



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 5 LUTEGO 2018 R.

(C/2024/3196)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2017-2018

Posiedzenia od 5 do 8 lutego 2018 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. In Memoriam	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	4
5. Komunikat Przewodniczącego	4
6. Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół	6
7. Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół	6
8. Wniosek o skorzystanie z immunitetu: patrz protokół	6
9. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	6
10. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): patrz protokół	6
11. Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	7
12. Akty delegowane i środki wykonawcze (art. 105 ust. 6 oraz art. 106 ust. 4 lit. d) Regulaminu): patrz protokół	7

Spis treści	Strona
13. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	7
14. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130b Regulaminu) (złożenie): patrz protokół	7
15. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	7
16. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	7
17. Porządek obrad	7
18. Raport roczny Europejskiego Banku Centralnego za 2016 r. (debata)	8
19. Manipulowanie badaniami naukowymi przez korporacje wielonarodowe w następstwie badań emisji przeprowadzonych na małpach i ludziach przez niemiecki przemysł motoryzacyjny (debata)	27
20. Blokowanie geograficzne oraz inne formy dyskryminacji ze względu na przynależność państwową klientów, ich miejsce zamieszkania lub miejsce prowadzenia działalności (debata)	38
21. Decyzja podjęta w sprawie pakietu dotyczącego sprawiedliwego opodatkowania (II i III) (debata)	48
22. Racjonalne pod względem kosztów redukcje emisji oraz inwestycje niskoemisyjne (debata)	54
23. Przyspieszenie innowacji w dziedzinie czystej energii (debata)	64
24. Sprzeciw wobec aktu wykonawczego: Dodanie Sri Lanki, Trynidadu i Tobago oraz Tunezji do wykazu krajów trzecich wysokiego ryzyka (debata)	72
25. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	75
26. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	80
27. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	80

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 5 LUTEGO 2018 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wznowienie sesji

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 18 gennaio 2018.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.04)

3. In Memoriam

Le Président. – La semaine dernière, nous avons eu la tristesse d'apprendre le décès de notre collègue Édouard Ferrand.

Élu au Parlement européen en 2014, il a été chef de la délégation du Front national au sein de l'ENF et a siégé dans la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural ainsi que dans la commission parlementaire mixte avec la - Turquie.

M. Ferrand nous a quittés à la suite d'une maladie qu'il a voulu garder jusqu'à la fin dans une discrétion absolue et face à laquelle il a fait preuve d'une grande dignité. Il laisse une épouse et cinq jeunes enfants.

J'ai eu l'occasion d'échanger avec lui, l'année passée, lors de la visite dans les zones touchées par le tremblement de terre en Italie, où il représentait son groupe. Même si je ne partageais pas ses idées ni sa vision de l'Europe, je me souviens qu'il défendait avec conviction sa position politique.

Au nom du Parlement, je souhaite exprimer les condoléances les plus sincères à sa famille, à son épouse, à ses enfants et à tous ceux qui lui ont été proches au cours de sa vie et qui, aujourd'hui, pleurent sa disparition.

Je vous invite à vous joindre à moi pour observer une minute de silence.

(L'Assemblée, debout, observe une minute de silence)

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chiedo a quest’Aula: si può essere bersaglio della follia e dell’odio solo a ragione del colore della propria pelle? Sparare da un’auto in corsa e colpire indiscriminatamente più neri possibile. Ecco il risultato di chi incita alla superiorità razziale, di chi instilla paura nei cittadini, di chi usa e propone la sua offerta politica fomentando l’odio. Il mio sostegno da quest’Aula a tutte le vittime dell’odio, indipendentemente dal colore della loro pelle.

Presidente. – Grazie, onorevole Kyenge. Quello che è accaduto a Macerata, in Italia, è qualche cosa di inaccettabile e di inammissibile che tutti quanti noi condanniamo con fermezza e senza alcuna esitazione.

4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

5. Komunikat Przewodniczącego

Presidente. - L'11 gennaio ho ricevuto una lettera dei presidenti dei gruppi PPE, S&D, ALDE e Verts/ALE sulla condotta del vicepresidente Czarnecki, con cui si chiedeva l'applicazione della procedura prevista dall'articolo 21 del regolamento, a seguito di dichiarazioni relative a un altro deputato al Parlamento europeo.

La questione è stata esaminata dalla Conferenza dei presidenti in due riunioni successive: il 18 gennaio e il 1° febbraio. Il 18 gennaio ho inoltre ricevuto una lettera del vicepresidente Czarnecki, in cui quest'ultimo affrontava le preoccupazioni sollevate nella lettera sopraccitata. Successivamente, il 23 gennaio ho sentito il vicepresidente Czarnecki su tale questione.

Dopo aver preso nota delle sue osservazioni, il 1° febbraio la Conferenza dei presidenti ha deciso, a maggioranza di tre quinti dei voti espressi, che rappresentano almeno tre gruppi politici, di proporre al Parlamento di porre fine al mandato del vicepresidente Czarnecki, ritenendo che abbia commesso una colpa grave, ai sensi dell'articolo 21 del regolamento.

Il Parlamento deciderà mercoledì in merito a tale proposta, a maggioranza di due terzi dei voti espressi, che rappresentino la maggioranza dei deputati che lo compongono.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W związku z tym chciałabym zapytać o następującą kwestię: Czy biorąc pod uwagę to, co Pan Przewodniczący przed chwilą przedstawił, możemy spodziewać się, że Prezydium Parlamentu Europejskiego będzie recenzowało wypowiedzi posłów w państwach członkowskich? Chciałabym również zapytać, kiedy Prezydium Parlamentu Europejskiego odniesie się do haniebnych wypowiedzi pana Verhofstadta, obrażających naród polski, które padły tutaj w tym parlamencie? Bo to jest niebywała sytuacja. Chcecie państwo oceniać wypowiedzi posłów wygłoszone poza Parlamentem Europejskim. Na podstawie którego artykułu Regulaminu Parlamentu?

(Oklaski grupy ECR)

Presidente. – L'articolo 21 del regolamento prevede che la richiesta avvenga da parte di tre gruppi parlamentari che rappresentino la quota alta. Non si tratta di una sanzione ai sensi del regolamento, sanzione che può essere inflitta o meno dal Presidente. Non è né il Presidente né l'Ufficio di presidenza a decidere, bensì la Conferenza dei presidenti. Quindi è una richiesta che viene dai gruppi, non è una sanzione inflitta ai sensi del regolamento, ma si applica l'articolo 21. A me non toccava altro che far rispettare il regolamento.

Si è votato all'interno della Conferenza dei presidenti e quindi tutta la procedura è stata rispettata. Quindi non si tratta di sanzioni, perché il Presidente non può infliggere sanzioni per ciò che accade fuori del Parlamento. Io posso infliggere sanzioni per ciò che accade all'interno del Parlamento.

La richiesta di rimuovere dall'incarico di vicepresidente dipende, ai sensi dell'articolo 21, da una richiesta che viene da diversi gruppi politici.

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die Kollegin verweist auf die freie Rede, und die freie Rede wird von keinem Abgeordneten in Frage gestellt. Aber wir reden hier nicht von einem normalen Abgeordneten. Wir reden von einem Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments.

Genauso, Herr Präsident, wie wir von Ihnen als EVP-Kandidaten erwarten, dass Sie das Amt parteineutral ausführen – und Sie machen das hervorragend, Herr Präsident Tajani – genauso erwarten wir auch von anderen Vizepräsidenten, dass sie sich so verhalten, wie es dieser Institution, dem Europäischen Parlament, gemäß ist.

Wenn wir einen Vizepräsidenten haben, der in inakzeptabler Weise eine demokratisch gewählte Kollegin hier mit Nazi-vergleichen verunglimpft, wenn wir einen Kollegen haben, der die Institutionen der Europäischen Union auf inakzeptable Art und Weise mit der Sowjetunion vergleicht, dann ist eine rote Linie überschritten. Dann muss man auch Konsequenzen ziehen. Deswegen werden wir als Fraktion für die Abwahl von Czarnecki werben.

(Beifall)

Um den Kollegen der PiS gleich die Munition wegzunehmen: Meine Fraktion ist im gleichen Atemzug bereit, einen anderen Kandidaten von PiS als Vizepräsidenten zu akzeptieren. Es handelt sich nicht um eine Abwahl gegenüber Polen, es handelt sich nicht um eine Abwahl gegenüber einer Fraktion oder einer Partei. Wir stimmen für jeden anderen Kollegen, den die ECR vorschlagen wird. Aber im konkreten Fall Czarnecki glauben wir, dass Konsequenzen notwendig sind.

(Beifall von Seiten der PPE und der ALDE)

Presidente. – Ha chiesto la parola l'onorevole Bullmann, ma non è che dobbiamo fare un dibattito sull'onorevole Czarnecki, perché la decisione è già stata presa. Si voterà e l'Aula sovrana, a scrutinio segreto, come richiesto, deciderà cosa fare.

Ho risposto soltanto in termini giuridici all'onorevole perché aveva fatto riferimento all'Ufficio di presidenza. L'Ufficio di presidenza non c'entra nulla, e non c'entrano nulla le sanzioni che infligge il Presidente. È una decisione che viene presa in base all'articolo 21 e tutta la procedura è stata rispettata. È stata garantita anche la possibilità all'on. Czarnecki di dire la sua. Il verbale dell'incontro che ha avuto con me è stato sottoscritto e non ci sono state scuse da parte dell'on. Czarnecki. Quindi, tutto è stato fatto alla luce del sole.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich will auch keine Debatte heraufbeschwören. Ich will nur die Frage der Kollegin beantworten: Nein, in der Konferenz der Präsidenten ist keine Stimme laut geworden, dass es die Zensur von Auffassungen geben sollte; und das wird es auch nicht geben. Aber es gibt eine Würde des Europäischen Parlaments, es gibt eine Würde dieses Hauses. Und bitte vergessen Sie nicht, dass die europäische Einigung in der Ablehnung des Kriegs und in der Ablehnung des Nationalsozialismus gewachsen ist. Das ist Verpflichtung und Erbe. Und wer in dieser Weise Nazivergleiche zieht, der überschreitet eine rote Linie. Wir – die Sozialdemokratische Fraktion – möchten nicht, dass dieses Haus von jemandem vertreten wird, der mit Nazivergleichen arbeitet. Das gehört in dieses Haus ebenso wenig, wie Nazis in dieses Haus gehören. Darauf bestehen wir.

Im Übrigen schließen wir uns den Worten des Kollegen Weber an. Selbstverständlich stehen wir zur Verfügung, einen Repräsentanten, eine Repräsentantin, die diese Grenze nicht überschreitet, aus der entsprechenden Fraktion mit zu wählen. Wir sind für die Pluralität in diesem Haus. Aber keine Nazivergleiche, und keine Nazis an der Spitze dieses Hauses! Das hat hier nichts verloren.

(Beifall)

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, je voulais juste soutenir votre position. Je pense que vous avez mené cela tout à fait correctement. Vous savez que, dans cette Assemblée, je suis très attaché à ce que nous ayons des débats contradictoires et des oppositions d'idées et c'est tout à fait normal.

Mais, lorsque l'on recourt à des attaques personnelles visant à dégrader la personne, comme cela a été fait par M. - Czarnecki, on dépasse toutes les bornes. Je combats les idées du PiS, je combats les idées, par exemple, de l'extrême droite, mais vous ne m'enlèverez jamais le respect de toute personne humaine.

Tous les élus ici ont la même légitimité et sont des personnes humaines dignes de respect, et M. Czarnecki n'a pas été à cette hauteur-là. C'est en cela que c'est inacceptable.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche io penso che ci debbano essere dei paletti. È per questa ragione che ho indirizzato al suo ufficio una lettera, sottoscritta da oltre cento deputati, per chiedere che nelle aule del Parlamento europeo non avessero accesso forze politiche come Casa Pound che si autodefiniscono i fascisti del terzo Millennio.

Vorrei che quest'Aula rispondesse e provasse a mantenere fermi anche questi paletti, perché appunto, dopo i fatti di Macerata, vanno respinti e vanno respinti con fermezza in ogni sede dove il fascismo si annidi.

Presidente. – Onorevole Forenza, ci sono delle regole che vanno rispettate all'interno di questa casa. Il Presidente non autorizza eventi, semmai può vietare delle iniziative che ci sono all'interno del Parlamento. Ma quando non arrivano pregiudicati o persone che sono elencate in liste terroriste, io non posso impedire a un parlamentare ...

(Il Presidente si rivolge all'on. Krasnodębski)

Onorevole, è inutile che alzi la voce con me. Si sieda e rispetti l'Aula! Si sieda e rispetti! Si metta in silenzio! Benissimo, vedo che la democrazia non sa neanche che cos'è!

Ha finito di fare il suo comizio, senza chiedere la parola? È inutile! Si calmi perché qui non dobbiamo litigare, dobbiamo soltanto esprimere delle posizioni politiche. Quindi la richiamo all'ordine e all'educazione. Chiaro?

Stavo rispondendo: quando una persona è invitata da un parlamentare, a qualsiasi forza politica appartenga, e non ci sono violazioni della legge, non possiamo vietare una manifestazione. Tant'è che non è stato detto nulla, e poi l'esposizione politica non aveva niente a che fare con la vicenda di Macerata.

Io posso pure non condividere le posizioni, ma altrimenti non autorizziamo più o meglio vietiamo manifestazioni o incontri all'interno del Parlamento organizzati da parlamentari. Ma tutti i parlamentari, come diceva l'on. Lamberts prima, sono uguali perché rappresentano il popolo. Poi uno può condannare le loro idee, ma quando non ci sono dichiarazioni che violano le regole non possiamo impedire queste riunioni. Adesso procediamo perché abbiamo detto già molto.

6. Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół

7. Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół

8. Wniosek o skorzystanie z immunitetu: patrz protokół

9. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół

10. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): patrz protokół

11. **Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
12. **Akty delegowane i środki wykonawcze (art. 105 ust. 6 oraz art. 106 ust. 4 lit. d) Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
13. **Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół**
14. **Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130b Regulaminu) (złożenie): patrz protokół**
15. **Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół**
16. **Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**

17. Porządek obrad

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato alla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 1° febbraio 2018, è stato distribuito. A seguito di consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula la seguente proposta di modifica al progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno:

Lunedì e martedì:

Non sono proposte modifiche.

Mercoledì:

La relazione dell'on. Ignazio Corrao sullo scambio automatizzato di dati di immatricolazione dei veicoli in Portogallo sarà aggiunta alle votazioni di mercoledì.

Vi sono obiezioni?

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Comunico di aver ricevuto una richiesta da parte del gruppo ENF intesa a rinviare la votazione sulla relazione sulla composizione del Parlamento europeo a giovedì 8 febbraio o al 1° marzo 2018.

Nicolas Bay (ENF), au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, merci tout d'abord des propos que vous avez tenus en ouverture de cette séance pour rendre hommage à notre regretté collègue, Édouard Ferrand. Nous sommes très sensibles à l'hommage que vous lui avez rendu et, bien sûr, nous en ferons part à ses proches et, notamment à son épouse et à ses enfants. Merci également d'avoir fait observer une minute de silence en sa mémoire.

Nous souhaitons une légère modification de l'ordre du jour de cette session plénière pour que le vote sur le rapport Hübner et Silva Pereira, qui porte sur la composition du Parlement européen après les élections européennes et après le Brexit, initialement prévu mercredi, puisse avoir lieu, si possible, soit ce jeudi, soit lors de la mini-session à Bruxelles, le 1^{er} mars, parce qu'il apparaît que les opinions sur ce rapport sont assez partagées au sein de notre hémicycle et que l'absence d'un très grand nombre de députés d'un même groupe – ce qui sera le cas en raison du fait que beaucoup d'entre nous nous rendrons aux obsèques de notre collègue Édouard Ferrand, en région parisienne – pourrait avoir une incidence sur l'issue du vote. Par conséquent, nous soumettons cette demande à votre bienveillance.

Puis, Monsieur le Président, si vous me le permettez, je voudrais dire, s'agissant de M. Czarnecki, que, bien sûr, nous ne partageons pas du tout les propos qu'il a tenus mais ils s'inscrivaient dans le cadre d'une vive polémique avec un de ses collègues qui accusait la Pologne d'être une dictature. Il y a un principe de droit, si vous me permettez, très important, c'est qu'on ne peut pas être juge et partie. Or, quand la Conférence des présidents, composée presque exclusivement d'adversaires politiques de M. Czarnecki prend une décision contre lui, les principes du droit sont violés et on ne peut pas invoquer la démocratie tout en violant les principes élémentaires du droit.

Le Président. – La démocratie respecte les décisions de la majorité. Nous avons pris une décision à une large majorité. Un vote aura lieu au scrutin secret. Chacun pourra donc se prononcer comme il le souhaite.

C'è qualcuno che vuole intervenire contro la richiesta dell'on. Bay?

Maria João Rodrigues, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, Parliament's position was extremely clear regarding the fact that we deplore the death of our colleague, Mr Ferrand. This was very clear this morning.

Nevertheless, are now addressing another issue, namely two very important reports on which we have done a lot of work, and on which Parliament needs to come forward with a very clear position and a very clear vote. This is scheduled for Wednesday.

The S&D Group does not agree to postpone this vote. The vote should take place on Wednesday. To delay it would be a big mistake because Parliament needs to come forward with a clear position on this before the leaders' meeting addressing the same issue.

Again, we deplore what happened to our colleague, but we don't believe this is a reason to postpone a vote on such an important report.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato.

18. Raport roczny Europejskiego Banku Centralnego za 2016 r. (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Jonás Fernández, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari, sulla relazione annuale della Banca centrale europea (2017/2124(INI)) (A8-0383/2017)

Ho il piacere di dare il benvenuto al Presidente della Banca Centrale europea, Mario Draghi.

Prima di dargli la parola, vorrei che i parlamentari che non intendono restare in Aula decidano di farlo in tempi rapidi.

Jonás Fernández, ponente. – Señor presidente, es un placer iniciar este debate, recibir al presidente del Banco Central Europeo, Mario Draghi, al vicepresidente de la Comisión, el señor Dombrovskis, y a todos los colegas que van a participar en esta discusión sobre la ejecución de la política monetaria por parte del BCE.

Es cierto que el BCE es una institución independiente que ejecuta, en el marco de su mandato, el cumplimiento del objetivo de alcanzar una inflación cercana al 2 %, pero es verdad que, en los últimos tiempos, estamos teniendo severos problemas para situar la inflación objetivo en esa referencia de largo plazo. Todavía hace unos días conocíamos el dato del mes pasado que recogía una rebaja adicional de la inflación, hasta el 1,3 %, y es verdad que las previsiones sitúan ese 2 % muy entrado el año 2019.

A su vez, según los datos de crecimiento, es verdad que la zona del euro está recuperando capacidad, pero tenemos por delante un exceso de potencial, un exceso de capacidad de crecimiento suficiente: el Fondo Monetario, la propia Comisión Europea recogen en sus estimaciones del *output gap* un espacio muy amplio para poder seguir creciendo sin tensiones inflacionistas.

Por lo tanto, esta Cámara, en ese informe, respetando —como digo— la independencia clara del BCE, yo creo que sitúa dónde debe estar el debate para orientar también esa labor durante el próximo año.

Como decía, es verdad que la zona del euro está creciendo mejor, pero la política monetaria no es suficiente: necesitamos una política fiscal acorde, que permita diversificar las posiciones de cada uno de los Gobiernos en el ciclo económico para dotar al conjunto de la zona del euro de una política fiscal consistente. Es verdad que necesitamos también reformas que activen, que mejoren la productividad en el conjunto de la Unión: reformas que sean socialmente responsables, políticas socialmente con futuro. Pero, también, el informe apunta a la necesidad de consolidar el mercado interior. Necesitamos mejorar la consolidación de la Unión de Mercados de Capitales —que está impulsando la Comisión con el apoyo de este Parlamento— y necesitamos también consolidar la Unión Bancaria. Es una agenda de reformas, algunas ya propuestas legislativas, que están encima de la mesa del Parlamento Europeo, que necesitan del concurso y del debate de todos nuestros colegas.

Por lo tanto, pedimos una política monetaria acomodaticia en el buen sentido, en la buena dirección, reformas que siguen estando pendientes. Y además, el informe recoge, por supuesto, algunos efectos laterales de esa política monetaria, por lo que exhorta al BCE a que también haga un seguimiento puntual de ellos. Me estoy refiriendo a los problemas de redistribución de la renta y de la riqueza; me estoy refiriendo a los problemas que supone para la estabilidad financiera mantener una curva de tipos planos durante mucho tiempo; me estoy refiriendo también al control y al seguimiento de potenciales burbujas que pudieran estar identificándose en algunos segmentos de los mercados financieros y de los mercados también de *real estate*. Y, por lo tanto, pedimos al BCE que haga un seguimiento de esos efectos laterales de su propia política monetaria.

Pero el informe apunta claramente a nuevos instrumentos de transparencia, a la necesidad de que el CSPP tenga unos criterios claros de elegibilidad para evitar problemas de discriminación entre las grandes y las pequeñas empresas. Necesitamos mejorar la aplicación del ELA, para darle credibilidad y robustez en el conjunto de la zona del euro, y necesitamos mejorar el diálogo monetario, el control que esta Cámara ejerce del trabajo del Banco Central Europeo — que es una institución, como reconoce el informe, que está vinculada también por el Acuerdo de París, que ha firmado el conjunto de la Unión Europea—.

Yo creo que es un informe completo, importante, y espero que de este debate salgan nuevas aportaciones.

Mario Draghi, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Mr President, Mr Vice-President of the Commission, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I am very pleased to be here to discuss with you the ECB's activities and your draft resolution on the ECB's Annual Report for 2016.

Today's debate represents a good opportunity to take stock of progress made and discuss the way forward. A decade ago, the global financial crisis was starting. Today, while further efforts are needed to overcome its legacy, the euro area economy is expanding and employment is rising. Your draft resolution points out that monetary policy has played a key role in this recovery process. The ECB has indeed acted decisively, in line with its mandate. We have addressed financial fragmentation and supported the economy, enabling inflation gradually to converge towards our objective.

The draft resolution also notes that the independence of the ECB has allowed us to take resolute action within our mandate. But independence is just one of the cornerstones of our institutional framework. Accountability is its necessary counterpart. And you, as the representatives of the people of the European Union, are the heart of our accountability. Together, independence and accountability underpin our effectiveness and our legitimacy.

In my remarks today, I will focus on two particular issues that have been raised in the draft resolution. First, I will elaborate on economic developments in the euro area and the role of the ECB's monetary policy. Second, I will discuss the state of the financial sector and the measures needed to further strengthen its resilience.

The euro area economy is expanding robustly, with growth rates stronger than previously expected and significantly above potential. According to preliminary data, euro area real GDP increased by 2.5% in 2017, compared to the 1.7% that had been foreseen in our December 2016 staff projections for the same year.

The economic expansion is broad-based. The dispersion of growth rates across countries and across sectors is at its lowest level in 20 years. Accordingly, we see positive growth in over 85% of the sectors in the euro area economy, compared with a historical average of 75%. Employment growth has recently strengthened, as well, in all the main sectors, namely industry, construction and market services. These developments bode well for economic growth, as expansions tend to be stronger and more resilient when growth is broad-based.

The number of people employed in the euro area has also increased by around 7.5 million, since hitting a low in mid-2013. Employment has now reached its highest level since the introduction of the euro. The unemployment rate continues to decline and now stands at close to a nine-year low of 8.7%, down by 3.3 percentage points from its highest level.

As more people find jobs, household incomes rise. This has helped to strengthen private consumption growth, which in turn is boosting business investment. In addition, a number of other factors have supported investment. These include higher demand for euro area exports, rising corporate profitability and an increasing use of installed productive capacity.

These positive developments have been fostered and reinforced by the pass-through of the ECB's monetary policy measures, which have eased funding conditions for households and firms. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in particular have benefited from our policy measures. The growing inclusiveness of this economic expansion is partly due to the renewed vigour of small businesses, which are a key engine of income creation in our economy.

While our confidence that inflation will converge towards our aim of below, but close to, 2% has strengthened, we cannot yet declare victory on this front. After increasing to 2% in early 2017 due to a rise in energy prices, headline inflation has fluctuated since May last year between 1.3% and 1.5%. Measures of underlying inflation, which exclude the most volatile components, remained subdued and have yet to show convincing signs of a sustained upward trend. Also, new headwinds have arisen from the recent volatility in the exchange rate, whose implications for the medium-term outlook for price stability require close monitoring.

On the back of improved economic conditions, the financial stability situation in the euro area has also continued to evolve positively. As I will explain in more detail, for the time being we have little indication that generalised imbalances are emerging.

Overall, while we can be more confident about the path of inflation, patience and persistence with regard to monetary policy are still warranted for underlying inflation pressures to build up and inflation to converge durably towards our objective. That is why – at our last meeting – we reaffirmed the decisions taken at our October monetary policy meeting last year. Accordingly, our net asset purchase programme, running at a monthly pace of EUR 30 billion, will continue until September 2018, or beyond, if necessary, and in any case until the Governing Council sees a sustained adjustment in the path of inflation consistent with its inflation aim.

In parallel, we will reinvest the principal payments from maturing securities purchased under the asset purchase programme for an extended period of time after the end of those purchases, and in any case for as long as necessary. We expect our key interest rates to remain at their present levels for an extended period of time, and well past the horizon of our net asset purchases.

Looking forward, we remain fully committed to our price stability objective and – in line with our monetary policy strategy – we aim to stabilise inflation around levels that are below, but close to, 2% within a meaningful medium-term horizon.

As always, our monetary policy will continue to be guided by our assessment of the progress made towards our objective. Our forward guidance continues to provide a stable framework for our monetary policy stance and its outlook. In line with that guidance, monetary policy will evolve in a fully data-dependent and time-consistent manner.

Let me also say a few words about the financial sector. Your draft resolution also considers several aspects related to the euro financial sector and I would like to follow up on some of them. Let me first of all emphasise that our monetary policy and a healthier financial sector are mutually reinforcing. By supporting the economic recovery, our monetary policy measures have had a positive impact on the credit quality of banks' loans to businesses and households, and have helped banks further to reduce their provisioning costs. Moreover, a stronger economy generates greater volumes of sustainable bank lending. Both factors have therefore strengthened the solidity of the European banking sector.

A better integrated and sounder financial sector has also been able to transmit our policy impulses more evenly across the euro area. The improved health of the banking sector, coupled with our credit easing measures, has brought about a marked improvement in the transmission process, as shown by the reduced heterogeneity of bank lending rates across countries, and by the improved borrowing conditions for SMEs. A more robust financial sector has also allowed us to pursue an accommodative policy for as long as necessary, without any build-up of significant financial stability risks.

The draft resolution points in particular to the risks stemming from possible asset bubbles. We are closely monitoring developments in some market segments, such as prime commercial real estate and housing markets in some countries, and corporate bond markets for lower-rated issuers. As we explain in our Financial Stability Review, asset price increases in euro area markets have so far not been accompanied by excessive credit growth. Although credit flows have been recovering, growth rates are still far below anything we saw before the crisis, and on the low side of the range of growth rates historically seen during recoveries. So there is no evidence of systemic credit-fuelled bubbles.

The efforts we have made in recent years to strengthen prudential regulation and supervision, above all with the establishment of the banking union, have certainly played a role in protecting financial stability. In particular, ECB banking supervision plays a key role in ensuring the safety and soundness of banks. It enhances the banks' resilience through strengthened prudential regulation. It also fosters cross-border financial integration and provides a level playing field by harmonising supervision across the euro area.

Also, on the macro-prudential side, we see national authorities in close cooperation with the ECB being very active in further mitigating the emergence of possible systemic risks, especially in respect of residential real-estate developments.

Despite the improved cyclical environment, improved market sentiment and the substantial strengthening of its shock absorption capacity, the European banking sector continues to face structural challenges, as you also state in your resolution. Indeed, overcapacity and cost inefficiencies continue to weigh on bank profitability in certain banking markets. Moreover, the high stock of non-performing loans (NPLs) needs to be further reduced and any future build-up needs to be avoided. Non-performing loan levels have been declining for more than three years and good progress has been made on the EU Council Action Plan, although there is still a considerable way to go. Additional efforts by banks, supervisors, regulators and legislators are needed to create an environment in which non-performing loans can be effectively managed and efficiently disposed of.

Strengthening the resilience of the euro area financial sector also means adapting to a changing operating environment. The resolution mentions, for instance, the growing role of fintech companies. This means more competition for banks, including in the field of lending and payment services. At the same time, new technology presents an opportunity for banks to increase the value added and the cost-efficiency of their services.

Another factor shaping the euro area financial sector is the United Kingdom's decision to leave the European Union. At this stage, we do not have clarity regarding the shape of the UK's future relationship with the EU. Well-managed preparations are thus essential for dealing with frictions in the transition from the current situation to the new eventual equilibrium, especially in the event that no transitional agreement is reached between the EU and the United Kingdom.

Banks and financial institutions are not the only ones that have to prepare for an operating environment in a state of flux. Policymakers too, at national and European level, have to make sure that the regulatory framework is fit and ready to safeguard the resilience of the financial sector in the face of new challenges.

Let me mention two examples. First, finalising the banking reform package is crucial. The package will strengthen the regulatory architecture, reduce risks in the banking sector and increase financial stability. It will introduce into Union law new internationally agreed standards, such as the leverage ratio requirement, which will restrict the build-up of excessive leverage in the banking system, and the standard on total loss-absorbing capacity, otherwise known as TLAC, which will strengthen the resolution framework. As co-legislators, you play a vital role in this process, and I would encourage you to aim for consistent implementation of the internationally agreed standards, so as to ensure a level playing field worldwide and to reduce options and national discretion as much as possible.

Second, it is important to complete the architecture of the banking union by putting in place the agreed common backstop to the Single Resolution Fund and by establishing a European deposit insurance scheme (EDIS). These are two fundamental pieces of the banking union project and their implementation should not be postponed. The backstop should ensure that sufficient funding is available at all times to guarantee orderly resolutions.

A fully-fledged EDIS is an indispensable counterpart to the single currency as everyone in the euro area should be able to have confidence that the money in their bank account enjoys the same level of protection, regardless of where the account is held within the euro area.

Let me conclude. We pay close attention to Parliament's resolution on our annual report, and we will respond in detail to the issues you raise there when we publish our ECB Annual Report for 2017. The strong relationship between Parliament and the ECB not only demonstrates the importance of accountability, but also bears possible lessons for reflection on the future of Economic and Monetary Union, the strengthening of which should remain a priority.

A well-designed and effective policy framework requires clear institutional architecture, measurable objectives and the tools to achieve them – and it needs to be accompanied by strong accountability. This is not only essential to ensure that policies are effective. It is also crucial if the public is to understand those policies and play an active role, in particular via their representatives in Parliament.

Thank you for your attention. I am now at your disposal for questions.

(Applause)

President. – Thank you very much, Mr President. I also want to thank you for your personal cooperation with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and with Parliament.

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Jonás Fernández, and the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) for their report on the ECB's annual report. It is a pleasure to be here today to discuss this with you and President Draghi.

An ex-post debate on the ECB's activities by the European Parliament is an expression of democratic accountability. So let me start by saying that the Commission largely shares the general thrust of the report prepared by the ECON committee. The Commission shares the report's views that the ECB's independence in the conduct of its monetary policy, as enshrined in the Treaty, is crucial to the objective of safeguarding price stability. Accountability and independence are intertwined, and in this report the Commission shares the views that the ECB's responsibilities and tasks require transparency towards the public at large.

The Commission also shares the views of the ECON report that the ECB's unconventional monetary policy actions, such as forward guidance and quantitative easing, improved the transmission of monetary policy. They also had a positive impact on the overall financing conditions in the euro area and certainly contributed to the start of the ongoing economic upswing. The implementation of the above-mentioned ECB policy measures is expected to keep on gradually improving the financial conditions and contribute to bringing inflation closer to the ECB's objective of close to but below 2%.

We also share the ECON report's views that a prolonged period of low or even negative interest rates could represent a challenge to the profitability of various actors in the European financial sector. That said, the low interest rates were necessary to support the recovery and had some positive impact in the short term on financing costs and capital gains for banks.

These introductory remarks sum up our main points on the report. I am looking forward to a fruitful debate today and I trust that you will confirm the constructive engagement that has developed between the Parliament and the ECB over the years. Finally, I also would like to thank President Draghi for highlighting the importance of the work of completing Economic and Monetary Union and the Banking Union, and we fully share this priority.

Siegfried Mureşan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I welcome this debate as part of the European Central Bank's accountability towards the European Parliament. As you have said, President Draghi, the euro area recovery continues at a steady pace; unemployment has continued to decline and has reached the lowest level since January 2009; domestic demand has strengthened, and we have seen 18 quarters of consecutive growth. However, the positive economic outlook still has to translate into higher public and private investments and we still have to progress on reaching our inflation objective.

We are still concerned about the risks of the persisting low interest rates for the insurance and pension sectors as well as for private savings. This is an important element of the European Parliament's report with regard to the ECB's activity for 2016. This is why the ongoing tapering is necessary for the economy to get back on track and to be self-sustaining. Unconventional monetary policy tools have reached their limits. Monetary policy cannot and shall not be the tool to resolve all of the EU's economic and financial shortcomings. I agree with President Draghi when he says that Member States have to increase their efforts in implementing growth-enhancing structural reforms, while at the same time maintaining sound and responsible budgets to support the economic recovery.

Finally, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Jonás Fernández, for his work on this report, and we are sending – with the debate today and with its adoption tomorrow, hopefully with a large majority – a clear signal to the ECB on the Parliament's position on your activity in the year 2016.

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président de la Banque centrale, Monsieur le Vice-président, cher rapporteur, c'est un moment important pour la politique monétaire, mais aussi pour la politique économique que ce rendez-vous autour du rapport annuel de la Banque centrale.

Vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Président, cette fois-ci, au fond, le contexte économique s'améliore pour l'économie européenne, et pourtant la politique monétaire doit encore contribuer à soutenir l'activité économique.

De ce point de vue, notre rapport vous invite à contribuer à une réflexion dont on sent qu'elle est en train d'émerger parmi les experts sur la réalité de l'inflation, alors que souffle un air nouveau. En effet, votre mandat défini autour de 2 % correspond à un mode de production, à un état de la mondialisation dont on voit bien qu'il est peut-être remis en cause. Il me semble que la Banque centrale a une partition à jouer dans ce domaine.

Au-delà de ce que peut faire la politique monétaire en toute indépendance, il nous semble que les messages que vous envoyez doivent être soutenus lorsqu'il s'agit d'inciter les États membres à revoir leur politique salariale, à revoir leurs structures du secteur bancaire, et aussi ce thème qui a été finalement tant évoqué à Davos, qui est celui de la lutte contre les inégalités.

Parmi les nouveaux défis, nous voyons de plus en plus d'États et de banques se préoccuper de la question de la cybersécurité et des monnaies virtuelles. Là aussi, nous attendons des perspectives de la part de l'institution que vous présidez.

Enfin, de notre côté, en tant qu'institution, vous le savez, nous accorderons énormément d'importance aux conditions de désignation de votre futur vice-président. Nous attendons une *shortlist*, une liste équilibrée et qui permette de répondre à tous les critères retenus par le traité pour occuper la fonction de vice-président de votre institution.

Sander Loones, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Mijnheer Draghi, fijn u hier te zien. U weet, ik ben geen grote fan van uw laks monetair beleid. Integendeel, ik ben behoorlijk kritisch. Ik ben dan ook erg blij dat het verslag dat wij hier vandaag bespreken ook kritisch is op verschillende punten.

Hier staan we nu, drie jaar later, 2 000 miljard euro later, vanwege uw monetaire experiment, mijnheer Draghi, uw *quantitative easing*, een experiment dat we nooit eerder op die schaal hebben gezien in de Europese Unie. En eindelijk gaan er voor het eerst ook stemmen op om dat experiment te doen stoppen. De legitimiteit ervan wordt in vraag gesteld en men wil dus dat experiment doen stoppen in september. Dat is broodnodig en zeer belangrijk, want wanneer wij al te lang veel te lage rentes hebben, dan stapelen de schulden zich op. Publieke schulden en private schulden swingen de pan uit en dat kan niet blijven duren. Die schulden breken records en de gevolgen daarvan hebben we eerder al eens gezien in 2008, met het begin van de financiële economische crisis.

Wie vandaag goed kijkt, zal zien dat er ook minder rooskleurige cijfers zijn en elementen die we kunnen aanhalen. Uw gratis geldbeleid heeft ervoor gezorgd dat de allerrijksten zeven vette jaren hebben beleefd en dat de minder rijken, de middenklasse, de armere mensen op hun tanden hebben moeten bijten. Zij moeten vaststellen dat hun spaargeld niets meer opbrengt. Ik vraag het u, mijnheer Draghi, stop ermee, niet in september maar vandaag.

Nils Torvalds, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, we all know that the ECB plays a crucial role, and sometimes more crucial than we actually understand at a given moment. Everybody still remembers the phrase 'whatever it takes'. If that phrase hadn't been pronounced I think we would have been much worse off than we are today.

So we do have a lot of respect for the independent nature of the bank, but at the same time we of course need some democratic scrutiny, and I therefore appreciate that Mr Draghi is here with us today.

In the report we have here in front of us, I think we have been able to strike a fairly good balance, with a balanced tone. Mr Draghi and the ECB have done a fairly good job and they have been playing a very important role in addressing the crisis.

But it is also important to point out that actions taken by the ECB sometimes fall short of what Member States need. At the same time this is probably also a good point to say that the Member States don't always do what they should to increase the resilience of the system.

I think we are heading towards more normal interest rates. That would be a great improvement. I therefore think that the next report by the European Central Bank will be much more interesting than the one we have been reading now, because you are going to be placed in a situation where you have to make some very tricky decisions on how to stop helicopter money. I wish you the best.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της Ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Draghi, εμείς δεν θα σας επικρίνουμε για το πρόγραμμα ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης, αλλά διότι δεν συμβάλλετε και εσείς όσο πρέπει ώστε να προετοιμαστούν η ευρωζώνη και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για την επόμενη κρίση και την επόμενη ύφεση. Σας επικρίνουμε γιατί χρειάζεται να στραφούμε ταχύτερα και εντονότερα από μια δογματική μονομέρεια στη λιτότητα σε πολιτικές βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης· γιατί η λογοδοσία και η ενίσχυση της πρέπει να εξασφαλιστούν όχι μόνο στα λόγια αλλά και στην πράξη.

Ζητούμε να δεχθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα τις συστάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Διαμεσολαβήτριας για την ενίσχυση και της διαφάνειας και της δημοκρατικής λογοδοσίας. Να αποσυρθείτε από την Ομάδα των 30. Όλοι ξέρουμε ότι αυτό το διάστημα η οικονομία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της ευρωζώνης πάει κάπως καλύτερα, αλλά αυτό δεν μπορεί να κρύψει τα ελλείμματα και τα κατασκευαστικά προβλήματα της ευρωζώνης: ατελής οικονομική ένωση, ατελής τραπεζική ένωση, έλλειμμα διαφάνειας και δημοκρατικής λογοδοσίας, μονομέρεια στη λιτότητα.

Πρέπει να δρομολογηθούν άμεσα το ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα εγγύησης καταθέσεων και πολιτικές εναρμόνισης που θα κλείσουν τις μαύρες τρύπες μέσα από τις οποίες περνά η εκτεταμένη φοροδιαφυγή των μεγάλων πολυεθνικών αλλά και τα συστήματα απάτης και κλοπής του ΦΠΑ, μέσω των οποίων χάνουν τόσο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όσο και τα κράτη μέλη τεράστια ποσά σε βάρος των έντιμων φορολογουμένων. Αυτά περιμένουμε από εσάς.

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, it is ten years now since the irresponsible activities of bankers and the structural problems of the global banking system led to the bailing out of the financial sector at great public cost. While the activities of central banks have patched up the system, many of the fundamental design flaws have not been addressed. There is still an urgent need for deep structural reform of the euro area banking system, as institutions remain too big or too interconnected to fail.

My group remains concerned that this point is not being adequately addressed in the report. In our view, the ECB remains a provider of implicit public subsidies to these institutions that represent a fundamental threat to the stability and efficient allocation of capital in the EU and internationally.

As Greens, we are also determined to ensure that the ECB's activities are consistent with our Paris climate commitments and that the asset purchase programme does not undermine our rapid transition away from fossil fuels.

David Coburn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I would suggest to Signor Draghi that he and all of Europe should be concerned with the way Messrs Barnier and Verhofstadt are treating the City of London in these so-called Brexit 'negotiations', which are nothing of the sort. Whether Barnier or Verhofstadt like it or not, the City of London is the banker of Europe, if not the world, and it will remain so after Brexit. By not organising a proper deal, Verhofstadt and Barnier are threatening the stability of the eurozone. As euro fanatics, Barnier and Verhofstadt would rather damage the economic future of the people of Europe than in any way upset the European project, which is their sole objective and fanaticism.

Barnier's job is not to negotiate a deal but to nobble, destroy, damage Britain's ability to embarrass the European Union by running an effective market-driven economy rather than the European command economy envisioned by the European project which has failed so miserably in eastern Europe over the last 50 years.

Mr Draghi, more than anyone, as an Italian banker, should know the precarious situation many Italian banks are in, and that creating problems in the City of London and making it harder for Italian banks and people round Europe to obtain credit may well damage Italian banks and push them over the edge into bankruptcy, followed by the eurozone. This will hardly help small businesses all over Europe.

Why should Britain care? Well, quite frankly, we don't want an economic basket case on our frontier. We want to trade with you. We want to do business with you. We want to be friends with you, but we want to retain our own bank accounts and our own economy as we are quite entitled to do. I would ask you, Mr Draghi, are you not concerned about what's going on with Barnier and Verhofstadt?

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr President.

Bernard Monot, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président Draghi, la doxa mondialiste actuelle voudrait faire croire que l'économie va mieux, et notamment que le redressement de la croissance dans les pays de l'Union européenne serait dû à la politique accommodante de la BCE, mais cette vision idéalisée ne prend pas en compte le niveau très élevé des risques systémiques.

Pour le Front national, il y a six zones de danger pour l'économie mondiale, sur lesquelles la BCE a une influence. Tout d'abord, le volume d'endettement privé au sein des pays de l'OCDE est himalayen. La remontée des taux d'intérêt à long terme aura un effet catastrophique, avec des faillites en chaîne.

Deuxièmement, le risque d'effondrement des marchés financiers, encore plus important qu'en 2000 et 2008, se concrétisera lorsque les banques centrales cesseront leurs injections de surliquidités.

Troisièmement, l'expansion hors de contrôle du *shadow banking*: l'élite politique et financière essaie de duper l'opinion publique en prétextant que le système bancaire serait maintenant plus sûr grâce aux règles de Bâle, mais paradoxalement le *shadow banking*, cette finance de l'ombre, est à haut risque. Les gérants d'actifs, de *hedge funds* et des compagnies d'assurance, notamment, n'ont jamais été aussi extrêmes dans leurs implications.

Quatrièmement, les CCP: ces chambres de compensation des marchés financiers mondiaux sont de véritables bombes à retardement. Elles concentrent plus que jamais tous les risques de marché et l'interopérabilité, c'est-à-dire l'interconnexion des CCP, multiplie le risque d'effet domino jusqu'à l'effondrement de tout le système financier mondial. La BCE stoppera-t-elle une telle contagion par la faillite d'une CCP?

Cinquième danger, le monde parallèle du *block chain*, et enfin la cybersécurité, avec des cyberattaques terroristes du système.

Loin de votre résilience fantasmée, Monsieur Draghi, le modèle économique ultralibéral et mondialiste nous conduit vers le pire krach de tous les temps. J'espère que la BCE en est consciente et s'y prépare.

Presidente. – Per quanto riguarda le domande «blue card», io le concedo dopo che hanno parlato i rappresentanti a nome dei gruppi, perché poi ognuno ha la possibilità di replicare. L'onorevole Coburn ha parlato ora. L'onorevole Henkel potrà chiedere la parola dopo. Adesso la parola è all'onorevole Balz.

Burkhard Balz (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Präsident Draghi! Ich freue mich, dass wir heute zu dieser außerordentlich wichtigen Debatte hier zusammengekommen sind. Die EZB hat in den letzten Jahren einige wegweisende Entscheidungen treffen müssen, die bedeutend zur Stabilität des Euros und zum Aufschwung in der Realwirtschaft beigetragen haben. Es scheint, als seien wir nun auch dank des beherzten Eingreifens Ihrer Zentralbank und der Politik über viele Krisen hinweg. Europa und auch die Euro-Zone wachsen so stark wie selten.

Und dennoch lassen die Herausforderungen nicht nach. Die technologischen Entwicklungen auf den Finanzmärkten finden derzeit in einem atemberaubenden Tempo statt. In den letzten Wochen haben uns die erheblichen Kursschwankungen der Kryptowährungen und die damit einhergehenden großen Verluste vieler Anleger wieder vor Augen geführt, dass virtuelle Währungen schon lange kein Spielgeld mehr für einige wenige Technikbegeisterte sind.

Viele Finanzinstitutionen – darunter europäische Großbanken – fordern nun von uns, dass wir handeln, um den relativ neuen Markt für virtuelle Währungen mit seinen drastischen Kursausschlägen zu zügeln. Dabei gilt es jedoch zunächst, den Regulierungsbedarf festzustellen, ohne den Spielraum für Innovationen und Entwicklungen auf dem digitalen Marktplatz zu stark einzuschränken.

Herr Draghi, virtuelle Währungen werden auch für die EZB eine der großen Herausforderungen der Zukunft sein. Wie schätzen Sie den Regulierungsbedarf auf diesem Gebiet ein, und welche Mittel und Instrumente gedenken Sie als Zentralbank einzusetzen, um dieses Thema anzugehen?

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

Președintele: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Balz, wir haben ja vorhin Herrn Draghi gehört, der davon sprach, dass wir Verantwortung brauchen. Die Kommission hat vorhin gesagt, dass sie dafür ist, dass die Bankenunion nun vollendet wird. Ich frage Sie mal: Was halten Sie eigentlich davon, wenn wir jetzt demnächst gemeinsame Haftung haben – das ist ja genau das, was die Kommission will – und dann der deutsche Sparer für das Gezocke von französischen, italienischen und griechischen Banken haftet?

Burkhard Balz (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. Na, nun habe ich heute mal ein anderes Thema gewählt, und zwar das der technologischen Herausforderungen. Aus gutem Grund, weil ich natürlich auch keinen deutschen Wahlkampf, den wir hoffentlich abgeschlossen haben, hier ins Parlament bringen wollte. Aber Sie kennen meine Meinung: Ich war über die Jahre hinweg – glaube ich – einer derjenigen hier im Parlament, der eben genau diese Themen nie, wirklich nie, wollte, und das gilt für den Abgeordneten Balz bis zum heutigen Tag.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io vorrei ringraziare il relatore Fernández e tutti i gruppi politici per il contributo a questo testo equilibrato, in cui viene espresso, con chiarezza, un giudizio positivo sull'azione di politica monetaria della BCE e si riconosce l'importanza delle misure non convenzionali per garantire la stabilità dei prezzi, evitare la deflazione e migliorare l'accesso al credito di imprese e famiglie e, in ultima istanza, per il rilancio della crescita economica e dell'occupazione.

Come lei ha detto, Presidente Draghi, se i risultati tuttavia sono indubbiamente positivi, non possiamo ancora dichiarare vittoria, e la decisione di proseguire il programma di acquisto titoli fino a settembre, e oltre se necessario, è quindi pienamente condivisibile.

Naturalmente, la politica monetaria da sola non è sufficiente a garantire il passaggio da una ripresa ciclica ad una strutturale. Per questo, da un lato, è necessario un *policy mix* adeguato, con riforme strutturali socialmente equilibrate, volte ad aumentare il potenziale di crescita e una politica di bilancio che, a livello aggregato, si muova di pari passo con la politica monetaria e non contro di essa, e, dall'altro lato, occorre completare l'Unione economica e monetaria e rafforzarne *governance* e strumenti.

Il pacchetto di riforma presentato dalla Commissione rappresenta, da questo punto di vista, un primo passo importante. Il Parlamento fa la sua parte per renderlo più ambizioso e anche per concorrere a garantire l'indipendenza della BCE anche nei delicati passaggi che ci attendono nel rinnovo di alcune posizioni di vertice del suo Consiglio.

Stanisław Ożóg (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Kiedy trzy lata temu EBC ogłosił program skupu europejskich obligacji, zgłaszaliśmy swoje zastrzeżenia co do skuteczności tych działań. Z perspektywy czasu okazuje się, że mieliśmy rację i że tanie finansowanie trafia głównie do sektora publicznego, który większość wydatków przeznaczają na konsumpcję. Trudno mówić zatem o spektakularnym efekcie inflacyjnym, a śmiesznością chyba byłaby mowa o efekcie rozwojowym. Tych konkluzji w sprawozdaniu pana Fernández'a niestety brakuje. Rozczarowuje również fakt, że pozytywnie ocenia Pan federalny charakter EBC oraz popiera dalszą emisję europejskich bezpiecznych aktywów, czyli euroobligacji. Polska delegacja nie może w pełni poprzeć tego sprawozdania i wstrzyma się od głosu.

Panie Prezesie EBC, chwalił się Pan wysokim wzrostem PKB w strefie euro. Chcę przypomnieć Panu to, o czym Pan wie: że są kraje w Unii Europejskiej z ponad dwukrotnie wyższym rozwojem gospodarczym.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. –Am dedus că sunteți nemulțumit de politica făcută de Banca Europeană, având în vedere că nu s-a văzut o scădere semnificativă a inflației, dar, în raport, este precizat la punctul 18.

Dumneavoastră considerați că politica monetară este suficientă pentru redresarea economică și pentru creșterea economică sau avem nevoie și de politici fiscale, politici sociale, ca să putem ajungem la scăderea șomajului, la creșterea economică și, evident, la o scădere a inflației?

Stanisław Ożóg (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Na pewno sama polityka monetarna, sama polityka fiskalna czy sama polityka społeczna nie rozwiąże problemu rozwoju gospodarczego. Konieczna jest suma działań, pełen pakiet funkcjonowania na rynku, ażeby pobudzić jego rozwój. W przypadku EBC uważam, że nie do końca wywiązuje się on ze swojego zakresu działalności.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, I have two very specific questions for President Draghi.

First of all, since 2014, the ECB's annual reports have referred to monetary financing issues in Hungary. The ECB has repeatedly asked for assurances that central bank resources are not being used for financing the state as this is banned under Article 123 of the treaties. In 2016, in response to a question from my colleague Mr Bullmann, the ECB stated that it was monitoring the situation. In 2017, I put the same question and got the same reply, namely that you were monitoring the situation. Now it is 2018, do you consider that the situation in Hungary has been remedied or is there evidence of a violation of Article 123?

My second question is as follows. In several Member States the pension systems show considerable weaknesses and shortcomings, and that is contrary to the aim of sustainable public finance. Do you consider that governments are doing enough to reform their pension systems?

Barbara Kappel (ENF). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident Dombrovskis, Herr Präsident Draghi! Im EZB-Jahresbericht 2016 werden vier zentrale Risiken für die Finanzstabilität im Euro-währungsgebiet aufgeführt. Es sind dies der Anstieg der globalen Risikoprämien, die geringe Rentabilität der Banken, die Tragfähigkeit der Staats- und Unternehmensverschuldung und die Liquiditätsrisiken im Bereich der Investmentfonds. An dieser Ausgangssituation hat sich leider auch für 2018 nicht viel geändert. So ist beispielsweise die Rendite italienischer Staatsanleihen mit einer Laufzeit von zehn Jahren seit 2016 um 0,7 Prozentpunkte auf nunmehr 2 % angestiegen.

Die EZB hält heute deutlich mehr italienische und französische Schuldtitel, als es der Kapitalschlüssel der nationalen Notenbanken vorsieht. Das deutet in der Regel darauf hin, dass die Renditen dieser Anleihen unter hohem Aufwertungsdruck stehen. Dazu kommen strukturelle Probleme in den Mitgliedstaaten der Euro-Zone. Wirtschaftswachstum und Arbeitslosenzahlen entwickeln sich uneinheitlich, und auch die Inflationsrate bleibt unter den Zielvorgaben.

Vor diesem Hintergrund hat der ECON-Ausschuss im November letzten Jahres einen Initiativbericht verabschiedet, der mehr Transparenz und eine höhere Rechenschaftspflicht gegenüber dem Parlament, also einen besseren geldpolitischen Dialog fordert. Ein transparenter, verbesserter geldpolitischer Dialog, z. B. unter Einbeziehung der nationalen Parlamente, wie wir das im Europäischen Semester haben, wäre wünschenswert. Ich freue mich schon, Ihre konkreten Vorschläge zu hören.

Brian Hayes (PPE). – Mr President, I welcome the report by my colleagues and thank them for that report, and welcome President Draghi to the European Parliament. When one looks back at the last 10 years, significant progress has been made in getting the eurozone economy to a much better place. We look at the job numbers, we look at GDP growth, especially in the last three years, and we look at the emerging investment which is taking place. Getting inflation close to 2% is not just important in terms of reflating the eurozone economy, but it is also important in helping to reduce debt piles, which are very significant in countries that went through a bailout programme such as my own, so I recognise that progress.

I also recognise the very significant impact that you have made, President Draghi, in terms of the bond-buying exercise that you directed with the Governing Council, and that sends out a strong message of trying to reflate the economy at a time when we needed funding. We recognise that it will come to an end at some point, it will be tapered, but I think there are issues still, and I have raised them before, surrounding how much each Member State is asked to give in terms of the national outstanding amount.

My issue is to ask you once again to continue a dialogue with policymakers and Member States, and especially go to Member State parliaments. I hope you will have an opportunity to visit the Irish Oireachtas and possibly the Finance Committee between now and the end of your mandate in October 2019. I think that sends out the right signal to Member States, to national parliaments, to have an engagement with the President of the ECB so that those Member State policymakers are aware of the objectives for our currency.

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

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – Thank you, Brian, for accepting this question. We are coming up to a Parliament vote on possible candidates for the Executive Board and I'm asking myself whether it is a good development that former finance ministers, who have basically participated for years in the Eurogroup, are now sent right away to sit on the ECB's Board? Does this correspond to the value of independence of central banks for which your party family has also fought, and for which there is a great tradition, also in Germany? Do you think it's a positive development that we have this sort of candidates?

Brian Hayes (PPE), blue-card answer. – I want to thank my colleague for a very good question. I believe that the issue of the appointment of ECB Board members must obviously concern the question of technical competence and technical performance, but also the question of accountability. It is obviously open for all Member States to put forward various candidates, that are then to be considered by the Eurogroup and ultimately by the Council, and indeed by this Parliament in our deliberations. I am not going to preclude anyone, but I am simply saying that it is important that that question of objectivity, independence and technical competence are the key characteristics for us all to consider before a decision is made.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Dieser Bericht zur Europäischen Zentralbank ist der beste Bericht, den ich in diesem Haus bislang gelesen habe. Er macht viele wichtige, richtige, kritische Bemerkungen über die Geldpolitik der Europäischen Zentralbank in ihren Auswirkungen auf Sparer, auf Rentenversicherung, auf die Stabilität des Bankenwesens und ähnliche Dinge. Er macht auch eine ganz entscheidend wichtige Bemerkung gleich am Anfang: Monetäre Staatsfinanzierung ist verboten. Und dann verwickelt er sich leider in einen großen Widerspruch, weil er am Ende fordert, dass griechische Staatsanleihen nun auch noch von der Europäischen Zentralbank aufgekauft werden sollen. Das wäre ja genau die monetäre Staatsfinanzierung, die wir nicht haben wollen, insbesondere angesichts des Risikos, dass hier das Emittentenlimit dann plötzlich voll ausgeschöpft wird und die EZB in großen Mengen griechische Staatsanleihen aufkauft. Das darf nicht sein, und das ist eine große Schwäche des Berichts.

Herr Draghi! Die EZB hat aber noch eine andere Herausforderung, und eine Frage möchte ich in diesem Zusammenhang an Sie richten: Das Aufkaufprogramm für Staatsanleihen ist grob verzerrt zugunsten bestimmter, vor allem südeuropäischer Staaten. Professor Heinemann hat heute erneut in der F.A.Z. darauf hingewiesen, hat auch Ihre sogenannten Widerlegungen widerlegt. Können Sie bitte dazu Stellung nehmen, aus welchem Grunde die EZB solche Staatsanleihen viel zu stark aufkauft?

Marcus Pretzell (ENF). – Herr Präsident, Herr Draghi! Ein Jahrzehnt Finanzkrise, und Europa war ursprünglich weder Ausgangspunkt noch Zentrum dieser Krise. Man kann vielleicht auch sagen: Die Krise ist in Europa nicht mehr ganz so akut. Aber wir haben es geschafft, zum chronisch kranken Mann zu werden, denn außerhalb des Euro-Raumes haben sich die Kennzahlen deutlich besser entwickelt als im Euro-Raum. Inflationszahlen, Geldmengenwachstum, Target-Salden, Kennzahlen an den Finanzmärkten und an den Bankenmärkten, BIP, Investitionszahlen, Arbeitslosenzahlen – das alles sind Kennzahlen, die auch für die Zukunft nichts Gutes erwarten lassen, jedenfalls nicht die große Wende, die wir alle seit Jahren erwarten.

Und da kommt nun vielleicht ganz recht ein gutes Signal für Sie, Herr Draghi, aber ein schlechtes für alle Bürger in Europa aus Deutschland, wo man angekündigt hat, den Krisenfonds ESM jetzt europäisch zu institutionalisieren und als europäische Institution Ihnen tatsächlich zu übergeben. Das mag Ihrer losen Währungspolitik zugutekommen, ist aber ein ganz, ganz schlechtes Signal für alle deutschen Sparer.

Werner Langen (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wir behandeln ja das Jahr 2016: den Bericht der EZB. Die Zeit ist vorangeschritten und es haben sich viele Dinge geändert: der Antrag Großbritanniens, die amerikanische Präsidentenwahl mit allen Folgen. Es haben sich also Rahmenbedingungen geändert, die nicht nur auf die Finanzkrise vor zehn Jahren zurückweisen, sondern auch im weltweiten Rahmen. Die Währungsschwankungen sind größer geworden, und der Präsident der EZB sagt: Wir haben bisher alles richtig gemacht, wir setzen das einfach so fort.

Deshalb stellt sich die Frage: Erstens, wenn Sie sagen, wir brauchen in den Mitgliedstaaten Reformen, da kann ich Ihnen 100 % zustimmen, das haben Sie immer gesagt. Aber bevor wir Einlagensicherungen und Abwicklungsfonds als Teil des Bankenpakets verabschieden, brauchen wir diese Reformen wirklich.

Das zweite Thema ist nach meiner Überzeugung: Wenn wir einen Europäischen Währungsfonds schaffen – ich bin dafür –, dann muss klar sein, wie er kontrolliert wird und wie er finanziert wird und wer die letzte Verantwortung dafür trägt.

Insofern sind viele Fragen im Reformpaket offen. Und es wird jetzt darauf ankommen, Herr Präsident Draghi, dass Sie eine moderate Wende in der Zinspolitik einleiten.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Mario Borghesio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quali sono le conseguenze della politica illustrata e anche lodata nella relazione? Che i titoli di debito sovrano, prima acquistati dalle banche private, oggi si trovano depositati negli attivi delle banche centrali nazionali.

Chi ci guadagna? Uno solo: la Germania. Il venditore e finanziatore, che peraltro aveva scelto, sbagliando, il suo debitore – Grecia e Spagna – e si vede salvato da noi poveri contribuenti dei poveri Stati del Sud Europa. Per salvarlo, ci siamo indebitati proprio con la BCE. Oggi siamo nella situazione in cui è facile prevedere che i tassi finanziari aumenteranno a danno di chi si è indebitato, cioè nostro, in generale, con un rischio evidente, vale a dire quello di destabilizzazione dei mercati finanziari.

Altro tema è il MUV, responsabile unico della vigilanza europea, sottratta alle banche centrali, che non ha tutelato i depositanti. Nonostante gli *stress test*, c'è stata una serie paurosa di crack bancari, situazione che oggi è al centro e all'attenzione degli elettori italiani, con responsabilità gravissime nel governo.

Qual è stata, mi domando e spero che lei risponda, l'attività di monitoraggio e di controllo del MVU? Ci può dare dati concreti? Ci può dare garanzie per il futuro? E poi, e concludo Presidente Draghi, vuole finalmente avere il coraggio di dire quello che lei sa benissimo, e cioè che i derivati sono una cellula tumorale del sistema finanziario?

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

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Raport z roku 2016 jest drugim raportem, który przeczytałem – po roku 2015 – i muszę powiedzieć, że z samego raportu jestem usatysfakcjonowany. Zarówno z tych informacji, które dotyczą procesu wykupu euroobligacji, zawarcia pakietu stabilności, jak i również innych elementów.

Natomiast to, co mnie dziś niepokoi, to brak polityki informacyjnej na tyle precyzyjnej, aby na tej sali nie pojawiały się tak poważne rozpiętości dotyczące przyszłej polityki obejmującej euroobligacje. Z jednej strony padają informacje, opinie, że dobrze się dzieje, że bank cofa się w tej polityce, a z drugiej strony sali padają zarzuty, iż ta polityka prowadzona czy kontynuowana będzie źródłem poważnych kłopotów i perturbacji w europejskich finansach. Zwracam uwagę na konieczność lepszej polityki informacyjnej.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, concordo nel sostenere la necessità a livello europeo di politiche nazionali di bilancio sane e favorevoli alla crescita, nel rispetto del Patto di stabilità, nonché riforme socialmente equilibrate ma anche ambiziose.

La previsione di un tasso di inflazione nella zona euro al di sotto del 2 % fino al 2020 conferma che la politica monetaria, da sola, non è sufficiente a sostenere la ripresa economica. Essa va assolutamente accompagnata da politiche concrete a livello nazionale e comunitario.

È indispensabile un miglioramento delle condizioni di accesso al credito per le PMI. Il persistere di condizioni differenziate di credito negli Stati membri non potrà favorire uno sviluppo economico sano ed armonizzato. Credo anche che siano fondate le preoccupazioni per le incerte conseguenze legate allo strumento del *quantitative easing*, per effetto della ripresa dei consumi.

Ringrazio il Presidente Draghi per il coraggio delle scelte adottate in questi anni difficili. Penso però che i compiti della BCE richiedano una maggiore trasparenza nei confronti del grande pubblico e un maggiore obbligo di rendiconto nei confronti del Parlamento.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Draghi, οι ευθύνες της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας, ως μέλους της τρόικας, για τη μετατροπή της Ελλάδας σε ένα απέραντο κοινωνικό νεκροταφείο είναι τεράστιες. Αυτό έχει συνομολογηθεί ακόμη και από τον κύριο Dijsselbloem, ο οποίος δήλωσε ότι τα μνημόνια διέσωσαν τις ξένες τράπεζες και όχι την Ελλάδα. Όμως η ΕΚΤ συνεχίζει το «business as usual» σε σχέση με τα κόκκινα δάνεια, απαιτώντας την ενεργοποίηση των ηλεκτρονικών πλειστηριασμών προκειμένου τα «κοράκια» να αρπάξουν τα σπίτια των Ελλήνων.

Επιπλέον, η ΕΚΤ συνεχίζει παράνομα να αρνείται την ένταξη των ελληνικών εταιρικών ομολόγων, καθώς και των κρατικών ελληνικών ομολόγων, στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση, και όλα αυτά τη στιγμή που η Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος, μόνο για τη διετία 2015-2016, δαπάνησε 42,5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για τη συμμετοχή της στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση.

Τέλος, κύριε Draghi, για άλλη μια φορά επισημαίνουμε ότι η ΕΚΤ πρέπει επιτέλους να αποχωρήσει από την τρόικα, προκειμένου να παύσει η σύγκρουση συμφερόντων που υπάρχει, δεδομένου ότι η ΕΚΤ «φοράει τέσσερα καπέλα»: είναι μέλος της τρόικας, είναι δανειστής των κρατών μελών, ελέγχει τις συστημικές τράπεζες και υποτίθεται ότι είναι ανεξάρτητη νομισματική αρχή.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πολιτική μου ομάδα έχει καταθέσει δύο τροπολογίες στη σχετική έκθεση και σας καλώ να τις υπερψηφίσετε. Με την πρώτη τροπολογία ζητάμε να καταδικαστεί η κερδοσκοπική συμπεριφορά της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας στην περίπτωση των ελληνικών ομολόγων που εξαιρέθηκαν από τη διαδικασία του κουρέματος το 2012, η οποία απέφερε κέρδη σχεδόν 6,2 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ στο ευρωσύστημα, όπως έχει ομολογήσει ο κύριος Draghi σε σχετική ερώτηση. Η διαδικασία αυτή προκάλεσε πρόσθετες δημοσιονομικές πιέσεις και δεινά για τον ελληνικό λαό. Θέλουμε να καλέσουμε το ευρωσύστημα να επιστρέψει άνευ όρων τα κέρδη αυτά στην Ελλάδα και, σε διαφορετική περίπτωση, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση να μην πληρώσει αυτά τα ομόλογα, ούτως ώστε να μπορέσουν να ακυρωθούν τα μέτρα λιτότητας που συμφώνησε η ελληνική κυβέρνηση για τα επόμενα 36 χρόνια, μεταξύ των οποίων είναι η μείωση του αφορολογήτου και το κόψιμο των συντάξεων.

Με τη δεύτερη τροπολογία θα θέλαμε να εκφραστεί η αποδοκιμασία για το γεγονός ότι οι προσπάθειες μείωσης των κόκκινων δανείων που προωθούν η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και τα κράτη μέλη, σε πολλές περιπτώσεις έχουν ως συνέπεια την προσβολή του θεμελιώδους δικαιώματος στη στέγαση, με αποτέλεσμα χιλιάδες νοικοκυριά χαμηλού εισοδήματος να χάνουν ή να ζουν με τον φόβο ότι θα χάσουν τα σπίτια τους λόγω τραπεζικών χρεών.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πρώτο άρθρο της έκθεσης που συζητάμε σήμερα είναι και το πιο σημαντικό. Μεγάλη σπουδή επιδεικνύει το Κοινοβούλιο προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσει ότι σε καμία περίπτωση δεν θα αμφισβητηθεί η ανεξαρτησία της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας. Ταυτόχρονα όμως, ο οργανισμός αυτός όχι απλώς επηρεάζει αλλά σε μεγάλο βαθμό καθορίζει τις ζωές των ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Πότε ρωτήθηκαν οι πολίτες; Πότε συναίνεσαν στο να παραχωρήσουν μια τόσο μεγάλη εξουσία σε έναν ανεξάρτητο οργανισμό; Πότε αφαιρέθηκε η εξουσία αυτή από τα κράτη και ποια δημοκρατική νομιμοποίηση έχει ο οργανισμός αυτός;

Ο δήθεν έλεγχος του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου δεν έχει κανένα νόημα γιατί γίνεται κατόπιν εορτής και, επιπλέον, είναι επιδερμικός και χωρίς ουσία. Γιατί δεν έχει καθαιρεθεί ο πρόεδρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας μετά από τη χαρακτηριστική αποτυχία του στη διαχείριση της κρίσης; Σε ποια ιδιωτική εταιρεία θα είχε παραμείνει στη θέση του ο διευθύνων σύμβουλος εάν δεν μπορούσε να αντιμετωπίσει μια κρίση εδώ και δέκα χρόνια; Ζητάμε την επιστροφή των αρμοδιοτήτων αυτών στις εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες και τον έλεγχο αυτών από τα κράτη μέλη ως πρώτο βήμα προς την ανάκτηση της εθνικής κυριαρχίας και ανεξαρτησίας.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor Draghi, la Unión Europea ha atravesado uno de los momentos clave de su historia. Hemos visto una situación de falta de crédito, particularmente para las pymes, que dificultaba la recuperación económica, y una baja inflación que impedía a los Estados miembros de la Unión aliviar sus niveles de deuda. El Banco Central Europeo ha desempeñado un papel muy importante en la recuperación económica, pero ha quedado claro que la política monetaria por sí sola no basta para lograr una recuperación económica sostenible y más equilibrada e integradora.

Usted lo ha dicho, hacen falta reformas estructurales. Y España es un buen ejemplo de ello. Actualmente las ha hecho y crece por encima del 3 % y ha creado a lo largo de los últimos tres años más de medio millón de puestos de trabajo anualmente.

Podemos hacer un balance positivo de la actuación del Banco Central Europeo, con una reciente mejora de las expectativas tanto para 2018 como para 2019. Entramos ahora en un escenario de retirada de estímulos gradual en tiempo y cantidad, garantizando que en ningún momento se ponga en riesgo la recuperación económica.

Para concluir, quiero felicitar al autor del informe. Y me gustaría hacer un llamamiento, en línea con el dictamen del Banco Central Europeo, para que se continúe con las negociaciones para el establecimiento del Sistema Europeo de Garantía de Depósitos como tercer pilar de una auténtica unión bancaria, que contribuirá a reforzar y salvaguardar la estabilidad financiera de la Unión Europea.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, am citit cu atenție acest raport de 13 pagini și trebuie să spun că sunt dezamăgită văzând că doar un rând și jumătate, la articolul 24, vorbim de IMM-uri.

Eu cred că toți de aici știm că nu există încă o creditare a IMM-urilor în statele membre, deși ponderea în economia noastră, în piața internă, sunt IMM-urile. Vreau să mă adresez domnului Draghi, dacă poate să ne spună la cuvântul de final dacă își propune ceva BCE legat de posibilitatea practică, nu teoretică, de creditare a IMM-urilor. În raport este prevăzut, sigur, deficitul de productivitate în zona euro și, mai ales, cumva mă îngrijorează că se estimează că acest deficit merge până în 2020. Poate BCE să facă ceva să nu se adeverească acest lucru, adică să nu mergem cu deficit până în 2020?

Sigur, m-ar preocupa să știu și să spun celor care m-au ales dacă studiul de impact asupra politicilor monetare îl puteți transmite în mod transparent, să putem să știm și să informăm cetățenii, pentru că aici vorbim de țări în zona euro și țări care nu sunt încă în zona euro. Aștept cu interes răspunsul.

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Herr Präsident Draghi, Sie haben uns heute eine Ad-hoc-Theorie präsentiert. Eine Ad-hoc-Theorie ist: Ich mache eine bestimmte Politik und suche die Begründung dafür. In Wirklichkeit ist es ja so, dass Sie seit Ihrem berühmten Wort „whatever it takes“ eine Zinsnivellierungspolitik betreiben, um die notleidenden Schuldnerstaaten vor dem Bankrott zu bewahren. Das ist das Ziel Ihrer Politik. Und die Konsequenz dieser Politik ist, dass hier immer wieder nach Reformen gerufen wird.

Ja, wenn die Zinsen nahezu null sind oder in vielen Bereichen sogar negativ, wenn Sie die Inflationsrate reinrechnen, gibt es keine Reformen. Stattdessen produzieren Sie Blasen. Im Zeitraum 2002 bis 2005 waren auch die Realzinsen in kritischen Staaten negativ, und die Konsequenz waren Immobilienblasen, andere Blasen. Und genau das produzieren wir. Ich sage Ihnen: Sie versuchen jetzt, Probleme zu bekämpfen, und schaffen größere Probleme in der Zukunft.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Hvala g. Draghi za poročilo, ki je spodbudno. Govori o gospodarski rasti, o manjši brezposelnosti, večji zaposlenosti v Evropski uniji.

Moja vprašanja so tri: prvič, kaj bo naredila Evropska centralna banka, da bodo državne finance, predvsem pa finance bank, v prihodnje zdrave, da ne bo prišlo do ponovnega plačevanja slabih kreditov s strani davkoplačevalcev držav?

Drugič, kaj lahko stori Evropska centralna banka, da bo razlika med revnimi in bogatimi državami manjša, da ne bomo imeli zopet te težave in da bomo zopet čez nekaj let morali jamčiti za finance posameznih držav?

In tretje vprašanje, kaj ima namen Evropska centralna banka narediti na področju kriptovalut? Vedno večja je ta kapital-ska vrednost, baloni so veliki in če želimo imeti urejene te kriptovalute, mora tudi Evropska centralna banka narediti odločne korake v smeri ureditve tega področja.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, pozdravljam svakako aktivnosti Europske središnje banke koja je svojim mjerama omogućila razdoblja povoljnog financiranja i smanjivanje razlika u visini kamatnih stopa među državama članicama, što se u praksi itekako osjeti. To je značajno doprinijelo stvaranju uvjeta stabilnosti, predvidljivosti, sigurnosti i povjerenja, a to su glavni preduvjeti razvoja investicija i novih poslovnih pothvata.

Imam jedno pitanje za predsjednika Draghija, a to je kako povoljne uvjete financiranja učiniti što dostupnijima svim poduzetnicima i rizičnijim projektima zato što nam za snažniji rast i smanjivanje nejednakosti u razvijenosti među državama članicama trebaju inovacije, trebaju nova znanja i vještine koji su temelj novih tehnoloških rješenja, što je temelj za rast produktivnosti, a sve to za bolji rast i stabilniji rast plaća.

Međutim, nedostaje financiranje upravo za te rizičnije projekte koji nas vode u razvoj.

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

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank honourable Members and President Draghi for the fruitful discussion.

Let me conclude by mentioning a point which directly concerns the Commission. The report encourages the Commission to study schemes such as a Central Bank digital currency and Digital Base Money with a view to improving public access to payment systems. We agree that further study of the potential challenges associated with these schemes to access payment systems is needed. To this end, we will liaise closely with the ECB, as the report invites us to do. We count on your continued support in building the foundations for sustainable growth and job creation in Europe.

Mario Draghi, President of the European Central Bank. – Mr President, let me first thank Mr Fernández and his colleagues for the report. It is very encouraging for our work that you stress how our measures have contributed to the recovery and to financial stability.

You noted in the report that the institutional framework enshrined in the Treaties allowed us to take decisive action in line with our price stability mandate, and this has been the objective of our monetary policy throughout. It still is the objective of our monetary policy. In the course of exchanges we are often told that our monetary policy affects one category or another, but our objective is price stability, defined as an inflation rate which is close to, but below, 2% for the whole of the euro area, not necessarily for one specific country. That is how our monetary policy should be judged: whether in the medium term we reach this objective.

I would like to thank Commission Vice-President Dombrovskis, and all of you, for this very relevant and useful debate. The debate shows that, while we are now seeing the positive results of our policies, we should not be complacent, but should rather strive for continued improvement.

I apologise in advance that, given the short time I have, I cannot comment on each and every statement, but let me touch on some of the issues that you raised.

One issue raised by several honourable Members concerns the effects that our monetary policy has on the distribution of income and wealth. So let me say a few words about the effects of quantitative easing (QE). It is quite clear that QE raises asset prices. The holders of assets are generally wealthy institutions or wealthy people, so in the short run you have a worsening of distribution. At the same time, to the extent that QE is successful, it increases employment – as I have said, and I am going to say it again – and it is by far the most powerful measure for decreasing inequality in any economic system.

From this viewpoint, even though in the short run one has some negative consequences, in the medium and long term the positive consequences outweigh, very consistently and significantly, any short-term negative concerns. This has been shown, by the way, in several studies. The best way to decrease inequality is to increase employment, and that is what we have done, contributing to increasing employment by 7.5 million jobs over three-and-a-half years.

When we look at wage growth – and that is very important for us because it is, in a sense, what tells us whether inflation is moving towards our objective in the medium term – annual growth in terms of compensation per employee increased gradually from 1.1% in the second quarter of 2016 to 1.7% now. It is still below its historical average, which is 2.1%, so we have to be more patient, but looking at what happens in other jurisdictions – for example the United States which is, by the way, far advanced in the business cycle – we see that wage growth picks up in the end. The recent data in the USA show exactly this.

We have to be aware that we have weak productivity growth, ongoing impacts of labour market reforms implemented in some countries during the crisis and certainly a much bigger labour supply coming from stronger migration flows and higher participation rates. Participation rates of women and older people especially have increased considerably. Also, the low-inflation environment that has prevailed for a long time is now influencing current negotiations. And, by the way, one thing that is quite important in explaining this light response by wages is that even though we had a significant increase in employment, when we go and look at the quality of this increase in employment we see a lot of part-time and temporary arrangements. I am listing all these factors, because they are explanations of why the nominal wage-growth response is going to be lower than we had expected.

But we know by looking at other jurisdictions which had, by and large, the same problems that, in the end, nominal wages are going to go up, and they are going up, albeit at a subdued rate.

As regards the effects of our monetary policy, some speakers questioned the effectiveness of this policy. We have estimated that our measures have made a substantial impact on the economic performance of the euro area. Considering all the measures taken between 2014 (and even before, in 2013) and October 2017, the overall impact on EU area real GDP growth is 1.9%: 1.9 percentage points over three years.

One Member pointed out that investment is still low. We are coming from very, very low levels of private investment but, if anything, over the past three or four quarters, private investment has picked up and it is actually increasing at a much more satisfactory rate than in the past.

Since the end of May 2014, lending rates for households and non-financial firms have declined significantly. There is one thing I said in the introductory statement which is very important: during the crisis we observed widely differing lending rates by banks in different parts of the euro area, but this difference has now shrunk and rates are very close nowadays, as are growth rates, by the way.

One measure we often look at to determine the strength of the growth process and expansion is how different the growth rates are in different parts of the euro area. Well, the degree of difference now is something like we had in 1995-1996. In other words, it is a historical low. All countries nowadays are growing.

By the way, some Members questioned the effectiveness of our monetary policy for SMEs but, in fact, the lending conditions for SMEs have improved significantly across all sectors and countries. The gradual recovery in loan growth is continuing. The recovery started about four years ago and then really picked up, and it is continuing, though we are not seeing anything like we had before the crisis. So growth rates in lending are good, but nothing euphoric like we saw before the crisis.

One point that was made was that we are focused on buying southern countries' bonds. That is not true. We do not favour certain countries over others in the implementation of our programme. Our purchases are guided by the ECB's capital key, which takes into account GDP and population. But if one focuses on purchases at specific points in time, for example on 2017 only, this is bound to yield wrong interpretations. The overall stock of euro system holdings is the relevant metric for any assessment of the programme, and not the recent purchase flows. So, in fact, if you look at the stock, you will see that, as far as German bonds are concerned, we are above the capital key for that country.

By and large, one should consider the design of the programme: it is flexible and the distribution of actual purchases on any given day often deviates from the ECB capital key. But just consider: this was in the original design of the programme when we had countries like Greece, whose bonds we did not purchase. Of course, then, we had to deviate from the capital key.

Some other observations concerned the side effects of our monetary policy. I just wish to reiterate that our measures are proving effective but, at the same time, we are aware of potential side effects and we have to differentiate between the various ways in which they affect economic actors.

For example, for individual savers, an accommodative monetary policy means that they accrue fewer nominal returns on their savings. However, such a policy also supports economic expansion and this bolsters employment, income, returns on investment and tax revenues. It therefore benefits households in their capacity as workers, entrepreneurs, investors, borrowers and taxpayers.

There is no one specific country that has benefited most from our monetary policy. Everybody has benefited. Public sectors in all countries saved billions on interest rate payments; private sectors across countries and sectors saved billions on interest rate payments to banks; and purchasers of houses could have access to mortgages with much lower interest rates than at any time in the past. This has not only boosted the construction industry but has also boosted investment for the purchase of houses.

So we see benefits accruing right across society and not specifically located in one country. When the monetary policy is successful, both creditors and borrowers benefit from it.

Similarly, let me continue now on savers. There are several channels through which our policies affect pension and insurance schemes. Beyond the effect on the liability side, it is important to see what happens on the asset side. Our monetary policy has had a beneficial impact on this side of the equation, as the value of the investment portfolio has increased. But, having said that, I completely agree there is a need to put pension systems on a stable path because the survival of any single country's pension system cannot be dependent only on the proper configuration of interest rates. It must be actuarially sensible.

I have already addressed, in my introductory remarks, the issue of possible asset bubbles currently being formed in the euro area. For the time being, we have little indication that generalised financial imbalances are emerging. There are no signs of general asset-price misalignments in the euro area but some segments do need close monitoring and one of them is the prime commercial real-estate market, where we actually see stretched valuations. Also, in some large cities and in some countries real-estate prices have increased at a faster pace than household incomes. This certainly requires monitoring.

Finally, yields in the euro area corporate bond markets, especially for some of the lower-rated issues, have started to look exceptionally low by historical standards, but what are we going to do? Are we going to change monetary policy because of these side effects which are not, by the way, systemic? No, the answer is to enact macro-prudential policies which are the best tool for tackling these challenges – also given their country-specific and sector-specific merits. In late 2016, the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) issued a set of country-specific warnings on medium-term vulnerability in the EU residential real-estate sector.

Now a word about Brexit. We are not party to these negotiations but we are certainly monitoring their evolution and, clearly, I agree that much depends on these negotiations and possible arrangements. Of course we always prepare for any eventuality and, at the same time, we are assessing the direction, the probability and the potential impact of risk, but the bottom line is that either this transition is well managed and there will not be substantial risks, or it is not, and the risks will be there. We are certainly looking at that and we have to be prepared for that.

Let me also add that, as far as our role as supervisors is concerned, our good cooperation with the Bank of England is important in coping with the potential risks, and especially the risks of any cliff-edge effects. Certainly, transitional arrangements along the lines of the December European Council guidelines could be useful to smooth out the Brexit process but, as we all know, the materialisation of the transition period is still exposed to political uncertainty, and that will remain for some time to come.

On financial supervision, I welcome the review of the European system of financial supervision, including changes to the European supervisory authorities. Some of your comments touched upon the issue of transparency. Here, let me reiterate that we are in complete agreement about the importance of ECB transparency vis-à-vis the European public. We have continuously assessed where we need to further strengthen our transparency framework, and we have demonstrated our commitment, improving our framework as necessary.

Just briefly, let me list a few of the actions we have taken. The accounts of Governing Council discussions are now published four weeks after each monetary policymaking meeting. There was none of that a few years ago. Since 2015, the Executive Board members, as well as the Chair of the Supervisory Board, publish their diaries covering professional meetings with external parties. None of that was in place until a few years ago. And in 2016 we decided to disclose the agreement on net financial assets (ANFA). Last year we also published the text of the emergency liquidity assistance agreement. We have announced transparency in relation to our purchase programme, especially transparency on the corporate sector purchase programme.

Some of you made reference to the European Ombudsman's recommendations on the interaction of members of the ECB decision-making bodies, including myself, with the Group of 30 (G30). We have certainly taken note of the Ombudsman's letter and we will respond in time, but let us remember that the European Ombudsman has already concluded that the ECB must conduct dialogue with market participants and that there is no evidence that the G30 meeting could have directly influenced, or have had an adverse impact on, the ECB's supervisory tasks. The Ombudsman has also confirmed that the ECB has a robust system of safeguards in place to manage its contacts with the financial sector.

Again on transparency, we publish on our website extensive documentation on all these interactions with markets. We disclose agendas and summaries of the discussions, so I can assure you that the ECB is, and remains, committed to reviewing, adjusting and updating our transparency framework.

One or two speakers touched on Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies. Let me first say that we are not observing a systemically relevant holding of digital currencies by supervised institutions – by banks, in other words. Actually, the credit institutions established in the European Union are showing a limited appetite for digital currencies like Bitcoin, notwithstanding the high level of public interest. However, recent developments, such as the listing of Bitcoin futures contracts by US exchanges, could lead European banks too to hold positions in Bitcoin, and therefore we will certainly look at that.

However, we should understand that Bitcoin and other digital currencies are in the unregulated space and should be regarded as very risky assets. Virtual currencies are subject to high volatility and their prices are entirely speculative. Banks should measure the risk of any holdings of digital currencies in their portfolio accordingly. Right now, digital currencies are not subject to a specific supervisory approach. Work is under way in the Single Supervisory Mechanism to identify potential prudential risks that these digital assets could pose to supervised institutions.

There were some other specific points. We are going to consider the possibility of having a Charlemagne commemorative coin. On monetary financing in Hungary, we will assess the existence of monetary financing in our report. As you know, the ECB is accountable to the European Parliament, but members of its Executive Board, myself included, have accepted invitations to discuss our monetary policy generally and broadly in national parliaments, so I would be glad to accept an invitation from the Irish Parliament if I were to receive it.

I think I have gone through most of your questions. Thank you.

Jonás Fernández, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, quería agradecer especialmente al presidente Draghi y al vicepresidente Dombrovskis que nos hayan acompañado en este debate y, por supuesto, a todos los colegas que han participado, especialmente a los ponentes alternativos —a Mureşan, a Loones, a Torvalds, a Papadimoulis y a Scott Cato— con los que hemos estado discutiendo este informe. Pero quería aprovechar este último minuto para dirigirme al Eurogrupo.

Europa está exigiendo cada día más democracia. Los ciudadanos europeos, en cada una de las citas electorales, nos exigen más transparencia, más rendición de cuentas, más debate público, una mayor capacidad de conocer y discutir las políticas europeas. En las próximas semanas, en los próximos meses, tenemos por delante la discusión para cubrir varias vacantes en el BCE. Y por eso me atrevo a dirigirme, representando a la mayoría de esta Cámara, al Eurogrupo para exigir que nos envíe una lista de candidatos que el Parlamento pueda discutir; una lista que incorpore también el equilibrio de género y que permita a la ciudadanía, a través del debate parlamentario, un conocimiento profundo de los distintos candidatos, de los distintos perfiles; una lista que permita al conjunto de los europeos hacerse dueño de la evolución del BCE.

Así que, aunque a nivel personal tendría algún requerimiento adicional, me quedo en eso: necesitamos acercar Europa a la ciudadanía, necesitamos democratizar más Europa y necesitamos dignificar este Parlamento.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Euroalueen kasvulukujen valossa euro on pelastettu. Pelastus nojaa edelleen vahvasti niin rahapoliittiseen kuin investointikysyntäänkin liittyvään elvytykseen. Pelastus voi olla lyhytaikainen pitkäaikaistyöttömien kustannuksella saavutettu voitto ja osoittautua raskaaksi taakaksi varallisuuskuplien puhjetessa ja uuden kriisin alkaessa.

Pitkällä aikavälillä euron pelastaminen edellyttää toimivaa euroaluetta, jossa markkinat ovat tehokkaat ja hintamekanismi ohjaa resurssien kohdentumista. Vain toimivien markkinoiden pohjalta voidaan rakentaa kestävä kilpailukyky ilman jatkuvaa EKP:n massiivista rahapoliittista elvytystä. Käytännössä euron pelastaminen edellyttää mm. yhtenäisiä työmarkkinoita euroalueella. Erilaiset kielet, kulttuurit ja käytännöt luovat esteitä, joita, kuten muitakin sisämarkkinoiden esteitä, olisi syytä käsitellä asiaan kuuluvissa yhteyksissä myös tässä mietinnössä eikä keskittyä vain poliittisesti sopiviin ongelmiin.

19. Manipulowanie badaniami naukowymi przez korporacje wielonarodowe w następcie badań emisji przeprowadzonych na małpach i ludziach przez niemiecki przemysł motoryzacyjny (debata)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de la Declaración de la Comisión sobre la manipulación de estudios científicos por multinacionales tras los ensayos de emisiones en monos y en humanos realizados por la industria del automóvil alemana (2018/2565(RSP))

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first I want to state very clearly and strongly that the Commission, and I personally, are shocked by the news that emissions tests have been conducted on animals and humans, because No EU laws justify such behaviour. These were private tests commissioned by the German car industry, and the Commission condemns them in the strongest possible way.

The EU has always been highly committed to animal welfare. The EU legal framework in this regard provides for very strict requirements and barriers and, of course, there is no provision for animal testing in the legal framework for cars.

The legal follow-up to this unacceptable case is in the hands of national authorities. We are happy to see that the German Government will urgently investigate the matter. This testing of animals and humans adds a new and, I have to say, a much sadder dimension to what we saw during the 'dieselgate' scandal. It was just two-and-a-half years ago that we found out that car manufacturers had cheated in emissions tests. Then we read in the press just last year that private emissions tests had been conducted on animals in the USA and on humans in Germany.

When I first heard it, I frankly couldn't believe it. I thought it was just a very unfunny joke. But I have to say, again very personally, that this is the second time the car sector has shown that it is completely untrustworthy.

One has to question the ethical behaviour of the German car industry. Is this really, yet again, just an incidence of misbehaviour by a few individuals in a company? I have to say, frankly, I doubt that. There is a systemic problem in this industry. The industry promised us – during our investigation into the emissions scandal – a cultural change: that it would be transparent and would investigate. Yet, once again, we find out about this situation via the media.

We should again, and say very strongly, that we must not accept breaking the law, and equally we must not accept the breach of ethical standards.

I have repeatedly asked for full transparency in the wake of 'dieselgate'. Unfortunately I have had to hear, at very regular intervals, that yet another car manufacturer is being investigated for cheating, or that another car recall is being commissioned.

At the moment the tools available to us to remedy this situation are still limited. The Commission has launched infringement procedures against some EU Member States. I have also repeatedly asked – and I am repeatedly asking in writing and via Ministers in the Council – for Member States to cooperate fully and inform us fully about the state of play in the investigations and about the remedial action they are taking.

I am afraid to say that their willingness to do so has been at best very limited. In the Commission we work very hard, hand in hand, on air quality and our citizens' health, so I want to say first that I fully support Commissioner Vella in his most recent efforts to accelerate compliance with long-overdue emissions limits. From my side, and with the strong support of the European Parliament – for which I thank you very much – we have put a legal framework in place that would largely prevent future emissions cheating. This should assure consumers and should make the car industry more competitive, as I have repeated many times.

However, more ethical behaviour by the car industry now has to follow. This is a must because, as the unacceptable behaviour reported last week shows, changing the legislation alone will not be sufficient: the car industry needs to assume full responsibility for its behaviour. European industry must mean quality – on different levels, including quality in terms of ethics.

In this context I will ask Member States to verify the information about testing on humans and animals, to establish whether this situation was occurring in Europe. We know about the testing on humans, but we don't know whether animal testing has been occurring. And we owe it to our citizens to investigate.

I will, of course, come back to you with the response I receive from the Member States.

Peter Liese, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auch ich halte die Versuche für völlig inakzeptabel, und ich will noch ein Argument hinzufügen: Die Grenzwerte für Feinstaub, Stickoxide und andere Schadstoffe sind so berechnet, dass auch gesundheitlich anfällige Menschen – ältere Menschen, asthmakranke Kinder und so weiter – über einen längeren Zeitraum keinen Schaden nehmen, wenn sie den Belastungen ausgesetzt sind. Wie man dann an Affen oder auch an gesunden Probanden testen kann – wenige Stunden – und daraus Erkenntnisse ziehen kann, dass die Werte vielleicht nicht in Ordnung sind, das erschließt sich mir nicht. Insbesondere gibt es ja auch Regeln, wann man überhaupt Tierversuche machen kann. Ich halte das überhaupt nicht für akzeptabel, dass man hier Tierversuche gemacht hat, und auch die gesunden Probanden – mir erschließt sich nicht, was überhaupt der Sinn sein sollte. Deswegen stimme ich der Einschätzung zu, dass das völlig inakzeptabel war und dass wir das deutlich kritisieren müssen.

Es geht um Langzeitbelastung, und deswegen dürfen wir jetzt auch bei der Frage, wie wir die Schadstoffe in den Griff kriegen, nicht kurzfristige Maßnahmen machen, die vielleicht sogar kontraproduktiv sind. Wenn man eine Straße sperrt und die Leute fahren dann einen Umweg, der vielleicht viel länger ist, dann ist das nicht der Sinn. Wir müssen an die Wurzel des Problems bei den Autos, aber auch beispielsweise bei den Bussen. Da habe ich die Kommission schon mal aufgefordert, etwas zu tun – die Antwort war nicht sehr überzeugend. Und beispielsweise bei den Schiffsmotoren: Es ist unglaublich, dass Schiffe immer noch den letzten Dreck verbrennen, in den meisten Fällen ohne wesentliche Abgasreinigung. Da müssen wir endlich etwas tun, um die Gesundheit der Menschen und die Umwelt besser zu schützen.

Kathleen Van Brempt, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, exposing human beings to toxic diesel fumes in a laboratory, and also the monkeys in the United States, already brings us very low. But add to that the fact that the cars in these tests were manipulated, and so the results were manipulated too, and that reminds us, for instance, of the tobacco industry. Remember when they in the past paid for so-called independent research to say that there are no hazardous substances in cigarettes? The aim is to undermine the work of legislators such as us, and at the same time mislead consumers.

This week, we will establish a special committee on glyphosates – the same story! Big multinationals paying for so-called independent research with the sole aim of saying to the public that their products are safe; undermining our work in Parliament and making sure that consumers are misled. As long as public authorities, the Commission and national Member States do not punish that misbehaviour, the car industries, and other industries too, will go on doing this. It is time for the Commission – I heard you very clearly, Commissioner, and I like the way you speak and I like the words that you use – but we need action, not just condemnation but also action! In our national market surveillance authorities too, we also need to show our teeth. This is leaving millions of fraudulent cars on our roads, more than two years after the ‘dieselgate’ scandal and our committee work in this Parliament!

In our economy, Commissioner, and in our society, no private company, no sector – they may be the largest, they may have a lot of people working there – but none of them should be allowed to act as they do today, as the car industry does today, because then they think they are untouchable and that is absolutely unacceptable!

Hans-Olaf Henkel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich stimme allem zu, was hier an Kritischem vorgebracht wurde. Ich muss daran erinnern, dass ich selbst mal sechs Jahre lang für die deutsche Industrie verantwortlich war, und man muss sich schämen. Aber Herr Liese hat zu Recht gesagt, dass man auch mal über die Ursachen nachdenken muss. Da fällt mir doch ein Unternehmen ein, das sich immer wieder hervortut: Volkswagen. Darüber müssen wir heute mal kurz sprechen.

Ich erinnere mich noch sehr gut, dass der Volkswagen-Vorstand vor einigen Jahren einen Mitarbeiter von General Motors eingestellt hat, um an die Geheimnisse von General Motors heranzukommen. Er wurde dafür schwer bestraft. Gerhard Schröder hat als Aufsichtsratsvorsitzender von Volkswagen ein IG-Metall-Mitglied eingestellt und zum Vorstand gemacht. Dieses IG-Metall-Mitglied hat dann systematisch Betriebsräte bestochen, ihnen die Prostituierten bezahlt und schließlich sogar noch die Geliebte eines dieser Betriebsräte eingestellt.

Vor einigen Wochen kam heraus, dass der Betriebsrat von Volkswagen ein extrem hohes Gehalt bekam, was den Verdacht nährte, dass es sich hier um Betrug handeln könnte. Man hat ihm inzwischen das Gehalt wieder gekürzt. Dann kam Diesel-Gate – es wurde darauf hingewiesen – und schließlich jetzt dieses Affentheater. Man muss sich schämen.

Was ist einer der Gründe für Volkswagen? Immer dann, wenn Politik und Wirtschaft zusammen sind, kungeln, dann kommt so was dabei raus. Es beginnt immer wieder mit Kungelei, es kommt dann zur Korruption und schließlich zur Verwahrlosung der Sitten. Es ist Zeit, dass bei Volkswagen aufgeräumt wird. Das Erste, was geschehen muss: Das Unternehmen muss endgültig privatisiert werden.

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

Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Dear colleague, I very much appreciate your activity here in Parliament. Concerning this important issue, and especially the testing of emissions on animals and human beings, do you not think that it is now time that we should promote, within the European Union, legislation on research ethics for such conditions?

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – If, indeed, we come to the conclusion that this was possible because there is a law missing, then we should come up with another law. But I tend to believe that we don’t need new laws, I think they violated regulations and laws.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, laat ik beginnen met mevrouw de commissaris hartelijk te danken voor haar stevige woorden, want die verontwaardiging naar aanleiding van het nieuws van vorige week van de testen op apen en mensen, die delen wij allemaal. Die verontwaardiging is ook volledig terecht. Want dit heeft niets te maken met wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Sterker nog, dit is het ondermijnen van wetenschappelijk onderzoek – net zoals collega Van Brempt zei – vergelijkbaar met de tabaksindustrie. Het toont eens te meer aan dat het moreel kompas van de Europese auto-industrie volledig van slag is. Ruim twee jaar geleden ontstond het dieselgate-schandaal en ondanks de vele beloften van de auto-industrie rijden nog altijd miljoenen sjoemeldiesels over de Europese straten. Dat is één van de grootste schandalen.

Maar het allergrootste schandaal is natuurlijk dat onze lidstaten – en de commissaris benadrukte dat ook al –het toestaan dat de auto-industrie zich boven de wet toont. Want ze hebben niet goed getest. Ze hebben niet gehandhaafd. Er zijn geen verplichte terugroepacties. En er worden geen boetes opgelegd. Waar zijn de Duitse boetes voor Volkswagen? Waar zijn de Britse boetes voor Skoda? En waar zijn de Italiaanse boetes voor Fiat? Ze zijn er niet!

Mijn vraag aan de Commissie is – ook bij afwezigheid van de Raad –: wat kan de Europese commissaris hier zelf aan doen? Dat is natuurlijk een van de hoofdvragen. Wij wilden dat vorige week ook in het debat in de milieucommissie aan de orde stellen. Helaas hadden wij nog niet de schriftelijke beantwoording op onze schriftelijke vragen. Ik zou het zeer op prijs stellen als wij die beantwoording alsnog zouden kunnen krijgen, voordat we in de milieucommissie het debat wederom met u kunnen aangaan. Maar dank voor uw stevige worden vandaag.

Stefan Eck, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, wertere Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Politik zeigt sich wieder einmal schockiert: VW, BMW, Daimler-Benz ließen Abgastests an zehn Affen durchführen. Selbst Kanzlerin Merkel, die in ihrer gesamten Amtszeit kein Interesse an Tierschutz zeigte, meldete sich zu Wort: Die Tests an Affen und sogar an Menschen seien ethisch in keiner Weise zu rechtfertigen. Die Reaktionen in der Bevölkerung reichten nach Bekanntwerden der Tests von unethisch bis abstoßend.

Ich kann Ihnen sagen, dass ich diese Abgastests in keiner Weise billige, und ich kann die Betrügereien der beteiligten Konzerne nur noch als skandalös bezeichnen. Aber was ist das für eine Farce, die jetzt hier in diesem Haus vorgeht! Tagtäglich sterben in der EU zigtausende Tiere in Tierversuchen; allein in Deutschland werden jährlich etwa 2 500 bis 3 000 Affen in Tierversuchen gequält und getötet. Neue Arzneimittel wurden und werden in klinischen Studien unter Inkaufnahme von großen gesundheitlichen Risiken an Patienten getestet. Man macht immer noch Tierversuche in der Tabakindustrie. Wo ist hier die politische Empörung? Ich habe sie nicht vernommen. Erklären Sie mir einmal, warum ein abstrakter, sinnloser Tierversuch – und es gibt genügend davon – ethisch zu rechtfertigen ist, aber die Dieselabgastests nicht.

Wir sollten die Gelegenheit jetzt nutzen und deutlich herausstellen, dass alle Tierversuche generell unethisch und nicht zu vertreten sind. Andernfalls machen wir uns lächerlich, weil das Europäische Parlament offensichtlich zu ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, j'ai un message pour Volkswagen et ses concurrents de l'industrie automobile. Par deux fois, dans le scandale du diesel et lors des tests sur les animaux, vous avez menti aux citoyens. Vos excuses publiques et les licenciements de vos dirigeants ne trompent personne. Nous attendons des réparations.

Je suis terrifiée que l'éthique ait à ce point quitté les méthodes du premier constructeur mondial. 600 000 salariés dépendent de vous, 400 000 Européens sont victimes chaque année de la pollution de l'air. Respectez-les! Au lieu de cela, l'industrie automobile utilise des méthodes dignes de l'industrie du tabac en enfermant des singes dans des cages, à inhaler vos vapeurs diesel.

Mais j'ai un scoop pour l'industrie automobile: le diesel est cancérigène. C'est l'OMC qui le dit depuis 2012. Alors, le diesel c'est fini. Le reste du monde a déjà pris le virage des véhicules propres partagés autonomes.

Alors, indemnez les consommateurs européens comme aux États-Unis, effacez l'ardoise, pour qu'enfin on puisse regarder vers le futur.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI*Wiceprzewodniczący*

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le groupe Volkswagen se voit reprocher d'avoir mené en 2013 et en 2014 une étude sur 25 humains en bonne santé pour laquelle ils ont dû inhaler du dioxyde d'azote, gaz très toxique et polluant majeur de l'atmosphère terrestre. En 2014, des singes ont été enrhumés et forcés à respirer la fumée émise par un véhicule.

Outre le fait que cela porte atteinte de manière flagrante au respect du bien-être animal et à celui de la personne humaine, ces tests constituent un deuxième scandale. En effet, ils visaient à étudier les effets de la pollution des moteurs diesels Volkswagen truqués à l'époque pour paraître moins polluants, ce qui est d'autant plus condamnable.

Aussi, il sera intéressant de voir les suites que la Commission européenne donnera à ces révélations, quand on sait combien elle est attachée au respect des règles de concurrence équitable et à celui des réglementations en vigueur.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Veliko raje bi poslušal, da Evropska zveza proizvaja najboljši električni avto kot pa novice o novem škandalu.

Že prejšnji je načel zaupanje potrošnikov in ge. komisarki sem hvaležen, da je tako poudarila dve ključni besedi – zaupanje in etika. Načeto je zaupanje potrošnikov in ni dovolj tehnika, potrebujemo tehniko z etiko.

In mislim, da mora Evropska zveza razviti nadzorne, sankcijske in preventivne ukrepe, da bomo postali odporni proti tovrstnim lažem in manipulaciji.

In še nekaj bi se vprašal – naslov, ki je izvajal raziskave, se imenuje Evropsko-raziskovalna skupina za okolje in zdravje v prometnem sektorju. Kdo podeljuje pravico do rabe besede „evropsko“? Kajti beseda „evropsko“ pomeni, kot da smo skoraj zraven, ker smo evropska institucija.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je m'étonne, mais je ne suis pas surprise de me retrouver, une fois de plus, debout dans cet hémicycle pour parler des méfaits de l'industrie du diesel.

Je m'étonne, car les faits dont il est aujourd'hui question – expérimentations sur des singes et des humains soumis à l'inhalation de gaz toxiques, au mépris de toute considération pour leur dignité et leur santé – sont extrêmement graves. Ils sont même sidérants. Consternants. C'est inimaginable!

Mais je ne suis pas surprise, car la course effrénée à la rentabilité, sans souci du coût humain, social, sociétal, a depuis longtemps démontré sa nocivité, quel que soit le domaine économique. Certains industriels automobiles n'ont pas hésité à mettre sur pied un *business model* basé sur la tricherie, signe d'un sens éthique défaillant, qu'on retrouve donc aussi dans les expériences révélées par la presse allemande.

L'enquête sur les fraudes aux mesures d'émissions avait bien montré la façon dont certains tordent à leur avantage les règles européennes en matière d'émissions. On voit aujourd'hui que c'est la même chose pour les règles d'essais cliniques et les normes de protection animale. Dans ces domaines, il incombe aux autorités européennes de faire toute la lumière mais aussi d'agir.

Il serait en outre bienvenu que la Commission indique au Parlement européen où en sont les cinq procédures d'infraction ouvertes en juillet 2017 à l'encontre de cinq États membres qui ne sanctionnent pas correctement les fraudes aux émissions. Les deux sujets ne sont pas déconnectés, ils sont bien liés.

(L'oratrice accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement intérieur))

Peter Liese (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich habe ja meine Meinung zu den Tests gesagt. Ich halte sie auch für unverantwortlich. Aber in der deutschen Übersetzung hieß es, Frau Kollegin: Menschen und Affen wurden gezwungen, diese Gase einzuatmen. Nach meinen Informationen war das bei den Menschen an der RWTH Aachen mit freiwilligen Probanden. Da sollte man, glaube ich, sauber argumentieren. Ich hoffe, das war ein Übersetzungsfehler, oder haben Sie Erkenntnisse, dass die Menschen gezwungen wurden?

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – J'ai les mêmes informations que vous. Mais vous vous rendez compte que ces volontaires ont dû inhaler des gaz très toxiques. Cela ne vous choque pas?

Il est temps qu'on puisse protéger les consommateurs et les citoyens européens de la même manière qu'ils le sont dans d'autres États. C'est ce que nous avons adopté dans le rapport de la commission d'enquête EMIS et il faut que ce soit réellement pris en compte.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Skandal, o którym mówimy, ma oczywiście o wiele szerszy zakres niż tylko te eksperymenty. To także skandal polityczny. Tajemnicą poliszynela są powiązania między elitami politycznymi a osobami zarządzającymi czołowymi koncernami przemysłu samochodowego w Niemczech. Fakt, że kiedyś zaufany współpracownik Angeli Merkel prosto z urzędu kanclerskiego przeszedł do pracy na wysokim stanowisku w koncernie Daimler jest tylko jednym tego przykładem. Zatem nie chodzi tylko o Volkswagena, jak nas przekonuje kolega Henkel. Wszyscy pamiętamy spór Komisji Europejskiej z Volkswagensem, ostatecznie przegrany przez Komisję w wyniku zadziwiającego wyroku Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej. Niestety w tej sprawie Komisja nie wykazała się wytrwałością. Dolna Saksonia jest nadal właścicielem 20 % akcji w Volkswagencie, a w radzie nadzorczej jest reprezentowana przez premiera kraju związkowego i ministra gospodarki kraju związkowego. Można więc wątpić, czy rzeczywiście rząd krajowy i rząd federalny nie wiedziały o manipulacjach w sprawie emisji i o przeprowadzanych eksperymentach na zwierzętach i ludziach. I one też ponoszą za to odpowiedzialność.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Tatsache ist, dass deutsche Firmen Tiere und Menschen benutzt haben, um ihre Autos sauber zu lügen. Doch so berechtigt die Diskussion über Tierversuche und Menschenversuche immer wieder ist, ist der größere Versuch, der stattfindet, derjenige mit sehr vielen Menschen jeden Tag auf unseren Straßen. Ich kann auch die Empörung unserer Kommissarin nicht ernst nehmen, wenn sich aus der Empörung über Versuche an Menschen und Affen nicht auch die Empörung ableitet an diesem großen Versuch, der Tag für Tag auf den Straßen stattfindet.

Die Autoindustrie, Frau Bieńkowska, muss von Ihnen, gemeinsam mit den Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten dazu gebracht werden, dass Grenzwerte endlich eingehalten werden, denn sonst ist die Autoindustrie – und Sie auch und Ihre Kollegen in den nationalen Regierungen – dafür verantwortlich, dass Menschen krank werden und auch vorzeitig sterben. Die Technik dazu ist da, sie muss endlich angewandt werden. Und wenn nicht ordentliche Nachrüstungen passieren, dann muss endlich über Fahrverbote geredet werden. Das ist die eigentliche Konsequenz aus dem Skandal.

Wir sollten – da gebe ich Frau Van Brempt Recht – der Lobby der Autoindustrie nicht mehr trauen. Sie sollte den Status Lobby *non grata* bekommen, so wie das auch bei der Tabakindustrie heute der Fall ist. Wir haben genug von diesen Lügen!

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Som vi kan høre her i aften, ligger tilliden til den europæiske bilindustri på et meget, meget lavt niveau – og helt berettiget. Dieselgate med snyd, abetest med udstødningsgas og manipulation af testresultater. Det duer simpelthen ikke! Vi skal gøre noget! Og ja, der er ny lovgivning på vej, som giver medlemsstaterne bedre mulighed for at kontrollere, men det varer mere end to år, inden den lovgivning er på plads.

Fru Bieńkowska, det er rigtig godt at høre, at du vil det samme som os, nemlig at der skal ske handling, men så gransk EU-lovgivningen og se, om der ikke er nogle redskaber, vi kan bruge for at straffe bilindustrien i Europa. Det duer ikke det her! Vi skal have gransket, om den overholder konkurrencereglerne, og vi skal have sat nogle nye etiske spilleregler op for vores bilindustri. Taberne i dette er altså forbrugerne og vores miljø, og det går ikke! Vi skal have genopbygget tilliden, og det kan vi kun, hvis vi viser bilindustrien, at vi ikke finder os i det her.

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kollegen! Diese Automobilindustrie, die ist einfach nicht mehr zu übertreffen. So was von skrupellos, so was von unethisch. Also diese Affentests und Tests am Menschen sind ja eigentlich nur der weitere Beweis für die Unethik dieser Lobby.

Daraus ergeben sich drei Fragen an die EU-Kommission. Die erste: Müssen wir nicht bei den Tierversuchen bestehende Lücken in der Gesetzgebung schließen? Bei Kosmetik ist es klar, warum nicht auch in anderen Bereichen? Zweite Frage: Professor Doktor Greim, der Leiter dieser Affentests, sitzt in den Gremien von Ihnen bei Diesel, bei Glyphosat und bei einer dritten Substanz, bei den *endocrine disruptors*. Wie ist das möglich? Wenn der nicht nächste Woche da rausfliegt, ich denke, dann haben Sie ein Problem.

Drittens, Frau Harms hat es angesprochen: Der eigentliche Skandal ist: Hunderte Millionen EU-Bürger sind dem Diesel und den nichtkonformen Dieselaautos ausgesetzt. Wo ist Ihre Liste der Hardware-Updates? Seit Wochen, Monaten versprochen. Wann kommt die Kommission mit einer Liste raus, welche Autos technisch aufgerüstet werden können, um diesem eigentlichen Skandal, an dem Menschen in Europa sterben, ein Ende zu setzen?

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das, was mit den Tests vorgefallen ist, ist natürlich durch nichts zu rechtfertigen und auf das Schärfste zu verurteilen. Dennoch möchte ich meinen Fokus heute in die Zukunft richten, nämlich die Frage aufwerfen: Wie kann man in Zukunft so etwas vermeiden? Frau Kommissarin, ich glaube, wir können so etwas vermeiden, indem wir den Schritt in die nächste Generation gehen, die nämlich elektrisch betrieben sein wird. Obwohl die Technologien heute schon vorliegen, kommen wir nicht signifikant weiter. Wir kommen deswegen nicht signifikant weiter, weil wir nämlich heute die Infrastruktur nicht haben, die wir benötigen – ob das E-Ladesäulen sind, Wasserstofftankstellen, oder auch Gastankstellen.

Deshalb, Frau Kommissarin, im Besonderen: Wir brauchen 680 000 Elektroladesäulen europaweit, wir brauchen 10 600 Wasserstofftankstellen, und das alles kostet uns ungefähr 24,2 Milliarden Euro. Deshalb schlagen wir einen European Clean Mobility Fund vor, der zu 85 % von der Industrie, zu 10 % aus EU-Mitteln und zu 5 % aus CO₂-Strafzahlungen gespeist werden kann.

Diesen Vorschlag unterbreiten wir Ihnen, Frau Kommissarin Bienkowska. Jetzt liegt es an Ihnen, ob Sie etwas daraus machen oder nicht.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con questo scandalo si sono superati tutti i limiti etici e morali.

Il biossido di azoto nuoce alla salute umana e questo è sufficientemente documentato. L'industria automobilistica tedesca avrebbe quindi dovuto semplicemente adeguarsi e non cercare di dimostrarne una presunta innocuità. È oltremodo sconcertante l'apparente disponibilità di parti del mondo scientifico che, consapevolmente, hanno effettuato inaccettabili esperimenti che mettono a rischio la salute di esseri umani ed animali.

Questi test rappresentano una violazione dei diritti fondamentali riconosciuti dai trattati e dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali, ma anche del regolamento (UE) n. 536/2014 sulla sperimentazione clinica dei medicinali per uso umano e della direttiva sulla protezione degli animali utilizzati a fini scientifici.

Questa dei test di emissioni è una triste vicenda che richiede risposte urgenti ed inequivocabili. La Commissione deve intraprendere un'indagine approfondita su queste pratiche e sulla loro conformità alla normativa europea e, auspicabilmente, avviare una procedura di infrazione.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αποδεικνύεται για άλλη μια φορά ότι η γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία είναι κράτος εν κράτει. Το είδαμε στην περίπτωση του «Dieselgate» και το βλέπουμε και στη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση, καθώς έχουμε δοκιμές εκπομπών σε ανθρώπους· 25 συνάνθρωποι μας έχουν εκτεθεί σε διοξείδιο του αζώτου. Πρόκειται για παράνομες πράξεις. Πρόκειται για παραβίαση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Πρόκειται για ανήθικη συμπεριφορά. Από εκεί και πέρα, έχουμε δοκιμές αντίστοιχες και σε ζώα, κυρίως σε πιθήκους. Αποδεικνύεται, λοιπόν, ότι πρέπει να δοθεί τέλος στην αουδοσία της γερμανικής αυτοκινητοβιομηχανίας. Πρέπει επιτέλους να υπάρξουν έλεγχοι. Πρέπει να υπάρξει βαριά τιμωρία και, φυσικά, πρόβλεψη για αποζημίωση των συνανθρώπων μας που συμμετείχαν στα πειράματα αυτά.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, notre société est-elle à ce point malade pour en arriver à faire respirer pendant plusieurs heures des gaz toxiques à des cobayes humains et à des singes, ce que je considère être des actes de torture contre des animaux qui, eux, ne peuvent pas dire non? Dans cette affaire du *dieselgate*, le scandale s'ajoute au scandale, la honte à la honte et le dégoût au dégoût pour les pratiques des industriels prêts à tout pour tricher et par appétit du gain.

C'est pourquoi nous demandons une enquête; nous demandons aussi qu'ils soient sanctionnés, car ils contreviennent à la Charte européenne des droits fondamentaux, ils offensent nos valeurs et, en fin de compte, ils nous font honte.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario Bienkowska, ecco chi alimenta la falsa scienza, la pseudoscienza *prêt-à-porter* delle lobby. Quando, nel 2012, lo IARC ha dichiarato che i gas di scarico dei motori diesel sono cancerogeni certi per l'uomo, le lobby dell'auto sono corse a finanziare questi esperimenti vergognosi e inaccettabili su cavie animali e umane, nel tentativo di confutare la scienza. Ed è chiaro perché l'hanno fatto, perché in quegli stessi anni l'industria dell'auto costruiva auto truccate, vendute come più ecologiche, ingannando i consumatori e causando uno dei problemi sanitari più gravi del nostro secolo: l'inquinamento atmosferico. È un killer silenzioso che causa oltre 400 000 morti all'anno e nelle nostre strade continuano a circolare 37 milioni di auto diesel sporche, nella totale indifferenza e inazione degli Stati membri, e questo lei lo ha ricordato.

Signora Commissario, i cittadini europei ne hanno abbastanza. Il tempo per gli sconti ai costruttori di automobili è terminato. Io ringrazio e apprezzo le sue parole, ma mi aspetto da parte della Commissione delle azioni concrete e nessun passo indietro sui pacchetti mobilità perché stiamo strizzando nuovamente l'occhio al settore dei costruttori dell'auto e questo non è più accettabile.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gospod predsednik, tudi sam sem zgrožen nad vsemi temi razkritji, da se je v tem konkretnem avtomobilskem koncernu posluževalo tako neetičnih in nehumanih metod, kot so testiranja na ljudeh in opi-cah.

In sprašujem se, torej, kako daleč gremo lahko pri tem pridobivanju dobička, kje so te meje? Očitno te najbolj osnovne civilizacijske meje padajo in torej, kako daleč gremo lahko tudi pri tem, da smo neobčutljivi, neodzivni na tovrstne škandale?

Mislím, da je seveda na vrsti tudi Evropska komisija, da ostro reagira, ne samo z opozarjanjem in z morebitnim spreminjanjem pravil, ampak tudi z ustreznimi sankcijami, ker ko gre za tako temeljne kršitve, tudi temeljnih pravic in tudi tistih pravic, ki so povezani v mednarodnih listinah, ki izhajajo iz spoštovanja človekovega dostojanstva, potem seveda tukaj ne sme biti izjem, tukaj ne sme biti opravičila za kakršna koli ravnanja, ki so v nasprotju s tem.

Tako da še enkrat poziv Komisiji za ostro sankcioniranje, da se škandali ne ponavljajo en za drugim.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αποτελούν μία θλιβερή ανάμνηση από το παρελθόν τα εγκλήματα στο όνομα της επιστήμης. Όταν, όμως, τα εγκλήματα αυτά διαπράττονται με στόχο το οικονομικό όφελος, τότε γίνονται ειδηχθή και πρέπει να τιμωρούνται αυστηρά και παραδειγματικά. Από τα μέσα ενημέρωσης πληροφορηθήκαμε ότι μία γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία έκανε πειράματα σε ανθρώπους και μία αντίστοιχη αμερικανική σε πιθήκους για να διαπιστωθούν οι επιπτώσεις που έχει η εισποχή καυσίμων αυτοκινήτων στην υγεία των ανθρώπων. Πρόκειται για μια απαράδεκτη και ανήθικη πράξη η οποία παραβιάζει ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και δεν έχει κανένα νόημα, διότι γνωρίζουμε πολύ καλά ποια είναι τα επίπεδα μονοξειδίου του άνθρακα, διοξειδίου του άνθρακα και οξειδίων του αζώτου που βλάπτουν την υγεία του ανθρώπου.

Πρέπει λοιπόν τα κράτη να συνεργαστούν με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ούτως ώστε να θεσπιστεί κατάλληλη νομοθεσία και να προβλεφθούν κυρώσεις για τις εν λόγω βιομηχανίες. Διερωτώμαι, όμως: είναι δυνατόν αυτό να γίνει όταν οι αυτοκινητοβιομηχανίες έχουν στενή συνεργασία με ευρωπαίους πολιτικούς;

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich schließe mich der Verurteilung dieser menschen- und auch tierunwürdigen betrügerischen Versuche an. Ich möchte aber heute vielleicht auch noch auf ein anderes Problem lenken. Wenn wir heute die große Empörung haben, wie hier Menschen und Tiere Schadstoffen ausgesetzt werden, und wenn wir schon von der Tabakindustrie und Autoindustrie gesprochen haben, würde ich Sie ersuchen, in der Kommission zu prüfen, ob wir nicht ein generelles Rauchverbot in Autos erlassen könnten, denn es sind tagtäglich Hunderttausende Kinder, Minderjährige, Unfreiwillige, die im Auto sitzen und hier Schadstoffen in hoher Konzentration ausgesetzt sind. Einige Mitgliedstaaten haben hier schon eine Gesetzgebung, die das berücksichtigt, eingeleitet.

Ich würde Sie ersuchen, im Sinne des Schutzes von Kindern, von Minderjährigen, aber auch zum Schutze der Gesellschaft vor den Gefahren des Rauchens, nämlich Unaufmerksamkeit im Straßenverkehr, hier Maßnahmen zu setzen. Die Empörung heute gegenüber der Industrie ist berechtigt, aber ich glaube, es wäre auch einen Versuch wert, im täglichen Leben hier Besserungen herbeizuführen.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Bieńkowska, δεν αρκεί να δηλώνει η Επιτροπή σοκαρισμένη. Το ερώτημα είναι έως πότε η Επιτροπή θα αντιμετωπίζει τόσο χλιαρά τα σκάνδαλα, την ανηθικότητα και την εξαπάτηση από την πλευρά της αυτοκινητοβιομηχανίας; Γιατί οι ευρωπαϊκοί μηχανισμοί δεν βρήκαν αυτό που ανακάλυψαν οι δημοσιογράφοι; Πού είναι οι αυστηρές κυρώσεις, οικονομικές αλλά και νομικές, εναντίον όσων παραβιάζουν κάθε έννοια ηθικής και νομιμότητας; Ορισμένοι έχουν μπερδέψει την ελεύθερη αγορά με την εξαπάτηση, την ανηθικότητα και τη μετατροπή των ανθρώπων σε πειραματόζωα. Πού είναι η υλοποίηση εκείνων των ισχυρών ευρωπαϊκών πολιτικών που θα βάλουν κανόνες και εμπόδια σε αυτά τα σκάνδαλα; Στο σκάνδαλο «Dieselgate I» και στο σκάνδαλο «Dieselgate II» που το ζούμε τώρα; Και γιατί αρκείστε στις έρευνες της γερμανικής κυβέρνησης; Δεν πρέπει να ερευνηθεί και η Επιτροπή; Δεν πρέπει να έχουμε κοινούς ευρωπαϊκούς κανόνες; Θέλουμε επιτέλους πράξεις· όχι απλώς να εκφράζετε τη λύπη σας.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συμβολή των αυτοκινήτων στη συνολική ρύπανση της ατμόσφαιρας ανέρχεται σε 60% για το μονοξείδιο του άνθρακα, 30% για τα οξειδία του αζώτου, 50% για τους υδρογονάνθρακες και 3,5% για το διοξείδιο του θείου. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι τα καυσαέρια εκπέμπονται στο ύψος της αναπνοής του ανθρώπου, τα αυτοκίνητα κατατάσσονται στους μεγαλύτερους ρυπαντές της ατμόσφαιρας των πόλεων, με ποσοστό συμμετοχής 80 έως 99%.

Οι αυτοκινητοβιομηχανίες, προκειμένου να ανταποκριθούν στις απαιτήσεις της Επιτροπής για τις προδιαγραφές που πρέπει να πληρούν τα νέα οχήματα ως προς τους ρύπους, δεν διστάζουν να παρουσιάσουν παραπλανητικά στοιχεία, όπως έγινε με το πειραγμένο λογισμικό στο σκάνδαλο της Volkswagen τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2015. Όμως δεν σταματούν εκεί. Σύμφωνα με το νέο σκάνδαλο που ξέσπασε στη γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία, οι όμιλοι Volkswagen, Daimler και BMW, θέλοντας να αποδείξουν ότι οι κινητήρες δεν είναι επικίνδυνοι, χρησιμοποιούσαν όχι μόνο πιθήκους αλλά και ανθρώπους σε πειράματά τους, με στόχο να διαπιστώσουν εάν τα καυσαέρια των ντιζελοκινητήρων είναι επιβλαβή στα πρωτεύοντα θηλαστικά.

Δεν αρκεί η συγγνώμη που ζήτησε η Volkswagen και το Ινστιτούτο Αναπνευστικών Μελετών έπειτα από την απίστευτη αυτή αποκάλυψη. Ζητάμε την παραδειγματική τιμωρία όλων των εμπλεκομένων στο σκάνδαλο αυτό.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, yes, I understand the outrage and I agree completely with colleagues who have expressed it, especially when this is coming from what we deemed very reputable companies – like Volkswagen, with a worldwide reputation – and the practices have been rather shocking and there is certainly a need to bring them to order and ensure it does not happen again.

I think it is probably too easy to say the Commission is to blame – it can only do so much – but I think what we have to do now is ensure that we learn lessons from what has happened and collectively come up with a solution. Because with more emphasis being put now on decarbonising transport, more research will be required but it has to be done in a very moralistic way, whether that involves animals, humans or anything else.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o escândalo que resultou do conhecimento da fraude de manipulação das emissões automóveis lançou alguma luz sobre os padrões segundo os quais se regem estas multinacionais.

A pulsão dos lucros sobrepõe-se ao ambiente, à saúde, em última instância, mesmo à vida humana, um eloquente retrato do capitalismo.

A Comissão Europeia não saiu ileso. A complacência ou mesmo cumplicidade de quem sabia que os testes feitos e os valores de referência não tinham como ser comprovados ficou evidente neste processo.

Fica assim evidente a promiscuidade existente entre o poder económico e o poder político, promiscuidade que os pios apelos à ética e à responsabilidade da indústria só confirmam. Na prática, a regra é «business as usual».

As revelações agora feitas de que vários construtores utilizaram cobaias humanas e outros primatas para testar os efeitos na saúde das emissões dos motores a diesel confirmam que não estamos perante episódios isolados, mas sim perante um problema sistémico, e para problemas sistémicos só soluções sistémicas.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Elżbieta Bienkowska, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first I want to reiterate what I said before. Without the car industry taking responsibility and admitting that what they are doing is immoral, we will not achieve everything that we can because of course legislation and changing the legislation is not sufficient. I want to state once again very clearly that once we have the legislation – because for now we do not have tools as the Commission to interact and to react in such a situation, but agreement on the type approval was reached in December so I am happy that we will have it – the situation will of course be different. But, as far as animal and human testing are concerned, this is another situation again.

So now the national authorities must check what the situation looked like in Europe, whether testing on animals took place and whether we have evidence of this. We probably have the evidence of testing on humans, but again the only link we have is the European Charter of Fundamental Rights. On animal testing we have the legislation for the cosmetic industry and I will discuss with my colleagues in the Commission whether to perhaps extend this testing to cars and the car industry. But as far as extending the emission tests on cars to the health issue, of course politically I support the idea, but technically we should look at all emissions, not only from cars. This requires a much more holistic approach, including specific car tests on health. We can of course discuss it, but again I will come back to this.

Without morality in the industry, I do not think we will cover the whole range of problems that may appear one day or another. I will do my best because I will soon have – or my successor will soon have – tools for emissions and for the things that are under the type approval regulation, but animal testing is much wider than we thought during the emissions scandal. As you probably know, I am very dedicated to enforcement. We are currently – I think for three or four months now – analysing information after the first packet of infringement procedures that we opened against five Member States for failing to fine Volkswagen. So, regarding the second package, we are currently analysing the information and data provided by the Member States and I can again reassure you that, if Member States do not cooperate – and they are not so very open on this – I will go ahead with the next step of the procedure. We are not ready for this yet.

On the hardware update and the list of equipment, we do not have the technical data in the Commission to provide such a list. If you ask me to do so, I can ask the Member States to provide this information for us, but I can assure you it will take a few more months or even years.

For the list of equipment and hardware, I am very open to this. I have only recently heard about this list of equipment and hardware updates, so I can ask the Joint Research Centre whether they are ready to prepare this for us. On recalls, maybe you know that under current regulation the Commission has no power to issue EU-wide mandatory recalls. This will change with the new type approval framework. It is still currently the joint responsibility of Volkswagen and the Member States. I have written a few letters over the last few months calling on Member States to issue mandatory recalls. After this letter the number of Member States with mandatory recalls increased from four to seven, but of course the results of the recalls are not the same everywhere in Europe. In those Member States where the recalls are mandatory they are much higher and much better. If the situation does not change in the next couple of weeks, I am prepared to take further steps on our side and of course again it is legal action against Member States where recall rates are very low and definitely for those where the recalls are voluntary the rates are very low.

On the comparison with glyphosate and with the other tests or studies that were submitted, I want to underline that these tests on animals that we are discussing now are not required by our EU type approval legislation. So in the context of EU legislation in other areas and other domains, industry has to submit the studies. This is mandatory. It has to submit the studies when applying for approval of the substances and this was what happened with the glyphosate. Here with private testing such an obligation under our EU type approval legislation does not exist so I think this comparison with some other cases is not relevant.

Regarding the response to the written questions to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), I was told that the current horizontal rules did not foresee such a submission of the written answer ahead of the regular exchange of views, but I can assure you that I will provide you with this response this evening or tomorrow morning. I have been told that we can only provide written answers ahead of the inquiry committee. That is why I am very open to having this exchange with the ENVI Committee, but I was told that horizontally the situation is not appropriate, but we will provide you with the answers to the written questions at the latest tomorrow morning.

I want to finish by reiterating what I said at the beginning. We cannot fix mistrust only with a regulatory framework and with legislation. This must come from the industry itself, but it is not happening for now. This is not happening for now and I think this is the biggest shame and the saddest thing in all of this because, after the diesel scandal and after the whole discussion we had with them, I thought that this transparency would be everywhere. Unfortunately, even if I compare the dates, I see that the moment the diesel scandal occurred, it finished. This was about the moment when they were testing on animals and humans – it was 15 and 14, I checked it – so it was at more or less the same time. We will do our best on type approval and emissions. I will discuss testing on animals with my colleagues in the Commission because this is joint work with the Commissioner responsible for health and consumer protection. We will of course discuss it together, but I will still repeat that, without proper discussion with the industry and without a proper admission by the industry that they were doing the wrong things, we will not achieve 100% success because life is much broader than we can imagine. Could you imagine a month or two ago that something like this would be discussed today? No. I was not surprised because I have been living with this for the last two years so I know how things are going, but still I was shocked. Can you imagine what will happen in the next six to ten months? Again we will try then to prepare legislation and to change the legislation. The legislation is extremely important but it is not the only thing. We have the legislation in place. Member States have the legislation in place. But it does not work if there is no will for it to work.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo za te odpowiedzi. Pani Komisarz, rzeczywiście życie jest trudne i czasami nas zaskakuje, ale czasami mamy ochotę, żeby Komisja nie zawsze była zaskakiwana. Myślę, że problem będzie ważny i będziemy się z tym spotykać. Dziękuję Pani za udział w dzisiejszej popołudniowej debacie. Dziękuję koleżankom i kolegom za wypowiedzi.

Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Carolina Punset (ALDE), por escrito. – La industria del automóvil no ha podido caer más bajo, tras conocerse que Volkswagen, BMW y Daimler utilizaron monos y personas en experimentos, cuyos resultados ocultaron por ser perjudiciales para la salud. Al igual que el tabaco en su día, este sector miente. Las marcas manipulan once millones de vehículos, y nos toman por tontos. A la industria del automóvil no le importan las más de 70 000 muertes prematuras que desde 2103 han provocado las emisiones de los carburantes, principalmente diésel, con niveles de contaminantes extremos en más de 130 ciudades de 23 Estados. El lobby del petróleo es su gran aliado. El 78 % del petróleo consumido en Europa se destina al transporte rodado, único sector industrial que no reduce sus emisiones de GEI y las continúa aumentando. Pero lo más sangrante es el alto grado de subvenciones que reciben los combustibles. Según el FMI más de 5,3 billones de dólares, es decir, el 6,5 % del PIB mundial. Con estos compañeros, el sector de la automoción campa impune minando nuestra salud y destruyendo el planeta. Un cambio de propulsión sin emisiones se dará cuando se rompa la viciada relación con el lobby del petróleo, mantenida por las abrumadoras subvenciones de los Estados.

20. Blokowanie geograficzne oraz inne formy dyskryminacji ze względu na przynależność państwową klientów, ich miejsce zamieszkania lub miejsce prowadzenia działalności (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Różę Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein w imieniu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów w sprawie blokowania geograficznego oraz innych form dyskryminacji ze względu na przynależność państwową klientów, ich miejsce zamieszkania lub miejsce prowadzenia działalności na rynku wewnętrznym oraz w sprawie zmiany rozporządzenia (WE) nr 2006/2004 i dyrektywy 2009/22/WE (COM(2016)0289 - C8-0192/2016 - 2016/0152(COD)) (A8-0172/2017)

Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, sprawozdawczyni. – Panie Przewodniczący! Są takie dni, kiedy należy się cieszyć, kiedy należy odczuwać satysfakcję. Dzisiaj właśnie mamy taki dzień, bo dzisiejszy dzień wieńczy pracę wielu ludzi, wielu instytucji, wielu organizacji. Dziś możemy powiedzieć, że wspólną pracą osiągamy coś mierzalnego dla obywateli Unii Europejskiej, coś, co naprawdę wpłynie pozytywnie na życie każdego z nas.

Prawie dwa lata temu tutaj obecny komisarz Andrus Ansip zaproponował zakaz odmowy sprzedaży online ze względu na narodowość czy ze względu na lokalizację klienta. Bo nie jest przecież normalne, aby w zjednoczonej Europie XXI wieku, gdzie swobodnie się poruszamy między państwami, wciąż istnieją tak bezsensowne ograniczenia w świecie handlu elektronicznego.

Dziś możemy powiedzieć, że idziemy po sukces, sukces jeszcze niepełny, bo jest bardzo dużo do zrobienia, ale dzięki nowemu prawu każdy z nas odczuje konkretne zmiany na lepsze. Jutro, proszę państwa, głosujemy. Koniec z odmową sprzedaży przy zakupie towarów lub usług online z powodu miejsca zamieszkania lub narodowości klienta. Koniec barier technicznych w dostępie do stron internetowych i aplikacji. Koniec z automatycznym przekierowywaniem na stronę internetową sprzedającego w innym kraju bez zgody klienta. Koniec ze stosowaniem w tym samym sklepie różnych warunków sprzedaży towarów i usług, w tym też ceny, w zależności od narodowości lub miejsca zamieszkania klienta. Koniec z odmową sprzedaży ze względu na kraj wydania karty kredytowej.

Zadbalismy również o interesy sprzedawców. Jeśli przedsiębiorca nie kieruje swojej oferty, jeśli nie kieruje swojej działalności gospodarczej do danego kraju, to konsument nie jest w dalszym ciągu geoblokowany, ale organizuje sobie sam odbiór towaru, i dzięki takiemu rozwiązaniu mali sprzedawcy nie muszą znać przepisów każdego z 28 krajów Unii Europejskiej z osobna, bo tych przepisów jeszcze nie zharmonizowaliśmy.

Nie ukrywam, my chcieliśmy więcej. Zabiegaliśmy razem z Komisją o włączenie do tego rozporządzenia przynajmniej treści nieaudiowizualnych, tych strzeżonych prawem autorskim: eBooks, muzyka, oprogramowanie, gry. Niestety nie udało się nam się przewalczyć oporu Rady. Wdzięczna jestem moim koleżankom i kolegom za współpracę i za gotowość do kompromisu, bo dzięki temu geoblokowanie – na razie tylko produktów fizycznych – przechodzi do przeszłości.

Kieruję słowa uznania do przedstawicieli prezydencji estońskiej – taki mały kraj i jego znakomici przedstawiciele pokazali, jak sprawnie można prowadzić złożone negocjacje, tym bardziej że często więcej wyzwań stawało przed nimi wśród partnerów z Rady niż w trakcie negocjacji z Parlamentem i Komisją. Więc jeszcze raz wszystkim dziękuję: członkom Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów, w tym szczególnie innym sprawozdawcom, oraz moim dzielny i kompetentnym współpracownikom.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank Parliament for this important achievement, and particularly the rapporteur, Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein. You have demonstrated your belief in this proposal and how it will benefit Europeans. Thank you for helping it become reality.

The Geo-Blocking Regulation lies at the heart of the e-commerce package that we designed to remove barriers for consumers and companies trading online. It will end artificial segmentation and unjustified discrimination based on nationality or residence. Using either of these as a reason to deny access to websites, goods or services will finally no longer have a place in Europe's single market, either online or offline.

Today, only 37% of websites allow consumers to buy from another EU country, because people get blocked and rerouted elsewhere. This situation cannot exist in a digital single market, and we have to end it. Our aim is that, by Christmas, all Europeans will be able to enjoy online shopping without being blocked, rerouted or discriminated against. That is why we need to adopt this regulation without any further delay.

I would also like to ask for your support and commitment to make the entire digital single market a reality on the ground. Again, the clock is ticking. We have to move quickly, and adopt and implement initiatives where the co-legislators have already reached agreement. We are making good progress on e-commerce, and European consumers should soon feel the benefits of recent political agreements, which need to be implemented quickly. From 1 April this year, new rules on the cross-border portability of online content services will allow Europeans to access their music and e-books when they travel to other EU countries. To make sure this happens, companies should comply with the rules as from their dates of application.

We recently agreed on new rules to make prices for cross-border parcel delivery services more transparent and affordable. Consumers and companies, in particular SMEs, will be able to send and receive products across the EU with greater ease and confidence. It is also essential for the success of the Geo-Blocking Regulation that we work as hard as we can for this regulation to be quickly and formally approved.

In December, new rules on VAT for electronic commerce were adopted. They will facilitate VAT collection when consumers buy goods and services online and make it easier for online businesses to comply with their VAT obligations. Member States should now work quickly and efficiently to transpose this directive.

In addition, it is vital that we make progress on other proposals that are still being negotiated and are necessary for the digital single market. I am talking about the proposals on digital contracts, which concern contract rules on the supply of digital content and the online sale of goods.

Thank you for your attention, I am looking forward to the discussion.

Εύα Καϊλή, *Εισηγήτρια της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας, Έρευνας και Ενέργειας*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω τους συναδέλφους μου για το αποτέλεσμα των διαπραγματεύσεων των τριμερών διαλόγων, διότι έγινε ένα εξαιρετικά επιτυχημένο βήμα προς την ολοκλήρωση της ενιαίας ψηφιακής ευρωπαϊκής αγοράς. Είμαι ιδιαίτερα χαρούμενη καθώς, ως εισηγήτρια εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας Έρευνας και Ενέργειας, βλέπω ότι οι προτεραιότητές μας στην επιτροπή έχουν διασφαλιστεί και, μάλιστα, με το παραπάνω. Όλοι οι πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης θα έχουν πλέον πρόσβαση χωρίς γεωγραφικούς αποκλεισμούς σε διαδικτυακές προσφορές προϊόντων και υπηρεσιών άλλων χωρών, χωρίς να ανακατευθύνονται σε άλλες ιστοσελίδες και να πληρώνουν διαφορετικές τιμές για το ίδιο προϊόν.

Συγχαρητήρια και σε εσάς, κύριε αντιπρόεδρε, γιατί παραμένετε φιλόδοξος ώστε να έχουμε πλέον πρακτικά πρόσβαση σε καλύτερες τιμές και τέλος των διακρίσεων ανάμεσα στους ίδιους τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες: κάτι που δεν ήταν και εύκολο. Μερικές φορές ήταν πιο εύκολο να εξαγάγεις στην Κίνα, παρά να ξεπεράσεις τα εμπόδια που υπήρχαν στην αγορά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Μάλιστα, η υποχρεωτική πλέον αποδοχή των πιστωτικών καρτών θα διευκολύνει τις συναλλαγές στο Διαδίκτυο, χωρίς να εξαιρούνται ούτε οι χώρες στις οποίες ισχύουν περιορισμοί στην κίνηση κεφαλαίων. Η άρση αυτών των εμποδίων είναι ένα αποφασιστικό βήμα προς όφελος των πολιτών και δημιουργούμε νέες δυνατότητες και για τις επιχειρήσεις, ώστε να μπορούν να αναπτύξουν τις δραστηριότητές τους και να προωθούν τα ποιοτικά τους προϊόντα εντός Ευρώπης. Παράλληλα, διασφαλίζεται σε δύο χρόνια, κατά τη διάρκεια της αναθεώρησης του κανονισμού, η επέκτασή του και σε άλλους τομείς για άλλα προϊόντα και υπηρεσίες σε χαμηλές τιμές και στην καλύτερη δυνατή ποιότητα. Αυτό δημιουργεί μια πιο ισχυρή Ένωση σε πολλούς τομείς.

Bogdan Brunon Wentz, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung*. – Herr Präsident! Ein voll funktionsfähiger digitaler Binnenmarkt ist wichtig für den europäischen Kultur- und Kreativsektor. Wir begrüßen den Ansatz der Kommission, elektronisch erbrachte Dienstleistungen, die Zugang zu urheberrechtlich geschützten Inhalten gewährt, aus dem Geltungsbereich der vorgeschlagenen Verordnung herauszulassen. E-Books oder Musikdienste haben unterschiedliche Finanzierungs- und Lizenzierungsmodelle, die eine sorgfältige Analyse erfordern. Der Kulturausschuss unterstützt daher die Überprüfungsklausel unter der Bedingung, dass besondere Aufmerksamkeit auf die Besonderheiten von Kulturgütern und -dienstleistungen gelegt werden muss.

Es muss aber auch daran erinnert werden, dass im Bereich von audiovisuellen Diensten und territorialen Urheberrechtsregelungen besondere Komplexität besteht. Aus diesem Grunde werden audiovisuelle Dienste in einem speziellen, eigenen rechtlichen Rahmen behandelt, in der AVMD-Richtlinie und in der SatCab-Richtlinie. Wie auch der Kommissar sagte, laufen die Trilogie zu den beiden Dossiers.

Der Vorschlag zum Geoblocking sollte keine audiovisuellen Dienste umfassen. Der Kulturausschuss spricht sich gegen die Änderung der Regulierung audiovisueller Dienste durch die Hintertür und außerhalb des sektorspezifischen rechtlichen Rahmens aus.

Antanas Guoga, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, the future regulation on geo-blocking is a big step towards strengthening the e-commerce sector in Europe. It will give EU citizens access to a wider choice of goods and services. Today only 15% of Europeans buy products from online shops based in another EU country. One of the main reasons is precisely the geo-blocking practice, and we need to get rid of this. EU citizens have a right to be able to shop online in another EU country just like the locals do. That is the core idea behind the digital single market that we have been working on in the European Parliament.

I would like to thank the EPP rapporteur, Ms Róza Thun, for her commitment and a great job during the negotiation process with the Commission and the Council during the Estonian Presidency. The agreement between the Council and the Parliament will remove barriers to e-commerce by avoiding discrimination based on a consumer's nationality, place of residence or place of establishment. It will prevent discrimination for consumers and companies based on access to prices, sales or payment conditions when buying products and services in another EU country.

EU consumers will benefit now from better prices when buying online, and traders will be protected with a clearer set of rules laid down in this draft regulation. It is unfortunate that the inclusion of non-audiovisual copyrighted content in the scope of the regulation was rejected by the Council. I, as shadow rapporteur on this file in the Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI), together with Ms Thun, will work towards a review in two years' time.

All in all I believe it is a balanced approach.

Virginie Rozière, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord remercier mes collègues et particulièrement M^{me} la rapporteure pour l'excellent travail et la collaboration sur ce dossier.

Je pense que le texte que nous nous apprêtons à adopter est un bon compromis, qui permettra de réaliser un pas supplémentaire vers un marché numérique approfondi et plus efficace au bénéfice des consommateurs. Parce que je voudrais rappeler que le marché intérieur est l'un des piliers de la construction européenne et que, si internet bouleverse les modes de consommation, il ne doit pas être un moyen de revenir sur les bases de notre Union.

En particulier, les discriminations entre consommateurs au sein du marché intérieur sont inacceptables. Lorsque je me rends dans une boulangerie en Belgique ou lorsque nos collègues, ici, vont dans un commerce à Strasbourg, on ne doit pas leur opposer un refus de leur vendre ce qu'ils souhaitent acheter, sous prétexte qu'ils sont italiens ou belges ou parce qu'ils résident dans un autre État membre. Sur internet, c'est exactement la même chose et je me réjouis que ce règlement mette fin aux situations de discrimination.

Ce règlement va donc se traduire par un choix plus large pour les consommateurs et un bénéfice supplémentaire pour eux. Mais, de la même manière que les discriminations sont inacceptables, il aurait été tout aussi inacceptable d'amoinrir injustement la protection des consommateurs au prétexte qu'il s'agit d'un achat en ligne. Ce règlement, fort heureusement, comme notre groupe l'a demandé, permettra de maintenir un haut niveau de protection des consommateurs qui s'engagent dans des transactions transfrontalières.

Je voulais aussi souligner ici qu'il était important d'être prudent quant à l'impact de ce règlement sur des secteurs spécifiques, avec un modèle économique spécifique. Aussi, je me réjouis que le secteur de la culture puisse faire l'objet d'une évaluation ultérieure dans le cadre d'une éventuelle révision prochaine.

Mais ce que ce texte montre surtout, au-delà des avancées que nous avons pu mettre en place, c'est que c'est dans le cadre d'une harmonisation toujours plus exigeante en matière de protection des consommateurs que nous pourrons construire un marché intérieur toujours plus efficace. Je pense que c'est dans ce sens-là, aussi, que l'Union européenne doit avancer.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ik ben heel blij dat de Europeanen vanaf eind dit jaar in heel Europa op koopjesjacht kunnen gaan zonder dat ze daarbij op allerlei hindernissen stoten vanwege de plaats waar ze zich bevinden. Door de nieuwe regels waarover we zullen stemmen zal de winkelervaring immers veel leuker worden. De onlinemarkt zal heel wat ruimer zijn, met in veel gevallen een goedkoper aanbod van goederen en diensten. De bedrijven zullen ook niet op de hoogte moeten zijn van de wetgeving van alle Europese lidstaten. Zo zullen zij ook aangemoedigd worden om ook in andere lidstaten te verkopen. Onze bedrijven zullen dan ook kunnen genieten van een bredere klantenbasis, een win-win situatie dus.

De audiovisuele sector wordt niet geraakt door deze regels, en gelukkig maar. Deze sector speelt immers een belangrijke rol bij de vorming van onze taal en onze cultuur. Een onvoorwaardelijke universele toegang tot series of andere producties zou de financiering daarvan in het gedrang kunnen brengen en dat zou dan weer negatieve effecten hebben op de culturele diversiteit.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I had the honour to chair the negotiations on this file on behalf of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, and I can truly thank Ms Thun for all her work and all her efforts. This regulation is a good first step.

No longer can Disneyland say that the French can get cheaper tickets than Czechs. This regulation fixes this. No longer can a company redirect customers without their consent. If I ask for the German website, I want a German website, not a Czech one. This regulation fixes this.

No longer can a company refuse because a credit card was issued in another country. If I go shopping in Austria, my Visa card is just as good as an Austrian Visa card. This regulation fixes this.

This said, we must address the elephant in the room: copyrighted content. Let's be honest, this regulation will not fix the problem of blocked access to movies, TV, software or even e-books. It will not fix the first item that people think of when they hear the word geo-blocking and we must continue to move towards the end of this type of geo-blocking. We must end this artificial barrier in the digital single market.

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, at the outset of the Commission's efforts to tackle geo-blocking, research showed that digital borders were widespread in the EU, that they cost businesses millions in sales and that people supported decisive action against them. A very important and popular topic indeed.

This week we are voting on the second of three legislative actions on the issue, but all three have turned out to be no more than baby steps, merely carving out exceptions for certain groups of people in certain situations. After they are implemented, geo-blocking will remain widespread. That is a missed opportunity.

I applaud all the steps forward that have been taken in this legislation, and I thank the rapporteur Róza Thun for her efforts to make it even more ambitious, but I deeply regret that these efforts were shot down by the governments in Council and that, as a result, digital media, like video games, e-books or music, will be unaffected by this regulation, and that fear prevailed over the commitment to building a true digital single market, which cannot develop until we abolish digital borders and not just reduce them.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the ultimate aim of this legislation and other such proposals, is the furthering of the single market and harmonisation of legislation across Europe. Such reports exist in order to fulfil one political objective, a United States of Europe. Recent events in the UK prove that there is no appetite for this. Differences in prices are because of supply and demand, ultimately a common sense approach adopted by businesses. The European Union is made up of 28 Member States, all of whom carry different cultures and identities, a one-size-fits-all approach to such diversity just does not work.

It is of course a positive to be giving citizens better access to goods and services, however businesses should be free to conduct sales as they see fit, without the EU telling them what to do.

If it worked for businesses to implement the aims of this legislation they would have already done so themselves. The Commission should recognise this and leave Member States and businesses to determine what is in their own best interests and act as they see fit.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, selon le rapporteur, 15 % des consommateurs, je dirais «seulement» 15 % des consommateurs et 8 % des professionnels ont acheté ou vendu en ligne dans un autre État membre.

C'est la raison d'être et la justification du règlement dont nous débattons aujourd'hui. Voici l'illustration du sens des priorités à la sauce du marché unique numérique. Les législateurs européens sont convaincus de trouver ici, avec ce règlement, le remède à la crise existentielle que traverse l'Union européenne.

Alors que dit ce texte? Que les raisons de ces faibles taux de consommation transfrontalière ont pour origine les barrières injustifiées infligées par les États membres à travers la technique du géoblocage, éloignant les consommateurs européens du nirvana de la consommation.

Le «géoblocage» est un concept qui désigne en fait les frontières numériques. Ce concept est largement méprisé par le législateur européen qui le définit comme – je cite – une discrimination en fonction de la nationalité ou du lieu de résidence. Le règlement souhaite tout simplement en interdire l'usage aux professionnels.

Malgré l'exclusion, toute temporaire, des services audiovisuels du champ d'application du règlement – que je salue –, je veux dénoncer cette nouvelle intervention unilatérale brutale dans les équilibres économiques, une mesure qui aura de lourdes conséquences sur de très nombreux opérateurs, qui verront leurs consommateurs partir consommer là où c'est moins cher.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident! Die Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments über Geoblocking sorgt dafür, dass eine Rechtsgrundlage da ist, dass Handelsgeschäfte zwischen Kunden und Anbietern ohne ungerechtfertigte Diskriminierungen abgeschlossen werden können. Das hört sich so weit, so gut an. Aber wenn es ungerechtfertigte Diskriminierungen gibt, dann gibt es ja auch gerechtfertigte Diskriminierungen. Die vermisse ich hier, und ich vermute, das sind die politischen Diskriminierungen. Denn wir haben doch gerade erst auf der letzten Sitzung des Parlaments Geoblocking gegenüber Russland aus politischen Gründen erlaubt und dafür sogar eine eigene Truppe installiert. Was ist denn mit der Scheinheiligkeit gegenüber meinem Land, Deutschland, wo das Merkel-Regime erst ein Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz geschaffen hat, das es erlaubt, dass in einem privaten Unternehmen wie Facebook jetzt eine ganze Zensurarmee auf die Füße gestellt worden ist und hier plötzlich Leute abgeschaltet werden können – ohne rechtliches Gehör, ohne die Möglichkeit, ein freies Verfahren zu bekommen?

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, ik ben blij dat ik na de heer Voigt spreek, want die haalt alles door elkaar. Waar het om gaat is een bindend besluit binnen de EU. Dit heeft niets met Rusland of daarbuiten te maken. Het gaat hier om de interne markt en de wijze waarop we de zaak hebben ingericht. En onze burgers verdienen dat. Weg met de prijsdiscriminatie online. Het maakt niet uit waar je je aankoop in de EU doet. Het raakt iedereen. Want waarom zou een huurauto op mijn nationale luchthaven Schiphol in Nederland mij meer kosten dan een inwoner uit een andere lidstaat die aan de balie komt? En waarom zou een ticket voor Eurodisney in Parijs mij meer kosten dan de Fransen als ik online boek? Weg met de willekeur, ook in de voorwaarden en in de kortingen die worden geboden.

Ik ben ook blij dat Rosa Thun zich zo hard heeft ingezet en met de steun van het Estse Voorzitterschap heeft gezorgd voor een helder resultaat dat ook handhaafbaar is door toezichthouders. We openen hiermee de bladzijde naar de digitale interne markt waarvoor we nu zoveel voorstellen doen. Slechts 15 % van de consumenten doet aankopen over de grens in de Unie en het aantal bedrijven dat nu op de digitale markt begint, is ook nog laag. Dus een goede stap. De volgende etappe betreft de digitale audiovisuele diensten. Dat kan binnen twee jaar. Ik ben zeer blij. Ik begrijp niet waar u uw voorbeeld vandaan haalt.

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

Udo Voigt (NI), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Kollege! Ich hätte nur eine ganz kurze Frage: Ist Ihnen denn bekannt, dass man auch über Facebook Waren, nämlich Werbung, kaufen kann und dies in Deutschland vielfach abgeschaltet wird, ohne ein Gerichtsverfahren, ohne die rechtliche Möglichkeit, hiergegen etwas zu tun?

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Waar het om gaat, is dat we hier in de Europese Unie bedrijven en ook burgers op dezelfde manier moeten behandelen. Ik weet niet hoe het precies zit met reclame, of je die kunt tegenhouden. Ook daarvoor geldt dat er op dezelfde manier moet worden omgegaan. Reclame maakt soms deel uit van de boodschappen die worden verstrekt. Maar de kern is dat de burgers waar ze ook een aankoop doen, op dezelfde manier worden behandeld.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, la fine del geoblocco ingiustificato rappresenta un'ulteriore tappa del processo di costruzione del mercato unico digitale. Dopo l'abolizione del *roaming* e dopo che abbiamo consentito la portabilità dei contenuti online, i cittadini europei potranno finalmente vedere la fine di quelle barriere e discriminazioni ingiustificate, che fino ad oggi hanno costituito un impedimento alla possibilità di avere un *e-commerce* europeo.

La Commissione, infatti, ha rilevato che oltre il 63 % dei siti di vendita online applica ancora forme di blocco che spesso terminano con l'impossibilità pratica di concludere un acquisto o di scegliere l'offerta più conveniente. Da oggi gli acquisti online saranno più facili. Ad esempio, la possibilità di noleggiare una macchina senza pagare alcun sovrapprezzo a seconda della nazionalità o dell'ubicazione del consumatore è certamente una conquista.

Tuttavia, in conclusione, rimangono sfide importanti davanti, che non potranno essere vinte fintanto che non sarà definito un quadro armonizzato di regole fiscali, di garanzia per la sicurezza dei prodotti e di piena tutela dei consumatori.

Daniel Dalton (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, who has done a good job here. E-commerce is one of our fastest growing industries. Consumers no longer recognise borders and boundaries when shopping. The internet gives them the choice to look for anything, anywhere. That is a revolution in choice. But sadly, the law and many companies have yet to catch up with shoppers. That is why this regulation is important: breaking down artificial barriers and ending unfair price discrimination.

Now I am sad that I cannot yet pay to watch cricket coverage and other audiovisual stuff here in Belgium, but that will come in the future. Because with more competition, we get lower prices and better service: everyone wins. We have come a long way from the Commission's original proposal, which needed some work, but no company now has to sell where it cannot deliver. But everything will see more transparency and cheaper pricing. This is a digital revolution in action.

So I commend this report as an action of good policy – but a warning: do not cut the EU off from the rest of the world. This should be a template for global e-commerce. We should see customs de minimis thresholds brought in line with offline thresholds. E-commerce and consumers should not be punished just for shopping online.

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

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Przypuśćmy, że rząd francuski dofinansowuje coś, powiedzmy Disneyland. Czy w tym momencie nie wolno Disneylandowi wprowadzić ulgowych cen dla Francuzów?

Daniel Dalton (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – Well, as I understand it, we're in a single market and in a single market there's a principle that consumers cannot be discriminated against on nationality. That's the principle of the single market in general and it should be a principle that applies in the digital single market. We can't have two different rules for online and offline commerce.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Wenn wir morgen die Verordnung zum Geoblocking verabschieden, dann sind wir dem digitalen Binnenmarkt einen großen Schritt näher gekommen. Geoblocking widerspricht dem Ziel eines gemeinsamen Binnenmarktes diametral. Es ist absurd, dass für immaterielle Güter künstliche Grenzen errichtet werden. Der morgige Beschluss ist ein wichtiger Etappensieg, weil er die Rechte der Konsumenten stärkt, den Wettbewerb fördert und zur Verfestigung eines gemeinsamen Marktes beiträgt. Wir haben viel erreicht, und dem Dank an die Berichterstatterin und an die Schattenberichterstatterinnen kann ich mich gerne anschließen.

Wir sollten uns aber nicht darauf ausruhen. Wir haben noch viel zu tun. Unser Ziel muss ein wirklich grenzenloses Internet sein, das für alle Angebote und Plattformen gilt. Deshalb ist unsere gegenwärtige Arbeit an der Copyright-Gesetzgebung so wichtig. Wir müssen sie verantwortungsvoll ausführen und dürfen dabei den gesamteuropäischen Aspekt nicht verlieren.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, zákaz diskriminace na základě státní příslušnosti stanovuje již směrnice o službách na vnitřním trhu. Pravidla vnitřního trhu musíme přizpůsobit dnešní digitální realitě a blokování říci jasné ne. Díky tomuto nařízení budou občané na vnitřním trhu moci nakupovat zboží elektronicky za férových podmínek, rezervovat ubytování, využívat služby po celé EU a konečně bez rozdílu původu zákazníkům.

Návrh je podle mého názoru rozumně vyvážený. Zákazníci by měli mít přístup ke zboží a ke službám za stejných podmínek, ale pro podnikatele to nebude znamenat nepřiměřené náklady a ani automaticky nevznikne povinnost dodržovat právní řád státu spotřebitele, ani povinnost doručovat zboží na celém území EU. Považuji za správné, že nařízení se nebude vztahovat na elektronicky dodávané služby a díla, která jsou chráněna copyrightem, jako jsou knihy, hudba a další, a mělo by tomu být do té doby, než vyřešíme spravedlivé financování autorů.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, diskriminace spotřebitelů na základě jejich národnosti nebo země pobytu je bohužel každodenní realitou vnitřního trhu Evropské unie, a to nejen v online prostředí. Omezená možnost výběru, odlišné platební podmínky, neopodstatněné cenové rozdíly, ale také odlišná kvalita na první pohled stejného zboží jsou nepřijemnou zkušeností pro řadu spotřebitelů.

Nařízení o zeměpisném blokování některé z těchto diskriminačních praktik omezí a usnadní spotřebitelům přístup k řadě zboží a služeb. Jedná se o krok správným směrem a ráda bych za něj poděkovala zejména paní zpravodajce Rózi Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein.

Práce na dotváření férového vnitřního trhu, kde mají spotřebitelé rovný přístup ke zboží a službám, ale také kde nejsou spotřebitelé vědomě a úmyslně klamáni, jeho přijetím rozhodně nekončí. Věřím, že toto vezme Komise v potaz i při přípravě balíčku opatření nové politiky pro spotřebitele, na který už netrpělivě čekáme.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ενιαία αγορά είναι μια σημαντική κατάκτηση της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και φυσικά, στο πλαίσιο της ενιαίας αγοράς δεν επιτρέπονται διακρίσεις οποιουδήποτε τύπου. Είναι λογικό λοιπόν ότι η ενιαία ψηφιακή αγορά πρέπει να λειτουργεί με τον ίδιο τρόπο. Το γεγονός ότι το Διαδίκτυο αξιοποιείται πλέον για την αγορά υπηρεσιών ή προϊόντων δεν σημαίνει ότι νομιμοποιούνται οι διακρίσεις εις βάρος των καταναλωτών. Δεν μπορούν να υπάρχουν διακρίσεις αναλόγως της εθνικότητας του καταναλωτή ή αναλόγως του τόπου διαμονής ή του τόπου κατοικίας. Επομένως, οι αποφάσεις τις οποίες λαμβάνουμε και ο κανονισμός, ο οποίος πλέον καταργεί όλες αυτές τις διακρίσεις, είναι ένα σημαντικό βήμα σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Όμως θα πρέπει να παύσουν και οι διακρίσεις που αφορούν το μουσικό περιεχόμενο και τα βιβλία. Αυτά κακώς έχουν μείνει εκτός κανονισμού.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o comércio, mesmo na sua forma dita eletrónica, parte de processos de produção e distribuição concretos e de relações sociais de produção concretas, reais e não virtuais, não desmaterializáveis.

A venda de bens e serviços no Mercado Único, mesmo pela via eletrónica, exprime uma ligação que se estabelece por via desse mercado entre os diversos produtores, entre os trabalhadores dos diferentes países, postos em concorrência direta, aproveitando as diferenças salariais e de direitos para forçar uma desvalorização geral da sua força de trabalho.

Numa integração capitalista é este o sentido da tão propalada liberdade de circulação de mercadorias e serviços: nivelar por baixo, aumentar a exploração, conquistar mercados e aumentar lucros em linha ou fora dela.

Obviamente que está ainda por libertar todo o potencial do comércio eletrónico, como em geral o enorme potencial das aquisições da ciência e da técnica em benefício dos trabalhadores e dos consumidores.

É verdade que há obstáculos no ambiente em linha que frustram naturais expectativas dos consumidores, mas trabalhar para os superar não nos deve fazer perder de vista este quadro mais geral.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gospod predsednik, vsak dan umetne digitalne meje blokirajo milijone Evropejcev pri naročanju blaga, gledanju filmov, poslušanju glasbe po spletu, gledanju športnih prenosov in vse to zaradi tako imenovanega geoblockinga, zaradi te tako imenovane nepravilne in nedopustne diskriminacije.

To, kar imamo sedaj na mizi, to uredbo, na neki način ne moremo biti čisto zares veseli, ker pomeni tudi razočaranje, ker so bili odstranjeni številni dobri elementi, predvsem pa je uredba v celoti izključila videoposnetke, glasbo, e-knjige, spletne računalniške igre, to je tisto področje, ki se največ uporablja pri naročanju, samo zato, ker pač je nekdo iz neprave države in ta geografska blokada zaradi držav izvora je seveda nedopustna in se pravi geoblocking lahko odpravimo v celoti ali pa ne.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Blokowanie geograficzne to problem, z którym na co dzień boryka się wielu obywateli. Badania wskazują, że około 30 % konsumentów robiących zakupy online przynajmniej raz napotkało problemy z zakupem towaru na stronie zagranicznej. Praktyki takie jak przymusowe i automatyczne przekierowanie na stronę lokalną w sposób oczywisty stoją w sprzeczności z zasadą równego dostępu do usług i dyskryminują klientów. Zapisy dyrektywy usługowej niestety okazały się niewystarczające, aby uniknąć takich sytuacji. Dlatego też popieram inicjatywę Komisji, która ma na celu wprowadzenie większej jasności prawnej i wykonalności.

Sprawa jest jednak niezwykle złożona, więc tym bardziej cieszę się, że po półtora roku intensywnej pracy udało się osiągnąć porozumienie, które wydaje się być bardzo rozsądnym kompromisem. Zakaz przekierowanie na inne strony bez wyraźnej zgody użytkownika oznacza, że konsumenci uzyskają dostęp do szerszej, niedyskryminującej nikogo oferty.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome the collective effort to combat discrimination against consumers by removing unnecessary barriers for accessing the same level and quality of online services for the benefit of citizens across the EU.

Nevertheless, for some online services it is important to keep a balanced perspective and ensure the viability of content creation, in particular for creative and media content. The principle of territoriality is at the core of the economic models of many European content producers, media services providers and channels. It is also in many cases how the production of high-quality European works of all types is ensured, nourishing a vibrant cultural diversity.

I am particularly concerned about small independent creators and artists. It is very difficult for smaller enterprises to earn a living today and I want to make sure that their interests are defended along with increased accessibility of content and cultural diversity for users.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, this debate was just music to my ears. Let's remember from where we had to start. We organised a so-called 'mystery-shopping survey' and according to those results 2% of those people who tried to buy some goods and services from another EU Member State just could not get access to those websites.

Then 27% of those lucky people who got access to those websites were not able to register because their IP addresses were wrong addresses: they were from France, from Germany, from Austria, from Poland – from some EU Member State that was wrong in some way.

Then 32% of those lucky people who were able to register were faced with delivery problems and to find solutions for those problems we launched our parcel delivery proposal, and I am happy that we were able to find consensus on that proposal.

But even 26% of those people who did not have issues of any kind with delivery problems, could not pay because their credit cards were issued in wrong the countries: in Sweden, in Finland, in Latvia, in Lithuania, in the United Kingdom – in some EU Member State that was wrong in some way.

All in all, just 36.6% of all those people who tried to buy some goods and services from another EU Member State were able to conclude those purchases successfully.

This is not the single market we would like to have in the European Union when only every third person is able to conclude those purchases successfully.

We have to hurry up. We have to have some votes here in Parliament, in the Council, then publishing, then a signing ceremony and then nine months, and then it will already be Christmas time. But our people deserve to enjoy their Christmas shopping next year without being afraid of being blocked or re-routed. So I would like to ask you to hurry up.

Then I would like to state very clearly that the Commission is fully committed to carrying out a comprehensive assessment of this regulation's scope to identify if other sectors should also be included.

We will pay particular attention to the non-audiovisual copyright protected services like software, games, e-books and music that the regulation only covers only partially now. We will keep our promise to the co-legislators.

Once again I would like to cordially thank the rapporteur Ms Róza Thun and all the Members of the European Parliament.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commission Vice-President for his words and for the excellent cooperation, and thanks also to your wonderful team, Mr Vice-President.

Colleagues, thank you for this constructive debate, which has been music to my ears. This compromise was long, this compromise was difficult but we have managed to achieve it. This compromise, thanks to the determination and hard work of many of us, will bear good fruits. I am asking for your broad support in the vote tomorrow.

We proved today that the European Union can deliver concrete results for citizens all over Europe, bringing positive changes in our daily lives, but for the full completion of the digital single market we still need many reforms and a lot of work. We need to do our best to break down national silos. There is no place for protectionism in our common European market. The next step we should take is harmonisation of the VAT rules. We also need to unify copyright protection rules and open up the services market in the audio-visual sector. We need to improve the functioning of parcel delivery within the EU, and this is not all.

I am counting on the Commission to continue the role of a leader in this extremely important process. I hope that the Council will help us in these efforts. As for us, in Parliament, I hope to see this project at the forefront of our agenda. Already now, I am looking forward to the review in two years, which you have just mentioned Mr Vice-President. Citizens want improvement, they want changes, for a more united digital single market, and we will keep working on delivering that improvement.

Przewodniczący. – To była prawdziwa przyjemność przewodniczyć tej debacie. Już dawno nie było tak dalece posuniętej jedynomyślności na tej sali. Bardzo dziękuję panu wiceprzewodniczącemu Ansipowi i życzę miłego wieczoru w Strasbourgu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 6 lutego 2018 r.

Declarações escritas (artigo 162.º)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – Il *geoblocking* rappresenta una pratica commerciale discriminatoria impiegata per segregare artificialmente i mercati, così da massimizzare i profitti. In altre parole, ciò che accade in pratica è che i venditori online: o impediscono ai consumatori di accedere a un sito Internet in quanto il loro indirizzo IP indica una specifica ubicazione geografica, oppure li indirizzano verso un sito locale di vendite online che pratica prezzi diversi. Proprio alla luce di ciò ed in vista della realizzazione del mercato digitale unico, le pratiche di *geoblocking* dovrebbero essere vietate, soprattutto in quei settori quali l'audiovisivo dove una tale pratica risulta evidente ed ingiustificabile agli

occhi del comune cittadino. Il regolamento in questione rappresenta dunque un atto normativo rilevante, ma a causa dell'esclusione dall'ambito di applicazione dello stesso dei contenuti audiovisivi, della musica in *streaming*, dei videogiochi e degli *e-book*, la sua efficacia è stata drasticamente depotenziata. Cui *prodest*? Di sicuro non ai cittadini europei che continueranno a subire la pratica dei blocchi geografici, con un impatto negativo tanto per la circolazione dei contenuti che per la promozione e salvaguardia della diversità culturale. Gli interessi economici di pochi hanno avuto, ancora una volta, la meglio sugli interessi della collettività.

Nicola Caputo (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Impedire i blocchi geografici e altre forme di discriminazione dei clienti basate sulla nazionalità, il luogo di residenza o il luogo di stabilimento.

Валентин Радев, *в писмена форма*. – Уважаеми колеги, забраната за блокиране на географски принцип е важен елемент на стратегията за цифровия единен пазар. С премахването на този принцип ще се разшири свободата на електронната търговия и европейските граждани ще получат по-добър достъп до уебсайтове за електронни продажби. Търговците вече няма да имат право да блокират или ограничават достъпа до своя онлайн интерфейс от страна на клиентите по причини, свързани с тяхното гражданство или място на пребиваване.

Имайки предвид, че днес едва 15% от европейците пазаруват онлайн от установени в други държави магазини, прекратяването на географското блокиране ще допринесе за развитието на единия пазар и ще премахне важни пречки пред търговията. Това ще бъде от полза и за европейските предприятия, които ще могат да се възползват от силното развитие на трансграничната онлайн търговия.

За момента услугите, свързани със защитено с авторско право съдържание или произведения в нематериална форма, са изключени от приложното поле на регламента. Но се надявам след две години, когато се направи преглед на неговото прилагане, да бъдат включени и тези услуги. Така ще можем да допринесем за премахване на оставащите пречки пред свободното движение на стоки и услуги и максималното развитие на вътрешния пазар.

Romana Tomc (PPE), *pisno*. – Se vam je že kdaj zgodilo, da vas je spletna stran, ki je prodajala določeno storitev, po tem, ko je zaznala, da ste iz druge države, preusmerila na drugo stran, kjer so bile po možnosti te storitve dražje?

Vesela sem, da z uredbo to odpravljamo, saj bo od sedaj blokiranje ali preusmerjanje zaradi potrošnikovega državljanstva, kraja prebivališča ali njegovečasne lokacije na drugo spletno mesto prepovedano.

Glede na raziskavo Glasu evropskih potrošnikov pri standardizaciji (ANEC) je skoraj četrtina vprašanih že doživela, da je bilo njihovo spletno naročilo zavrnjeno, ker so doma iz druge, "napačne" države EU. Uredba trgovcem omogoča, da čezmejnim strankam dovoljuje dostop do spletnih strani, značilnih za posamezne države.

Upam, da bo ta uredba odpravila prikrajšanost in omogočila boljši dostop do blaga in storitev strankam.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *in writing*. – We aspire to support the realisation of the full potential of the internal market as an area without internal barriers. Ensuring the free movement of goods and services is one of our greatest values and achievements. Nowadays, the internal market includes also e-Commerce, which is one of the main key drivers for the growth. According to statistics only 15% of consumers buy online from other EU countries and 8% of traders sell cross-border (as compared to 24% of domestic sales), which is absolutely not enough. Therefore, we should try to reduce trade barriers as fast as possible. It is unacceptable for the consumers to be prevented from accessing certain websites, not be able to buy certain goods in other Member States or have to pay a different price – only based on their place of residence or even temporary location. I appreciate hard work and effort of the Rapporteur Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein. The adopted report covers many important issues that required difficult inter-institutional negotiations. The final agreement opposes discrimination in the e-Commerce which is an important step forward for the EU.

Iuliu Winkler (PPE), *in writing*. – The debate on the Regulation addressing geo-blocking and other forms of discrimination based on nationality is timely and vital for our citizens. By seeking to effectively implement the Single Market, not only for goods, but also for services, digital commerce, capital and energy, we would create 4 million new jobs for our citizens, while adding approximately 1.5 billion to the EU economy. Even though this is a step in the right direction, the proposal at hand is yet imperfect, given that it does not address all forms of discrimination, particularly copyrighted content. This includes transmissions of films, television, music or e-books. I see a link here to the truly worrying situation of almost 50 million people, those citizens belonging to ethnic and linguistic minorities across Europe, who continue to be affected by such discriminatory practices. It is exactly these citizens who have come together and signed

the Minority SafePack Initiative, aiming to address such key deficiencies and tackle discrimination based on ethnicity. The geo-blocking of copyrighted content is an important factor here, and it is the obligation of the EP to also hear the voice of citizens belonging to minorities and address this shortcoming in the revision of this Regulation.

21. Decyzja podjęta w sprawie pakietu dotyczącego sprawiedliwego opodatkowania (II i III) (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie decyzji podjętej w sprawie pakietu dotyczącego sprawiedliwego opodatkowania (II i III) (2017/2857(RSP)).

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank Parliament for organising a debate on the EU VAT reform, a key initiative included in the 2017 Commission work programme and a topic of utmost importance for Member States and businesses.

Member States rely heavily on value added tax (VAT) revenues to finance their public spending. However the VAT gap between expected revenue and revenue actually collected is estimated at more than EUR 150 billion per year. It has also been estimated that cross-border fraud alone represents an annual loss of revenue of around EUR 50 billion, money that could be spent on public services.

The current VAT system is not only prone to fraud, but also too fragmented for a growing number of businesses operating cross-border. Therefore the Commission decided to renew the VAT system as part of its agenda for a fair and efficient tax system in the European Union. In particular, the Commission is proposing to create a single European VAT area that caters for the challenges of the 21st century.

I recall that the weaknesses of the current system were acknowledged also by this Parliament in its resolution 'towards a definitive VAT system and fighting VAT fraud' of November 2016. In the same resolution Parliament shared the Commission's view that the definitive VAT system should be based on the principle of taxation in the country of destination, which addresses tax competition between Member States.

I am proud to say that the Commission has delivered on all its commitments made in the Action Plan on VAT of April 2016. The first proposal of the Action Plan, which will modernise and simplify VAT for cross-border e-commerce, was adopted by the Council in December last year. This is very good news for businesses.

Furthermore, between October last year and 18 January this year, the Commission adopted the last five proposals announced in its Action Plan. I will present these five proposals to you today by focusing on their three main objectives.

Firstly, to create a single VAT area that establishes a level playing field for EU businesses and in particular for SMEs.

Secondly, to create a single VAT area that is fraud-proof, with tax administrations working closely together.

And thirdly, to create a single VAT area that treats Member States equally and grants them more freedom in setting VAT rates.

So to start with the first objective, a level playing field for businesses, I would remind you that our current VAT system is fragmented, complex for a growing number of businesses operating cross-border. The latter have VAT compliance costs 11% higher than companies having only domestic activities. We have to open the borders of VAT and create a real single VAT area for EU companies.

The proposals adopted in October 2017 represent the cornerstone for a new system, based on the principle of taxation in the country of destination, which will result in taxing cross-border sales the same way as domestic sales. The main simplification is that companies selling cross-border will deal with their VAT obligations via a one-stop-shop. That means that traders will make declarations and payments using a single online portal.

The Commission also adopted in January 2018 measures to simplify VAT procedures for SMEs, which represent over 98% of all EU businesses. Currently the cost of compliance under the present VAT system hits SMEs much harder than it does big business. The proposal we made will extend the benefits of the VAT SME exemption to all small businesses, irrespective of whether they are established in the Member State in which the VAT is due or not.

The new rules will also simplify compliance for a larger group of SMEs – exempt and non-exempt from VAT. All businesses with a turnover of less than EUR 2 million per year will be able to benefit from simplified registration, invoicing, reporting and book-keeping obligations. We estimate that this proposal will result in a compliance cost reduction of up to 18% for SMEs.

The second main objective of our VAT reform is to address the unacceptable problem of VAT cross-border fraud which, as already mentioned, represents around EUR 50 billion per year. Criminal networks exploit the weaknesses of the current VAT systems. Journalists have also established links between cross-border fraud and the financing of terrorism. This is no longer acceptable and we should put an end to this phenomenon. By eliminating borders for VAT procedures, the new definitive VAT system should eliminate much of the large-scale cross-border VAT fraud.

As implementing a new regime will take time, we need to take urgent measures to contain cross-border VAT fraud. This is why the Commission proposed in November 2017 a proposal to enhance the cooperation between national administrations and close loopholes in information sharing.

This proposal, which is now being discussed in the Council, aims to build trust between Member States by allowing them to exchange more information, in a more efficient manner, so as to better detect and identify fraudsters. This proposal will also boost the cooperation between national tax authorities and law enforcement authorities such as customs, OLAF, Europol and the newly created European Public Prosecutor's Office.

Eventually our intention is to reduce complexity around the issue of reduced VAT rates. Although there are general rules, over 200 reduced and zero rates still exist in all Member States, that were initially intended as temporary derogations from the general rules.

In the frame of the definitive system based on the principle of destination, which will address tax competition, Member States would have more freedom to set their VAT rates under harmonised rules that will treat all Member States equally.

One of the major changes proposed by the Commission is to replace the list of goods and services to which reduced rates can be applied with a negative list to which reduced rates cannot be applied. The main advantage of this negative list is that it is to be structured according to the statistical classification. The same statistical classification will also be used to collect and publish structured information about reduced rates applied in all Member States via a web portal. On these grounds the web portal will allow all businesses to easily retrieve information on VAT rates.

Further harmonisation concerns the use of reduced rates. They must clearly be for the benefit of citizens, who are the final consumers paying VAT. To prevent revenue erosion the Commission will protect VAT as an important source of income for Member States. Indeed Member States will have to ensure that they apply an effective average weighted VAT rate of at least 12%, which is the lowest applied today in some EU Member States, and the requirement of a minimum standard VAT rate of 15% will become a permanent requirement.

Finally the proposed amendments to the VAT Directive as regards reduced rates will enter into force only when the definitive regime is effectively in place.

To conclude, let me say that these proposals represent a win for both Member States' revenues and European businesses. So it is our responsibility to act and therefore I call on Parliament to take the lead and show ambition for real reform of the VAT system.

Luděk Niedermayer, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, losses in tax collected have very serious consequences for our economy as well as for society. It is not just a shortage of government revenues; it distorts competition, sometimes it helps to finance illegal activities and, if losses are too high, it can push up the tax rates in other categories.

That is why I am very happy that this area is one of the priority of EU and in last years, we made significant achievements. After focusing on income tax of large corporations and later on addressing the issue of anti-money laundering and transparency of ownership, now the Commission is coming with the action plan and the proposals included in the VAT package. It is very important because of VAT is one of the largest sources of government revenues and, as it was said, we are losing a lot of money. I am glad that an important part of the proposal is the simplification of tax compliance, especially for small and medium sized businesses. We need to collect taxes better just not more expensively.

I call on the Finance Ministers to reach agreement on the package and to go forward really quickly. I believe that better collection of taxes should not be used for increasing the government revenues. I believe we do not need to spend more, we just need to spend better. In my view, money gained should be invested mainly in the reduction of public debt and the reduction of the most devastating taxes for the economic growth. This is the way how we will benefit the future of our citizens and the growth of the EU economy.

Puhetta johdi HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président, merci de ce «paquet», comme nous disons en langage européen.

Bien sûr, il retiendra l'attention lorsque vous aiderez les PME dans le dédale d'une fiscalité qui, parfois, les déborde. Mais, je voudrais m'intéresser à la question des taux réduits, car c'est un sujet politiquement extrêmement sensible sur lequel ce Parlement européen vous a souvent sollicité.

Vous faites une proposition qui nous met au cœur de nos contradictions. Plutôt que de débattre et de négocier autour d'une annexe, vous proposez d'accorder davantage de flexibilité aux États membres, avec le risque d'avoir une géométrie totalement variable selon les États membres et donc un impact sur une logique du marché intérieur qui, elle, sera remise en question.

Cela permet, cela dit, de répondre à un certain nombre de préoccupations, notamment la question des taux zéro sur un certain nombre de produits ou l'alignement de la fiscalité du livre papier sur le livre numérique qui, du point de vue de la culture, est un enjeu tout à fait essentiel.

Je veux, cependant, attirer votre attention sur deux points. D'abord, j'aimerais vous demander comment vous avez identifié ce taux minimum de 12 % de collecte de la TVA des États membres. Quel est le taux actuel par État membre?

Enfin, je pense que, du point de vue de l'impact transfrontalier sur un certain nombre de produits, cette flexibilité laissée aux États membres nous appellera à mettre en place des mécanismes permettant de contrer les effets de cette concurrence qui pourrait s'installer dans les zones frontalières.

Lieve Wierinck, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ik verwelkom het werk van de Commissie. Als schaduwrapporteur op CCTB en DAC6 zijn eerlijke belastingen de afgelopen maanden een belangrijk onderdeel van mijn werk geweest.

Het kan niet langer zijn dat eerlijke, hardwerkende ondernemers de prijs betalen voor een systeem dat niet naar behoren functioneert. Zoals de Commissie heeft aangetoond, lopen we enkel aan btw jaarlijks 50 miljard euro aan inkomsten mis. Dit is geld dat uit het illegale circuit moet worden gehaald en naar cruciale infrastructuur, gezondheidszorg en onderzoek zou moeten gaan.

Goederen, diensten en kapitaal stoppen al lang niet meer aan de grenzen van onze lidstaten. Een oplossing moet dan ook grensoverschrijdend zijn en moet steunen op samenwerking door het uitwisselen van informatie, met behulp van de relevante agentschappen, maar ook tussen de agentschappen. Eveneens is dit een kans om de huidige systemen en procedures te vereenvoudigen en zo de administratieve lasten voor onze bedrijven te verlagen. Vooral voor onze kmo's zou een dergelijke vereenvoudiging een verademing zijn.

Ten slotte, of het nu om directe of indirecte belastingen gaat, het wordt tijd dat iedereen zijn eerlijke bijdrage levert. De inspanningen van de Commissie zijn voor mij alleszins een stap in de goede richting.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, é verdade que as receitas fiscais são muito importantes para os Estados-Membros e é verdade que há uma perda fiscal de milhões de euros todos os anos em relação ao IVA e que poderia ser gasta em serviços públicos. Tudo isso é verdade, mas em relação a esta reforma há vários problemas: o primeiro é o que assistimos atualmente desta tendência da Comissão Europeia agir sobretudo numa transferência da cobrança dos impostos diretos para os impostos indiretos. Deveria ser exatamente o contrário, porque só os impostos diretos garantem que há uma verdadeira redistribuição.

O segundo problema tem a ver com esta definição de mínimos. A definição de mínimos não elimina a desigualdade profunda que existe na tributação ao nível da União Europeia e, por isso, a tributação de rendimentos de capital não tem parado descer nas últimas décadas ao mesmo tempo que se carrega tanto sobre quem trabalha. E depois há o problema de fundo, Sr. Comissário, e com isto termino. É que não faz sentido falar em mínimos enquanto existirem jurisdições fiscais privilegiadas no espaço da União Europeia, porque isso tem um nome: chama-se roubo fiscal.

Sven Giegold, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Vice-President, colleagues, thanks first of all to the Commission for this bold approach to VAT. This is very much needed. We know about the problems of fraud. We welcome in particular that you took the concerns of small and medium-sized businesses seriously. My colleague Molly Scott Cato has lobbied very hard for this and the Parliament did this, so this is really the right direction you are taking. But I have to say that we have concerns concerning the increasing number of exemptions which are possible under the new regime. You have now an umbrella for the exemptions but Member States can even add more products which are treated differently from one state to the other, and even if you have put limits to that, this is not the vision of a common market. In a common market, we should have common tax rates when it comes to indirect taxation.

So therefore, we call on colleagues, the Member States and the Commission not to forget about the dream of a common market where common rules determine our common sales and business area.

Jörg Meuthen, *im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wir reden hier heute über Entscheidungen der Kommission zum Thema „faire Besteuerung“. Das sollten wir nicht tun. Das Thema gehört gar nicht hierher. Die EU ist nicht zuständig für dieses Thema. Das darf sie auch nicht werden.

Zur Bekämpfung von Umsatzsteuerbetrug sollen die Mitgliedstaaten durchaus zusammenarbeiten. Aber wir brauchen dafür nicht die neuen Kompetenzen für Eurofisc, die die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat. Hier entsteht ein Europäisches Finanzamt bei der Kommission. Achten Sie den Grundsatz der Subsidiarität. Fair zu besteuern heißt auch, sich keine Kompetenzen für Besteuerung zu ermöglichen. Wir brauchen keine Untergrenzen für Steuersätze – nicht bei der Mehrwertsteuer und auch nicht bei der Körperschaftsteuer. Fair ist es, wenn jedes Land seine eigenen Steuergesetze beschließt. Ganz allein. Ohne die Einmischung der Kommission.

Hier im Parlament und auch im Rat werden wir genau hinsehen, welcher Kollege und welcher Finanzminister leichtfertig nationale Souveränität in steuerlicher Hinsicht aufzugeben bereit ist.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident! Das Thema gehört sehr wohl hierher. Wenn wir daran denken, dass wir allein eine Mehrwertsteuerlücke von 170 Mrd. Euro haben, wenn wir daran denken, dass allein durch den grenzüberschreitenden Steuerbetrug den europäischen Steuerzahlern 50 Mrd. Euro verloren gehen, und wenn wir daran denken, dass wir ein gemeinsamer Binnenmarkt sind, und wenn wir an die Arbeit des TAXE-I-, des TAXE-II- und des PANA-Ausschusses denken: Ja, das Thema gehört hierher.

Wir benötigen natürlich auch einen europäischen Mehrwertsteuerraum. Es ist daher richtig, dass wir die Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten und der Behörden verstärken, wenn Steuerbetrüger zunehmend grenzüberschreitend operieren. Es ist richtig, dass wir ein einheitliches System der Mehrwertsteuersätze schaffen. Aber dabei müssen wir die 250 Ausnahmen reduzieren, um weitere Ungleichbehandlungen zu beseitigen.

Es ist richtig, dass wir eine vereinfachte Regelung, insbesondere für KMU, einführen, wenn die Komplexität des Systems Wachstum und Beschäftigung bremst. Es ist richtig, dass wir ein neues, besseres System schaffen, wenn die Mehrwertsteuer eine wachsende öffentliche Einnahmequelle auch für die Europäische Union sein soll, denn wir müssen bei der zukünftigen Finanzierung der Europäischen Union stärker auf Eigenmittel setzen.

Wir freuen uns auf die Zusammenarbeit. Es gibt Dinge nachzuschärfen, aber der Ansatz ist richtig gewählt.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, Mr Vice-President, as you said VAT fraud costs EU Member States more than EUR 50 billion in lost revenue each year and now, I think, finally we are taking this seriously. We have popped the hood of Europe's ailing VAT system and, let's be honest, it's a mess as must now be painfully obvious to anyone who has worked seriously with the issue of tax, VAT fraud and avoidance and evasion. National laws, schemes and regulations are not a deterrent to these abusers. On the contrary, they are enablers of them. The more rules and the more exemptions, the easier it becomes to find loopholes. In the EU we still maintain no less than 28 different national VAT regimes, all with different rates and exemptions.

I'm happy to say that with the fair tax package proposed by the Commission we are finally taking action to plug the gaps of Europe's leaking coin coffers, to deny those who would cheat and swindle their way out of their fair contribution to society and, at the same time, making life just a little bit easier for the vast majority of companies who pay their fair taxes and their fair VAT.

Finally, we will set up a system that returns control over individual VAT rates to Member States' own discretion by doing so in a way that will not distort competition and that will not allow for a race to the bottom. I look forward to our continuing work on these important files and to ensure a VAT system that is fit for the 21st century.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, we welcome the proposal to strengthen the unified VAT regime so that VAT is paid in the country where the goods or services are consumed and at the rate applicable in that country. This is essential to tackle the high current levels of VAT fraud. We welcome any simplification of rules related to cross-border transactions that will aid businesses, especially SMEs, to operate in the internal market. Personally, I am also delighted that the Commission is inviting all EU Member States to follow the UK practice of exempting the smallest businesses from VAT altogether, something I have been campaigning for for some time.

My worry is that the Council will try to block these reforms. It would represent a defeat for businesses and for tax cooperation in the EU if Member States are not able to trust each other and accept that one country can collect and send VAT revenues on behalf of another. The temporary VAT regime has been in place for 25 years now, and it is time we worked together to replace it with something that works better for citizens as well as businesses.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Arndt Kohn (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte zwei Teilaspekte des Reformpakets für eine gerechtere Mehrwertsteuer in der EU erwähnen. Punkt 1: Die Betrugsbekämpfung und die Kooperation zwischen nationalen und internationalen Behörden muss wirksame und schnelle Möglichkeiten zum Informationsaustausch bringen – technische, aber auch rechtliche.

Nun aber Punkt 2: Bei den Mehrwertsteuersätzen soll die unübersichtliche Liste der ermäßigt zu besteuernenden Güter wegfallen. Stattdessen sollen die Mitgliedstaaten aus einem bunten Strauß an Mehrwertsteuersätzen wählen können: Stichwort Flexibilität. Ein Steuersatz von 0 %, ein Steuersatz zwischen 0 und 5 %, zwei Steuersätze zwischen 5 und dem Normalsteuersatz von mindestens 15 %, und das alles zu einem gewogenen Durchschnitt von mindestens 12 %.

Wissen Sie, wonach das klingt? Das klingt nach Chaos. Wenn dies so bleibt, bedeutet das erheblichen Aufwand für Buchhaltung, Steuerberatung und Finanzverwaltung. Dies birgt erhöhtes Fehler- und Betrugsrisiko. Dabei wollten wir doch genau das vermeiden.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι προφανές ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για την καταπολέμηση της απάτης γύρω από το σύστημα της λειτουργίας του φόρου προστιθέμενης αξίας. Ταυτόχρονα, το βασικό πρόβλημα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι το φορολογικό ντάμπινγκ που εφαρμόζεται στη πράξη, καθώς υπάρχουν χώρες με πολύ χαμηλό και άλλες με πάρα πολύ υψηλό ΦΠΑ. Στην Ελλάδα, κ. Dombrovskis, εφαρμόζεται αυξημένος ΦΠΑ διότι αυτό έχει επιβάλει η τρόικα. Τελευταίο παράδειγμα είναι η επιβολή αυξημένου ΦΠΑ στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, εκεί όπου υπάρχει ανταγωνισμός από την πλευρά της Τουρκίας με χαμηλότερο ΦΠΑ. Διαμαρτύρονται οι κάτοικοι στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, διαμαρτύρονται οι μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις και πρέπει να το δείτε αυτό. Δεν είναι δυνατόν να έχουμε την αύξηση του ΦΠΑ στα νησιά του Αιγαίου: με αυτή τη διαδικασία οδηγούνται πραγματικά στην οικονομική καταστροφή. Παράλληλα, πρέπει να έχουμε μηδενικό ή πάρα πολύ χαμηλό ΦΠΑ για τα βασικά είδη πρώτης ανάγκης, τα είδη διατροφής όπως επίσης και για τις υπηρεσίες κοινής ωφέλειας.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, armonizar el tipo mínimo del impuesto de sociedades y el IVA, más arrojo señalando y combatiendo los paraísos fiscales y aplicar ya el protocolo de la OCDE para evitar la deslocalización de los beneficios a la hora de tributar —conocida como BEPS— son las recetas que los expertos definden para mejorar la fiscalidad de la Unión.

Compitiendo para captar contribuyentes nadie gana. Todos perdemos capacidad para financiar políticas públicas, y esos recortes afectan demasiadas veces a nuestro modelo social. Los federalistas europeos deseamos además un ministerio europeo de Hacienda y un Tesoro europeo.

Hay modelos que regulan muy razonablemente la relación entre las haciendas centrales y las haciendas autónomas vinculadas, como el que utilizamos en el País Vasco y Navarra con los sistemas del concierto y el convenio. Estos sistemas, además de determinar aportaciones en función de las competencias que cada uno ejerce, favorecen la responsabilidad, son una herramienta antidéficit, previenen la corrupción y son un estímulo para crear políticas de fomento de la economía real, como ha reconocido en varias ocasiones esta Cámara.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank you for this debate, which shows the high interest and need for a deep reform of our VAT system.

As I mentioned in my introduction, since the first package of reforms in 2016 the Commission has gradually adopted proposals that would allow a fundamental reform of the VAT system in the EU. But there is no time to rest on our laurels; we still have a long way to go.

First of all on the Commission's side. Before this summer the Commission will come forward with two legislative proposals: one introducing changes in the VAT Directive, which will contain detailed arrangements putting into practice the cornerstone of the definitive regime adopted in October 2017, while the second one will address the issue of VAT fraud in online sales.

Secondly on Parliament's and Member States' side. The debate is now in your hands. At the highest political level we need an ambition to deliver the real reform of our VAT system, to create a level playing field for EU companies, to support SMEs so that they can grow and benefit from the opportunities of the single market, and to put an end to cross-border fraud which steals public revenues and finances criminal organisations or possibly even terrorist activities.

On VAT reduced rates; we are proposing to give more freedom to Member States in a framed manner, so I will come back to some of the concerns which were raised in this regard. Indeed it is very important that this does not lead to revenue erosion or distortion of competition. That is why we have put safeguards in place in terms of the minimum effective VAT rate, in terms of negative lists which mainly concern high value, easily portable goods, which are the ones probably most prone to being moved across borders, and this proposal would only come into force once a definitive VAT system will be in place. We are, of course, are ready to discuss with co-legislators whether those safeguards are sufficient and what is the best way to address potential risks of revenue erosion.

Now as regards the broader issue, I think we share the need to reform the current VAT system in the interest of Member States, of EU businesses – mainly SMEs – and of European citizens. So with your support we are confident that progress can be achieved in the coming months.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), írásban. – Üdvözlöm, hogy az Európai Bizottság végre egy olyan csomagot tett a jogalkotók asztalára, amely egy koherens rendszerben teljesen megreformálná az uniós áfafizetés szabályait. Éppen itt az ideje, hogy megszüntessük az áfacsalások lehetőségét.

Jelenleg Európában 28 féle adórendszer működik, különböző szabályokkal és kiskapukkal. A közös piacon az áruk és szolgáltatások szabad áramlása nyomán keletkező áfa megfizetése, illetve a szabályok átláthatatlansága különösen a tagállamok együttműködésének hiánya miatt óriási problémát jelent. Évente nagyjából 150 milliárd euróra rúg az EU tagállamaiban a be nem fizetett áfa, vagyis több mint az EU teljes éves költségvetése hiányzik a tagországok költségvetéséből. Ebből ráadásul 50 milliárd euró az, ami olyan áfacsalásokhoz köthető, mint például a Magyarországon is ismert határokon átnyúló körkörös áfacsalás.

A Bizottság által javasolt rendszer megfordítja az áfafizetés és visszaigénylés szabályait. Ha az EU elfogadja a javaslatot, akkor a határokon átnyúló áfafizetést és a visszaigénylést is úgy kell majd kezelni, mintha a határokon belül történne. A különbözetet pedig a tagállamok egymás között számolnák el, egyszerűsítve ezzel az adminisztrációt is. Ehhez a tagországok közötti jóval nagyobb együttműködés szükséges.

Nem kétséges, hogy a rendszer meg fogja szerezni a Parlament támogatását. Felhívjuk a Tanácsot is arra, hogy minél előbb fogadja el a tervezetet, komoly milliárdokat spórolva ezzel a költségvetéseknek.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Die Europäische Kommission schlägt eine EU-weite Reform der Mehrwertsteuersätze und der Mehrwertsteuererhebung vor. Aufgrund der ineffizienten Steuererhebung, der unkoordinierten Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten und der fragmentierten Mehrwertsteuerregelungen wird die Mehrwertsteuerlücke zwischen den erwarteten Einnahmen und den Einnahmen aus der Mehrwertsteuer in der EU auf 150 Milliarden Euro pro Jahr geschätzt. Grenzüberschreitender Betrug kostet die Mitgliedstaaten 50 Milliarden Euro pro Jahr. Daher möchte die Kommission das derzeitige MwSt-System reformieren, um ein gerechteres und effizienteres Steuersystem in der Europäischen Union zu schaffen. Ein wichtiges Element des MwSt-Pakets ist ein EU-System zur vereinfachten MwSt-Einhaltung.

Die Steuerkonformitätskosten für grenzüberschreitend tätige europäische KMU sind um 11% höher als für KMU, die ausschließlich inländische Tätigkeiten ausüben. Die Kommissionsvorschläge würden die Befolgungskosten durch vereinfachte Registrierungs-, Rechnungsstellungs- und Buchführungsregeln für KMU mit einem Umsatz von weniger als 2 - Millionen Euro pro Jahr um 18% senken. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die EU weiterhin an einer besseren Zusammenarbeit zwischen den europäischen Steuerbehörden arbeitet und die Befolgungskosten für europäische Unternehmen senkt, ohne die Tür zu einer europäischen Mehrwertsteuer zu öffnen. Eine größere Flexibilität der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Senkung der Mehrwertsteuersätze für bestimmte Waren und Dienstleistungen ist mit einer weiteren Harmonisierung verknüpft.

22. Racionalne pod względem kosztów redukcje emisji oraz inwestycje niskoemisyjne (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Julie Girlingin ympäröstön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö ehdotuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiiviksi direktiivin 2003/87/EY muuttamisesta kustannustehokkaiden päästövähennysten ja vähähiilisyttä edistävien investointien edistämissä (COM(2015)0337 - C8-0190/2015 - 2015/0148(COD)) (A8-0003/2017).

Julie Girling, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and all of his team, some of whom are with us here today. I would like to thank the Council and their hardworking team and, of course, all my wonderful hardworking colleagues here in Parliament.

Nothing is ever perfect, and the emission trading system (ETS) is certainly no exception to that, but it remains the cornerstone of our EU policy to combat climate change and we have done our best to agree an ambitious update. The ETS has had a chequered history. There have been many detractors over the years. We tackled many problems – from a carbon price that was clearly too low to make the market function to the extremely difficult issue of striking the balance between our environmental ambition and the protection of energy-intensive European industry. This is always open, and we are always discussing it, but it remains a system operating in 31 countries.

The rest of the world has sometimes been disappointingly slow to catch up, but now we have some momentum going. We have the recent agreement with Switzerland, we have President Trump to thank for the call to action in the United States, which has meant some ambitious plans in California and their tie-up with Ontario, and indeed even movement in China, where I know the Commission has been very active in terms of helping with their own putative system. So we are making this agreement in the context of a world that is moving forward. It would be nice, actually, to be criticised at some point for not being the best system in the world, so we look forward to that in the near future hopefully.

However, the background to this update is challenging. We must have a system that can deliver the EU's Paris commitments, but sometimes reality is at odds with this. We were working against the background of the 2014 Council conclusions, which was not always helpful. There are challenging internal politics around the relationship between the EU 15 and more recent accession states, with a lively discussion on the absolute amounts and on the conditions that would be appropriate to impose in providing the flow of funds to assist these Member States.

We also had the difficult issue of indirect cost compensation, warmly embraced by some Member States and not by others, leading to a fundamental question as to whether, if some Member State governments are prepared to support their industry financially and others are not, EU funds should be used to iron out the differences. We await further developments on state aid rules to illuminate this question. I welcome the compromise that we reached on this, but we did not settle the matter. The discussions will continue.

I do not intend to list all the final conclusions of the deal, just a couple that are highlights for me. The 2023 review – in line with the global stock-take of the Paris Agreement – will include a possible increase in the 2.2% linear reduction factor. This is a major achievement. Secondly, there is the substantial withdrawal of excess allowances from the system. And, thirdly, what is called the 'Duncan mechanism' in tribute to the rapporteur who preceded me – I think we should now call it the 'Lord Duncan mechanism' – comes in if the cross-sector correction factor is applied. If it is not needed, then additional funds go to the Innovation Fund and the Modernisation Fund. We have changes to benchmarks and carbon leakage lists, offering a fine balance between carbon leakage protection and ambition.

These are just a few points. There is a clear stamp of the European Parliament on this agreement – new thinking and new mechanisms which have been taken on board – and I thank my colleagues for this.

But sometimes what defines the role of rapporteur is the most frequently asked question: what did you want that you didn't achieve? Well, for me, there are two clear things here: the important issue of environment performance standards – we did our best, we made advances but we didn't get the specific, clear numerical limit we wanted – and the issue of shipping. We got our recital on the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), but we wanted more. I think Parliament has made a very clear statement that this is not good enough. We pass this baton on to others in other pieces of legislation, but I hope they will recognise the job that we did.

Fredrick Federley, *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för industrifrågor, forskning och energi*. – Fru talman! Vi har kommit till vägs ände och vi ska nu egentligen bara klubba igenom beslutet som i vissa delar var väldigt komplicerat men i andra delar varit betydligt enklare. Jag tror att vi har gjort så mycket som vi har kunnat i de olika institutionerna, men också här i de olika utskotten i Europaparlamentet.

Jag tror att vi inför nästa runda som vi snart börjar ladda för ska ta med oss dels halvtidsöversynen, men också att vi om 10 år ska ha ett nytt regelverk på plats. Så jag tror att vi måste ta oss en funderare i Europaparlamentet på hur mycket vi ska fortsätta att urvattna det här systemet, vilket vi har gjort på flera sätt. Vad de pengar och de värden som den här marknaden skapar faktiskt ska användas till, tror jag är en grundfråga.

Det andra är hur många fler fonder kan vi se till att skapa för att göra saker som kanske inte alls ETS-systemet egentligen är tänkt för. Jag tror att vi måste ställa oss en fråga som kommer att vara hård, svår och smärtsam här inne: Hur länge ska vi fortsätta att göra undantag för vissa medlemsstater, och hur länge ska vissa medlemsstater anses vara nya? Efter hur många årtionden är alla medlemsstater lika och behandlas lika inför våra lagar?

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am glad we are meeting tonight to finalise the adoption of the revised European Union Emission Trading System (ETS) Directive, creating a solid framework for the European carbon market for the next decade.

The European Union ETS remains the most important instrument to realise our ambition of a reduction of at least 40% in greenhouse gas emissions within the European Union by 2030. With the political agreement reached in early November last year, we can proudly show to our citizens and to the world that the European Union is delivering and turning political words into legal commitments.

The trilogue agreement on this proposal is the result of a long, complex and thorough negotiation process that necessarily involved compromises from all sides. The support and active engagement of the rapporteur, Ms Girling, and also of the shadow rapporteurs, Mr Belet, Ms Guteland, Mr Gerbrandy, Ms Konečná, Mr Eickhout, Ms Evi and Ms D'Ornano, was crucial in this regard.

I would like wholeheartedly to thank Ms Girling for her skillful work on this challenging file and congratulate her on the result. Only the constructive spirit of the negotiators of both institutions made it possible to reach a solid compromise and I am happy that the Commission could facilitate this trilogue agreement as an 'honest broker'.

As I said, the agreement required compromise from all parties involved. It strikes a proper balance between strengthening the European Union carbon market and incentivising industry to decarbonise with innovative solutions and renewable energy, while being mindful of the specific challenges of lower-income Member States, in particular regarding the modernisation of their energy systems.

The European Union ETS is a great example of a forward-looking regulation where European legislation enables innovation and modernisation of our energy system. The European Parliament has greatly contributed to the final shape of the trilogue outcome. Each side of the triangle of issues at the core of the discussion clearly carries the European Parliament's signature. The political impetus for strengthening the European Union ETS originated in the European Parliament. The temporary doubling of the feeding rate for the Market Stability Reserve and the limitation set for the validity of allowances in the reserve will ensure that market balance will be restored swiftly and that the carbon price creates incentives for long-term low-carbon investments.

Regarding the free allocation to avoid carbon leakage, a free allocation buffer of around 450 million allowances was created, at Parliament's request, to avoid a cross-sectoral correction factor. This provides European industry with certainty in terms of free allocation and a reliable planning horizon. And finally, because of the European Parliament's insistence, the modernisation provisions will also enable activities fostering a just transition of labour on the way towards a low-carbon economy; and, as an additional safeguard for investments, no support from the Modernisation Fund will be granted to coal-related energy generation, with the exception of district heating in Bulgaria and Romania.

I could continue this list, referring to other issues such as a larger Innovation Fund, but I think that, together, we can be proud of the result of our joint effort to agree on an improved and robust architecture for the renewed European Union ETS.

I invite you to lend your support to the political agreement in tomorrow's vote to ensure that the legislation enters swiftly into force and the necessary changes are in place by January 2021. There is no time to lose in the European transition to a low-carbon economy. This is what we have promised to our citizens. This is what they expect from all of us.

Florent Marcellesi, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Desarrollo*. – Señora presidenta, la transición energética también es una cuestión de justicia y reparto entre los países del Norte y los países del Sur. Y es una pena que este informe, bastante débil, no lo haya tenido mucho en cuenta. En línea con el Acuerdo de París, la Unión Europea habría podido convertir su régimen de comercio de derechos de emisión en un instrumento potente para el clima y la solidaridad.

Algunas ideas para el futuro: que la mitad de los ingresos de la subasta se asignen a la lucha climática en los países vulnerables; que el sector de la aviación contribuya al objetivo climático para 2030 al mismo nivel que los otros sectores y que esos ingresos vayan a la lucha climática en los países vulnerables; que el transporte marítimo internacional contribuya en función de las emisiones generadas en, hacia o desde los puertos europeos; que se limite el factor de emisión cero de la biomasa a los desechos y residuos para evitar acaparamiento de tierras y deforestación en el Sur.

La transición energética en Europa no se puede hacer a costa de los demás, sino en solidaridad con los demás.

Ivo Belet, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, anderhalf jaar hard werken en onderhandelen, en dan anderhalve minuut spreektijd: het blijft een uitdaging natuurlijk.

De hervormde ETS is ongetwijfeld een van de absolute pijlers van het Europese klimaatbeleid. We mogen zeggen, in tegenstelling tot wat de vorige spreker zei, dat de ingrepen wél ambitieus zijn, maar dat ze ook realistisch zijn en dat ze haalbaar zijn.

Het doel van het ETS is om de bedrijven en ook de energiesector stimulansen te bieden om energie op een duurzame manier te produceren en te verbruiken en tegelijkertijd koolstoflekage te vermijden. We weten allemaal wat koolstoflekage is. Meneer Eickhout, het heeft geen zin dat we maatregelen nemen om bedrijven te laten versluizen naar andere regio's waar geen maatregelen zijn, zoals wij die wel nemen. Dat is totaal zinloos.

Een derde punt: we rekenen erop dat het innovatiefonds ook in de huidige periode snel wordt ingezet om de transitie te ondersteunen. We zijn inderdaad, zoals de commissaris zei, zeer tevreden dat de financiële ondersteuning voor het innovatiefonds onder impuls van het Parlement is opgetrokken.

In concluding, let me warmly thank and congratulate my colleague Julie Girling and her team for the excellent job they have done in a sometimes challenging context. Let me also thank you, Commissioner, and your team, the cabinet and administration, for the tremendous work that you have done.

Jytte Guteland, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Var sak har sin tid och jag är en av dem som har fajtats och verkligen varit tuff i förhandlingarna för att få det här att bli en skarpare klimatlagstiftning, men i dag tänkte jag vara glad. Jag tror att det är viktigt för nya fajter framöver i lagstiftningar om klimatet att man också firar när man har skärpt lagstiftning och lagt en bättre, i linje med Parisavtalet.

Det här har varit långa och tuffa förhandlingar, och det är tydligt att synen på klimatet är tudelad, både i Europaparlamentet och i EU:s medlemsländer. På ena sidan finns de progressiva som ser möjligheterna och som vill göra mer för att lösa klimathotet. På andra sidan har vi de konservativa som vill fortsätta att stoppa huvudet i sanden och som gärna vill krama gamla fossila bränslen och bibehålla utsläppsrean. Vi socialdemokrater och S&D-gruppen har varit pådrivande i förhandlingarna.

Genom att skrota upp till 2 miljarder utsläppsrätter får vi slut på den rådande inflationen i systemet och vi gör det dyrare att släppa ut; det är bra. För oss har det också varit viktigt att göra omställningen till ett klimatsmartare samhälle på ett mer rättvist och socialt hållbart sätt. Alla ska följa med, och i synnerhet i regioner där det är svårt med omställningen på grund av stora utmaningar att lämna det fossila är det viktigt att det finns stöd för arbetare, så att man kan följa med i omställningen.

Jag är också glad att reglerna tydligt signalerar att alla sektorer måste bidra. Ingen ska åka snålskjuts på andras förbättringar. Klimatarbetet angår oss alla. Och visst – jag hade gärna sett ett ännu stramare bättre regelverk, men vi har skärpt systemet, vi ser till att EU tar ansvar i den här lagstiftningen, och det ger oss styrka att fajtas ännu mer i kommande lagstiftningar.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Klimaat én jobs beschermen, dat was de hoge inzet bij de hervorming van het emissiehandelssysteem. De werking van de Europese koolstofmarkt moet beter en efficiënter om klimaatvriendelijke investeringen verder te stimuleren. Tegelijk moeten we vermijden dat bedrijven wegtrekken uit Europa naar derde landen waar de klimaatregels minder strikt zijn, want dan verliezen we twee keer: we verliezen de jobs en we doen niets voor het klimaat. De Europese Unie neemt wereldwijd de leiding in de strijd tegen klimaatverandering. We mogen van winnaars geen verliezers maken. Het akkoord is op dit punt zeker een stap vooruit in vergelijking met het oorspronkelijke Commissievoorstel, maar voor ons had de bescherming tegen de koolstoflekkage best nog verder mogen gaan.

Tot slot: de sterke focus op innovatie is bijzonder welkom. Een koolstofarm Europa bereik je niet alleen door een werkbaar systeem van emissierechten, maar ook door duidelijk in te zetten op innovatieve oplossingen van het klimaatprobleem in én buiten Europa.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to start by thanking Julie Girling for the excellent job she has done as our rapporteur, especially jumping in late when Ian Duncan had to step down. She might not yet deserve the title of Baroness but the mechanism should certainly be named after Julie Girling instead of Ian Duncan.

Today's result: what shall we make of it? Well, only the future will tell us whether what we have been doing has been sufficient. We do know that the price of carbon credits has gone up by about 20% so far, so it might be successful. Surplus of allowances, we tackled that. I think the coal phase-out in Germany, the Netherlands and Italy is easier to achieve now. The Innovation Fund has been increased, which is important; and I think one of the major improvements that Parliament has made is that the Modernisation Fund is not applicable to coal-fired investments. That is very successful.

But there are two elements I would like to stress. First of all, carbon leakage. We are still handing out 95% of all allowances for free to industry, even for sectors that have no real trade or carbon intensity. That is still something that is not too good.

And lastly, we continue referring to conclusions from the European Council from 2014. That is like in the Renaissance looking back to the Middle Ages! Let us please stop referring to those pre, pre, pre-Paris conclusions from Council – and that applies to both the Commission and the Council. Let's move forward! Paris is beyond 2014.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, dovoluje také mně se přidat k zástupu všech, kteří chtějí poděkovat Julii Girlingové, která se ujala tohoto dokumentu de facto v polovině, jak již bylo řečeno, a dovedla ho podle mého názoru zdárně do úspěšného konce, protože po letech usilovné práce Vám dnes předkládáme reformu systému obchodování s emisními povolenkami. I přes velmi obtížná vyjednávání se domnívám, že předložený text uspokojivě vyvažuje jak otázku ochrany klimatu a implementaci Pařížské dohody, tak i ochranu evropského průmyslu a jím garantovaných pracovních míst.

Přijatý dokument asi plně neuspokojí žádný tábor. Na jedné straně tady máme řadu skvělých opatření, která povedou ke zvýšení ceny povolenky. Na stranu druhou opatření chránící případný nárůst průmyslové výroby v EU či výjimky pro ochranu našeho ocelářského sektoru. Ano, vidím tam ještě řadu nedodělků, které jsme z různých důvodů nemohli odstranit. Jako je například nedořešená otázka ochrany evropského průmyslu před dovozem surovin a výrobků ze států, které nesdílí náš postoj k boji s klimatickými změnami, jako je tzv. carbon adjustment mechanism.

Bylo by dobré, aby v dalších letech Evropská komise tuto otázku konečně jednou provždy vyřešila, když se to nepodařilo zde. Zvláště pak s přihlédnutím k ohrožení našeho silného průmyslu levným dovozem z Číny. Mluvila jsem o tom na této půdě již mnohokrát.

Před dokončením této práce nám do celého procesu vletěl nemilosrdně tzv. zimní energetický balíček, který nám však některé instituty a nástroje z předchozího teprve dokončovaného balíčku značně narušuje. Nemohu si odpustit apel na Komisi: Prosím, dělejte ty věci tak, ať se spojí.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, first of all I too would like to thank Julie Girling, who stepped in later in the process and did a great job in delivering this result.

I know you probably are not happy back home, Ms Girling, but the Greens too are thanking you. That doesn't help you at home, but still the thanks are there, and we as Greens can also support the reform because it's an improvement on what we have. Though let's be honest: it is not very difficult to get an improvement on what we have, right?

And that is really still the problem. Finally we are doing something on the surplus of allowances, and getting rid of that surplus to a certain extent, but we're not there yet. This system is still not functioning right. The prices are now around EUR 10, whereas we know that, for Paris implementation, prices need to be around EUR 40 or 50, and we know that the emission trading system alone will not deliver that.

So this is a good basis we have developed, we can support the improvement, but now it's time for Member States to take national action and implement additional, national, policies because this alone will not deliver Paris, and you all know that.

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi dal canto nostro abbiamo sempre spesso espresso diversi dubbi su un sistema basato sul mercato per affrontare le politiche climatiche e la questione climatica. Non riusciamo a vedere l'ETS come il pilastro delle politiche climatiche dell'Unione europea. Non lo riusciamo a vedere perché non lo è stato in passato e purtroppo temo non lo sarà neanche in futuro, nonostante tutti i numerosi tentativi di rafforzare questo strumento.

Ovviamente mi auguro fortemente di sbagliarmi. Io personalmente mi sono chiesta più volte se stiamo però tentando di tutelare il clima o stiamo cercando di costruire un meccanismo complicatissimo di ingegneria finanziaria e di speculazione, se stiamo cercando di ridurre le emissioni nel mondo reale o stiamo facendo soltanto dei calcoli basati su numeri virtuali e su proiezioni, se stiamo applicando seriamente il principio «chi inquina paga», oppure vogliamo capovolgerlo – ovvero per continuare ad inquinare è sufficiente pagare un obolo – e, infine, se stiamo cercando veramente di spingere verso la trasformazione energetica industriale dell'Europa, perché sia davvero sostenibile e competitiva, o stiamo tentando di tenere in piedi il modello legato al fossile.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Morgen wird hoffentlich ein sehr guter Tag für den Klimaschutz in Europa und weltweit. Ich glaube, wir werden eine Reform beschließen, die dazu führt, dass das ETS endlich seinen Zweck erfüllt. Wer in klimafreundliche Technologien investiert, wird belohnt. Wer alte Dreckschleudern weiterbetreiben möchte, wird bestraft. Nach Ansicht von Experten wird der Preis schon in wenigen Jahren – etwa in vier, fünf Jahren – auf deutlich über 30 Euro steigen und im Schnitt der nächsten Periode deutlich über 20 Euro liegen. Da werden wir dann Investitionen sehen, die wir bisher leider nicht gesehen haben.

Aber damit diese Investitionen auch tatsächlich in Europa passieren und wir die energieintensive Industrie, die im internationalen Wettbewerb steht, nicht aus Europa vertreiben, war es für uns als EVP wichtig, kostenlose Zertifikate für diejenigen zu liefern, die auf dem neuesten Stand der Technik sind. Also nur wer schon auf dem neuesten Stand der Technik ist oder entsprechend investiert, der wird kostenlos versorgt – die anderen müssen zahlen.

Wir helfen der Industrie zusätzlich durch den Innovationsfonds, und wir helfen Mittel- und Osteuropa durch den Modernisierungsfonds. Ich glaube, das ist insgesamt eine sehr gute Sache. Wir schützen Arbeitsplätze, wir schaffen Innovation, und wir helfen dem Klima.

Deswegen auch mein Dank an Julie Girling, an die Schattenberichterstatter, vor allen Dingen an Ivo Belet für die EVP, und an den Kommissar und sein Team. Ich glaube, das ist ein gutes Gesetzgebungswerk, und ich bitte alle, morgen zuzustimmen.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, je crains qu'une nouvelle fois nous ne rations le train de l'histoire, car le texte qui nous est proposé est un texte fade. Il est fade parce que, tout au long des discussions, les uns pour des intérêts nationaux, les autres pour des intérêts sectoriels ou d'autres pour les deux en même temps, en arrivent à ces résultats.

Vous n'êtes pas sans savoir que je défends l'ajustement carbone aux frontières mais, vous-même, vous vous y êtes toujours opposé parce que vous disiez – vous dites toujours – que c'est une mesure protectionniste. Protectionniste, oui: protectionniste du climat, de l'environnement, des emplois. Je plaide donc pour l'ajustement carbone aux frontières. D'ailleurs, beaucoup de pays tiers, dont la Chine, l'ont très bien compris et investissent massivement pour décarboner leur industrie et leur économie.

Imaginez le ridicule de la chose si demain, dans cinq ans, dans dix ans, les produits importés sont moins carbonés que les nôtres. Nous aurons l'air idiot, ne trouvez-vous pas, Monsieur le Commissaire? C'est donc pour cela que nous manquons d'ambition et là nous avons raté le train de l'histoire. Et vous savez, moi, les soupes fades, je n'aime pas les manger.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W europejskiej polityce energetycznej niezbędne jest zrównoważone i realistyczne traktowanie ambicji środowiskowych i powiązanych z tym kosztów wynikających z ograniczeń technicznych. Niestety kompromis w sprawie EU ETS nie uwzględnia tych założeń. Wprawdzie gwarantuje on Polsce możliwość wykorzystania niewykorzystanych uprawnień z okresu 2013-2020 i zwiększa trochę liczbę uprawnień w ramach mechanizmu kompensacyjnego, a także – co ważne i za co dziękuję – uwzględnia specyfikę produkcji ciepła na potrzeby komunalne przez kontynuację bezpłatnego przydziału uprawnień dla tego sektora na korzystnych zasadach. Jednocześnie niestety ogranicza możliwość finansowania w ramach mechanizmów kompensacyjnych inwestycji opartych na paliwach kopalnych, nawet takich, które są efektywne ekonomicznie i charakteryzują się wyjątkowo niską emisyjnością. Z tego powodu nie będę mogła w całości poprzeć tego sprawozdania.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W telewizji i w tej epoce pamięta się tylko to, co było dwa tygodnie temu, nie wcześniej, ale ja wychowałem się bez telewizji. Chodziłem na studia, gdy nie było jeszcze telewizji, dlatego świetnie pamiętam czasy, kiedy setki tysięcy młodych ludzi szły ratować Ziemię, kiedy profesorowie robili wykresy, udowadniali, że grozi Ziemi katastrofa, że grozi Ziemi potworne globalne oziębienie. Wszystko to było udowodnione dokładnie tak samo, jak teraz jest udawdaniane przez innych wariatów, że grozi Ziemi totalne przegrzanie. Otóż wtedy na szczęście nie było Unii Europejskiej, czyli grona ludzi, którzy gotowi są zmarnować biliony, byle pokazać, że coś się robi, byle co. Dlatego wtedy nikt nie poszedł siedzieć, natomiast Wy pójdziecie siedzieć za zmarnowanie pieniędzy ludzi na bezsensowne działania. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Françoise Grossetête (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chère Madame Girling, merci à vous, parce que nous attendions depuis longtemps cette réforme du marché du carbone.

Je tiens à remercier aussi mes collègues du groupe PPE, parce que nous avons beaucoup travaillé avec Ivo Belet et Esther de Lange pour finaliser notre position sur un sujet aussi complexe. Parce que, lorsque nous avons mis en place le système OTS, on pensait que le prix serait de 30 euros la tonne. Nous en sommes bien loin puisque ce prix oscille entre 6 et 9 euros en raison d'un surplus de quotas sur le marché.

Cela, bien sûr, empêche d'accélérer les investissements «bas-carbone» et le passage de la réduction annuelle de l'allocation des quotas de 1,7 % à 2,2 %, révisable en 2024, permettra d'enrayer ce surplus.

Grâce à cette réforme, les quotas seront distribués de manière plus juste, pour être en phase avec les émissions réelles des sites industriels et cela permettra de créer le Fonds pour la modernisation de nos secteurs électriques et de mobiliser dans un fonds d'innovation l'équivalent de plus de 400 millions de quotas pour l'innovation en Europe. C'est fondamental.

Ainsi, nous respectons nos engagements suite à l'accord de Paris mais, en même temps, nous défendons nos secteurs industriels qui font face à une concurrence internationale difficile. Notre industrie est performante, elle doit absolument mettre en œuvre des normes très élevées. Nous devons l'accompagner pour qu'elle garde sa compétitivité car, ce qui est essentiel, c'est de concilier une vraie stratégie industrielle avec une diplomatie climatique active.

Puhemies. – Minun on vielä puututtava edelliseen puheenvuoroon. Edustaja Korwin-Mikke, Te sanoitte, että kaikki, jotka ovat tekemässä tätä päätöstä, joutavat vankilaan, ja tämä on ehkä asia, jota Te tässä salissa ette voisi sanoa.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con l'approvazione della riforma dell'ETS l'Unione europea ribadisce il proprio impegno sottoscritto con l'accordo di Parigi e ringrazio anch'io la relatrice Girling per il lavoro fatto. Si tratta di un'importante direttiva, dove si è riusciti a coniugare l'obiettivo di politica climatica di ridurre le emissioni di CO₂ del 40 % entro il 2030 con la competitività del settore manifatturiero e la spinta a una sua ulteriore innovazione con il fondo ad hoc.

Importante, da questo punto di vista, aver aggiornato le regole per definire quali settori industriali siano maggiormente esposti al fenomeno del cosiddetto *carbon leakage*, in modo da cogliere il reale livello di esposizione alla concorrenza commerciale di paesi che non applicano i nostri livelli di tutela ambientale.

Sono stati poi compiuti passi avanti sul tema della compensazione dei costi indiretti. Avrei auspicato la creazione di un meccanismo di compensazione a livello europeo, come richiesto dal Parlamento, ma ritengo comunque significativo l'impegno preso dalla Commissione di effettuare una valutazione del mercato del carbonio, che serve anche a capire quanto sta funzionando il meccanismo, e nel 2024, se ritenuto opportuno, presentare proposte legislative che vanno verso un meccanismo europeo.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – In dit debat is heel veel al gezegd. Ik voeg me namens de EVP uiteraard bij de felicitaties aan Julie Girling en haar hele onderhandeling.

Zowel in de milieucommissie als in de industrie-commissie stond voorop dat we aan de ene kant uiteraard ambitie wilden – want, ja, het systeem moest worden aangepast –, maar ook realisme, zodat onze industrie, onze innovatie en onze banen niet naar elders vertrekken. Daar schiet noch het klimaat iets mee op – aangezien we vaak de schoonste producenten van de wereld zijn – noch de werkgelegenheid. Natuurlijk moet je de industrie blijven aanzetten tot innoveren. Maar daar moet je ze mee helpen, in plaats van ze hier weg te pesten.

Ik ben dus ook heel erg blij met de versterking van het innovatiefonds, zodat ontwikkelingen, zoals bijvoorbeeld ook koolstofafvang en -opslag, de projecten die nu in de haven van Rotterdam voor liggen, hopelijk doorgang kunnen vinden. Datzelfde geldt ook voor koolstofafvang en -hergebruik, het plan dat er ligt om vanuit het chemische cluster in Geleen CO₂ naar de kassen in Noord-Limburg te vervoeren, die daar weer als grondstof gebruikt kunnen worden.

Dat zijn volgens mij de projecten die we in Europa nodig hebben. De slimme oplossingen die zorgen voor innovatie, maar die ook Europese handen aan het werk houden.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękujemy za przygotowanie reformy EU ETS. Na tej sali różnimy się co nieco w ocenie tej reformy, ale w jednym się nie różnimy: wszyscy dziękujemy pani sprawodawczyni. Ja chciałbym jeszcze dołączyć do tego wszystkich kontrsprawozdawców, a także tych, którzy byli w komisji ITRE, dlatego że ta komisja miała pewne zadanie do wykonania, mianowicie obronić naszą reindustrializację, obronić przemysł, producentów stali, producentów cementu, papieru, nawozów. Myślę, że to się udało. To bardzo ważne. Proszę jeszcze pamiętać, że często w walce o ochronę klimatu czy środowiska grozi nam ubóstwo energetyczne, a to bardzo wiąże się z problemem ciepłownictwa w wielu regionach, które odchodzą od węgla stopniowo, krok po kroku. Dlatego zachowanie w funduszu modernizacyjnym, a częściowo także innowacyjnym, możliwości potraktowania sektora ciepłowniczego w sposób szczególny powoduje, że mamy szansę na ochronę ludzi, którzy mogliby cierpieć na skutek braku dostaw energii. To jest również zaleta systemu, który wprowadzamy.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, io non sono molto contenta. Devo dire che ringrazio prima di tutto i colleghi del Parlamento, a cominciare dalla relatrice Girling a Ivo Belet, Esther de Lange e tutti gli altri. Avevamo fatto un buon lavoro per un anno e mezzo, ma per avere veramente quell'equilibrio che serve tra la politica climatica e ambientale e la protezione della competitività delle nostre industrie e la preservazione dei posti di lavoro manca un capitolo, quello della compensazione dei costi indiretti, che è rimasto allo status quo.

Il Parlamento aveva messo in piedi qualche cosa di meglio e di più. Si è sfranto nel negoziato per la resistenza degli Stati membri, incomprensibile, perché provoca, anche secondo l'antitrust italiano, un vero scompenso e squilibrio all'interno del mercato unico. La maggiorazione dei costi dell'elettricità derivati dall'ETS diventa, per alcuni paesi come l'Italia, che già paga l'elettricità un 30 % di più della media europea, una cosa insostenibile.

Quindi io chiedo, signor Commissario, di non aspettare il 2024 per aprire questo capitolo e che si tratti di un capitolo di giustizia sociale e di equità. Ne abbiamo parlato, l'Europa non può essere madre e matrigna.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Mieliśmy bardzo różne oceny na początku, kiedy debata nad tą reformą się rozpoczęła. Chcę zauważyć, że po pierwsze, osiągnęliśmy ważny cel, który pozwoli na to, że europejskie firmy nie będą narażone na ucieczkę emisji i będą dalej podlegać ochronie. Po drugie, że wprowadzono instrumenty, które pozwolą na to, że sektor energii w krajach, które potrzebują transformacji – takich m.in. jak Polska – dostanie środki z systemu na pokrycie części kosztów niezbędnej transformacji. Po trzecie, wsparcie i wyjątkowe traktowanie otrzymał sektor ciepłowniczy, który w takich krajach jak m.in. Polska jest kluczowy dla redukcji nie tylko emisji CO₂, ale również emisji zanieczyszczeń takich jak tlenki siarki, azotu, pyły i w ogóle całe zjawisko smogu, które związane jest z niską emisją. Chcę również podkreślić, że szkoda, że ciepłownictwo w całości nie trafiło na listę priorytetowych projektów funduszu modernizacyjnego. Wydaje mi się, że niewątpliwie ocena tej regulacji przyniesie dodatkowe jakieś oceny, ale to co udało się tutaj uczynić, jest też wspólną zasługą zarówno sprawozdawców, jak również wszystkich uczestniczących w debacie.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I think it is wonderful to behold the amount of MEPs from across the political floor who are working so hard so that we can put policies in place to meet our commitments on the Paris Agreement. Last month we had the clean energy package, energy efficiency and renewable energy, and tonight the ETS. I think that wonderful work has been done here. It is a very difficult file and I would like to thank everybody involved in moving towards the Innovation Fund, carbon capture and storage, limiting especially carbon leakage.

One area where I would especially like to thank my colleague, Esther de Lange, is where I badgered her about Prodcum, which was very important for the agri-food sector in Ireland. As a result of the work by Esther, Ivo and others, it saves them about EUR 40 million because the original proposal was so impractical. So that shows you the hard work that goes on behind the scenes and I think everybody can take a bow.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a redução da emissão de gases com efeito estufa em pelo menos 40 % até 2030 é uma meta fundamental para garantir a sustentabilidade do planeta, a qualidade do ar, mas também para dar um novo incentivo à modernização da economia europeia.

Saúdo o trabalho que foi feito e que deu um contributo importante em termos da flexibilidade na gestão das licenças para melhorar a transparência e a racionalidade do mercado. Foi também feito um esforço, ainda que não com êxito total, para reduzir as distorções de concorrência provocadas por diferentes políticas nacionais de custos indiretos. Foram introduzidos fatores de simplificação e foram criados dois fundos importantes para apoiar a transição das indústrias, fomentando a inovação e a modernização, protegendo emprego e a competitividade.

Estamos, por isso, não perante o ótimo, mas perante uma proposta razoável. É preciso eficácia e monitorização para que os objetivos de descarbonização e de inovação sejam plenamente atingidos.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προσπαθεί να ανταποκριθεί στις δεσμεύσεις των Παρισίων για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και αυτό το έχει αναθέσει κυρίως σε ένα σύστημα εμπορίας εκπομπών άνθρακα, το σύστημα ETS, το οποίο στηρίζεται επί της ουσίας στην ίδια την αγορά. Θα έλεγα ότι δεν είναι σύστημα αποτελεσματικό και ότι πολλές φορές οδηγεί σε κερδοσκοπία ενώ δημιουργούνται παράλληλα ορισμένες απίθανες καταστάσεις. Για να εξηγήσω τι εννοώ, η Βουλγαρία και η Πολωνία έχουν πάρει εξάιρεση από την αγορά δικαιωμάτων αερίων ρύπων ενώ δεν ισχύει παρόμοια εξάιρεση για την Ελλάδα, με αποτέλεσμα η ελληνική ΔΕΗ να ζημιώνεται 400 εκατομμύρια EUR το χρόνο. Ταυτόχρονα, στην περιοχή γύρω από την Ελλάδα, οι βιομηχανίες στη Τουρκία, στη Βουλγαρία, στα Σκόπια, στην Αλβανία λειτουργούν όπως είναι και δεν δεσμεύονται από κανέναν περιορισμό. Το σύστημα λοιπόν είναι παράλογο και θα έπρεπε να έχει δοθεί και εξάιρεση και στην Ελλάδα για να μπορεί να λειτουργήσει η ΔΕΗ όπως λειτουργεί η βουλγαρική ομόλογος της, με εξάιρεση. Ευχαριστώ πολύ.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir machen im Moment wirklich eine ganze Menge auf EU Ebene, wenn es darum geht, das Klima zu schützen, Energie einzusparen, effizienter damit umzugehen, insgesamt könnte man also sagen: unsere Schöpfung mitzuerhalten und dazu beizutragen. Das ist eine ziemlich starke Herausforderung, weil wir zum Einen ehrgeizig sein wollen. Paris ist angesprochen worden, COP21, 22 und 23 hatten wir auch schon. Wir wollen das Klima schützen. Wir wollen es aber nicht alleine, wir wollen das möglichst weltweit machen, und wir wollen natürlich auch dabei sehen, dass wir zwar das Verursacherprinzip anwenden und sagen: Wer das Klima schädigt, der muss auch entsprechend dafür entschädigen und bezahlen. Das ist vollkommen richtig. Wir müssen aber auch in Betracht ziehen, dass wir Arbeitsplätze nicht gefährden wollen, dass wir ja auch wettbewerbsfähig bleiben wollen und dass wir möglichst ein ausgewogenes Instrument haben wollen.

ETS ist ein marktwirtschaftliches Instrument, das gut funktioniert. Ich glaube, dieser Kompromiss, den wir bei der Verhandlung gefunden haben – Julie Girling, herzlichen Dank –, der ist wirklich gut. Denn wenn keiner hundertprozentig zufrieden ist – so habe ich den Eindruck –, ist es immer ganz gut. Also ich glaube, damit können wir gut leben, darauf können wir gut aufbauen, darauf können wir stolz sein.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, há um problema de partida na abordagem ao objetivo de redução das emissões dos gases de efeito de estufa que é a opção e a insistência numa abordagem de mercado que revelou soberamente não apenas a sua ineficácia, mas também a sua perversidade.

A partir do clamoroso falhanço inicial, pensaram algumas boas almas que, colocando alguns remendos no sistema, ele nos conduziria finalmente aos proclamados objetivos. Debalde. A criação de um comércio de licenças para poluir lançou as bases de mais um esquema milionário de geração de ativos financeiros fictícios, quem sabe se mais uma bolha especulativa pronta a ser insuflada. Nada fez, nem faz, pela desejada redução de gases com efeito de estufa, sobretudo se a queremos concretizada num quadro de justiça social e de sustentabilidade económica.

O que seria um mirífico incentivo à adoção de tecnologias hipocarbónicas tornou-se o maior desincentivo. Deixar nas mãos do mercado objetivos ambientais, que bem podiam e deviam ser lembrados por outras vias, será útil para alguns, sem dúvida, mas prejudicial para o ambiente e para as populações.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Miguel Arias Cañete, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank all of you for your constructive work throughout the intensive co-decision process and for your interventions in this debate. As I have said before, we can be proud of the result of our joint efforts and I count on your support in tomorrow's vote.

The European Union Emissions Trading System (ETS) is a key instrument of our climate policy and we all managed to agree on a solid and robust framework for the next decade to ensure that we meet our ambitious emissions reduction target, while preserving the competitiveness of our industry and fostering low-carbon innovation and modernisation.

Internationally, many are looking at us and our European Union ETS as a model to develop similar forward-looking climate policies, and by putting in place the necessary legislation to renew and strengthen the European Union ETS, the European Union confirms its determination to lead the way in the fight against climate change and honouring our commitments under the Paris Agreement.

Let me make a final comment because there have been some interventions relating to the need for a centralised fund for indirect cost compensation. I know that this was a particularly difficult chapter in the negotiations, with almost irreconcilable views on issues such as a fully harmonised system. Indirect cost compensation will be continued in the form of state-aid schemes. We will not, however, see a mere continuation of the past. The continued use of a state-aid scheme is accompanied by substantially enhanced and timely transparency in reporting requirements.

Every Member State providing state aid will, as soon as the legislation is in force, have to publish, within three months of the end of a calendar year, the actual amount of compensation paid out in total and the benefiting sector, and this is a substantial improvement. The enhanced reporting that has been agreed will already start this year, and as part of future reviews the ETS Directive clearly foresees that the Commission should also consider whether measures in relation to indirect cost compensation should be further harmonised.

I hope that all of you will support this ETS new system because we have made a big effort to seek compromise. Our rapporteur did excellent work, as did all the shadow rapporteurs, and in this spirit of compromise we have improved the system that, as some of you said, has not worked perfectly in the past, but really this time I think we are going in the right direction and I hope it delivers as much as we expect from the work we have done.

Julie Girling, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank everybody who spoke. It is very kind of you all – well, most of you – to speak highly of the work that we have done, but let us remember that it was a joint effort.

When you are listening to a debate like this, it is easy to get hung up on all the detail, all the things that we could have done, or should have done, a little bit better, or the bits we left out and the Member States for whom it does not quite fit. So we have to bring ourselves back to basics and remember that the cap-and-trade system gives us the opportunity for an increased carbon price, which creates the incentive for industry to invest. It also creates a huge amount of money for Member States to invest in their own industry around the whole issue of decarbonising technology.

I think we need to call on all those Member States, as we conclude these negotiations and put this into law. We need to call on all of those Member States to remember that this does not constitute drawing a line which they do not have to pass. They can see this as just the start of the efforts they make towards achieving our Paris commitments. There is so much that they could do, and here we really need to hold their feet to the fire, to make sure they take advantage of the flexibilities that we have given them, and that we have built in, in order to achieve and invest wisely for the future.

As all of you know, this will probably be the last thing for which I take responsibility as a rapporteur, but I can assure you that I will be going back to my Member State and trying, firstly, to sort out what we are going to do when we are not part of this ETS system. Whatever comes of that, I hope it will complement it well, that my own Member State will continue to be an exemplar in terms of carbon-reduction investment and that we will be able to continue to work together in the happy spirit that we have done.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tiistaina 6. helmikuuta 2018.

23. Przyspieszenie innowacji w dziedzinie czystej energii (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Jerzy Buzekin teollisuus-, tutkimus- ja energiavaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö puhtaan energian innovoinnin nopeuttamisesta (2017/2084(INI)) (A8-0005/2018)

Jerzy Buzek, *sprawozdawca*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kontynuujemy debatę w kwestiach energetycznych. Wiadomo, że energia jest najważniejszą sprawą dla gospodarki. Trudno funkcjonować z nienaładowanym telefonem, samochodem bez benzyny, zimnymi kaloryferami czy niedziałającą aparaturą w fabrykach, urzędach czy szpitalach. Chcemy mieć bezpieczeństwo dostaw – to jest podstawa naszego działania. Chcemy jak najmniej obciążać środowisko – chodzi o klimat, ale chodzi także o wyeliminowanie takich zjawisk jak smog. I wreszcie chcemy, aby ceny za energię nie były zbyt wysokie – chcemy zachować konkurencyjność przemysłu. Mamy przy okazji pakiet czystej energii i sama nazwa tego pakietu mówi, o jaką energię, o jaką przyszłość energetyczną i jaką transformację w Unii Europejskiej chodzi. Jeśli to wszystko weźmiemy razem, to w zasadzie możemy sobie poradzić na dłuższą metę tylko dzięki temu, że będziemy inwestować w

nowe technologie energetyczne. Jest to sprawa zasadnicza dla naszej przyszłości i przyszłości transformacji energetycznej. Chcemy na pewno uwolnić inwestycje publiczne, środki prywatne, a także aktywność obywateli w zakresie wspomagania naszych działań na rzecz nowych rozwiązań dotyczących energetyki. Chodzi także o neutralność technologiczną, która została zagwarantowana w porozumieniu paryskim.

Trzy punkty wydają mi się najważniejsze w kwestii inwestowania w nowe technologie w Unii Europejskiej. Przede wszystkim uproszczenie programów i funduszy unijnych. Mówmy o tym od dawna, ale jeśli naprawdę chcemy skorzystać na dłuższą metę z funduszy na rzecz nowych technologii energetycznych, musimy koniecznie tego dokonać. I musimy zwiększyć finansowanie energetyki, nowych technologii energetycznych. W programie ramowym chcielibyśmy, żeby to było co najmniej 120 mld euro, ale chodzi o to, aby fundusze na energetykę procentowo zwiększyć o 50 %. I wreszcie, większe nakłady krajowe są bardzo potrzebne, ale absolutnie niezbędna jest koordynacja wydatków krajowych oraz wydatków europejskich, gdyż często powtarzamy te same badania i nie jesteśmy wystarczająco efektywni. Proszę pamiętać, że mamy nasz europejski instytut czystych technologii, który zajmuje się innowacjami i technologiami, a połowa jego działań służy doskonaleniu technologii energetycznych. Powinniśmy wykorzystać ten instytut. Mamy również Centrum Czystych Technologii Węglowych, które zostało sfinansowane z pieniędzy europejskich. Mamy cyfryzację, mamy problemy w transporcie, w budownictwie, mamy swoją politykę środowiskową, politykę regionalną, mamy połączenia infrastrukturalne – musimy wszystkie te programy połączyć. Tylko takie działanie może nam naprawdę przynieść zmiany w zakresie transformacji technologii energetycznych, bo transformujemy nie tylko nasz rynek energetyczny, ale transformujemy również technologie. Wszystkie te działania powinny wspierać innowacje w zakresie generowania, przesyłania, magazynowania i zużywania energii.

Carlos Moedas, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all let me congratulate the honourable Member, Professor Jerzy Buzek, and the respective shadow rapporteurs for the constructive, thorough and positive report on the Communication on accelerating clean energy innovation.

The suggestions proposed confirm and reinforce the Commission's position and will be instrumental in the ongoing implementation. We have presented the progress made last year in the Communication on the State of the Energy Union, but the coming year will be crucial. To this end, the Commission will continue to focus on the four flagships that we decided on in the Communication: e-mobility, decarbonising buildings, renewables and – last but not least – storage. In doing so, as noted in your report, coherence of EU actions is absolutely necessary. We are focused on building and reinforcing synergies across funding instruments and stakeholders, and on aligning our policies to support innovation and not hamper it.

Your report is clear: public procurement can be a powerful tool to support the market uptake for clean energy innovation. Within the Commission we are looking at ways and mechanisms to incentivise EU public bodies to use demand as a tool to foster innovation.

I am also pleased to see that we are aligned on the need to provide long-term financing certainty to better support and align incentives for innovators and investors. As you know, discussions on the design of FP9 are ongoing, and we take note of your suggestions with regard to the budget. Your assessment that funding for clean energy research and innovation will require a tremendous increase are the same as our conclusions. We agree with you, other international organisations agree with you, and we have to fight for that.

On your point on the EU's global clean energy leadership: we are the leaders. Europe is the leader and we should shout more about it. How many people are still surprised when we say that 40% of the patents in renewable technologies are European? Our leadership is also clear in the Mission Innovation initiative, gathering together 22 countries and the EU. At the time, I was introduced by the US Secretary of Energy as someone coming from the only country in the world that was able to run for four days straight on renewable energy alone. That is European leadership.

We are also working closely with other global initiatives, such as the Breakthrough Energy Coalition created by Bill Gates, which is now exploring a public-private collaboration with the Commission and four other Mission Innovation members.

Our views also coincide on the citizen's central role in energy innovation that you referred to. There is a need for a transformation of mindset and the development of new skills. The role of the Commission is to facilitate, but also to take account of more interdisciplinarity and user innovation in future calls. The legislative package you are currently negotiating with the Council reflects the central role given to consumers in all aspects: innovative services, technology, products and integration methodologies. We cannot do it alone, so thank you very much and I hope to keep working together for the future.

(Applause)

Stefan Eck, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit*. – Frau Präsidentin, werde Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Während Energiearmut rund 54 Millionen EU-Bürger betrifft, verhindern auf der anderen Seite einige unserer Politiken und Maßnahmen, dass wir den Zielen der Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung wirklich konsequent folgen. Greifende Maßnahmen in den Bereichen nachhaltige Energie und Klimawandel sind aber dringend erforderlich, das wissen wir alle – abgesehen von unserem Kollegen Korwin-Mikke. Mehr als je zuvor sehen wir uns mit all den negativen Auswirkungen unserer vergangenen Entscheidungen konfrontiert. Aber trotz internationaler Verpflichtungen und trotz des fortschreitenden Klimawandels tun verschiedene Mitgliedstaaten immer noch viel zu wenig für die Energiewende.

Vor diesem Hintergrund möchte ich die Kommission ermutigen, folgende Aufforderung an die Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten zu richten: Subventionen für fossile Brennstoffe müssen schnellstmöglich abgeschafft werden. Wir brauchen auf nationaler und kommunaler Ebene dringend Projekte für saubere Energie mit strengen Zeitvorgaben. Beim Umbau hin zu erneuerbaren Energien müssen die Beschäftigten aus dem fossilen Sektor öffentliche Garantien erhalten, die einen sozialen Übergang der Energiewende gewährleisten.

Isabella De Monte, *relatrice per parere della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea è da anni impegnata contro il cambiamento climatico attraverso lo sviluppo di energie rinnovabili nel settore dell'industria, dei trasporti e nella costruzione di edifici.

Nei prossimi anni, per continuare ad essere leader mondiali in tali tematiche, sarà importante migliorare l'accesso ai fondi europei per quelle nuove tecnologie che, in completa rottura col passato, si focalizzano su un'economia a basso utilizzo di carbone e carburanti fossili.

Inoltre, l'Europa dovrà cooperare sia con gli Stati membri sia con le piccole e medie imprese per mantenere gli impegni che sono stati assunti con l'accordo sul clima di Parigi. L'Unione europea dovrà concentrare le proprie azioni soprattutto nel settore dei trasporti, che è stato troppo a lungo esonerato dal dare il proprio contributo alla diminuzione di emissioni di carbonio.

Infine, voglio ricordare che puntare sull'efficienza dei trasporti pubblici e sull'energia pulita permetterà di sviluppare il turismo sostenibile.

Monika Smolková, *Spravodajkyňa Výboru pre regionálny rozvoj požiadaného o stanovisko*. – Pani predsedajúca, kvalita životného prostredia je jeden z najdôležitejších faktorov pre všetkých občanov Európskej únie. Preto aj investície do čistej energie sú investíciami do kvality životného prostredia. Hovorím za výbor REGI, preto chcem pripomenúť, že európske investičné a štrukturálne fondy ponúkajú významné možnosti na inovácie v oblasti energetiky a na ich zavádzanie na trh. Ale súčasne nie sú všeliakom. Preto vítame zámer Komisie zaviesť ciele finančné nástroje v záujme dosiahnutia primeranej rovnováhy medzi grantmi a inými finančnými nástrojmi. Verejno-súkromné partnerstvá a spoločné podniky v oblasti výskumu, vývoja a inovácií by mohli podnietiť investície súkromného sektora do oblasti čistej energie. Pritom nesmieme zabudnúť na kľúčovú úlohu regiónov, miest a obcí, pretože práve ony spolurozhodujú a nesú zodpovednosť pri prechode na iné zdroje energie. Sú oprávnenými žiadateľmi finančných zdrojov z európskych fondov a sú zdrojom informovanosti občanov o cieľoch a možnostiach zapojenia sa do prechodu na zdroje čistej energie.

Puhemies. – Tässä vaiheessa minun on valitettavasti ilmoitettava, että ilta on edennyt niin pitkälle, että en voi myöntää catch-the-eye-puheenvuoroja.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I welcome this report by my very good colleague Jerzy Buzek. I think that it sends an important signal that we, as a Parliament, want to see more support for energy innovation and that we recognise the vital need for this to happen if we are to meet our 2030 targets.

We have traditionally been at the forefront, as Commissioner Moedas has pointed out, but we need to do more because other areas of the world are catching up. For instance, China spent USD 44 billion on investment in clean energy projects in 2017, up from USD 32 billion in 2016. So, while we can be happy with ourselves, the rest of the world is probably moving quicker. Therefore, I really agree with Mr Buzek when he calls for an increased budget for FP9. Horizon 2020 did not make enough funds available.

We also need to look at ensuring that those funds are easily available. As Jerzy Buzek pointed out, we have too many financial instruments and in some of the seminars, etc., that I have held in my own constituency, the point was made to me several times that applying for funds is too complicated. There are too many streams and they need to be coordinated and simplified. I think if we do that in terms of renewable energy, for which I was rapporteur for the EPP, we can reach, and maybe surpass, our 35% target.

Петър Курумбашев, *от името на групата S&D*. – Г-жо Председател, бюджетът на Европейския съюз ще намалее през следващите седем години и в този смисъл е изключително важно, че докладът за ускоряване на иновациите се приема точно в този момент. Бих казал – точно навреме.

Има изкушение, когато бюджетът намалява, да се намаляват точно средствата за иновации за наука и се надявам, че този доклад ще даде силен сигнал да не се намаляват средствата в тази област.

Трябва да обърнем особено внимание на географските различия, особено за разпределението на тези фондове в държавите от Централна и Източна Европа. Трябва да продължи финансирането на проекти в сферата на електрическата мобилност и на водородната мобилност, както на леки коли, така и на автобуси, така и за индустриални нужди.

Позволете ми също да обърна внимание, че трябва да дадем възможност за по-добро менажиране на тези средства на регионално и на местно ниво, а не само на европейско и на национално ниво.

И накрая, позволете ми да благодаря на докладчика г-н Бузек. За мен беше чест да работя с един от представителите на тежката артилерия в този Парламент – г-н Йежи Бузек.

Gesine Meissner, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich zunächst einmal gerade bei unserem Berichterstatter Jerzy Buzek für die gute Zusammenarbeit an diesem Bericht bedanken. Das ist schon ein großer Bericht. Er ist sehr übergreifend, weil es hier um die Energie der Zukunft geht und um Innovationen, die wir dafür brauchen. Jerzy Buzek hat klargemacht: Energie wird für alles auch in Zukunft notwendig sein. Und ich behaupte mal, die saubere Energie, die wir im Zusammenhang mit dem Paket „Saubere Energie für alle Europäer“ wollen, ist vielleicht in vielen Punkten noch gar nicht ausgereift, vielleicht manchmal auch noch gar nicht so bekannt.

Darum, Herr Kommissar Moedas, ist auch Forschung so wichtig, um hier weiterzukommen. Ich denke zum Beispiel – weil ich mich viel mit maritimen Dingen beschäftige – an Energie aus dem Meer. Wir kennen schon Offshore-Anlagen für Windenergie zum Beispiel. Es wird aber geforscht an Wellenenergie, an Tide-Energie, und viele sagen, der Treibstoff der Zukunft für ein Flugzeug kann eventuell aus Algen produziert worden sein, und dann auch eben sehr umweltfreundlich, sogar eben CO₂-neutral. Viele Sachen können wir da noch erreichen.

Wir brauchen Technologieneutralität, wir brauchen viel Forschung. Wir müssen auch sehen, dass die Forschung klar ist, dass auch kleinere Unternehmen und kleinere Forschungseinrichtungen genau wissen, wo sie etwas beantragen können, wenn sie vorankommen möchten, und dass wir auch die Ressourcen in der Forschung möglichst effizient einsetzen. Dann kommen wir auch weiter damit.

Um Innovation wirklich voranzutreiben, brauchen wir auch einen Wettbewerb der verschiedenen Energien. Subventionen zum Anschieben sind gut, aber nicht dauerhaft. Das ist nicht das, was wir brauchen, um in die Zukunft zu schauen.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta. Sabemos que la transición energética es mucho más que un cambio de tecnologías, y que es también un cambio de modelo. La innovación científica y tecnológica tiene sin duda un papel muy importante, pero debe ir acompañada de un cambio profundo del sistema energético y de innovaciones también a nivel social, por ejemplo, que la ciudadanía sea el actor principal y central de esta transición energética.

Y es que este informe nace con un pecado original, a nuestro juicio, que es el concepto de neutralidad tecnológica. Es decir, lo mismo investigamos hoy en combustibles fósiles que en fotovoltaica. Lo que se está haciendo es colorear de verde el carbón; pintarle un molino de viento al gas; o ponerle una aspiradora de humo a una central térmica y llamarlo carbón limpio.

No basta solo con nutrir la ilusión de las falsas soluciones, ni tampoco basta solo con depender del mercado. Para incentivar esta innovación en energías limpias es fundamental fijar objetivos ambiciosos —cosa que no hace esta Cámara ni la propia Unión Europea en su conjunto, pues hay una incoherencia entre las palabras y los hechos—.

El mes pasado, en esta Cámara, los grandes grupos acordaban fijar objetivos de eficiencia energética y de energías renovables de tan solo el 35 %, no vinculantes para los Estados, es decir, poco más de lo que marcan las tendencias del mercado. Los sectores como la innovación en renovables o la eficiencia energética necesitan señales claras de apuesta pública; por eso defendemos que estos estén fuertemente respaldados por el sector público.

Jakop Dalunde, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! EU har en vision om att vi ska vara världsledande på klimatområdet, och i maj kommer kommissionen att presentera större delen av de kommande 7 årens politik och kommer visa hur budgeten och EU:s kommande forsknings- och innovationspolitik kommer se ut. Då kommer det att avgöras om vi kommer att leda eller om vi ska lämna över stafettpippen till andra.

Hörnstenen i EU:s kommande ramprogram för forskning och innovation måste vara klimatet, för om vi inte lyckas göra innovation här, ja, då spelar det ingen roll vad som kommer efter det. Vi måste se ökade satsningar på forskning i EU, men också i medlemsstaternas budgetar. I dessa kollektiva satsningar bör en allt större del satsas på att ta fram morgondagens lösningar för grön omställning. Vi ska se till att ha bra, hållbara transporter och förnybar energi som faktiskt levererar det vi lovade varandra i Paris. Klimatet kan inte vänta.

Dario Tamburrano, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dall'energia derivano la società, il tipo di relazioni, di morale, di leggi e di merci che è possibile produrre. Per accumulare risorse e quindi energia, quante guerre, trattati, annessioni, leggi e classi sociali si sono succeduti nel corso della storia dell'uomo.

L'innovazione tecnologica, invece, è sempre stata lo strumento del cambiamento, anche sociale, da quando l'uomo ha cominciato a usare l'aratro per produrre la prima forma di energia stoccata in maniera organizzata, il cibo.

Come decisori politici dovremmo impegnarci di più a difendere il futuro dalle zavorre del passato, e invece vedo spesso che molti di noi, purtroppo, sono impegnati a difendere il passato dal futuro.

Ringrazio il collega Buzek per aver preso in considerazione i nostri suggerimenti nella relazione. Produrre, consumare, stoccare e scambiare energia tra pari, magari con la *blockchain*, è fondamentale per una svolta decisa verso un modello produttivo più orizzontale, più uguale. La capillare diffusione di piccoli impianti messi in rete può dare un grande impulso alla transizione energetica. Facciamo affinché l'Unione dell'energia, con i cittadini al centro, non rimanga chiusa in un cassetto.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar Moedas! Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation sind gerade im Bereich der sauberen Energie von besonderer Bedeutung, denn nur dadurch kann die industrielle Vorreiterrolle und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit europäischer Unternehmen gesichert und ein nachhaltiges Wachstum und Beschäftigung geschaffen werden.

Die Europäische Union ist heute weltführend bei hochwertigen emissionsarmen Energieinnovationen, Innovationen bei der Energieeffizienz, bei erneuerbaren Energieträgern, intelligenten Netzen, Speichern und der Entwicklung sauberer Technologien.

Um auch in Zukunft am globalen Markt wettbewerbsfähig zu bleiben, muss Innovation im Bereich sauberer Energie jedoch beschleunigt werden. Das Optimierungsspektrum ist dabei weitreichend – von der Vereinfachung beim Zugang zu Forschungsmitteln über PPP-Projekte bis zur Umsetzung von Wissen in wirtschaftlich rentable Produkte. Und: Wir brauchen einen Regulierungs- und Finanzierungsrahmen, der mit dem Energiefahrplan 2050 und dem Pariser Abkommen im Einklang steht.

Als wichtigste Punkte sind dabei zu berücksichtigen – Herr Buzek hat das in seinem Bericht auch getan: die Kohärenz der Maßnahmen auf EU-Ebene, die Finanzierungssicherheit, die Absicherung der weltweiten Führungsrolle und die Mitwirkung der Bürger. Damit Europa weiterhin top bleibt, brauchen wir mehr Mittel, schnellere und bessere F&E für die saubere Energie.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la innovación en energía limpia debe ser un motor para cumplir con nuestros objetivos climáticos y energéticos, y también para aprovechar las oportunidades competitivas que presenta una energía limpia y asequible, asegurando así el liderazgo europeo en energía renovable. Para ello es fundamental eliminar progresivamente los subsidios a los combustibles fósiles, orientando esos recursos a la descarbonización eficiente del sistema. Es necesario el establecimiento de marcos regulatorios estables, así como la coordinación de los distintos instrumentos que fomenten energías y eviten duplicidades. No debemos olvidar que esta innovación debe llegar a todos los ciudadanos y especialmente a aquellos afectados por la pobreza energética.

Por último, esta innovación en transición energética debe ser compartida y exportada a terceros países, facilitando el acceso a la energía limpia. Esto también debe ser parte del liderazgo europeo en el mundo.

Jonathan Bullock (EFDD). – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Buzek for the work he has put into the drafting of this report. I understand his point of view that modern economies are undergoing a profound transition in the way they produce, transmit, store and use energy. However, my party and I cannot ignore the fact that the report agrees with the foolish concept of decarbonising Europe's economy and achieving climate targets as stated in the Paris Agreement.

We cannot deny the importance of fossil fuel energy. First of all, human activity contributes only 3% to the global carbon cycle. Secondly, coal use is on the increase globally and nothing we in Europe can do will stop it. We hear a lot about China's increase of, say, solar power but not so much about their increasing coal-fired generation. Furthermore, the emissions savings achieved by renewables have been exaggerated. Wind is intermittent and it requires conventional backup. That means that backup is run intermittently and inefficiently, which means more fuel and more emissions. Things need to be done differently.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, no mundo global em que hoje vivemos, uma potência económica como a União Europeia tem que estar na fronteira tecnológica em todos os sectores e alguns deles tem que assumir, de forma consistente, a liderança.

Face à sua dependência de abastecimento externo nos combustíveis fósseis e ao compromisso de digitalização e descarbonização, a transição energética tem que ser um dos setores em que essa liderança se tem que afirmar e para ela têm de ser canalizados recursos, talentos e determinação política, até porque ela convoca os saberes primordiais, como a matemática, a física, a química, a biologia, as ciências sociais, e promove a integração entre a digitalização e a descarbonização.

Saúdo, por isso, este relatório, pela sua oportunidade e pela riqueza do seu conteúdo. A União Europeia partiu à frente, mas tem estado, infelizmente, a perder vantagem na transição energética. Na mobilidade limpa já foi mesmo ultrapassada por outras potências industriais. Façamos, por isso, Sr. Comissário, Caros Colegas, deste relatório um impulso mobilizador ao serviço dos cidadãos e das gerações futuras.

Carlos Moedas, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the Commission and this House are already working together very closely, but any achievements would require many other partners – the Member States, private investors, industry and the citizens. It is through the engagement of all that we can do it, because today we cannot do it alone.

Looking ahead to the next framework programme, we will continue to invest. We will continue to increase the investment in clean energy, but we have to do more than that. We have to do more in terms of the way we look at innovation. Firstly, we have to simplify; as Mr Buzek rightly said, we have to be simpler. We have to create our own brand of innovation that everybody knows.

That is why we are looking at the idea of the European Innovation Council, the idea that we have to grasp innovation that comes from different sides, from the intersection of disciplines, as Mr Zorrinho rightly said, from the intersection of the physical and the digital worlds, through this idea of creating innovation that comes and solves our problems in ways and in many different places that we cannot even imagine.

Secondly, we have to link with the citizens: link with the citizens with mission-driven science, with ideas that people understand, with ideas that people can link to Europe, and that is also part of our project. Clean energy is a mission and that mission is the mission of Europe; we have to put it in words that people want to understand.

The other day in the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy one of the honourable Members, Claude Turmes, gave great examples of that. He said: 'Let's achieve a zero-carbon city. Let's achieve a zero-carbon chemical industry. Let's achieve a zero-carbon boat'. So let's work on it.

Jerzy Buzek, *sprawozdawca*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy, chciałbym Panu podziękować za przygotowanie komunikatu Komisji Europejskiej w tak bardzo ważnej kwestii jak innowacje w dziedzinie energetyki. Cały czas mówimy o pakiecie czystej energii, mówimy o ubóstwie energetycznym, mówimy o bezpieczeństwie dostaw. Nie poradzimy sobie bez tego rodzaju innowacji, o których tu mówimy.

Przed wszystkim musimy zmienić świadomość naszych obywateli. To już nie będzie tylko kwestia zmiany dostawcy energii czy kupna sprzętu o odpowiedniej klasie energetycznej. Ja jestem przekonany, że dzięki aplikacji mobilnej już wkrótce kupimy potrzebny prąd od małej spółdzielni na przykład w Lizbonie, posiadającej panele słoneczne na dachach okolicznych kamienic, albo po zakupach nasza lodówka wyliczy zapotrzebowanie na prąd, połączy się z portalem energetycznym i wyliczy potrzebną moc od właściciela elektrowni geotermicznej w słowackim Popradzie, albo nasz samochód elektryczny naładowany w nocnej taryfie odsprzeda część energii po dziennych stawkach, czekając na parking w pracy. Okna w naszym domu będą utrzymywać ciepło, ale również dzięki odpowiednim zainstalowanym urządzeniom wtopionym w szybach będą produkowały energię elektryczną, a więc to jest zupełnie nowa, atrakcyjna przyszłość. Jeśli nie przekonamy naszych obywateli, że o to warto walczyć, że to da nam również oszczędności energetyczne, oszczędności w naszych portfelach, to nie wygramy. Dlatego dziękujemy za akcję, Panie Komisarzy.

Ja chciałbym podziękować wszystkim kontrsprawozdawcom, pracowaliśmy rzeczywiście bardzo zgodnie. Zaczynaliśmy z nieco różnych punktów widzenia, ale udało nam się wykonać zadanie w taki sposób, że komisja przegłosowała sprawozdanie zdecydowaną większością. Bardzo wszystkim koleżankom i kolegom dziękuję.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tiistaina 6. helmikuuta 2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Andor Deli (PPE), *írásban*. – Tisztelt képviselőtársaim, a tiszta energiák terén igen éles verseny alakult ki az európai és más globális gazdasági hatalmak között, a párizsi klímacélok eléréséhez szükséges további lépéseket tenni, ezért kiemelten fontos a tiszta energiákkal kapcsolatos kutatások és fejlesztések támogatása. Az innovációk legnagyobb szízelékát a kis- és középvállalkozások fejlesztik ki, viszont az új technológiák kutatása és fejlesztése igen magas anyagi befektetést is igényel és egyben nagy kockázatot is jelent, ezért az EU egyik feladata e kockázati szint csökkentése.

Nem szabad elfeledkeznünk a kevésbé fejlett régiókról sem. Köztudott, hogy a technológia fejlesztések nagy része az EU legfejlettebb régióiban koncentrálódik, és a többi régió késéssel importálja az új fejlesztéseket. Ezért, második fontos feladatnak tartom, hogy biztosítva legyen a lehető leggyorsabb technológiai tranzíció, így hozzájárulva a területi kohézióhoz is. Sajnos nem tudok egyetérteni a jelentés azon részével, amely az energiatámogatások kivételével kapcsolatos, Magyarország és magyar néppárti delegáció számára a rezsicsökkentés kiemelt nemzeti érdek. Köszönöm, hogy meghallgattak!

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O sentido da mudança tecnológica – seus pressupostos e consequências – não é dissociável do contexto económico e social em que essa mudança se opera. Se quisermos, da formação socioeconómica vigente. Num sector energético liberalizado (e por isso mesmo tendencialmente concentrado), dominado desde a produção à distribuição e consumo pelos interesses de grandes grupos, atuando em regime de oligopólio, os pressupostos, os volumes, as opções e os resultados dos investimentos na inovação serão seguramente distintos dos que se poderão obter num quadro, que defendemos, de controlo público, democrático, sobre este sector estratégico. Será neste quadro que os desafios da sustentabilidade e da inovação poderão ser melhor abordados, assegurando a prevalência do interesse público e salvaguardando o futuro do planeta e dos seus recursos. Despejar milhões de um qualquer futuro Programa-Quadro de Investigação nas multinacionais do sector, a pretexto do apoio à investigação e desenvolvimento (como de certa forma já sucede com o Horizonte 2020), não nos aproximará de tal desiderato, bem pelo contrário.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D), per iscritto. – Gli assi di movimento fondamentale della transizione energetica dell'UE sono confluite nella strategia «Europa 2020» nonché nel quadro 2030 per il clima e l'energia e nella strategia energetica 2050 che ci siamo prefissati come Unione. In linea con questi ultimi, la competitività e la sostenibilità della politica energetica europea saranno garantite solamente con un incessante stimolo all'innovazione nel settore dell'energia pulita. La Comunicazione della Commissione che discutiamo quest'oggi riafferma quest'indispensabile passaggio, coerentemente con le tre relazioni votate a gennaio del cosiddetto pacchetto Energia, avviato dalla Commissione europea nel novembre 2016: una direttiva riveduta sull'efficienza energetica, una proposta di fusione della direttiva sulla promozione dell'uso dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili e un nuovo regolamento sulla *governance* dell'Unione dell'energia. Sarà quindi essenziale avere una visione coerente a livello dell'UE e degli Stati membri, sebbene nel rispetto dei diversi mercati nazionali del settore. In questo senso, non dovranno mancare nel medio e lungo periodo adeguati investimenti, tanto nei finanziamenti quanto nel capitale umano, rappresentato in questo settore non solo dal capitale per la ricerca ma anche dal diretto coinvolgimento dei cittadini europei, prosumatori del nostro mercato energetico e innovatori in questa lunga transizione verso un'appropriazione sociale dell'energia europea.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – Obywatele są kluczem do udanego wprowadzania niskoemisyjnych innowacyjnych rozwiązań – od inteligentnych liczników w swoich domach po duże farmy wiatrowe. Decydujące znaczenia ma znajdowanie nowych, lepszych sposobów angażowania obywateli Europy w przejście na gospodarkę niskoemisyjną oraz dopuszczenie do głosu istniejącego dużego poparcia publicznego. Bardziej zaangażowani obywatele ponoszą większą odpowiedzialność za bezpieczeństwo energetyczne własne i UE oraz pomagają opracować nowe i oryginalne modele biznesowe. By pomóc obywatelom Europy zmienić nastawienie oraz zrozumieć, w jaki sposób mogą oni wprowadzić innowacje i wykorzystywać narzędzia cyfrowe do produkcji, konsumpcji i zachowania bardziej zrównoważonej i czystej energii, należy wprowadzić systemowe programy edukacji. Konieczne jest także obniżenie bariery wejścia na rynek tak, aby ułatwić obywatelom uczestniczenie w nim, a także zapewnić otwartość, przejrzystość i uczciwą konkurencję. Unia Europejska musi stać się światowym liderem w dziedzinie innowacji energetycznych. Musi ponadto uprościć unijne programy i fundusze, aby inwestorzy i naukowcy mogli wykorzystywać je w sposób bardziej skuteczny. Przyspieszenie przejścia na konkurencyjną gospodarkę niskoemisyjną jest zarówno pilną koniecznością, jak i ogromną szansą dla Europy.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), în scris. – Accelerarea tranziției către o economie competitivă cu emisii reduse de carbon reprezintă atât o necesitate urgentă, cât și o oportunitate extraordinară pentru Europa, iar inovația este cheia. Raportul din proprie inițiativă „Accelerarea inovării în domeniul energiei curate” solicită o politică de inovare privind energia coerentă cu acordurile de la Paris și obiectivele UE privind energia și schimbările climatice.

Cum obiectivul comunicării Comisiei este de a stabili o strategie pentru pârgھیile de politică pe care UE le poate desfășura, pentru a stimula investițiile private în inovarea în domeniul energiei curate, prezentul raport invită Comisia să considere dimensiunea energetică o parte orizontală a politicii industriale a UE și să introducă eficiența energetică ca prioritate orizontală transversală, aplicată tuturor sectoarelor de activitate.

Stimularea inovării în domeniul energiei este posibilă prin centrarea sistemului energetic pe utilizator, prin luarea în considerare a aspectelor sociale relevante pentru inovația energetică, prin cooperarea tuturor părților implicate în acest proces și printr-o creștere substanțială a resurselor financiare pentru dezvoltarea și adoptarea de soluții inovatoare în domeniul energiei curate.

24. Sprzeciw wobec aktu wykonawczego: Dodanie Sri Lanki, Trynidadu i Tobago oraz Tunezji do wykazu krajów trzecich wysokiego ryzyka (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana päätöslauselmaesitys komission 13. joulukuuta 2017 antamasta delegoidusta asetuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivin (EU) 2015/849 täydentämisestä annetun delegoidun asetuksen (EU) 2016/1675 muuttamisesta lisäämällä Sri Lanka, Trinidad ja Tobago sekä Tunisia liitteessä olevan I kohdan taulukkoon, jonka Marie-Christine Vergiat, Cornelia Ernst, Marisa Matias, Merja Kyllönen, Helmut Scholz, Barbara Spinelli ja Lola Sánchez Caldentey ovat jättäneet käsiteltäväksi GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta työjärjestyksen 105 artiklan 3 kohdan mukaisesti (C(2017)8320 - 2017/3020(DEA)) (B8-0074/2018).

Marie-Christine Vergiat, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, comme d'autres, c'est avec surprise et incompréhension que, le 5 décembre 2017, j'ai vu apparaître la Tunisie sur la liste noire des paradis fiscaux, pilotée par le Conseil, puis, le 13 décembre, sur la liste des pays à haut risque en matière de blanchiment d'argent et de financement du terrorisme, pilotée par la Commission.

Pour la première liste, le Conseil est revenu sur sa décision, le 23 janvier 2018, et a sorti la Tunisie de cette liste en même temps que sept autres pays, dont le Panama. Dont acte. Mais pour l'autre, la Commission maintient sa position, et je n'ai pas été convaincue par ses arguments, le 29 janvier dernier, lors de la réunion LIBE-ECON. C'est pourquoi, au nom de mon groupe, j'ai déposé cette objection pour que la plénière puisse s'exprimer.

La question n'est pas la lutte contre le blanchiment d'argent ou le financement du terrorisme – nous sommes tous d'accord pour aller de l'avant et même plus –, c'est une question d'affichage et de priorités en ce domaine. La liste noire en question ne comportait au début de décembre que onze pays, dont cinq du MENA, tous en guerre. Afghanistan, Iraq, Syrie, Yémen plus l'Iran, mais pas la Libye et aucun pays du Golfe. Que vient faire là la Tunisie?

On nous dit, en off bien sûr, que d'autres pays vont venir, y compris des pays européens. Permettez-moi d'être sceptique. On nous dit aussi que l'inscription sur cette liste ne vaut pas sanction, mais surveillance accrue. C'est vrai, mais quel signal envoie-t-on aux investisseurs et aux créanciers de la Tunisie? Quels dégâts auront été faits d'ici à ce que la Commission revienne sur son acte délégué? Le fera-t-elle? Et si, oui, quand?

La Tunisie demeure fragile économiquement; elle avance pas à pas dans sa transition démocratique. Faut-il rappeler que ses nouvelles institutions n'ont vraiment commencé leurs travaux qu'en 2015 et que la modification de la législation sur ces sujets a été parmi les premières mesures prises? Ce qui a enclenché la procédure du GAFI! C'est un comble! Est-ce vraiment la meilleure façon de soutenir la Tunisie, comme nous ne cessons de le proclamer, que de la faire figurer sur cette liste?

L'évaluation du GAFI sur laquelle repose la décision de la Commission date de mai 2016. Or, une nouvelle évaluation a été publiée le 6 décembre 2017, soit avant la publication de l'acte délégué. Le GAFI lui-même vient d'en tirer les conséquences en sortant la Tunisie des pays à haut risque et en la mettant sur la liste des pays sous surveillance, ce qui entérine les avancées et les engagements du gouvernement tunisien. Plus de 26 engagements honorés au début de décembre et d'autres depuis!

Alors, pourquoi la Commission veut-elle à tout prix maintenir la Tunisie sur cette liste? N'y a-t-il pas d'autres pays, plus dangereux pour l'Union européenne, à y inscrire de façon plus urgente? Est-ce si compliqué de refaire l'acte délégué? Comment travaille la Commission sur les pays du GAFI et selon quelles priorités? M^{me} Mogherini a rappelé, encore aujourd'hui, que la stabilité de la Tunisie et la pleine réalisation de sa transition démocratique sont des questions prioritaires pour l'Union européenne, qui sera toujours aux côtés de ce pays.

Alors, il faut agir en ce sens, Madame la Commissaire. Je crains personnellement que les enjeux soient autres et que l'on cherche à faire pression sur la Tunisie pour qu'elle mette en œuvre plus rapidement d'autres réformes, notamment certaines réformes dites «structurelles». Pour vraiment soutenir la Tunisie, je vous invite, mes chers collègues, à voter en faveur de cette objection afin de mettre enfin en cohérence les discours et les actes.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing within the European Union and globally is a major political priority for all the EU institutions. This Parliament, in particular, has fought hard to ensure that our rules against money laundering set a gold standard for the world, most recently in December when we reached agreement on the latest upgrade of the Anti-Money-Laundering Directive.

The list of high-risk third countries plays an important role in the EU's framework and in protecting the EU financial system against the risk of money laundering and terrorist financing.

As regards Tunisia, the situation is clear. Tunisia still shows strategic deficiencies in this field, which today justify its inclusion on the EU list of high-risk third countries. The Commission welcomes and supports Tunisia's efforts to remedy the situation. An action plan was agreed between Tunisia and the Financial Action Task Force in December. The Commission strongly welcomes the fact that Tunisia is now accelerating the implementation of those agreed actions. We are in close contact and have regular meetings with the Tunisian authorities in this regard, but there is still work to be done, notably as regards regulation and supervision of the non-financial sector, transparency of beneficial ownership and targeted financial sanctions. We count on Tunisia to remove those deficiencies swiftly, on the basis of the action plan agreed with the Financial Action Task Force, and the Commission stands ready to provide support.

The Commission exchanged views on this issue in a joint meeting of the Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) and Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) committees last week, and the Commission made a formal declaration, describing the situation as I have just done and making a commitment to support Tunisia in this process.

Today, I would like to reaffirm that Tunisia is a privileged partner for the European Union, and we commit to reassessing Tunisia's progress as soon as possible during this year of 2018, with the aim of Tunisia being de-listed both by the Financial Action Task Force and by the EU. However, we are not there yet. There is still work to be done by Tunisia, and until then we have to fulfil our responsibility to protect the European Union and its financial system against the risks of money laundering and terrorist financing.

I would like to thank the ECON and LIBE committees for supporting this view last week, and I call on this plenary likewise to assume its responsibility.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, je suis un peu embarrassé parce que mon groupe a déjà discuté de cette question il y a quelques heures, et, malheureusement, nous n'avons pas pu prendre une décision. Nous avons finalement décidé que chacun voterait demain selon sa conscience. Le vote sera libre.

Je suis ensuite un peu triste parce que je vois que nous discutons uniquement de la Tunisie. Bien sûr, nous avons beaucoup de raisons de discuter de la Tunisie, mais nous oublions aussi un autre pays qui se trouve sur cette liste, le Sri Lanka. Je rappelle d'ailleurs que, tout comme nous soutenons le processus démocratique en Tunisie, nous soutenons également les changements politiques importants et récents au Sri Lanka. Nous avons aidé ce pays à recevoir le GSP+ et, maintenant, nous l'oublions un peu.

Je suis donc très proche des Tunisiens et des Sri-Lankais, surtout parce que je crois que nous devons être cohérents. Nous avons envoyé ces dernières années beaucoup de messages de soutien, nous avons donné de l'argent à ces pays et, maintenant, nous les voyons se retrouver sur cette liste des pays à haut risque, pour les politiques et, plus que pour les politiques, pour les sociétés en Tunisie et au Sri Lanka.

C'est incompréhensible! Personne ne comprend plus rien à ce que fait l'Union européenne. Si nous disons à ces gens que nous voulons les aider et qu'ils sont nos partenaires, mais si nous les inscrivons nous-mêmes sur une liste noire, ils ne vont rien comprendre.

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, sur cette affaire, je crois que vous devez vous engager pleinement avec le Parlement européen. Or, on le voit bien, vous nous abordez du bout des doigts, si j'ose dire.

Vous avez réaffirmé la priorité qu'était la lutte contre le blanchiment de l'argent. Vous savez à quel point ce Parlement est résolument engagé dans cette bataille, mais vous savez aussi que le soutien que vous affirmez vouloir apporter à la Tunisie est pour nous une préoccupation essentielle, compte tenu de l'enjeu stratégique de la relation que l'Union européenne développera avec ce pays.

De ce point de vue, la déclaration que vous avez faite ou que vous avez fait faire par l'un des membres de vos services, lors de la réunion des commissions ECON et LIBE, ne nous satisfait pas. Nous souhaiterions que vous puissiez revendiquer clairement le recours à votre propre grille d'analyse avant le vote de demain, comme vous vous y étiez engagée devant ces mêmes commissions. Vous l'aviez fait le 29 juin dernier, dans un mémorandum, en indiquant que vous utiliseriez votre propre grille d'analyse, indépendamment de celle du GAFI.

Nous souhaitons également que vous vous engagiez à ne pas mélanger toutes les réformes que vous attendez de la Tunisie et que votre décision ne porte que sur la possibilité de sortir ou non ce pays de cette liste. Nous souhaitons que vous vous engagiez à amender la déclaration avant le vote de demain.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a Comissão Europeia, apoiada em recente avaliação do GAFI, classifica a Tunísia, Trindade e Tobago e o Sri Lanka como países de alto risco por sérias deficiências na prevenção do branqueamento de capitais e de financiamento do terrorismo.

Não se pretende estigmatizar nenhum destes países, em particular a Tunísia, que é parceiro estratégico, democracia que queremos ver consolidada no flanco sul da União Europeia, região com grandes riscos e da maior importância para a segurança coletiva.

Importa, sim, reconhecer que este é um dos legados da cleptocracia que durante décadas oprimiu e desgovernou a Tunísia. Os verdadeiros amigos da Tunísia, como eu, não devem baixar o nível de exigência nesta matéria, muito pelo contrário, tal como não baixamos em relação aos próprios Estados-Membros da União Europeia.

Este ato delegado peca, aliás, por não abranger outros países da região que, com certeza, têm problemas de governação e de capacidade técnica muito mais graves. A Líbia foi citada. Por isso, vimos pedindo à Comissão que desenvolva o seu próprio processo de avaliação sem depender do GAFI. As deficiências no sistema de prevenção e de supervisão que levam à inclusão nesta lista podem ser rapidamente superadas pela Tunísia, havendo tanta vontade política em Tunes com há esforço de lóbi no Parlamento Europeu. Importa, assim, que a União Europeia providencie toda a ajuda, incluindo financeira, para apoiar esse esforço das autoridades tunisinas na capacitação. E é por isto, tudo sopesado, que votarei outra vez a favor do ato delegado.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first I would like to inform you about Sri Lanka's deficiencies. Sri Lanka shows deficiencies in international cooperation, in particular the provision of mutual legal assistance, inappropriate regulation and supervision of the non-financial sector, customer due diligence requirements for designated non-financial businesses and professions, weakness in risk-based supervision in the financial sector with a low level of sanctions, shortcomings in access to beneficial ownership information for legal persons, as well as for legal arrangements or inadequate regime on targeted financial sanctions and some other deficiencies.

Turning back to Tunisia, the Commission would like to welcome again the high-level commitment shown by Tunisia and its efforts in addressing its strategic deficiencies in the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing. Strong rules in the area help ensure security and stability, especially in the current context of terrorist threats in the EU and its neighbourhood. They are also necessary to ensure a sound, stable and solid financial system, which is a condition for sustainable growth. The Commission is therefore fully committed to support Tunisia in these efforts. This is something I can promise in this place. We are committed to support and to help. The European Union and Tunisia have a privileged partnership and we are here to support our partners. It is in our mutual interest. Our experts are in close cooperation to provide this assistance.

I hear the concerns expressed by Members of this Parliament today. I also confirm that we will work together to ensure that Tunisia can be rapidly removed, but the actual timing will depend on Tunisia's own efforts. At the same time, I want to reassure you that the EU listing has no punitive intention. It will not hinder our development policy, it will not restrict trade relations, and it will not block financial transactions.

Finally, Parliament has called on the Commission to have a more ambitious and autonomous assessment of third countries' risk. We have to ensure the success of this important process by showing from the beginning that the EU's autonomous assessment is objective and based on facts.

Puhemies. – Olen vastaanottanut yhden työjärjestyksen 105 artiklan 3 kohdan mukaisesti käsiteltäväksi jätetyn päätöslauselmaesityksen1.

Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 7. helmikuuta 2018.

1 Ks. pöytäkirja.

25. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista työjärjestyksen 163 artiklan mukaisesti.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, this is a very important issue for us, with the Commission currently undertaking a regulatory fitness and performance REFIT on the Motor Insurance Directive. As a result of the ECJ's Vnuk judgment, chaos could be caused for the insurance industry in the fields of motorsport, children's motorised toys and lawn mowers, as they could all be compelled to take out very costly insurance. This is a very important point and this is what sometimes happens when judgments are given on a particular case, leading to unintended consequences.

The Commission is close to coming forward with a very sensible suggestion, which is option 3 of their proposals. I am asking the Commissioner to bring forward option 3 as his favoured solution, because I think the vast majority in the industry would see this as the best way of dealing with the unintended consequences of the Vnuk judgment.

Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, egalitatea de șanse nu înseamnă doar obținerea unui loc de muncă, ci șanse egale și reale la educația superioară, astfel încât accesul femeii la funcțiile de decizie să reprezinte o garanție. Există, în continuare, o inegalitate în materia calificării, ceea ce poziționează femeia în imposibilitatea accederii la o poziție de conducere.

Ne dorim de la instituțiile europene să creeze mecanisme eficiente, care să ofere oportunități reale de perfecționare profesională pentru femei și să asigure accesul acestora în topul managementului public sau privat. La nivel european și mondial, femeile în funcții de înaltă responsabilitate, precum cea de prim ministru sau șef de stat, sunt încă destul de rare. Pe de o parte, avem state ca Finlanda, care a avut atât președinte, cât și prim ministru femeie, însă, pe de altă parte, astăzi sunt încă 13 state membre ale Uniunii Europene în care o femeie nu a ocupat niciodată o asemenea funcție. De curând, România reprezintă un exemplu de bună practică, prin investirea în funcția de prim ministru a fostului deputat european, Viorica Dăncilă. În guvernul României, 8 portofolii de ministru sunt ocupate de femei.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Mija kolejna rocznica układów jałtańskich. Tak naprawdę przez całą tę kadencję – od trzech i pół roku – nigdy o tym nie porozmawialiśmy, nawet w okrągłą 70. rocznicę Parlament odrzucił taką możliwość. Tymczasem tak naprawdę to naprawa skutków tamtego podziału Europy, tamtej kapitulacji Zachodu jest rzeczywistym sprawdzianem jedności europejskiej. Europa naprawdę solidarna to Europa usuwająca skutki komunizmu i dominacji sowieckiej w środkowej i wschodniej Europie, i wspierająca, a nie atakująca te państwa, które jej wtedy doświadczyły. Dzisiaj każdy akt przemilczenia Jałty, każde udawanie, że tego nie było, jest przekreślaniem solidarności europejskiej. Czas, żebyśmy zaczęli myśleć o tym wielkim zadaniu, które ciągle mamy do wykonania.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, terrorist attacks have increased in Europe since 2014 and that poses a threat to us. These attacks have happened in London, Paris, Brussels, and now have even reached my own Member State, Sweden. The problem is that terrorists move easily across borders and we are trying to prevent these attacks nationally. We need, therefore, further legislation to effectively counter terrorism. While different measures are certainly necessary, experts agree that increased cooperation between intelligence services is essential.

Today, the intelligence services largely operate within their own borders, but terrorists do not share information and terrorists work across the borders. That is the reason why we need to increase cooperation, sharing intelligence and analyses between the European security intelligence services. That is the only way we can protect Europeans and that is what we have to do.

Marie-Pierre Vieu (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, présentée comme une alliance industrielle répondant aux défis du TGV nouvelle génération et freinant la concurrence chinoise, la fusion Alstom-Siemens est en fait l'absorption de l'entreprise française par le groupe allemand qui, à l'horizon 2023, détiendra 50,5 % du capital. Après General Electric, on choisit donc la finance contre l'emploi, la recherche et le développement.

Les syndicats refusent cette logique, l'association Anticor pointe du doigt le gouvernement français qui organise ce démantèlement et permet au groupe Bouygues d'empocher 500 millions dans l'opération.

Je suis pour un engagement de la France dans l'industrie et une stratégie de relance européenne usant d'un protectionnisme dit solidaire. Je demande à la Commission européenne de défendre une coopération sur le modèle Airbus qui pourrait prendre la forme d'un groupement d'intérêt économique.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta. El vicepresidente de la Comisión, el señor Timmermans, insiste en que no ve ningún problema con el funcionamiento del Estado de Derecho y la separación de poderes en el Estado español. Será porque le parecerá normal que un ministro de Justicia avance en los medios de comunicación decisiones que solo competen a la justicia; o que el Gobierno llame a los magistrados del Tribunal Constitucional para tratar de influir sobre sus decisiones. Será porque le parecerá irrelevante que semejantes actitudes hayan llevado hoy mismo a Jueces para la Democracia a denunciar estas injerencias.

También le parecerá muy en la línea de la separación de poderes que los tribunales le digan a un parlamento cómo debe interpretar su propio reglamento; y le parecerá, sin duda, muy acorde con los derechos fundamentales que un juez mantenga en prisión preventiva a miembros del Gobierno de Cataluña por su ideología independentista, tal y como reconoce en sus autos, que por esta y otras razones son una auténtica demolición del Estado de Derecho.

No hay más ciego que el que no quiere ver. El problema es que el señor Timmermans, como comisario responsable de Estado de Derecho y Derechos Fundamentales, no solo está obligado a ver, sino también a mirar, y a hacerlo sin doble moral.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prendo la parola in quest'Aula del Parlamento europeo per denunciare, per l'ennesima volta, le conseguenze nefaste, le conseguenze negative di un accordo di partenariato economico, di un trattato di libero scambio, questa volta con il Camerun.

Mi sono trovato la settimana scorsa in Sicilia, la mia regione, e a Pachino, nella terra da cui prende il nome lo straordinario pomodoro, il datterino, si trovano nei supermercati i pomodori dal Camerun. I produttori locali non riescono più a stare sul mercato, non riescono più a produrre e ad avere una vita dignitosa.

Ecco, questa globalizzazione a tutti i costi, questo volere per forza favorire sempre multinazionali e grande distribuzione è assolutamente inconcepibile e insostenibile. Peraltro, gli stessi partiti italiani qua rappresentati hanno ratificato e votato questo accordo da tutte le parti, e questa è una cosa assolutamente inaccettabile.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, la Tunisie est en proie à une instabilité chronique depuis la révolution de 2011. Ces dernières semaines, de graves émeutes ont même éclaté dans plusieurs villes. Il faut aider la Tunisie, non par de belles paroles comme le fait le président Macron, mais par des actes. Il y va de notre intérêt car cette instabilité favorise la circulation des terroristes. Interpol vient de révéler que 50 djihadistes tunisiens ont accosté en Italie. L'un deux est déjà en France. Cela confirme l'exactitude de l'analyse du Front national.

L'aide économique aux pays instables est nécessaire mais elle ne suffit pas. Il faut dénoncer l'accord de Schengen et rétablir partout le contrôle par les États de leurs frontières nationales.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Oglądamy w tej chwili dziwny spektakl, mianowicie rząd polski wydał dziwną ustawę chroniącą godność Polski, i o dziwo, jeszcze dziwniej zareagował rząd Izraela, protestując przeciwko temu, że rząd polski nie życzy sobie, żeby o nim źle mówić. Mówi się o tym, że jest to przygrywka do tego, żeby rząd Izraela domagał się od Polski odszkodowań za mienie pozostawione przez Żydów, którzy zmarli bezpotomnie w wyniku działań niemieckich.

Otóż ja chciałbym zwrócić uwagę, że to żądanie, które jest wielokrotnie formułowane, jest całkowicie skrajnym nacjonalizmem, ponieważ pomordowani za okupacji przez Niemców Żydzi byli obywatelami Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, a nie Izraela, którego wtedy nie było. Dlatego ja tylko jedną rzecz chciałbym podkreślić, że kto popiera tego typu żądania, popiera skrajny absolutny nacjonalizm nieznanym w polskim prawie, w prawie europejskim.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τέσσερα χρόνια μετά, δεν έχουμε ακόμη ανταποκριθεί στις δικαίες απαιτήσεις των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών για το προσφυγικό/ μεταναστευτικό πρόβλημα που μας απασχόλησε σε τόσες πολλές συνεδριάσεις. Πρόκειται για ένα θέμα ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων υψίστης σημασίας, αφού εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες άνθρωποι έρχονται στην Ευρώπη προς αναζήτηση ενός αξιοπρεπούς τρόπου επιβίωσης. Στη χώρα μου την Ελλάδα, οι ροές συνεχίζονται κυρίως από τα παράλια της Τουρκίας προς τα νησιά του ΒΑ Αιγαίου. Οι πιέσεις που υφίστανται τα νησιά είναι τεράστιες. Οι υπηρεσίες ασύλου αδυνατούν να ανταποκριθούν στον αριθμό των αιτήσεων και οι κάτοικοι των νησιών, παρά το αποδεδειγμένο πνεύμα φιλοξενίας τους, βρίσκονται σε δεινή θέση. Το σχέδιο αναθεώρησης του Δουβλίνου καθυστερεί ενώ παράλληλα συγκεκριμένες χώρες αρνούνται να επιδείξουν αλληλεγγύη για αναλογική υποδοχή προσφύγων. Δεν έχουμε κατορθώσει να διαχειριστούμε αποτελεσματικά το πρόβλημα αυτό που κλονίζει τη συνοχή μας. Οφείλουμε όλοι ανεξαιρέτως να αναλάβουμε άμεσα τις ευθύνες μας, σεβόμενοι τα ευρωπαϊκά ιδεώδη και την ανθρώπινη ζωή, διότι αλλιώς παρέλκει κάθε συζήτηση για το μέλλον της Ευρώπης στη βάση των θεμελιωδών αξιών της.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, today is Kashmir Solidarity Day. It is a time for us to reflect on the many Kashmiris who are being killed, raped, tortured and injured and their fight for self-determination over the past 70 years. They are not asking for charity. They are asking for their rights, promised to them through UN resolutions.

The world cannot turn a blind eye to the grave human rights violations suffered daily in Indian-controlled Kashmir. The use of pellet guns on children as young as nine is despicable and has been condemned by Amnesty International. Their use must be banned and the Public Safety Act needs to be reformed so that Indian soldiers are accountable for their actions. We need change, progress and action, not just words, on this issue.

If we cannot get justice for the Kashmiris, then there will be no regional peace. Markets and trade can never be more important than lives and human rights. I pay tribute to all those people that have given their lives to the cause and I salute the Kashmiri resilience to this oppression. Their sacrifices must never be forgotten and we need to support the occupied Kashmiris to stop their persecution and suffering, as well as finally giving them their right to self-determination.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Το χθεςινό μεγαλειώδες συλλαλητήριο στην Αθήνα για το Σκοπιανό στέλνει ένα αποφασιστικό μήνυμα στα πέρατα του κόσμου, ότι η Μακεδονία είναι μία και ελληνική. Στέλνει αποφασιστικό μήνυμα ότι ο Ελληνικός λαός δεν ανέχεται το σφετερισμό του ονόματος της Μακεδονίας μας και της Ιστορίας μας από τα Σκόπια. Τα μαζικά συλλαλητήρια στην Αθήνα και στη Θεσσαλονίκη θορύβησαν τα κέντρα εξουσίας στις ΗΠΑ, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, στο ΝΑΤΟ αλλά και στα Σκόπια. Τα Σκόπια οφείλουν να σταματήσουν να χρησιμοποιούν το όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας, οφείλουν να εγκαταλείψουν τις αλυτρωτικές διεκδικήσεις κατά της Ελλάδας και οφείλουν να πάψουν να πιπιλίζουν την καραμέλα της δήθεν μακεδονικής εθνότητας. Το κίνημά μας, «Ελλάδα – Ο Άλλος Δρόμος», είναι αντίθετο σε οποιαδήποτε χρήση του όρου Μακεδονία από τα

Σκόπια, όπως και σε οποιονδήποτε γεωγραφικό προσδιορισμό παραπέμπει και χρησιμοποιεί τη λέξη Μακεδονία στο όνομα των Σκοπίων. Απαιτούμε δημοψήφισμα για το Σκοπιανό και είμαστε αντίθετοι στην ένταξη των Σκοπίων σε Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και NATO.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, today I launched ‘The One Thing’ campaign, aimed at giving young people a space to let us know the one thing that concerns them about Brexit. This is especially important now, as the British Prime Minister has confirmed that Britain will not be part of *the* Customs Union nor of *a* customs union.

The December joint EU-British report on Brexit is clear that there needs to be ‘full regulatory alignment’ between the North and South of Ireland. The British Government must now explain what the ‘specific solutions to address the unique circumstances of the island of Ireland’ are.

For Sinn Féin, this means designated special status; for the Irish Government it is designated special arrangements. Whatever it is called, it must ensure that the North of Ireland remains in the Customs Union and the single market. The assertion by Sammy Wilson of the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) that a brutal Brexit border would result in only a few checks on cross-border trade illustrates either gross ignorance on his part or an underlying desire to see just that, which is what I believe it is.

It must be ensured that the current legal framework retains our rights, and it must be ensured that application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights is also maintained. This is about upholding the Good Friday Agreement in all of its parts.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, de nuevo denuncio la catástrofe judicial en España. Mañana se cumplen cien días del exilio forzoso del Gobierno legítimo de Cataluña; hoy, ciento doce días de la cárcel de Sánchez y Cuixart, dirigentes sociales dignos y pacíficos, y noventa y cinco días de la del exparlamentario europeo y vicepresidente catalán Oriol Junqueras y la de Joaquim Forn, encargado de Interior. Todos sin juicio y con acusaciones ideológicas. España abandona la democracia en Cataluña.

Y también la abandona el Estado mexicano. Doce periodistas asesinados en 2017 y más de cien mil desaparecidos desde 2006. Con total impunidad.

Dos Estados en descomposición democrática: España y México. Y el Parlamento Europeo, que condena centenares de casos, guarda silencio. ¿Hasta cuándo los demócratas tendremos que pasar vergüenza por culpa de una institución como la nuestra que incumple claramente sus compromisos fundacionales?

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Egy 2016 őszén megrendezett európai parlamenti konferencián az ókori mitológiai történet metaforikus értelmében tanácskoztunk Európa újkori elrablásáról. A XX. században ezt tették a totalitárius rendszerek, nevezetesen a szovjet kommunizmus. Másilyen módon és eszközökkel, szintén Európa elrablására törekcszenek azok a globalista hatalmi erők, amelyek a migráció – eme jelenkori népvándorlás – programszerű támogatása, előmozdítása és kiterjesztése révén létében fenyegetik földrészünket.

Álláspontunk szerint Magyarországnak magyar országnak kell maradnia. Az Uniónak és tagállamainak ebben az értelemben kell megvédeniük saját európai és nemzeti identitásukat mindenféle világhatalmi merénylettel szemben.

Răzvan Popa (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, recent, de la nivelul Comisiei Europene au început să apară semnale privind introducerea de criterii suplimentare pentru acordarea fondurilor de dezvoltare către statele membre. Vorbim despre criterii politice, subiective și greu cuantificabile, care pot funcționa drept pretext pentru a reduce fondurile pentru statele membre.

Știu eforturile pe care România le depune pentru a le asigura cetățenilor săi o viață cât mai bună și cunosc cât de mult depind aceste eforturi de fondurile de coeziune. Îmi doresc ca orice decizie ce se discută la nivelul Consiliului European și cel al Comisiei Europene să țină cont, în primul rând, de nevoile de dezvoltare ale statelor membre. Cu cât economiile acestora sunt mai puternice, cu atât mai puternică este Uniunea Europeană. De asemenea, îmi doresc ca Parlamentul European, forul care îi reprezintă pe cetățenii statelor membre, să acționeze astfel încât, la baza oricăror decizii, să stea respectarea principiului solidarității, pe care Uniunea se bazează, și nu altceva.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, nikdo nám, českým poslancům, neblahopřeje ke znovuzvolení našeho prezidenta Zemana, bohužel není k čemu blahopřát. O volbách v České republice se psalo jako o referendu mezi směřováním na západ nebo na východ. Ano, pan prezident Zeman nás táhne hodně na východ a je vítán v Moskvě i v Pekingu.

Ale jeho zvolení souviselo ještě s něčím jiným. Česká republika je na tom ekonomicky dobře. Přesto, mnozí lidé nejsou spokojeni se svou situací a mají pocit, že neprofitují z ekonomického rozvoje, že se ho vlastně neúčastní. HDP v Praze vysoce překračuje průměr Evropské unie, ale v mnoha místech České republiky mají lidé mzdy, které jsou poloviční oproti minimální mzdě ve Francii nebo v Německu. Lidé mají strach z nezvládnuté imigrace, té současné i budoucí.

Ještě jako Středoevropané možná jsme si zvykli na vyšší standard. Ale jsem přesvědčená, že naši občané rozumí solidaritě i problémům, kterým čelí lidé v jiných částech světa. Paní místopředsedkyně, já jsem chtěla poblahopřát vám, Finsku i Vám osobně, že vy jste si zvolili prezidenta a nepodlehli jste nástrahám populismu.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Commissario europeo al bilancio Oettinger ha recentemente annunciato tagli inevitabili alle politiche di coesione nel Quadro pluriennale finanziario post 2020. Un errore, a mio avviso, quello di ridurre i fondi della principale politica di investimento dell'Unione, in un'Europa ancora provata dalla crisi economica, che ha accentuato al proprio interno le disparità economiche, politiche e sociali.

Per le regioni più povere, come ad esempio quelle del sud dell'Italia, significherebbe perdere tra i quattro e i sei miliardi di euro, considerando anche i tagli alla PAC annunciati dal Commissario tedesco. Al contrario, dovremmo rafforzare gli investimenti, aggiungendo anche nuove risorse su sicurezza e difesa, escludere i cofinanziamenti nazionali dal patto di stabilità, legare l'erogazione di tutti i fondi del bilancio europeo al rispetto dello Stato di diritto e della solidarietà intraeuropea.

Piuttosto che sovvertire e vanificare la politica di coesione, sforziamoci di dotare l'Unione europea di risorse adeguate mediante una seria ricognizione e individuazione delle risorse proprie. Solo così potremmo fare uno sforzo supplementare nella ricerca di risorse e potremo permetterci di evitare dolorosi e controproducenti passi indietro.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Madam President, during this parliamentary mandate, this House has repeatedly called for the so-called EU blacklist of non-cooperative jurisdictions. This list has finally been published by the Council in December last year and this is a step in the right direction. I welcome the decision by the Council, but there are a number of doubts about firstly, the criteria that have been used in order to establish this list. Let me remind you that only 17 countries or territories have been included on that list, whereas we have evidence that many more jurisdictions should also be considered. But more important is the fact that just after one month, in January, the Council has removed eight countries from that list. So my proposal to the Council is, firstly, to give us a precise list of criteria and, secondly, to tell us how this list will be developed in order to fight tax evasion and tax avoidance across the world.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, the UK arts sector is a hugely significant industry, contributing over GBP 87 billion to our economy and providing jobs to more than two million people. It returns more than the automotive, oil and gas, aerospace and life sciences industries combined. Our membership of the EU has been key to that success, with the majority of the sector voting to remain. So Theresa May's hard Brexit will have a devastating impact on our creative industries. For example, music tours are programmed years in advance and the UK Government's negative position on key policy areas, such as membership of the single market and the customs union, is very damaging.

Already, we have seen two top orchestras leave Britain because of Brexit, relocating to Belgium and Italy, and more will follow. I recently attended the Association of British Orchestras' conference in Wales, where the sector made it clear that freedom of movement is vital. The costs of a hard Brexit will fall directly on producers, with many tours becoming unviable, and this scenario will be replicated across the whole of the creative industries and mean fewer concerts by our favourite bands and musicians. As Billy Bragg says, 'music can heal the wounds of Brexit'. Let's ensure it can.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, conform tuturor analizelor și statisticilor, în ultimii 3 ani, s-a constatat o creștere îngrijorătoare a cazurilor de HIV, tuberculoză și hepatită C. 2017 a fost un an record privind infectarea cu virusul celor trei boli, considerate, pe bună dreptate, cele mai agresive. Numai în cazul HIV, conform Oficiului de supraveghere a cazurilor de HIV-SIDA, în 2017, s-a constatat o creștere cu 5,9 % la mia de locuitori a celor infectați. În acest context, consider că trebuie să tragem un semnal de alarmă în direcția revizuirii urgente a politicilor de sănătate ale Uniunii Europene și trebuie să determinăm comisariatul pentru sănătate al UE să urgenceze implementarea recomandărilor rezoluției Parlamentului European din iulie 2017.

Fără un program generalizat, aplicabil la nivelul tuturor statelor membre și fără o subvenționarea a testelor și a tratamentelor pentru categoriile defavorizate, în câțiva ani, probabil, va fi imposibil să controlăm răspândirea acestor boli. Este inadmisibil ca, în Uniunea Europeană, considerată cea mai importantă construcție politică a bătrânului continent, să discutăm astăzi despre creșterea alarmantă a cazurilor de tuberculoză, HIV și hepatită C.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Priekšsēdētājas kundze, komisāres kundze, kolēģi! Šogad 23. janvārī Latvijas Republikas valdība — Ministru kabinets — ir pieņēmis grozījumus Izglītības likumā. Šie grozījumi faktiski paredz slēgt vidējo izglītību nacionālo minoritāšu valodās un no 20./21. mācību gada paredzēt vidējo izglītību Latvijā tikai latviešu valodā.

Kolēģi, Eiropas Savienības oficiālais lozungs ir “Vienoti daudzveidībā”. Daudzveidība ir mūsu bagātība.

Šogad Latvijas Republika, mana valsts, atzīmēs simtgadi kopš tās proklamēšanas un dibināšanas, un pirms kara Latvija bija tiešām izcils demokrātijas piemērs, kad valsts, iedomājieties, kolēģi, garantēja vidējo izglītību astoņās minoritāšu valodās. Kolēģi, mūsu pienākums ir saglabāt vidējo izglītību nacionālo minoritāšu valodās, rīkosimies aktīvi, kolēģi, neklusēsīm šeit — Eiropas Parlamentā. Paldies.

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

26. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

27. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.49.)

—

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