Agenda para el Desarrollo Sostenible, como objetivo de este Fondo; o la inclusión de una cláusula de salvaguardia de los derechos humanos y laborales. Finalmente, la inclusión en el texto de la lucha contra los paraísos fiscales y la evasión fiscal creo que son un logro importante en los objetivos de este Fondo.

12.3. Dozwolone sposoby korzystania z określonych utworów i innych przedmiotów objętych ochroną z korzyścią dla osób niewidomych, osób słabowidzących i osób z niepełnosprawnościami uniemożliwiającymi zapoznanie się z drukiem (A8-0097/2017 - Max Andersson)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, jsem velmi ráda, že jsme dnes přijali legislativu, která transponuje mezinárodní Marrákešskou dohodu o zpřístupnění autorských chráněných děl osobám se zrakovým postižením. Tato výjimka zásadně ovlivní kvalitu života zrakově postižených občanů a umožní jim lepší zapojení do kulturního, ekonomického a sociálního života, samozřejmě v případě, že členské státy budou také spolupracovat.

V současnosti je za pomoci alternativních metod, tedy zejména v Braillově písmu, velkoformátovém písmu nebo v audioknihách dostupných celkem 20 % všech děl. Zpřístupnění dalších 80 % může mít tedy zásadní dopad na studijní možnosti a celkové vzdělávání těchto osob a zároveň to neovlivní komerční prodej, protože tyto osoby se zatím prostě nezapojují, nevyužívají autorsky chráněná umělecká díla. Věřím, že tedy odbourávání těchto bariér přispěje k zlepšení kvality jejich života.

Catherine Stihler (S&D). – Mr President, I am happy that today we are one step closer to ratifying the Marrakesh Treaty. EU action on facilitating access to published works for people who are blind, visually impaired or otherwise print disabled has been long overdue.

However, despite many of the good points contained in Parliament's report, I strongly condemn the introduction of compensation schemes for publishers. Not only could this provision violate Article 21 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities but there has been no proof of economic loss to be compensated for, and governments have never demonstrated that any damage is done to publishers by accessibly formatted works. This provision is in direct contradiction with the 'right to read' objectives of the Marrakesh Treaty and should be addressed, during the transposition phase, in EU Member State legislation.

Nonetheless, I hope EU Member States can give the treaty their approval so that it can finally be ratified this coming autumn.

12.4. Działania UE na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju (A8-0239/2017 - Seb Dance)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione compie qualche passo avanti in direzione di un nuovo sviluppo sostenibile per l'Europa, e per questo motivo il mio voto è stato favorevole.

Tuttavia, devo rilevare che avrebbe potuto essere più ambiziosa e chiedere di adottare obiettivi più vincolanti, a partire dal risparmio energetico e dall'autoproduzione individuale, per arrivare alla massiccia bonifica che deve accompagnare la riconversione dei siti industriali. Si dà giustamente molto peso alla riduzione dei gas serra nell'ottica del cambiamento climatico, ma non si attribuisce, ad esempio, lo stesso livello di allarme per molti altri inquinanti che appestano aria, acqua e suolo. Emergono sforzi tesi all'implementazione dell'economia circolare, al recupero, al riuso e al riciclo, ma abbiamo dovuto presentare degli emendamenti – non passati – per escludere da tale impianto l'incenerimento dei rifiuti. Si tenta di incrementare il ruolo delle energie rinnovabili nel mix energetico, ma si accetta il ricorso al FEIS, che è ampiamente utilizzato per sostenere le fonti fossili.

Signori, con questa proposta si tenta di fare un salto in avanti, ma per riuscire avremmo dovuto prendere una buona rincorsa.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, este es un informe importante —los Objetivos para el Desarrollo Sostenible—. Quiero destacar en mi explicación que me gusta mucho más la evolución que ha tenido en el desarrollo del Pleno que lo que inicialmente se aprobó en la Comisión de Medio Ambiente.

Es una respuesta a la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre la acción europea para la sostenibilidad y, lo que inicialmente se aprobó en esta comisión fueron cuestiones bastante injustas con la política agraria comunitaria. Insisto en que se ha corregido y por eso he votado favorablemente.

Quiero destacar que esta política agraria comunitaria ya en su última reforma hizo grandes esfuerzos medioambientales, se incorporó un aspecto tan importante como es el *greening*, que está suponiendo esfuerzos importantes para todos los agricultores y ganaderos europeos. No es justo decir que la agricultura europea no está colaborando con el medio ambiente: lo está haciendo; evolucionando a pesar de tener la competencia directa de productos de terceros países que no hacen lo mismo.

Por lo tanto, resaltar el papel de la agricultura europea.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСР). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, избрах да гласувам „въздържал се“ за този доклад, тъй като според мен той не казва нищо и всичко. Вярвам, че терминът „устойчивост“ е вече толкова употребяван, че е лишен от смисъл. Не е рационално, нито полезно толкова много области и проблеми да се разискват в един единствен документ. Единственото, до което води този доклад, е размяна на мнения. И докато съм склонен да се съглася с много от казаното, като например подобряването на качеството на въздуха и съживяването на селските райони, то не мога да приема предложението за увеличаване на финансирането на официалната помощ за развитие, така наречената ОПР.

Опитът показва, че сяпото наливане на пари в проблемните райони на света чрез инструментите за развитие и устойчивост, просто не работят. Не смятам, че харченето на парите на европейските данькоплатци за подобни проекти е полезно. Бих подкрепил подобно разходване на средства от тези инструменти, само ако е обвързано със задължително засилване на сигурността в проблемните зони и намаляване на имиграционния натиск върху Европа. Подобни предложения обаче липсват. Ето защо, въпреки няколкото полезни приложения на доклада, не бих могъл да го подкрепя.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, votei a favor deste relatório do qual, aliás, fui um relator-sombra, porque considero que, não obstante o desenvolvimento sustentável estar desde há muito no cerne do projeto europeu, temos ainda um longo caminho a percorrer no quadro da construção de um futuro melhor para as nossas crianças e o nosso planeta.

O Parlamento Europeu tem dedicado muito da sua atenção à aplicação da Agenda 2030 da ONU, que constitui um compromisso comum e necessita da participação e da cooperação de todos, incluindo os Estados-Membros, e da sociedade civil em geral.

As propostas deste relatório têm em comum o objetivo de reforçar o núcleo da estratégia global da União Europeia e constituem uma oportunidade para o Parlamento Europeu ancorar de forma definitiva e decisiva a sua visão, a sua agenda, sobre uma ação europeia para a sustentabilidade. Trata-se de uma vasta e interessante reflexão que responde aos desafios mais complexos interligados com que o mundo se defronta atualmente e apresenta um quadro de ação para as instituições da União Europeia, em particular para o Parlamento Europeu.

Caros Colegas, acredito que esta Casa tem um indeclinável papel na criação de um futuro melhor e mais sustentável para a Europa e este relatório pode vir a apresentar-se como uma peça chave deste desígnio.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) influence virtually every aspect of the EU's work. The global 2030 Agenda represents a commitment to achieving sustainable development by 2030 worldwide – a commitment that must be shared by all countries.

The aims of this agenda are to work towards human dignity, stability, a healthy planet, fair and resilient societies and prosperous economies. The EU shares these goals and therefore I voted in favour of this motion. By embedding the targets of the SDGs in the framework of EU policies, the EU will ensure that adherence to the aims of the SDGs is a key part of future policy initiatives. In doing so, we are ensuring that the EU will successfully deliver on the 2030 Agenda.

Finally, Mr President, may I compliment you on the efficient and calm manner in which you chaired today's session, contrary to what was said by one or two speakers. They were a tiny minority. The round of applause said it all.

12.5. Wspieranie spójności i rozwoju w regionach najbardziej oddalonych UE (A8-0226/2017 - Younous Omarjee)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, най-отдалечените региони в Европейския съюз, също както другите по-малко облагодетелствани, като планинските, са интегрална част от Европейския съюз. Имайки предвид обаче специфичните им характеристики, като отдалеченост например, те имат по-труден достъп до общия европейски пазар. Затова смятам, че тези региони трябва да имат специален статут и целево и улеснено подпомагане чрез бюджета на Европейския съюз.

Кохезионната политика е важен инструмент, който създава условия за икономическо развитие и просперитет за тези региони, затова трябва да остане и след 2020 година. Отдалечените, също както планинските региони имат потенциал за производство на качествени продукти. Затова при тях трябва да има по-опростени правила при подготовката и защитата по съответните схеми за качество.

Призовавам Европейската комисия за повече целеви средства и информационни кампании относно схемите за защитени географски означения, защото тези схеми дават ценни възможности за създаване, поддържане и развиване на поминък в отдалечените и планинските региони.

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

13. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.55 Uhr unterbrochen und um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

14. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

15. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130c Regulaminu) (debata)

15.1. O-000029/2017: Skutki skandalu dotyczącego przywozu mięsa z Brazylii

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Große Anfrage gemäß Artikel 130b der Geschäftsordnung von Monika Smolková, Olga Sehnalová, Pavel Poc, Eric Andrieu, Hilde Vautmans, Brian Hayes, Lynn Boylan, Petras Auštrevičius, Karoline Graswander-Hainz, Alfred Sant, Petri Sarvamaa, Momchil Nekov, Bogusław Liberadzki, Marian Harkin, Stanislav Polčák, Boris Zala, Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner, Matt Carthy, Martina Anderson, Liadh Ní Riada, Branislav Škripek, Bronis Ropė, Anna Záborská, Miroslav Mikolášik, Nessa Childers, Biljana Borzan, Jiří Pospíšil, Luke Ming Flanagan, Dubravka Šuica, Maria Arena, Vladimír Maňka, Ulrike Müller, Kateřina Konečná, Bart Staes, Pál Csáky, József Nagy, Annie Schreijer-Pierik, Norica Nicolai, Davor Škrlec, Martin Häusling, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Ivan Štefanec an die Kommission über die Konsequenzen des Skandals um die Einfuhr von Fleisch aus Brasilien (O-000029/2017 – 2017/2735(RSP)) (B8-0317/2017).

Monika Smolková, autorka. – Pán komisár, škandál s brazílskym mäsom a jeho dovozom do Európskej únie prepukol na jar tohto roku. Ale aj v týchto dňoch máme informácie, že práve USA koncom júna úplne zakázalo dovoz brazílskeho mäsa po tom, čo na svoje územie nepustilo až 860 ton hovädzieho mäsa kvôli obavám z ohrozenia verejného zdravia, pretože mäso obsahovalo kosti, krvné zrazeniny a potenciálne škodlivé baktérie. Ja len dúfam, že tých 860 ton už neputuje do Európskej únie.

EÚ má najvyššie štandardy bezpečnosti potravy na svete. Aj napriek tomu sa stalo, že v kontrolnom systéme máme obrovské diery, pretože sa rozdistribovalo množstvo pokazeného mäsa. Iba na Slovensku následná kontrola odhalila 21 ton pokazeného mäsa, ktoré obsahovalo salmonelu, a ktoré bolo dva roky v soli. Toto mäso by bolo skončilo na tanieri pre deti v školách, pacientov v nemocniciach, v sociálnych zariadeniach, ale aj pre hostí v reštauráciách.

Potravinové odvetvie je v EÚ druhým najdôležitejším odvetvím, ktoré zamestnáva viac ako 48 miliónov osôb. Zložitý potravinový reťazec stále umožňuje podvody a klamanie spotrebiteľov. Preto sa musia do európskej legislatívy dostať prísne sankcie a trestnoprávne postihy pri poškodzovaní zdravia spotrebiteľov.

Štatistiky, ktoré hovoria o výskyte rakoviny pankreasu a hrubého čreva sú neúprosne. Stredná Európa je smutným lídrom v týchto ochoreniach, čo je určite aj dôsledok nekvality potravín. Preto o to naliehavejšie sú otázky, ktoré sme Vám, pán komisár, položili.

Aké záruky vie dať Európska komisia európskym občanom, že nekalé obchodné praktiky v potravinovom dodávateľskom reťazci sa nebudú opakovať?

Vzhľadom na to, že vyšetrovanie brazílskych spoločností prebiehalo dva roky, ako je možné, že tieto nekalé praktiky neodhalili európske kontrolné orgány?

A ešte napokon tretia otázka. Keďže sú na európskych producentov mäsa kladené neustále vyššie sanitárne nároky, aké nároky budú kladené na brazílskych producentov v rámci aktuálne vyjednávanej obchodnej dohody medzi EÚ a Mercosurom?

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, in continuation of our previous exchanges on this issue, I am pleased to reply to the three questions listed in the text of the major interpellation and to provide you with the latest updates on the import of animal products from Brazil.

Let me start, however, by commenting on the wording of the preamble because it seems to imply that the Commission did not react decisively to the issue of the safety of imported meat products. Second, it mentions reports emerging over the last few weeks about illicit trading practices. I would like to know exactly which reports you are talking about. I have already provided you with facts and figures in relation to the reinforced checks carried out by our Member States which led to findings of non-compliant consignments. However, these consignments were not allowed entry into the EU but were rejected at the expense of the importers. In contrast to what the preamble states, however, there are no reports of findings of rotten meat.

If you have such information, it is not known to me, my services or the Member States. If you have it, please provide it to me. The so-called reports referred to in the preamble are not new. They refer to what was reported in the Brazilian press in March this year in relation to products supplied on the Brazilian market, but none of these products ever found their way to Europe – not because we were lucky but because we import only from a small number of establishments from a small number of regions. Moreover, all imports enter the EU only following strict controls. Let me remind you that this is a Brazilian meat fraud. Because of strict import measures and our reinforced checks, we have ensured that it has not become a crisis in the EU. It is important therefore that we deal only with facts. Otherwise this problem will become our problem. Our citizens want strong and transparent action and a high level of protection, and that is what I am committed to giving them.

I also want to address the claim that I did not provide comprehensive answers when I appeared before you in April. The fact is that time did not permit a comprehensive answer, but I provided full and comprehensive follow-up information in a letter to Mr Siekierski, who circulated it widely. Moreover, I arranged for my services to update you in a closed session of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development. I also responded to a wide range of written questions on the fraud itself and the wider Mercosur trade negotiations. I can only repeat that I am very sensitive to Parliament's concerns and that we are committed to keeping the House abreast of any and all developments.

I now want to turn to your specific questions. You will forgive me if I repeat these questions word for word, but I want to ensure that nobody can accuse me of avoiding this issue. First, how can the Commission guarantee to European citizens that these dishonest trading practices in the food supply chain will not be allowed to happen again?

You will recall that the Commission put in place reinforced checks at our borders as an initial response. This aimed to ensure the safety of imports and to allow Brazil the time to take the necessary corrective measures. These measures now include 100% physical checks of all animal consignments and 20% microbiological checks. The result of the reinforced checks performed on Brazilian meat imports up to the end of June were as follows:

First, 5 972 consignments were checked, including 1 566 laboratory examinations. Second, of these, 176 consignments were rejected, largely due to the presence of salmonella and a range of other non-compliances, mostly incorrect certification and cold-chain problems. These results show that the checks currently enforced provide a high level of protection against the introduction of serious risks into EU territory. This is an important vindication of the effective controls that the EU maintains on imports. These checks are, of course, carried out by the Member States, which have been fully supportive of the measures taken by the Commission on behalf of the EU. The Agriculture Council has twice been updated on the situation and fully supports the insistence of the Commission, and indeed all EU institutions, that Brazil addresses our concerns urgently.

As the Commission predicted, our measures have led to a general reduction of imports, with rates varying according to a particular sector. Here I would like to remind you that our measures were not meant to be used as a protectionist instrument against legal imports into the EU, but rather to ensure that the safety and health of our consumers are protected.

I will now turn to the provisional findings of the extensive audit conducted by the Commission from 2 to 12 May. This aimed to address in detail the effectiveness of the Brazilian control services. The results give serious cause for concern. The Commission has repeatedly stressed to Brazil that it cannot view this meat scandal as an isolated problem confined to a small number of establishments. Instead, it needs fundamentally to address questions about the credibility of its official control services. The audit report identified a number of systemic failures of control, which raised serious concerns on our part. First, a range of critical deficiencies were identified, in particular in the horse and poultry-meat sectors and meat preparations and products. Second, the Brazilian authorities failed to act on recommendations to address shortcomings raised in previous audits, despite repeated guarantees that measures had been taken to rectify those failings.

A week ago, on 29 June, the Brazilian authorities also sent an action plan to us, outlining corrective measures to address all the deficiencies identified in the audit report. This action plan is currently being evaluated by the audit services. In light of the results of the reinforced checks and the damaging findings of the most recent audit, I wrote to the Brazilian Minister of Agriculture, Blairo Maggi, on 7 June asking for robust and immediate action to be taken. Specifically, I requested that the following additional measures be taken immediately by the Ministry of Agriculture: first, to withdraw the authorisation of all companies to export horsemeat to the EU; second, not to propose any new establishment for approval for export to the EU; third, to perform 100% systemic pre-export microbiological checks on all poultry meat, meat products and preparations to be exported to the EU; fourth, that all consignments of poultry meat and meat products and preparations from Brazil shall be accompanied by a health certificate stating that the consignment has been sampled and analysed to check for the presence of salmonella strains and has been found to be compliant with EU legislation; and, fifth, that details of sampling, methods of analysis and results shall be attached to the health certificate accompanying the consignments.

In correspondence on 16 June, Minister Maggi accepted these measures. The Commission is currently in the process of clarifying a number of undertakings given by the Brazilian authorities, putting in place the necessary measures to ensure their effective implementation and advising Brazil of the risk of failure effectively to implement corrective measures. Meanwhile the current reinforced checks at the EU border will remain in place and, in any case, a follow-up audit will be conducted by the Commission by the end of 2017. The Brazilian authorities have been made aware that failure to implement the measures which I described may result in further restrictions, up to the suspension of the import of relevant food products.

I will now take your second question: given that the investigation into Brazilian companies was carried out over the course of two years, how is it that the European monitoring agencies did not pick up on the illicit practices?

The recent meat fraud in Brazil was discovered in an investigation of the federal police using criminal procedures. These include wiretapping all telephone conversations. You will appreciate that such procedures are not open to our audit services, or indeed any audit services. Our audit reports have, nonetheless, been very effective in highlighting weaknesses in the Brazilian control systems. In fact they are the reference internationally for assessing the performance of control services. It is also important to keep in mind that the findings to date relate to a relatively small number of establishments. Only four were approved for export. That is, of course, four establishments too many, which is why we immediately banned them exporting to the EU. There is no evidence that the fraudulent practices which appeared in the Brazilian press extended to export to the EU.

Let us keep in mind that we have very strict controls which are not only reliant on Brazil. Through our Member States, we carry out our own controls at the external borders where all consignments are subject to rigorous checks. Moreover, it is wrong to assume that Brazil has free access to our market. Only a small number of establishments from selected regions are approved. There are strict controls on what can be imported. For example, all beef must be deboned and matured. There are very strict controls on the movements of animals which are considered eligible for export to the EU. Our insistence on hormone-free products must also be respected. Our audit services have been very effective in ensuring that weaknesses are identified and followed up. In fact over time there has been a big fall in their beef exports to the EU due to the difficulties in meeting our requirements.

A further example of the rigour of our requirements is that no pigmeat imports are permitted from Brazil, owing to previous findings by our audit services, which Brazil had not addressed to our satisfaction. I am nonetheless disappointed that we continue to find problems in Brazil which they have consistent difficulties in addressing. It is not an accident that they do not have the access to our markets which they would like. It is instead a consequence of their failure over time to address our concerns.

Your third question is: given that European producers are held to ever higher sanitary standards, what demands will be made of Brazilian producers in the ongoing agreement negotiations between the EU and Mercosur?

Now moving to a wider dimension, I am aware that you have concerns about the impact of these events on negotiations with the Mercosur countries on a possible free trade agreement. I want to repeat what I have said before here and to be clear on one very important aspect of any such further agreement: it will not undermine our high safety requirements.

Our high food safety standards are not up for negotiation. No. All imports from Mercosur countries, present or future, will always have to adhere to, and abide by, the high quality of safety standards established by our European Union legislation and implemented through our credible certification and control system. The agreement would, however, reinforce cooperation and establish improved information and notification systems in the sanitary and phytosanitary field. It would also put in place a privileged communication channel with the four countries concerned, ensuring that our reaction capacity would be stronger.

To conclude, let me reiterate that a future EU-Mercosur agreement would not lower our high regulatory requirements and food-safety standards for agricultural imports, including from Mercosur countries.

You mentioned the United States' ban. We have to keep in mind that the United States' findings, which led to their ban, relate to a very small sample size. Their ban applies only to fresh beef, of which they import only minimal quantities. Moreover, they import from different establishments to the EU. We are not therefore necessarily comparing like with like. I do not consider that we need to be led by the US on issues of food safety. After all, the US has approved the use of hormones in beef production, ractopamine in pigmeat production and chlorination in poultry-meat production. These are practices we would never allow in Europe. So please be careful before advocating that we should follow the United States' example on food safety issues.

I am nonetheless carefully following the US actions. If they have legitimate concerns which would have consequences for the EU, we obviously need to take them into account.

Mihai Țurcanu, în numele grupului PPE. – Piețele cheie ale lumii și-au închis în ultimele luni porțile în fața cărnii de vită provenită din Brazilia. În urma scandalului rețelelor de comercializare frauduloasă a unor produse improprii consumului, China, UE și Statele Unite și-au suspendat importurile. În contextul asigurărilor date Comisiei Europene zilele trecute de către autoritățile braziliene cu privire la intensificarea controalelor în fabricile de carne, solicit Comisiei să dea dovadă de prudență și rigoare. Siguranța consumatorului european trebuie să prevaleze asupra oricăror considerente. Respectarea normelor de siguranță alimentară trebuie să se afle, de asemenea, în centrul negocierilor în curs între Uniunea Europeană și statele Mercosur pentru un acord de liber schimb. Este o situație care ne obligă să punem producția europeană pe primul plan prin măsuri mai eficiente de sprijinire a crescătorilor de animale.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, señor comisario Andriukaitis, tengo que decirle que me ha sorprendido la incorporación de esta interpelación hoy, en este Pleno. Porque estoy de acuerdo con usted y quiero ratificarle aquí, en esta sesión plenaria por la tarde de un jueves, que hemos tenido información por parte de su departamento; usted vino aquí en el Pleno del mes de abril y ha venido, es decir, la DG SANTE, en el último Pleno pasado, del mes de junio, a informar en la Comisión de Agricultura, y anteriormente tuvimos ya otro debate, también en la Comisión de Agricultura.

Por tanto, información tenemos. La última, que usted nos dio y que hoy nos ha ratificado y nos ha avanzado algo más, viene a decir que, efectivamente, como se ha hecho la auditoría a Brasil del 2 al 12 de mayo, y se han intensificado los controles por parte de las autoridades brasileñas, están apareciendo más casos de salmonela, es decir, al intensificar los controles estamos viendo cómo está pasando en Brasil lo que usted ha dicho perfectamente, y es que los controles sanitarios brasileños no funcionan bien. Tienen anomalías. Y, puesto que es un país del que importa la Unión Europea, evidentemente, tenemos que tener preocupación.

Yo creo que se están haciendo las cosas por parte de ustedes razonablemente bien. Lo único en lo que sí quiero insistir es en que permanezcan y se armonicen los controles de la Unión Europea para impedir que casos como este puedan suceder, porque la alerta sanitaria es muy importante.

Y, termino, nada tiene que ver con el acuerdo con el Mercosur. Es una crisis de salud alimentaria. Nada más.

Urszula Krupa, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Dziękuję za wyjaśnienia. Jednak niedawno debatowaliśmy także nad fałszowaniem i zaniżaniem norm produktów żywnościowych wysyłanych do państw Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej przez znane firmy zachodnie. Te produkty były droższe i gorszej jakości niż te wysłane do bogatych krajów starej piętnastki, czyli zamiast masła dawano nam margarynę, a zamiast cukru szkodliwe słodziki. Natomiast dzisiaj omawiany jest znacznie poważniejszy problem rangi skandalu, zagrażający zdrowiu, a nawet życiu ludzi poprzez sprowadzanie do krajów Unii z Brazylii zepsutego mięsa z wypełniaczami w rodzaju tektury, konserwowanego kwasami, chemikaliami i skażonego salmonellą.

Okazuje się, że największe kombinaty mięsne przez lata eksportowały na cały świat wołowinę i mięso drobiowe nie spełniające norm jakości, w tym duża część miała trafić do krajów Unii Europejskiej, co budzi zdziwienie, gdyż podobno nasze normy bezpieczeństwa żywności są najwyższe na świecie. Wśród trzydziestu producentów mięsa objętych śledztwem są najwięksi eksporterzy wołowiny i drobiu, którzy eksportowali mięsa niespełniające przepisów sanitarnych, co zaprzecza poglądom, że znane firmy nie mogą sobie pozwolić na fałszowanie, co jest czasem podkreślane. Przedsiębiorstwa branży mięsnej miały korumpować zarówno urzędników, jak i polityków, i z powodu korupcji niebezpieczne praktyki nie były zauważane przez brazylijskie organy kontrolne. Według doniesień prasowych Komisja Europejska dowiedziała się o oszustwach właśnie z prasy, mimo że śledztwo eksportera mięsa sprzedającego produkty na kwotę 12 mld dolarów prowadzone było od dwóch lat, a organy kontrolne państw członkowskich zgłaszały różne nieprawidłowości.

Wszystko wydaje się skutkiem prymatu handlu i pieniądza nad zdrowiem i życiem ludzi, co wymaga wzmożenia kontroli. Jednak w dobie globalizacji będzie to bardzo trudne i sam Pan Komisarz razem ze służbami nie da rady. Dobrze byłoby nie tylko wprowadzić kary, ale także powrócić do zasad w każdej dziedzinie życia, najlepiej tych chrześcijańskich.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commission for his explanation. The meat scandal in Brazil was of course shocking and European consumers naturally have legitimate concerns. Our priority should always be to protect the health of our consumers. This crisis must be solved and we must ensure that it does not happen again.

I believe that the EU has taken these concerns seriously. On revelation of the scandal the EU suspended meat imports from Brazil, but these restrictions must stay in place until we can be certain that there are no risks. The Brazilian authorities have to show they have implemented all the necessary measures for their inspection system and safety checks, and in this regard I welcome a second audit by the Commission at the end of this year.

The meat scandal should furthermore give the EU a more powerful argument for a strong SPS Chapter in the negotiations on an EU-Mercosur free trade agreement, which I hope can be concluded by the end of this year. After years of deadlock these negotiations have been revived and I call on the Commission to use this political momentum on both sides to continue pushing forward. This agreement will bring many opportunities for our businesses and consumers and should thus not be overshadowed by this scandal.

Stefan Eck, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, ich bin sicher, dass Sie alles tun werden, um zu verhindern, dass Gammelfleisch in die EU gelangt, denn wir wissen, es geht um nichts Geringeres als um die Gesundheit der europäischen Bevölkerung. Aber der brasilianische Gammelfleischskandal hat wieder einmal deutlich gezeigt, dass der Handel mit Fleisch- und der Konsum potenzielle Gefahrenquellen für die Menschen, für die Konsumenten darstellen.

Ich wundere mich aber schon, dass wir heute über diesen Fleischskandal reden, jedoch nicht über das, was in diesem Land im Zusammenhang mit der Fleisch- und Futtermittelproduktion seit Jahrzehnten entschieden eine ganz andere Dimension hat. Die brasilianischen Regenwälder werden für Weideflächen und den Anbau von Gensoja und Genmais als Futtermittel vernichtet. Indigene Völker wie die Guarani-Kaiowá wurden und werden von ihrem Lebensraum vertrieben und sogar getötet.

Es findet ein gnadenloser Vernichtungsfeldzug gegen die Natur und ein Genozid an diesen indigenen Völkern statt. Aber deswegen wird kein Importverbot als Sanktion auch nur in Betracht gezogen, weil die europäischen Bauern ohne die Futtermittel aus Brasilien ihre Schweine-, Hühner- und Kuhställe dicht machen könnten. Das ist doch der wirkliche Skandal! Innerhalb der letzten Jahrzehnte haben tausende Angehörige indigener Völker Brasiliens ihr Leben verloren, sind verhungert oder wurden sogar erschossen von paramilitärischen Einheiten großer Konzerne, korrupter Politiker und steinreicher Rinder- und Sojabarone.

Dass es ein paar brasilianische Schlachthäuser gibt, die ihr Ekelfleisch verkaufen, ist im Vergleich dazu eine Lappalie. Ich appelliere an Sie, auch dieses Problem wirklich in den Fokus Ihrer Arbeit zu stellen.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, este assunto é um assunto de inequívoca gravidade e, a meu ver, a Comissão Europeia tratou bem o problema no sentido de acautelar os interesses dos consumidores europeus. Mas, para situarmos bem esta discussão, convirá também lembrar que foram as próprias autoridades brasileiras a denunciar estas fraudes à União Europeia, a suspender as exportações e a fechar as unidades de produção em causa, o que significa que as autoridades políticas brasileiras estão, de facto, empenhadas em investigar todo este processo e a impedir novas fraudes, isto é, tem havido da parte das autoridades brasileiras toda a disponibilidade para participarem na investigação em curso acerca das deficiências que eles próprios reconhecem que existem no seu próprio sistema de controlo sanitário e fitossanitário. Por isso, não podemos também demonizar, de forma simplista, o Brasil, nem tão pouco a situação brasileira, que já foi, infelizmente, mas hoje, nos últimos anos, deram-se passos importantes para que a situação brasileira fosse bastante diferente daquela que foi agora aqui retratada.

Por outro lado, é importante salientar que nada disto pode pôr em causa as negociações em curso para a concretização de um tratado de livre comércio com os países do Mercosul. Está absolutamente garantido que, no contexto das discussões que neste momento estamos a levar a cabo, há um capítulo muito rigoroso sobre questões sanitárias e fitossanitárias, no sentido de salvaguardar a segurança dos consumidores europeus. Nem poderia, aliás, ser de outra forma. Agora o que é preciso é também investir seriamente no sentido de garantir a concretização deste acordo comercial que tem uma importância estratégica para a União Europeia.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, muito obrigado pelas explicações que deu aqui relativamente a este assunto. O Sr. Comissário questionou formalmente o Governo do Brasil sobre a fiscalização sanitária dos produtos de carne produzidos no país, tendo suscitado a credibilidade de sistemas de controlo sanitário, depois de a polícia brasileira tem investigado em março um esquema considerado muito grave de corrupção e de venda ilegal de carne.

Os ministros da agricultura reunidos no Conselho do passado dia 12 de junho discutiram o caso da fraude com carne proveniente do Brasil, tendo a Comissão Europeia informado que, em conjunto com os Estados-Membros, implementou medidas de combate à fraude, tais como a suspensão das importações dos produtos e estabelecimentos envolvidos e o reforço das verificações de controlo.

Na sequência da autoria realizada, foram identificadas deficiências críticas e sistemáticas e foi indicado que há muita coisa a fazer pelas autoridades brasileiras, aliás, como disse aqui o Sr. Comissário. Sr. Comissário, trata-se de um reiterado incumprimento das autoridades brasileiras que continuam a não atender às recomendações da União para o reforço do controlo sanitário.

O Brasil é o primeiro fornecedor de produtos agrícolas para a União Europeia com exportações de 1,7 mil milhões de euros de produtos de origem animal. Sr. Comissário, alguma coisa tem que ser feita. Eu penso que o Sr. Comissário é a pessoa indicada para travar isto.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, skandál s brazilským masem je mimořádně závažný, bohužel nikoliv ojedinělý. Před lety to byl skandál s koňským masem, který vyvolal v Evropě pobouření a obrátil pozornost k nekalým praktikám a podvodům v potravinářském řetězci. Byla přijata nejrůznější opatření a spotřebitelé byli ujišťováni, že je situace pod kontrolou, mechanismy dohledu byly posíleny a fungují.

Nyní tedy víme o selhání brazilské strany, kdy po léta bylo z Brazílie exportováno nevyhovující maso. Je proto zcela namístě se ptát, a proto jsem také podpořila iniciativu paní kolegyně Smolkové, jaká opatření Evropská komise podniká k tomu, aby bylo zaručeno, že k zákazníkům se dostane pouze maso, které nebude pochybné kvality, ať je produkováno v EU, nebo dováženo ze třetích zemí.

Hovoříme-li o jednotném trhu a o tom, co občany Evropské unie skutečně zajímá, pak jsou to právě odpovědi na tyto otázky, a já Vám za ně, pane komisaři, děkuji.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, скандалът с бразилското месо идва в тревожно за Европейския съюз време, когато в цяла Централна и Източна Европа гърми един друг скандал с различното качество на хранителните продукти в западната част на Европа и в централната и източната такава.

Направените изследвания в Чехия, Словакия, България за съжаление не само не разсейват тези подозрения, но и в голяма степен ги потвърждават. Това, разбира се, очаквано предизвиква и справедливия гняв на милиони граждани на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз в Централна и Източна Европа, които очакват да получават същото качество, за което са платили и което виждат по рекламите.

Затова двойният стандарт и гражданите „втора ръка“ както те се чувстват са напълно неприемливи и скандалът с бразилското месо също затвърждава тези по-скоро лоши негативни очаквания. Европейската комисия трябва да предложи мерки и решения на тези въпроси и да предложи как точно да бъдат избегнати подобни конфликти.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, htio bih naglasiti da se bojim da je ovaj skandal s uvozom mesa iz Brazila na neki način samo vrh ledenog brijega. Moramo staviti ruku na srce i reći sami sebi, imamo ozbiljnih problema zadnjih godina s raznim zaraženim mesom. U Hrvatskoj je bilo niz primjera gdje je osim brazilskoga mesa bilo i drugih vrsta mesa koje su bile zaražene salmonelom i na žalost i na druge načine i to meso koje je proizvedeno u Europskoj uniji.

Moramo staviti ruku na srce i reći sami sebi da imamo i mi unutar Europske unije svoje probleme jer ako nećemo mi sami tko će drugi brinuti onda o našim građanima, brinuti o našim potrošačima, brinuti o našem zdravlju? Zato gospodine povjereniče, uz veliko povjerenje koje imamo u vas i u rad Komisije, zaista inzistiramo da učinite sve kako bismo zaštitili naše potrošače i naše građane.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Kedves Kollégák, kedves Biztos Úr! A nagyobb nyomaték kedvéért én is rákérdezek, hogy már két volt szocialista tagállamból érkezett kollégám rákérdezt: Biztos Úr, lehetséges az, hogy gyengébb minőségű élelmiszerek vannak a volt szocialista országokban, így az én hazámban, Magyarországon ugyanazon név alatt, mint a nyugati tagállamokban? Végeztek Önök ezzel kapcsolatban vizsgálatokat? Van erről tudomásuk? Tehát egy adott árucikknek van egy bizonyos neve, egész más minőségű mondjuk Ausztriában, mint Magyarországon. A brazil élelmiszerbotránnyal kapcsolatban: nincs abban valami bizarr, tegyük a szívünkre a kezünket, hogy arról beszélünk, hogy európai uniós polgárokat megmérgezhettek a Brazíliából érkező hús? Hát miért nem a saját hazánkban a saját gazdáink, kisgazdáink által termesztett húst fogyasztjuk, Biztos úr, mint orvos, Ön nem ezt javasolná a betegeinek, hogy a helyben termelt egészséges élelmiszert fogyasszák?

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, with regard to the Brazilian beef scandal I listened very carefully to the Commissioner and I would summarise my reaction in two words: sincere, but naive. Sincerely he wants to ensure there are guarantees from the Brazilian authorities, but naively so because those beef barons, as Mr Eck pointed out, are never going to change, we have seen that. And we should be doing the same as the US and China: banning Brazilian beef and other products from coming into Europe instead of going along and looking for guarantees which we will never be able to ensure are there.

Secondly, it amazes me that at this time we are also going ahead with a Mercosur deal and we know that the main reason for the Mercosur deal for these countries is to send meat into Europe at a time when the CAP budget is under enormous pressure. There will be an 11 billion deficit because of the United Kingdom withdrawing. There will be a glut of products in Europe as a result, and yet we are talking about doing a Mercosur trade deal. If we do so, we should leave meat products out of it.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their suggestions and remarks. May I start with Ms Urszula Krupa, I do not see her in the Chamber but I would like to respond to her personally. The possibility of introducing bans was mentioned.

Colleagues, this is not about a trade war and it is not about protectionism. It is about possibilities to respect the rule of law, to justify our steps, to introduce our official control systems, and to guarantee food safety standards, and of course to follow possibilities to enforce our checks and to see how to address those issues – but it is not about unjustified bans. I know that some like to be protectionist, but this is not about protectionism. It is about possibilities to help the Brazilian authorities and also to have reliable official control systems and we are cooperating in this field.

We will see how things develop and see in which direction we should go. OK, if we do not achieve results we will, as I mentioned, introduce much stricter measures, but all are underway and through our cooperation we have the possibilities to address those issues. It is not about the possibility of once again introducing some unjustified measures, because that is not a European Union value.

The Commission is committed to ensuring that imports from Brazil, and indeed imports from all non-EU countries, are safe – have no doubts about that. The Commission is also very sensitive to the concerns of Parliament in this respect and to keeping you fully informed of developments.

Today I have updated you on the impact of the effective measures we put in place at the very beginning of this crisis. As you know, we reacted immediately. From the outset, the Commission has reacted quickly and decisively in full transparency to ensure that our consumers are not exposed to unacceptable risk.

Some of you mentioned the problem of salmonella within the EU. We have very strict rules. We have the rapid alert mechanism; we react immediately. Speaking of salmonella, we know all about the painful case in Croatia but we reacted immediately to find out from which establishment it came, and of course we know very well that pathogenic strains of salmonella must be addressed at operator level. We are trying to provide more measures to address these issues. Some countries in the EU have declared they are salmonella-free, but only a few. We will see how to move forward and encourage best practice, and of course to achieve better results, have no doubts about that.

Brazil must accept its responsibility to ensure the safety of its exports. Indeed, I have communicated this point to my counterpart, both in person and in writing. We have good collaboration with the Brazilian authorities at the moment. Mr Maggi has accepted the additional measures requested. However, we will maintain the enforced controls at EU borders and the Commission services will carry out a follow-up audit in Brazil by the end of this year, as I mentioned. This audit will examine all measures put in place by the Brazilian authorities to rectify the deficiencies identified in May.

If Brazil fails to implement the necessary corrective measures, the Commission will not hesitate to take stronger action, as I mentioned. This is not simply an empty threat. Rather, it is a reflection of our overarching commitment to ensuring that our consumers are protected from unacceptable risk in all cases.

Some of you mentioned problems with double quality food issues but that is not about food safety, it is not about this situation. Someone also mentioned rotten meat. Please, once again, present us with facts because we have a strict system. We know very well that all our countries, all our Member States, must have registered all those facts. If you have new evidence, please show us. We will react immediately, but we have our rapid alert system and at the moment they have no facts because we are sending those messages into society.

It is also very dangerous to send messages that are not well assessed because then society has a lot of rumours. This is very dangerous. It is against our possibilities to have trust in our food safety system, so I ask you to please present evidence. We are ready to react immediately, have no doubt about that.

Should there be any important developments on this file my services and I stand ready to discuss with you and to update you on the state of play at a plenary, or at committee level, or in writing.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

15.2. O-000044/2017: Armia UE

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Große Anfrage gemäß Artikel 130b der Geschäftsordnung von Beatrix von Storch im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion an die Kommission betreffend eine EU-Armee (O-000044/2017 – 2017/2760(RSP)) (B8-0322/2017).

Beatrix von Storch, Verfasserin. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Heute sind noch weniger Menschen hier im Plenum als am letzten Dienstag, als Herr Juncker sich schon aufgeregt hat. Ich kann das irgendwie verstehen. Die Antworten, die Sie auf unsere Anfragen geben, sind von einem nicht zuständigen Kommissar – Sie sind nicht zuständig –, sie werden verlesen – vorbereitete Statements, die von einem Beamten vorbereitet worden sind. Die Antworten werden uns vorab nicht zur Verfügung gestellt, weil Sie sagen: Sie kommen ja ohnehin hierher. Aber wenn Sie sowieso nur Statements verlesen, dann können Sie uns das Statement eigentlich auch vorab geben. Dann können wir besser darüber debattieren.

Was wir kritisieren: Die Antworten der Kommission sind grundsätzlich nichtssagend, und sie weichen dem Kern der Frage zu oft aus. Sie wollen als Europäische Kommission vom Parlament nicht kontrolliert werden. Aber ich gebe die Hoffnung natürlich nicht auf, und deswegen habe ich Fragen.

Erstens: Befürwortet die Kommission tatsächlich den Aufbau einer Interventionsarmee, die kriegerische Einsätze in Nachbarländern durchführen soll – Nachbarstaaten Europas? Warum hat diese Wertegemeinschaft Europa aus den Einsätzen und den Fehlern der USA nichts gelernt?

Zweitens: Wenn Juncker davon spricht, mit einer EU-Armee müssten die Werte der EU verteidigt werden: Soll das heißen, dass wir wie die USA mit militärischen Mitteln demokratische Strukturen in Libyen einführen wollen oder Gender-Mainstreaming in Marokko?

Und drittens: Warum hat Herr Juncker im März 2015 davon gesprochen, dass eine EU-Armee in einem Mitgliedstaat eingesetzt werden könnte? Gegen wen? Gegen die Regierung? Gegen die Regierung von Polen oder Ungarn beispielsweise? Oder sollen österreichische Einheiten auf Aufständische in Slowenien schießen? Mir fehlt da ein bisschen die Fantasie dafür, aber vielleicht helfen Sie uns gleich weiter.

Meine Meinung: Die EU-Armee ist das Letzte was wir brauchen. Es gibt keinen Grund, neben der NATO eine Doppelstruktur zu bauen. Die NATO muss ein Verteidigungsbündnis bleiben. Aber es ist ein Mythos, dass es die EU gewesen ist, die bislang den Frieden gesichert hat. Das war immer die NATO, und so soll es auch gerne bleiben. Den Frieden, den wir in Europa haben, der gefährdet eine EU-Armee vielmehr. Sie wollen den starken Mann gegen Russland markieren. Das brauchen wir aber nicht, denn dafür haben wir die NATO. Wir brauchen nun mal keine Doppelstrukturen, und die EU-Armee gefährdet natürlich auch die Neutralität von fünf Mitgliedstaaten in der Europäischen Union: Österreich, Finnland, Irland, Malta und Schweden.

Sie und viele andere Regierungen – auch die in Deutschland – wollen die EU-Armee, weil Sie einen weiteren Schritt hin zu den Vereinigten Staaten von Europa gehen wollen. Sie machen den gleichen Fehler wie seinerzeit beim Euro. Die gemeinsame Währung war auch eine ökonomische Fehlplanung und hat die politische Union erzwingen wollen. Das ist ziemlich erkennbar gescheitert. Die Krise des Euro hat uns viel Leid zugefügt – besonders den Griechen, aber auch anderswo. Und nun wollen Sie eine gemeinsame Armee, um die politische Union weiter zu erzwingen! Was wird das für Krisen verursachen! Krieg mit Russland?

Sie schaffen Strukturen, ohne europäischen Konsens zu haben. Eine solche Armee ist genauso wenig einsatzfähig wie der Euro. Der Euro hat es bereits bewiesen – und beim Euro ging es nur um Geld und nicht um Menschenleben.

Hören Sie doch bitte damit auf, militärische Ressourcen zentralisieren zu wollen. Europa kann sich mit der NATO und mit dezentralen Strukturen gut verteidigen. Eine zentralisierte Armee braucht man nur zum Angreifen, und das wollen wir nicht, und wir wollen auch die EU nicht als Militärmacht aufbauen, die in anderen Ländern interveniert. Das ist genau das Gegenteil von dem, was wir wollen. Wir wollen ein friedliches Europa, das sich selber schützt, aber das nicht in anderen Staaten interveniert.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, President Juncker's priority in the area of security and defence is to strengthen European defence cooperation. A recent proposal by the Commission, as well as steps agreed by the Council in May and the European Council in June, demonstrates that the EU as a whole is determined to take defence cooperation to a higher level: to invest more, collaborate more and put more emphasis on the actual output of the effort.

The reflection paper on the future of European defence, adopted on 7 June by the Commission, offers forward-looking defence scenarios as a contribution to the ongoing debate, identifying the main options for the direction of travel. Such future perspectives should not let us get distracted from the concrete work which we have been undertaking over the past year. The global strategy and the new level of ambition derived from it provide us with a strategic vision and purpose, which are now translating into concrete action. Deeper defence cooperation, in both operational and capability terms, is the only way Europeans can deliver the strong and state-of-the-art military capacity that we need to address external conflicts and crises, and thus protect the European Union and its citizens.

Also, in the long run, let there be no mistake: military capabilities are, and will remain, owned and operated by the Member States, which can choose to make them available within various frameworks, as has been mentioned, including the EU, NATO and the United Nations. We are mobilising European Union instruments to support Member States, not to set up common assets – what has been called an 'EU army'. Not at all. Absolutely not.

Moreover, we recognise that NATO remains the cornerstone of our Atlantic security, providing for the collective and territorial defence of its members. Indeed, the EU is committed to strengthening its cooperation with NATO on the basis of the joint declaration of 8 July 2016 by Presidents Tusk and Juncker and the Secretary-General of NATO, and its implementation. However, the EU has been contributing to addressing external challenges through the common security and defence policy crisis-management missions and operations for many years. That is also nothing new – and the public requires, and our security demands, that we do more as Europeans to help stabilise volatile regions and build local capacities.

This external action has a direct impact on our internal security. Nevertheless, such missions and operations can only take place outside the Union, and that continues to be the case. Irrespective of the particular circumstances of a conflict or crisis, the Union's action is always guided by respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law, which are essential elements of our Union.

The EU response to external conflicts, crises and instability will always combine a number of instruments, ranging from diplomacy, development and other forms of assistance to civilian or military crisis management. The complex challenges we face today cannot be tackled by one instrument alone, be it military or other.

The EU has a unique mix of tools and instruments. The nature of the threats we face requires us to use the broad toolbox at our disposal with greater flexibility, tearing down walls between external and internal, civilian and military, state and non-state instruments.

Stanislav Polčák, za skupinu PPE. – Pane předsedající, charakter vystoupení paní Storchové mě přesvědčil, že musím změnit svůj předem připravený projev.

Zaprvé jsem přesvědčen, že její kritika toho, že dnes ve čtvrtek odpoledne je zde málo kolegů, je nepřipadná za situace, kdy ona tady na červnovém zasedání ve čtvrtek odpoledne nebyla. Myslím si, že by si paní kolegyně měla sáhnout tak trochu do vlastního svědomí.

Zadruhé v té interpelaci podsouvá panu Junckerovi určitá sdělení, která nejsou v jeho sdělení obsažena. To je podle mého názoru rovněž trochu nepřipadné.

Zatřetí, pokud jde o kritiku pana komisaře, on v té minulé interpelaci, která si myslím, že splňuje kritéria pro označení za závažné, hovořil 16 + 4 minuty a myslím, že vystupoval velmi věcně, velmi zevrubně, kritizovat jej, to mně připadá rovněž nepřipadné.

A za čtvrté, a to je moje poslední vyjádření k této interpelaci, společná bezpečnostní a obranná politika dle Lisabonské smlouvy zahrnuje postupné utváření společné obranné politiky, přičemž to má být dosaženo na základě společného jednomyslného rozhodnutí Evropské rady.

Ivan Jakovčič, u ime kluba ALDE. – Gospodine predsjedniče, ne mogu se oteti dojmu, poštovana kolegice Storch, da se radi o jednom krajnje politikantskom pitanju. Kao što sam i očekivao, naime od Vas, ovdje ste u uvodu pomiješali sve. Pomiješali ste SAD, pomiješali ste Rusiju, a na kraju zamislite i to da bi europska vojska mogla djelovati i u Mađarskoj i Poljskoj. Dakle, zaista krajnje, krajnje politikantstvo.

Ali ipak, reći ću sljedeće, evo Sirija, kao dobar primjer. U Siriji ratuju SAD i Rusija. Tko trpi posljedice? Europska unija. Migrante koji dolaze iz tih područja upravo stranka kojoj pripada gospođa Storch želi iskoristiti za razbijanje Europske unije. Dakle, politikantstvo *par excellence*.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já ten problém vidím podobně jako mí předchůdci. Paní von Storchová na jedné straně zvedá velmi zásadní téma, jak intenzivní bude do budoucna spolupráce evropských zemí na obranné úrovni, to znamená, zda půjde o strukturovanou spolupráci pouze v oblasti třeba průmyslu, výzkumu, obranného a tak dále, anebo zda dokonce v budoucnu to dospěje až k společné armádě. Ale bohužel tou formou, jak je ta otázka položena, tak musím říci, že je velmi zavádějící a je vkládáno do úst panu Junckerovi něco, co neřekl. A tady já říkám jasně, obhajoba evropských hodnot, pro mě to je, paní von Storchová, obhajoba lidských práv. To je klíčové téma, je to téma, které musíme prezentovat, debatujeme o něm často zde a dneska už je Evropská unie jeden z mála světových hráčů,

кterý permanentně lidská práva obhajuje. A to je, myslím, strašně důležité a budme za to rádi. A vaše zpochybňování role Spojených států amerických, které dvakrát zachránily tento kontinent v první a druhé světové válce, mně připadá jako nepatřičné.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, уважаеми г-н Комисар, темата европейска армия е вечен спорен въпрос сякаш. Дублирането на НАТО е неразумно, икономически неизгодно и технически неизпълнимо. Държавите – членки на Северноатлантическия договор, дори не изпълняват задълженията си да влагат по 2% от своя брутен вътрешен продукт в своята отбрана и поне 20% в превъоръжаване и закупуване на ново оръжие.

Сътрудничеството за отбрана е нещо различно. За това може да се мисли и затова трябва да се говори. Ако става дума за общо закупуване на оръжие, екипировка за общо обучение на въоръжените сили, това е нещо, което би било полезно. Може да се мисли, и Комисията има роля тук, за това отделните държави да бъдат специализирани в производството на различна механизация, техника на различни бойни машини за авиацията, бронираната техника и военноморските сили. Това вече би било полезно за икономиката на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Kedves Képviselőtársaim! A Varsói Szerződés keretei között működő kötelező sorkatonai szolgálat idején sok vicces és kevésbé vicces anekdotát hallgattunk férfi évfolyamtársainktól, barátainktól. Az egyik így szólt, nagyon jól emlékszem, hogy az illetőnek azt kiabálta a katonai felettese, hogy „Futás, jönnek az olaszok!”. Mire az illető, ilyen tipikus értelmiségi egyetemista futott, aztán hátranézett és mondja: „Nem is jönnek semmiféle olaszok, minék fussak?” Na most kérdezem, hogy ez a bizonyos európai uniós kvázi hadsereg mit fog mondani majd a kiképzés alatt álló katonáknak, hogy kik elől kell futni? Tehát én teljesen logikusnak tartom von Storch asszonynak a kérdését, hogy ki az ellenség? Who is the enemy? Kivel szemben fog fellépni ez a sok pénzből létrejövő európai hadsereg, és mi lesz az, amit ők tudnak, és a NATO nem tud? Tessék tehát komolyan venni a kérdést és a felvetést.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Vytienis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to repeat certain things again because some information can be misleading. You know very well – we all know very well – that our military capacities are in the hands of the Member States. They own those capacities and they operate with those capacities. The decision to deploy national army forces remains at national, constitutional level, not at EU level. We are only supporting Member States to deepen defence cooperation among themselves and foster a common European perspective. That is all.

The EU can only decide to deploy a military operation with the mandate to potentially use armed forces outside the Union and with the mandate of the United Nations under international law. May I repeat once again this very important Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union, which states: ‘The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.’ These are our cornerstones.

The EU is taking concrete steps to strengthen European security and defence – in response to a clear demand by our citizens – and also to contribute to better sharing the burden across the Atlantic.

It is, of course, important to pay close attention to our strategic communications and to explain to a wider audience what we are doing and trying to achieve, and also what we are not doing. I think it is also very important to say what we are not doing. We are not making an EU army. The European Parliament is absolutely critical in relation to delivering on our promise to provide more protection and security for our citizens. We are doing this in the European way – as I like to emphasise – using the European Union’s unique mix of instruments, and in partnership wherever possible.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

16. Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół

17. Przekazanie tekstów przyjętych w trakcie obecnego posiedzenia : patrz protokół

18. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół

19. Przerwa w obradach

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

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.05 Uhr geschlossen.)

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
ALDE	Grupa Porozumienia Liberalistów i Demokratów na rzecz Europy
GUE/NGL	Konfederacyjna Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
EFDD	Europa Wolności i Demokracji Bezpośredniej
ENF	Grupa Europa Narodów i Wolności
NI	Niezrzeszeni