



**PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 3 KWIETNIA 2019 R.**

(C/2024/3836)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia z 3 i 4 kwietnia 2019 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji .....	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia .....	3
3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego .....	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół .....	4
5. Komunikat przewodniczącego (termin składania pytań wymagających odpowiedzi na piśmie (art. 130 Regulaminu)): patrz protokół .....	4
6. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół .....	4
7. Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół .....	4
8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół .....	4
9. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół .....	4
10. Porządek obrad .....	5
11. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (debata) .....	7
12. Debata z premierem Szwecji Stefanem Löfvenem na temat przyszłości Europy (debata) .....	18

Spis treści	Strona
13. Wspólne zasady rynku wewnętrznego gazu ziemnego (debata) . . . . .	41
14. Europejski Fundusz Morski i Rybacki (debata) . . . . .	51
15. Ustanowienie planu wieloletniego dotyczącego połowów eksploatujących stada denne w zachodniej części Morza Śródziemnego (debata) . . . . .	64
16. Wzmocnienie zabezpieczeń dowodów tożsamości oraz dokumentów pobytowych wydawanych obywatelom Unii (debata) . . . . .	69
17. Stosunki UE-Chiny (debata) . . . . .	75
18. Ustanowienie programu „Cła” na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie cel – Ustanowienie instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej (debata) . . . . .	87
19. Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem infrastruktury drogowej (debata) . . . . .	93
20. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych . . . . .	98
21. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół . . . . .	101
22. Zamknięcie posiedzenia . . . . .	101

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 3 KWIETNIA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

*Presidente*

### 1. Wznowienie sesji

**Presidente.** – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 28 marzo 2019.

### 2. Otvarcie posiedzenia

*(La seduta è aperta alle 14.00)*

### 3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego

**Presidente.** – Onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo appreso, non senza sconcerto, che la candidata del Parlamento europeo al posto di Procuratore capo europeo, la signora Laura Codruta Kövesi, è stata posta dalle autorità romene sotto il regime di controllo giudiziario, che comporta la limitazione della sua libertà personale, divieto di lasciare il paese senza autorizzazione, obbligo di presentarsi periodicamente alla polizia e divieto di rilasciare dichiarazioni alla stampa.

Fermo restando il principio di non ingerenza e non interferenza con l'azione dell'autorità giudiziaria, e nel pieno rispetto della presunzione di innocenza, voglio esprimere tutta la preoccupazione del Parlamento europeo per la situazione creatasi e ribadire in modo chiaro che la signora Kövesi rimane la nostra candidata e gode della nostra fiducia e del nostro appoggio.

*(Applausi)*

Chiedo quindi che le autorità romene rispettino il principio di cooperazione sincera tra Stati membri e istituzioni e non pongano ostacoli alla partecipazione della candidata a tutte le fasi della procedura di selezione per il posto di Procuratore capo europeo. Oggi stesso scriverò una lettera in questo senso alle autorità romene, così come deciso stamane dalla Conferenza dei presidenti.

**Josef Weidenholzer (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! Wir sind besorgt über die unverhältnismäßigen Maßnahmen gegen Laura Kövesi. Wir bedauern, dass die Bedenken, die unser Haus in seiner am 13. November mit großer Mehrheit angenommenen EntschlieÙung zu Rumänien vorgebracht hat, in den Wind geschlagen werden. Wir unterstützen den Vizepräsidenten der Kommission, Frans Timmermans, der heute sehr deutlich die Vorgänge angesprochen hat und umgehende Schritte angekündigt hat. Wir appellieren an Rumänien, wieder in einen konstruktiven Dialog mit der Kommission einzutreten und unverzüglich alle Aktivitäten einzustellen, die den gemeinsam vereinbarten Zielen widersprechen.

**Daniele Viotti (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi è una giornata triste per tutto il mondo. Come lei saprà e come sapranno i colleghi, nel Brunei è stata reintrodotta la pena di morte per lapidazione per gli omosessuali e per gli appartenenti a religioni diverse dalla religione mussulmana. Io credo che questo Parlamento debba impegnarsi – lei lo farà sicuramente e lo farà la nostra Vicepresidente Mogherini – ma questo Parlamento deve assolutamente dire una parola contro questo.

Lei sa che da anni nel Brunei non si può celebrare il Natale, e quindi le tradizioni cristiane non possono essere rispettate. Prima degli accordi commerciali, prima degli accordi finanziari con il Brunei, con l'Arabia Saudita, con la Turchia, con la Russia, con la Cecenia, vengono i diritti umani. L'Europa deve essere faro nel mondo dei diritti umani. La prego di dire una parola su questo, Presidente.

*(Applausi)*

**Presidente.** – Onorevole Viotti, io non posso che riconfermare l'impegno fermissimo del Parlamento europeo, che rappresenta mezzo miliardo di cittadini europei che vivono in un continente, l'unico continente al mondo dove non c'è la pena capitale, e la piena contrarietà all'introduzione della pena di morte in qualsiasi paese del mondo per qualsiasi motivo. Non c'è alcuna giustificazione al mondo per togliere la vita a chicchessia. E credo che questo sia il sentimento di tutta quest'Aula.

*(Applausi)*

**Livia Járóka (PPE).** – Mr President, I don't want to take up your time. I dressed up like this today because I am of Romani descent and next week is International Romani Day – 8 April. Last week, this Parliament celebrated this beautiful week with Roma week. Thank you very much to everybody for taking part in it and this time I'm rising up to thank the Romanian Presidency for seeking to stop evictions all around Europe. As you know, the weather is getting better and the poor people are being evicted. This is the only Presidency ever in the European Parliament who was ready to talk to us, from EU money, to solve the issue of the living conditions of the poor people of Europe. Next week is 8 April. I ask the six parties to support the Commission's efforts to put a very strong pro-Roma and anti-poverty strategy on the table in the Council.

4. **Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół**
5. **Komunikat przewodniczącego (termin składania pytań wymagających odpowiedzi na piśmie (art. 130 Regulaminu)): patrz protokół**
6. **Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
7. **Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
8. **Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**
9. **Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół**

## 10. Porządek obrad

**Presidente.** – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 28 marzo 2019 è stato distribuito.

A seguito delle consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula le seguenti proposte di modifica al progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno.

*Mercoledì*

La relazione dell'on. Grapini sull'istituzione del programma «Dogana» per la cooperazione nel settore doganale e la relazione dell'on. Pospíšil sull'istituzione, nell'ambito del Fondo per la gestione integrata delle frontiere, dello Strumento di sostegno finanziario relativo alle attrezzature per il controllo doganale verranno poste in votazione nella tornata di aprile II.

*Giovedì*

La raccomandazione dell'on. Arthuis sull'esecuzione del finanziamento del bilancio generale dell'Unione 2019 in relazione al recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione, che è stata posta direttamente ai voti, non è stata ancora approvata dalla commissione per i bilanci. Viene pertanto ritirata dall'ordine del giorno.

Modifichiamo così l'ordine del giorno.

Inoltre, la commissione giuridica ha approvato tre relazioni dell'on. Dzhambazki su tre richieste di revoca dell'immunità. A norma dell'articolo 9, paragrafo 9, del regolamento, queste tre relazioni saranno poste in votazione giovedì.

*Mercoledì*

Il gruppo PPE ha chiesto che il titolo delle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulle relazioni commerciali UE-Cina sia modificato in «Relazioni UE-Cina». Do la parola all'on. Preda per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

**Cristian Dan Preda, au nom du groupe PPE.** – Monsieur le Président, l'idée est très simple: les relations entre l'Union européenne et la Chine ne se réduisent pas aux questions commerciales. Vu les évolutions récentes d'un côté comme de l'autre, il serait bien d'élargir le champ de ce débat. J'en suis convaincu: vous allez accepter cette demande de notre groupe.

*(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)*

*Giovedì*

**Presidente.** – Per quanto riguarda le richieste relative alla giornata di giovedì, un gruppo di deputati che raggiungono almeno la soglia minima bassa e i gruppi EFDD e ECR hanno chiesto che la votazione sul pacchetto Mobilità, comprendente tre relazioni di Ismail Ertug, Merja Kyllönen e Wim van de Camp, sia ritirata dall'ordine del giorno.

Do la parola all'on. Novakov per presentare la richiesta a nome del gruppo di deputati che raggiungono la soglia bassa.

**Andrey Novakov, on behalf of a number of Members reaching at least the low threshold.** – Mr President, this is the fifth attempt in a row to put the mobility package back on the agenda. This has never happened before in the history of this institution. Not a single step has been made towards a compromise, nor a single shadow meeting nor a single conversation, nor a single effort to understand of all points of view. I ask you to vote in favour of removing the mobility package from the agenda.

*(Applause)*

If we allow this again – if we put this mobility package back on the agenda – if we neglect the result of yesterday's vote in the Transport Committee, it means that there is no rule of law in this chamber. Now, 45 days before the election there is no one that can explain why this is the right thing. So please, follow your conscience, vote in favour of moving this mobility package.

**Ismail Ertug, Rapporteur.** – Mr President, I have to say that this is a difficult situation now for all those who would like to have a constructive approach here in this House. Yesterday in the Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN) – and the Chair is here, as are all the other colleagues as well – we voted on more than 1 300 amendments, vote by vote, and we've clearly seen that there is a clear compromise – as I said last week in Strasbourg – which goes through the different groups. Therefore it's absolutely not necessary to postpone or cancel this vote. We are now prepared; the sector, the drivers all around the European Union, are waiting for action from this European Parliament. Therefore, I urge you all to vote against this approach.

(Applause)

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

**Presidente.** – Considerando la durata prevista della sessione di voto, propongo quindi di anticipare l'inizio della seduta alle ore 8.30, in modo che le votazioni possono iniziare alle ore 11.00. Siete d'accordo?

Per quanto riguarda il pacchetto «Mobilità», in seguito al voto della commissione per i trasporti – purtroppo non è cambiata la situazione in maniera sostanziale –, desidero informare l'Aula che ho deciso l'applicazione dell'articolo 174, paragrafo 8, del regolamento, che permette, laddove possibile, di votare emendamenti simili in maniera collettiva. Non si tratta di voto per blocchi predeterminati, come invece prevede l'articolo 174, paragrafo 7, ma di una possibilità a disposizione di chi presiede il voto per individuare nel corso delle votazioni emendamenti con contenuto simile o con lo stesso obiettivo da votare congiuntamente. Questo permetterà, mi auguro, di mantenere le votazioni entro tempi ragionevoli e assicurare un voto chiaro ed esplicito sui punti chiave.

Per la giornata di giovedì, il gruppo EFDD ha chiesto di aggiungere, come primo punto, la discussione sulla relazione dell'onorevole Stanishev relativa all'elenco dei paesi terzi i cui cittadini devono essere in possesso del visto all'atto dell'attraversamento delle frontiere esterne e l'elenco dei paesi terzi i cui cittadini sono esenti da tale obbligo, che è stata posta direttamente in votazione.

Do la parola all'on. Reid, che presenterà la richiesta a nome del gruppo EFDD.

**Julia Reid, on behalf of the EFDD Group.** – Mr President, the EFDD would like to request that the Stanishev report on Brexit visas is debated as the first item on the agenda tomorrow. We believe the decision to remove Claude Moraes, a British MEP, from this report for refusing to accept that Gibraltar is a colony of the UK is not only ludicrous, but is entirely unjustifiable. To reiterate, Gibraltar is designated a British overseas territory under British constitutional law, and the term 'crown colony' is obsolete. The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) should be ashamed that a majority of their Members today supported the removal of the British MEP, thus allowing the Spanish Government to hijack a report that had no mandate from Parliament to question the sovereignty of Gibraltar.

In two referenda – one in 1967 and another in 2002 – 99% of the people of Gibraltar voted to remain British. I therefore ask this House to support a full debate on this report to consider removing references to Gibraltar as a colony of the British Crown, and misleading statements that suggest there is a controversy between Spain and the UK concerning the sovereignty over Gibraltar.

**Esteban González Pons, en nombre del Grupo PPE.** – Señor presidente, los británicos han decidido irse. No tiene ningún sentido que, además de irse, quieran decidir cuál tiene que ser nuestra posición. En la Unión Europea se está dentro o fuera, y si se está fuera no se puede decidir qué es la posición que tenemos que mantener los que nos quedamos dentro.

Si se marchan, que no pretendan decidir por nosotros. Dentro o fuera. Han elegido fuera. Quizá esta sea la demostración de que no es necesaria una extensión larga del artículo 50.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

**Presidente.** – Sempre per giovedì, il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che sia aggiunta, come terzo punto, una dichiarazione della Commissione su un quadro completo dell'Unione europea in materia di interferenti endocrini. La discussione si concluderà con una risoluzione che sarà votata nella tornata di aprile II.

Do la parola all'on. Andrieu per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

**Eric Andrieu, au nom du groupe S&D.** – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, le 7 novembre 2018, la Commission a publié une communication qui était censée réduire l'exposition de nos concitoyens aux perturbateurs endocriniens. Malheureusement, force est de constater que cette feuille de route ne répond absolument pas à l'urgence sanitaire et environnementale.

Au regard de la menace que représentent ces substances pour la santé des 500 millions de citoyens européens, le groupe social-démocrate propose d'ajouter à l'ordre du jour de jeudi de cette période de session, comme troisième point, une déclaration de la Commission avec débat sur ce sujet, doublée d'une résolution qui pourrait quant à elle être adoptée lors de la session d'avril II.

*(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)*

*(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)*

## 11. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (debata)

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sul recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea (2019/2676(RSP)).

**Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, barely three weeks ago I was addressing you on the same topic, still hoping that some form of resolution would emerge from the parliamentary process in London. Unfortunately, as you know, the British parliament and government are still grappling with the issue of whether and how to exit the Union as we speak.

The European Council has expressed, among others, the willingness to adapt the political declaration, including in some of the directions considered during the indicative votes at the Commons.

The uncertainties and negative consequences therefore still remain as regards citizens, businesses and public authorities, with an already clear economic impact in terms of level of activity, investment and therefore jobs on both sides of the Channel.

At this very late stage, we are still determined to facilitate the conclusion of the withdrawal agreement. This should however not be to detriment of the solidarity among the Member States as regards, in particular, Ireland.

We therefore need to continue to take all possible steps in order to facilitate an orderly withdrawal. This is why in March the European Council considered a UK request for a short extension on the Article 50 period and decided on a two-track approach. Either the withdrawal agreement could not be approved by 29 March and the extension would run until 12 April, and the UK would have to indicate a way forward, or until 22 May if the withdrawal agreement is approved.

As you know, the withdrawal agreement has not been approved in time so the operating withdrawal date is now 12 April. The UK will have to indicate a way forward, possibly leading to a further extension, which would again require a unanimity decision by the European Council. Should the UK indeed come back with a request for a significant expansion, it should not undermine the operations of the institutions and would therefore have to foresee the holding of the European elections.

On the EU side at the least, I am confident that our institutions will be able to complete the consent and conclusion process in a good time and therefore ensure a timely entry into force of the agreement, if the agreement is eventually approved in the House of Commons.

The withdrawal agreement continues to be the best solution for both sides, including in terms of protection of citizens' rights. We are, however, under no illusion that should a no deal be the outcome of the process in London, it will have serious consequences, and we might know it at the last minute.

It is therefore all the more necessary to continue our preparation for all outcomes, including a no deal scenario. I'm so far encouraged by the significant progress made at the Union and national level, on preparedness and contingency. At this late stage in their legislative term, we should be pleased with a large number of contingency and preparedness related measures that our institutions have been able to agree, in spite of the heavy workload.

I am confident that with your cooperation it will be possible to complete the adoption of the remaining contingency measures in good time.

**Jean-Claude Juncker**, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, Madame la présidente du Conseil des ministres, ce qui s'est passé à Westminster ces derniers jours a renforcé ma conviction – qui n'a d'ailleurs jamais varié – que la meilleure voie à suivre est celle de la ratification de l'accord de retrait, qui a été approuvé par le gouvernement britannique et endossé en principe par ce Parlement, ainsi que par le Conseil européen.

Il y a dix jours, le Conseil européen a soumis la prorogation du délai de la négociation de l'article 50 jusqu'au 22 mai 2019 à une condition: l'approbation de l'accord de retrait à la Chambre des communes avant le 29 mars. Cela, hélas, n'a pas été le cas. Me référant à la déclaration de la Première ministre britannique la nuit dernière, je considère que nous disposons de quelques jours de plus, si le Royaume-Uni est en mesure d'approuver l'accord de retrait avec une majorité viable d'ici au 12 avril. Dans ce cas, l'Union européenne devrait également accepter une prorogation jusqu'au 22 mai. Le 12 avril est cependant la date ultime d'approbation possible. Si la Chambre des communes ne s'est pas prononcée avant cette date, aucune prolongation supplémentaire de courte durée ne sera possible. Après le 12 avril, nous risquons de mettre en danger le bon déroulement des élections au Parlement européen et de menacer le bon fonctionnement de l'Union européenne.

L'accord de retrait est et a toujours été un compromis. Un compromis équitable qui a permis à chacune des deux parties d'obtenir partiellement ce qu'elle recherchait, mais pas tout ce qu'elle recherchait. C'est à travers ce type de compromis que l'Union européenne, depuis le début, s'est bâtie. Ce sont de tels compromis qui ont permis au projet européen d'avancer, et c'est de ce type de compromis dont nous avons aussi besoin maintenant.

Une grande partie du débat à la Chambre des communes a porté sur les relations futures entre l'Union européenne et le Royaume-Uni. L'Union européenne est prête à ajouter une dose de flexibilité à la déclaration politique pour ouvrir la voie à un futur partenariat économique étroit entre l'Union et le Royaume-Uni. Nous sommes ouverts à tout un éventail d'options, allant d'un accord de libre-échange à des facilités douanières, à une union douanière, voire un espace économique européen. L'ouverture qui fut la nôtre depuis le début n'est nullement remise en cause et peut être davantage explicitée dans la déclaration politique.

Du côté de l'Union européenne, nous sommes prêts à entamer des discussions et des négociations sur notre partenariat futur dès que l'accord de retrait sera signé, avant même que l'encre ne soit sèche. L'équipe de négociation de la Commission est en place, mon ami Michel Barnier, notre négociateur en chef, est prêt et je voudrais pouvoir compter sur le même niveau de préparation du côté du Royaume-Uni. Que cela se passe ainsi ou non dépend entièrement du Royaume-Uni. Le Conseil européen a donné tout le temps et l'espace nécessaires à ce pays pour prendre sa décision.

Pour autant, je crois qu'un *no deal* le 12 avril à minuit est devenu un scénario de plus en plus vraisemblable. Ce n'est pas celui que je souhaite, mais j'ai fait en sorte, nous avons fait en sorte que l'Union européenne soit prête à y faire face. Nous nous y sommes préparés depuis décembre 2017. Nous avons toujours su que la logique de l'article 50 fait du *no deal* une option par défaut. Nous connaissons bien, depuis longtemps, l'équilibre des pouvoirs au sein de la Chambre des communes.

À ce jour, la Commission a publié 91 notes sur la préparation du Brexit, 32 actes non législatifs, 19 propositions législatives et 3 communications. Nous nous sommes rendus – les représentants de la Commission – dans chacun des 27 États membres pour les aider dans leurs préparatifs. Nous avons organisé 72 séminaires avec les États membres. Les mesures que les États membres et nous-mêmes avons prises atténueront les conséquences les plus rudes du choc d'un *no deal*. Elles offrent une véritable protection: elles garantiront que les citoyens de l'Union européenne et du Royaume-Uni pourront continuer à vivre et à travailler là où ils résident actuellement. Elles garantiront aussi que les avions pourront continuer à décoller et à atterrir. Nous avons adapté notre instrument financier pour pouvoir venir en aide au secteur de la pêche. Nous avons prévu les mécanismes qui permettent de poursuivre notre coopération policière



et nous avons pris les mesures nécessaires pour atténuer les perturbations sur nos marchés financiers.

Les mesures que nous avons prises sont temporaires et unilatérales. Elles protégeront les intérêts clés de l'Union européenne, au moins jusqu'à la fin de l'année, mais les turbulences que subiront les citoyens, les entreprises et quasiment tous les secteurs seront évidemment inévitables.

Le Royaume-Uni, lui, sera plus touché que l'Union européenne, parce qu'un *no deal* géré ou négocié n'existe pas, pas plus qu'une période de transition d'un *no deal*. Quoi qu'il arrive, le Royaume-Uni devra toujours donner une réponse aux trois questions principales de la séparation. Premièrement, les droits des citoyens devront être respectés et protégés. Deuxièmement, le Royaume-Uni devra continuer à honorer les engagements financiers qu'il a pris en tant qu'État membre. Troisièmement, il faudra apporter une solution sur l'île d'Irlande, qui préserve à la fois la paix et le marché intérieur. Le Royaume-Uni doit respecter l'esprit et la lettre de l'accord du Vendredi saint.

Pas d'accord de retrait, cela ne signifie pas qu'il ne doit pas y avoir d'engagement. Les trois questions que je viens d'énumérer ne vont pas disparaître du jour au lendemain. Elles constitueront même des conditions strictes pour rebâtir la confiance et lancer les discussions sur l'avenir.

Monsieur le Président, la semaine prochaine, au Conseil européen, nous écouterons la Première ministre, Theresa May, nous exposer ses intentions et nous déciderons de la voie à suivre. Les principes qui guideront mon action sont limpides. Nous travaillerons, États membres, Parlement européen, jusqu'au dernier moment pour éviter un *no deal*. En fait, les seuls qui profiteraient du choc d'un *no deal* sont les adversaires d'un ordre mondial fondé sur des règles. Les seuls qui se verraient renforcés sont les populistes et les nationalistes.

*(Applaudissements)*

Les seuls qui se réjouiraient seront ceux qui veulent affaiblir à la fois l'Union européenne et, détrompez-vous, le Royaume-Uni. L'Union européenne n'expulsera aucun État membre. Personnellement, avec Michel, je ferai tout pour éviter une sortie désordonnée du Royaume-Uni et j'attends des dirigeants politiques de l'Union européenne à 27 et de ce Parlement, ainsi que du Royaume-Uni qu'ils fassent de même. C'est la première fois, dans ce Parlement, que je lis un discours parce que je crois que chaque mot a son importance.

**Elmar Brok**, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Herr Kommissionspräsident! Für meine Fraktion möchte ich erklären, dass wir der Analyse und den Schlussfolgerungen der Kommission zustimmen und sie in diesen Tagen und Wochen auch weiterhin unterstützen werden. Ich glaube, es ist völlig klar: Ein harter Brexit kann nur vermieden werden – ob wir jetzt noch eine kurze oder eine längere Verlängerung haben –, wenn ein Austrittsvertrag abgeschlossen und vom Unterhaus angenommen worden ist. Dieser Vertrag ist ausgehandelt. Unter jedem Szenario muss das eingehalten werden; daran kommt man nicht vorbei.

Der zweite Punkt ist: Wir möchten keinen harten Brexit, weil der Schaden dann für alle groß ist – für Großbritannien sehr, sehr viel mehr als für uns, aber auch für uns. Und deswegen ist der Weg, zwei bis vier Jahre Zeit zu haben, um über die zukünftigen Beziehungen zu verhandeln und zu einem Freihandelsvertrag, zu einer Zollunion – was alles die Briten möchten, wir sind bereit, da mitzumachen – wie auch zu einer Verständigung zur äußeren und inneren Sicherheit, zu Forschung und anderen Bereichen und insbesondere Erasmus zu kommen. Diese Möglichkeit muss in den nächsten Tagen eröffnet werden. Wenn der Austrittsvertrag nicht ratifiziert wird, wird es einen harten Brexit geben ohne eine Möglichkeit, über diese Dinge zu verhandeln, mit all den Konsequenzen, die damit verbunden sind.

Und ich möchte daran erinnern, dass die Europawahlen ein Stichtag sind, bis zu dem das erledigt sein muss. Ich halte es nicht für gut, dass das Vereinigte Königreich an den Europawahlen teilnimmt und in diesem Sommer bestimmte weitreichende Entscheidungen mit trifft und sich dann vom Acker macht. Das heißt, wenn man zu einer längeren Verschiebung kommt, dann muss das mit Bedingungen verbunden sein – längerfristig, nicht bis zum Oktober — dann machen wir dieses Theater mit den *indicative votes* im *House of Commons* jede Woche weiter –, sondern das muss dann länger sein, und dann muss damit eine Neuaufstellung der britischen Politik verbunden werden. Wenn Regierung und Parlament scheitern und nicht vorankommen, muss das Volk sprechen, muss es Neuwahlen geben, muss es ein Referendum geben. Dafür braucht man einige Zeit.

Ich würde es aber vorziehen – damit wie eine vernünftige, schnelle Lösung haben und uns darauf einstellen können –, dass jetzt vielleicht doch noch die Gespräche Corbyn/May gelingen. Wir haben immer gesagt: Redet endlich miteinander! Das haben wir vor zwei Jahren gesagt, wir haben das vor drei Wochen gesagt, das haben wir vor drei Monaten gesagt. Endlich reden sie miteinander, und da sollten Corbyn und May endlich Land vor Partei stellen und über die Grenzen der Parteien hinweg zu einem Deal für das Land und für Europa kommen.

### IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

*Vice-President*

**Roberto Gualtieri**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, after two years of negotiations, three failed meaningful votes and two rounds of indicative votes, four days after the UK was meant to leave the EU, Theresa May has finally decided to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition to try to agree a plan on Brexit. One could say ‘better late than never’.

We now need to see if these talks will produce a credible way forward or if they are just another political exercise. We have always said that a closer EU-UK relationship would be beneficial for both sides and that, without touching the Withdrawal Agreement, the political declaration can be swiftly upgraded. So far, it has been Theresa May’s red lines that have made this impossible. We will see, this afternoon or the next day, if she is now really prepared to change these red lines and whether her party is prepared to follow her approach, whoever the next leader is.

Talks alone are not a solution until we see a credible and viable positive majority in the House of Commons before 12 April. This means that the threat of no deal has not disappeared. Politicians must act responsibly and do everything possible to avoid this scenario, which would be bad for everyone but a disaster for the UK. However, if this situation was to materialise, our group would work to ensure that the rights of all EU citizens were ringfenced in any circumstances. Citizens cannot pay the price for the failure of their politicians, and, if the UK Parliament continues to fail to deliver a solution, then the British people deserve the right to have their final say.

*(Applause)*

This is the reason why a longer extension cannot – and must not – be ruled out. If there is a request in this respect, it will have to be well motivated and the obligation of loyal cooperation should be defined and respected. But, in these circumstances, this request cannot be rejected. UK citizens are, and remain, European citizens, and their voice and their rights are not, and will not go, unheard in this House.

But why do we have this deadlock? Why do we have this constant difficulty to deliver a solution? And why are we now seeing in the opinion polls that at an increasing number of people are signing the petition to revoke Article 50? The truth is that Brexit is a tragic mistake. It is a lose-lose solution built on a mountain of lies. Because European citizenship is a concept full of substance, and losing it reduces, rather than increases, sovereignty. So what we can do, if Brexit takes place, is minimise this reduction of rights. But we will never say, in any circumstances, that Brexit is a positive solution. And whatever this Group can do to avoid this outcome, we will do it.

*(Applause)*

**Jacqueline Foster**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I'll begin with a message to my friends and my colleagues in Westminster. I too am a Conservative, and we were not elected for our charm and our intellect. We are elected because we have the word 'Conservative' stamped next to our name. And to those remainers, who have done everything to overturn the result and have now left our party, I say: 'bye bye'.

Power brings responsibility, and we can't always have everything we want. Conscience and principles are a luxury we can't always afford and are normally found on the benches opposite. Tough times demand tough choices, and that takes real courage. Regrettably, Mr Corbyn has been the problem and not the solution. He despises us and will do anything to gain power. He won't argue with me on that. He's already ditched free movement in an indicative vote, so I'm not holding my breath. But I live in hope. And to my loyal friends, the Unionists, I say: 'He is not your friend'.

The Withdrawal Agreement is still on the table, and I truly believe it is the solution. So Messrs Barnier, Juncker and Tusk: a tweak could have been quite helpful. No more than a paragraph could have perhaps resolved the issue. But now, again, we're having to ask for your patience so we can find a way forward.

Finally, this is not a game. The British people are demanding that we deliver on Brexit, not hold a European election. I think that's a relief to colleagues in this House. So for goodness sake, I say to my colleagues in London, support the Prime Minister's deal. It is truly the only way forward. The clock is ticking. Tick-tock.

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, first of all, I want to say to Ms Foster that I'm not a big fan of Jeremy Corbyn, but saying that it is Jeremy Corbyn who is the problem here – well, everybody knows that the problem is the division inside the Conservative Party.

(Applause)

That is the problem. Everybody knows that and, moreover, we are all following every day the voting inside the House of Commons. I can tell you that the sessions of the House of Commons have become more popular in Europe even than the matches in the Premier League. The only difference is – well, I can tell you – it's always a draw there in the House of Commons, while there are more goals scored, fortunately, I should say, mainly by some players, in the Premier League.

So let's be very sincere with each other. Let's hope that these cross-party negotiations that start today give a solution in the coming days. We, from all sides, have said it, we are open to change the political declaration to make that possible – customs union, free trade arrangement, a common market 2.0, maybe something else – we are open to do so. But it has been done before 12 April, and before 12 April, Ms Foster, there has to be a meaningful vote in the House of Commons, so that we have a basis to do so. Secondly, we also need a roadmap so that we can be sure that everything is implemented in the secondary legislation in Britain by and before 22 May. My last remark that I want to make: I know that a number of colleagues are thinking, 'ah, maybe a long extension'. Don't be under any illusions. The fact that we should create a situation where Britain is with one foot inside the Union and with one foot outside the Union is a tragedy. It is bad for the European Union. Can you imagine a little bit the new prime minister of Great Britain, Mr Johnson or Mr Gove, both the architects of the Brexit disaster, having the keys in their hands to the future of the European Union? I cannot think about that happening. It will be a disaster for the European Union and it's not the way to go forward.

Finally I think – and that is what my colleague Mr Gualtieri said – the only advantage of Brexit, Mr Gualtieri, is in fact the following: people can see for themselves now what it means when populists and nationalists take power in a country and make an image of a country and a future that does not exist in that country.

(Applause)

It's a good lesson for the European elections.

**Gabriele Zimmer**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Wie immer ist das Verfallsdatum der Erklärung von Theresa May ziemlich unklar. Wir wissen nicht, was heute Abend oder heute Nacht rauskommt, und wir wissen nicht, ob – wenn Corbyn und Theresa May sich einigen – dann das Parlament ihnen tatsächlich auch folgen wird, weil wir nicht wissen, wie stark überhaupt noch die Gefolgschaft – insbesondere bei den Tories – ist. Soviel auch zu Frau Foster, zu ihren Angriffen gegen Labour.

Das No-Deal-Szenario ist nach wie vor auf dem Tisch. Sollten die Abgeordneten zu Beginn der kommenden Woche der möglichen Einigung zwischen Corbyn und May nicht folgen, wird keine Zeit mehr sein, tatsächlich noch ein Verfahren auszuarbeiten, eine Begründung auszuarbeiten, warum man eine längere Verlängerung haben will. Dann wird es aus meiner Sicht zu einem Austritt am 12. April ohne Deal kommen. Und für dieses No-Deal-Szenario ergeben sich eine ganze Reihe von Gefahren, und wir fordern deshalb auch als Fraktion, dass in den Verhandlungen danach über die künftigen Beziehungen klar wird, dass wir die Bürgerrechte schützen werden, dass wir *ring-fencing* betreiben und zwar sowohl für die Bürger in UK als auch für die Bürger in der EU.

Eng damit verbunden ist, dass mit einem solchen No-Deal-Verfahren das *Good Friday Agreement* aufs Äußerste gefährdet ist. Es ist die Rede davon, dann zwei Grenzen zu ziehen: eine Seegrenze und eine Landgrenze. Ich glaube, das ist völlig klar: Meine Fraktion wird keinen neuen Grenzen, die wir hier in der Europäischen Union – in Europa – ziehen, jemals zustimmen können.

Und ich möchte dazu aber auch klar sagen: Was wir bisher erlebt haben, über die letzten Monate, das erinnert mehr an ein Casino als an etwas anderes. Wir sind über das Pokern beim Roulette gelandet, und jetzt sind wir beim russischen Roulette. Und das ist aus meiner Sicht eine riesige Gefahr, vor der wir stehen. Deshalb fordere ich alle auf, alles dafür zu tun, dass wir mit einem Deal aus der ganzen Geschichte herauskommen, und zwar bis zum 12. April, dass wir diese Entscheidung klar haben.

Ein Wort noch zu Claude Moraes: Ich finde es nicht in Ordnung, und ich möchte im Namen meiner Fraktion auch klar dagegen protestieren, dass mitten in einem Trilogieverfahren ein britischer Abgeordneter, der über viele Jahre an der Spitze des LIBE-Ausschusses steht und der hervorragende Arbeit geleistet hat, wegen des Einspruchs aus dem Rat und insbesondere von spanischen Abgeordneten hier im Europäischen Parlament nach der 6. Trilogieverhandlung aus den Verhandlungen herausgenommen wird. Ich möchte Claude Moraes für seine Arbeit, die er geleistet hat, danken. Er genießt höchsten Respekt von unserer Seite.

**Philippe Lamberts**, *on behalf of the Vets/ALE Group*. – Madam President: no. Three times ‘no’ to the Withdrawal Agreement. ‘No’ to a no-deal Brexit. ‘No’ to an outright revocation of Brexit. ‘No’ to a Customs Union. ‘No’ to participation in the single market. ‘No’ to the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice. ‘No’ to the free circulation of people.

The House of Commons increasingly sounds like Monty Python’s Knights of Ni – sorry, Knights of No. You might think that, short of the ability or will to make up their minds on what they want, they will hand over the decision to their constituents on that crucial matter that Brexit is. But there again, the answer is ‘no’. At this stage, the audience is left wondering whether Theresa May will find a shrubbery that will please the Knights of No.

One might argue that one’s place in history can be secured by saying ‘no’. So it was in 1940 when the United Kingdom stood up against Nazism. But the fact is that the greatness of the United Kingdom has been primarily built on positive choices, such as when the United Kingdom decided to be a founding member of the multilateral order we know today: the United Nations, NATO, World Trade Organization; that when it decided to join the European Union, when it decided to support the enlargement of the European Union, this is when the UK was at its best. And so it goes for any great achievement of humankind. The British Parliament now has to rise to the challenge and say ‘yes’ to a way forward.

Theresa May’s strategy of running down the clock has run its course. She waited until the 11th hour to reach out to the main opposition party. We can only guess whether a majority will be found for a future relationship that will include a customs union. But I’d like to remind everyone that this outcome presupposes the ratification of the Withdrawal Agreement. There is no way round this. Neither is there one around the fact that a no-deal Brexit is what will happen by default unless a positive alternative can be adopted. But the choice is not just between orderly and disorderly Brexit. Now that what Brexit means is becoming apparent, one can realise it is a negative-sum game for all players involved. Let it be known that the door remains open for the UK to remain a full member of the EU. With my British Green and European Free Alliance friends, we believe that the heart of Europe is where the United Kingdom belongs. On a daily basis, we see the positive contributions that your country has made to the EU and, likewise, millions of UK citizens see

the positive contributions the EU has made to their own country. As Democrats, we believe that making such a momentous choice for the country should be left to the people. Now is the time to put country above party politics.

**Patrick O'Flynn**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, despite Mr Juncker's determination to give a punishment beating to the United Kingdom, the current impasse is not exclusively his fault. It has been your misfortune almost as much as ours to be dealing with the worst prime minister in British history, someone who stands for nothing and can deliver nothing. When someone is so passive about having sand kicked in their face, it takes a restrained kind of bully to walk off the beach. We know from its dealings with Greece and others that the Commission is not a restrained kind of bully.

But you would be making a terrible mistake to assume that Mrs May is representative of the British people. You have men like Tony Blair whispering in your ear about the dream of the British suddenly embracing your project of integration. Do not believe it. We are a different kind of European nation. We have a different history, a different geography and different modern networks too. You should ask why Blair, in his pomp, could not risk a referendum on euro membership. You should ask why Brown could not risk a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty and you should ask why Cameron, when he was forced to hold a referendum on membership, lost it to the greatest number of British people ever to vote for anything.

Finally, you should ask yourselves why – after being threatened with no food, no water, no medicines and no jobs – the latest polls show that more British people wish to leave the EU with no deal next Friday than to remain. Once you've asked these questions then you should look ahead. You should imagine how Mrs May's successor would seek to rebuild shattered Tory support before the next general election if we have not left. He or she will be leading a party whose potential support is overwhelmingly formed of leave voters. Do not expect consistency from the Conservatives, by the way. The Tooting Popular Marxist Front will not last.

Instead, the answer is obvious, Guy Verhofstadt is right. The successor will seek to rebuild support by making your lives a misery through vetoes and political sabotage, by rejecting every proposed development of your project. So, reject another extension, resolve that Brexit will happen on WTO terms next Friday, and then negotiate constructively to tie up the loose ends after that. Do this and we can still be your best customer, but lock us in and we will be your worst nightmare.

**Gerard Batten**, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Madam President, every time we think that things can't get worse, they do. Every time Mrs May gets up to speak, we think that she may say something to resolve the situation. Instead, she just sinks lower into tragedy and farce. Now she's handing the Brexit hot potato to Jeremy Corbyn, and apparently the European Union will decide whether we take part in the European elections or not.

Has the whole Brexit process fiasco been an elaborate conspiracy between Mrs May and the EU, or is it just due to her monumental incompetence? Either way, we have to hand it to you, Mr Juncker and Mr Barnier. You have done what Philip of Spain, what Napoleon, what Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler couldn't do: you have brought Britain to its knees, without firing a single shot. But you could not have done any of these things without the connivance of the traitors, quislings and collaborators in the British Parliament and British establishment. As Seneca said, a nation cannot survive treason from within – and treason it is. Mrs May and the Tories planned to betray Brexit from the start. They have betrayed it by means of delaying and impeding, with the intention of finally overturning it altogether and setting aside the decision of the referendum.

Many of the 17.4 million people in the UK who voted Leave now believe that their vote is pointless. But Britain is still nominally a democracy, and the vote is the only weapon that ordinary people have. Those 17.4 million people can still vote for Brexit, and they can make a start on 2 May when the UK Independence Party is fielding candidates up and down the country in the English and Welsh local elections.

Mr Juncker, if I heard you correctly, you said that there will be no extension to Article 50 beyond 12 April, and if there is no agreement on the withdrawal deal, then we leave by default and go on to WTO terms. I think that's one of the few things you've said I actually agree with. Good: let's bring it on. But if Britain is forced to take part in the European elections on 23 May, then UKIP will field a full complement of candidates in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. There will be no deals or alliances with opportunist parties and their daily allowance-grabbing candidates. UKIP will stand on the policy of unilateral and unconditional withdrawal. No compromises and no surrender. And UKIP will carry forward that policy into the next general election. UKIP will accept no agreement on any other terms. We stand for a complete and total exit from the European Union. The struggle to set Britain free from the European Union

continues. UKIP leads that struggle. Vote UKIP. Vote Brexit.

**President.** – Mr Smith, do you want to make a point? I won't allow questions at all in this session. No blue cards.

**Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, Rule 11, paragraph 3 of our Rules of Procedure to make a point of order about what was a flatly disgraceful speech from Mr Batten right there.

(Applause)

He does not speak for the people of the United Kingdom, he barely speaks for his own party, such as it still exists. And to use that sort of rhetoric in this house of democracy is utterly shameful. Can I suggest that you and the Presidency think whether or not this House should continue to give a platform to these wreckers for their poison?

**President.** – Excuse me Mr Batten, I have the microphone and I will speak, and then I may allow you to speak.

Can I say that I will definitely bring your issue to the President. I was also concerned about the use of another term: punishment beating. I find that a difficult term in the context of my own country.

Sir, do you have a point?

(Applause)

**Gerard Batten (ENF).** – Madam President, this gentleman represents a party which claims it wants independence and yet it's happy to be subservient to the European Union. By all means, ban me and watch my vote go up in the United Kingdom.

**Mike Hookem (NI).** – Madam President, if Messrs Juncker, Tusk and Barnier think they are dealing with a British prime minister, then I have news for them. Theresa May might still have the title, but she's nothing more than a prime ministerial ghost squatting in Number 10, awaiting the political *coup de grâce* from a party that despises her. While many of you just want the whole Brexit debacle to be over, to get on with your building of a European superstate in peace, Mrs May is clinging to your enterprise like a dog on a postman's leg. Not only is Mrs May ignoring her party and the electorate in trying to force a vassal state deal on Britain, she's also negotiated her way into enacting the Remain-minded policies of the Labour opposition.

Now bearing in mind the attitude of the British people to the EU project to date – and imagine what it would be like after a complete Brexit betrayal – shall I call on you all to do Britain and the EU project a favour? Give May the *coup de grâce* the Conservatives are too weak to deliver, and let the UK leave on 12 April.

**Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE).** – Madam President, I still have to make one comment because what also shocked me in Mr Batten's statement was that he called the UK 'nominally a democracy'. I would disagree. I think it is a democracy in reality.

Let me start, however, on a positive note, welcoming rather encouraging reports on the launching of the settled status scheme in the UK, but I think that the challenge today is somewhere else. For 129 days we have had a withdrawal deal on the table and we now have a European Council decision regarding extension until 12 April. So it is dramatically late, but not too late, and there is still a chance to avoid no deal by accident. But that requires the UK to set a workable plan with a clear end result.

It is the last chance for Prime Minister May to establish, with the leader of the Labour Party, a common approach, based on what has been lacking so far, which is trust – a common approach that would allow the UK to move forward and avoid no deal. This is crucial because the future of citizens is at stake. All the concerns we see coming out of the House of Commons relate to the Political Declaration, and we are ready to look at different options to accommodate British worries about the future.

Let me finish by underlining once more that no deal is in nobody's interests, no deal is not what the European Union has striven for and no deal is not what the United Kingdom has committed to achieve.

**Richard Corbett (S&D).** – Madam President, does Mrs May really wish to make a deal with Jeremy Corbyn? It would involve her abandoning everything she has said up to now about customs union, Single Market: abandoning every red line she laid down. If she doesn't, the House of Commons will continue to reject her deal and to want to avoid a no-deal scenario. But it's significant that, in the indicative votes that took place in the House of Commons, the one that gained the highest number of votes was the proposal to have a confirmatory referendum putting it back to the people. And that's not surprising, because look at public opinion in Britain; look at the swings in the opinion polls; look at the numbers of people who've signed a petition to simply revoke Article 50. There is growing support for reversing this historic mistake, and on 10 April it would be folly if the European Council decided that it prefers to end this without a deal and without further ado, just at the point when we can change this course of action.

**Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR).** – Madam President, earlier we heard Mr Farage, Mr Batten, Mr O'Flynn and Mr Hookem, and I think they are experts in London bashing, as much as Mr Verhofstadt is.

President Juncker, last week you accused Britain's ex-Prime Minister of being one of the biggest destroyers in recent history. While I agree that Brexit is indeed a catastrophe for both Britain and the European Union, I ask myself: how can you put Mr Cameron in the same gallery as other real destroyers of history in Europe? I think I know the reason. I think you want to deflect from your own role in Brexit. Where the Lisbon Treaty called for competition, you advocated the opposite: harmonisation. Where the Treaty called for subsidiarity, your Commission constantly pushed for more power to Brussels. And while Britain joined a football club, you decided to play hockey. It was your policies which forced David Cameron to call for a referendum in the first place, and it was your refusal to grant him more autonomy on immigration matters which contributed ...

*(Interjection from the President)*

Mr Cameron is not one of the biggest destroyers in recent history, but your insult of David Cameron must be one of the biggest smokescreens ever produced by a politician in recent history. Avoid becoming the President who lost Britain. Give Mrs May an extension without any conditions so we maintain a chance that they stay in the European Union.

*(Applause)*

**Catherine Bearder (ALDE).** – Madam President, I was born in 1949. Europe was in chaos, a mess left by a war of hate and racism. Thankfully, visionary, clear-thinking people worked to build a safe, secure, united and free Europe, building a union based on values and principles that protect its citizens, with freedoms that were just a dream in 1949. We all stand on the shoulders of those architects: Schuman, Monnet, Adenauer, Churchill, and our own Simone Veil, and so many others.

This union is a gem. It sets the benchmark for the world on trade standards, environmental protection and human rights. It's not perfect, but it's the best yet. We must all defend it. And this Chamber is the shining example of cooperation and tolerance. I wish Westminster could follow our example. As the UK turns its back on the EU, descending into chaos and confusion, whatever the outcome, it will be bad for Britain.

So I look to future generations, including my own sons, born as European citizens, with hard-won rights, into a peaceful continent. It is the young who must rebuild the UK's trust with the EU, bringing Britain back to its rightful place with its closest neighbours.

On a personal note, I thank you for the tolerance you have all shown to us Brits as we have driven you to the end of your patience. Thanks too for the friendship and support to me and others with so many in this House as we've been fighting to stay with you.

You will remain our friends.

**President.** – Madam Bearder, I really will have to interrupt.

Not only that, colleagues, I broke the gavel, so I will have a real problem keeping time. But on a very serious note, we have a real difficulty. I'm going to announce now that there is no catch-the-eye possible at all, with my apologies to colleagues who wanted to make an intervention, and I ask the next speakers to please adhere to time.

**Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, what the British Government could not do to Ireland during the conflict, Member States, the 27 of you must not even contemplate doing during peace. Our peace process is too important, so don't even try to contemplate to reinforce partition by hardening the border in Ireland. And as for erecting two borders, the solution is to remove borders, not to add borders.

Of course the EU needs to protect its single market. However, the EU must also uphold its treaty obligation to do no damage to an international agreement – the Good Friday Agreement. There is a democratically endorsed way for the EU to do both, yet you are ignoring the solution.

If you think by constructing two borders in Ireland you will encourage the British back to the negotiation table after a crash you know little about the British establishment, because it doesn't give a hoot about the people of Ireland. It never has and it never will. So, if in the event of a crash, you choose not to advance our democratic pathway back into the EU, then at least do no bloody harm.

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, a little over 20 years ago in this Chamber I made my first plenary speech as an SNP member – Scotland's party of independence – and I came here hoping that I would play a part in Scotland's transition to normality as an independent country. That was not to be, and look where we are now. I could never have imagined 20 years ago, that I'd be trapped in this idiotic Westminster chaos of Brexit.

Voters in Scotland voted to remain. Every single local authority area in Scotland voted by majority to remain, and yet Westminster continues to ignore Scotland's interests in this process. And to date, we have seen the London government and Parliament failing even to make a negotiated settlement amongst themselves, let alone an international one.

Scotland can and must do better, and I think that our recent experience in the last two or three years has amply illustrated the argument for independence for Scotland, so that we, as a normal country, can make our own arrangements with our neighbours and the rest of the world.

**Paulo Rangel (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Caro Presidente da Comissão, Senhor Michel Barnier, Presidência, o primeiro ponto que queria que ficasse claro é que ninguém quer nem deseja que o Reino Unido saia. Foi uma decisão do Reino Unido e se ele a quiser revogar será bem-vinda. Mas, se não a quiser revogar, será também respeitada. O Reino Unido faz falta à União Europeia e falo de um país atlântico que sabe que a visão atlântica do Reino Unido faz falta.

Mas choca-me imenso, choca-me muito, que a nossa discussão aqui seja essencialmente geopolítica, sobre soluções políticas. Ninguém fala sobre os cidadãos e as empresas que estão neste momento a sofrer a maior crise de incerteza e de instabilidade. É isso que eu peço, quer à Comissão, quer ao Conselho, quer ao Parlamento: que se fixem no interesse dos cidadãos e das empresas.

Temos de pensar num plano de contingência para os próximos dias, temos de pensar naqueles que em casa estão a sofrer. São milhões e milhões de cidadãos europeus que neste momento sofrem com esta confusão criada pelo Reino Unido.

**Seb Dance (S&D).** – Mr President, I would say to Ms Foster that that was quite some speech. You say 'goodbye to remainers'. Well, given Brexit has destroyed the Conservative Party, fairly soon we'll be able to say 'goodbye and good riddance to the Conservative Party', and I look forward to that day.



We cannot rely on a decision that's made in a panic. If the deal is passed in a panic, if some other concoction is passed in a panic, it is not sustainable. I understand we want a resolution to this, I want that no less than anyone else, but please, we may need more time. The only sustainable way forward is to put whatever comes out of this process to a vote of the people, because it is nothing like what was offered in 2016. And don't be afraid of giving us more time if we need a longer extension, Mr Verhofstadt and others, don't judge us by the people over there who rail against the benefits of the European Union.

Judge my country by the plurality of people who are in it: the pro-Europeans, the millions who have signed the petition to revoke Article 50, the millions who have taken to the streets to defend the values of this place. We are the true Britain, we defend Europe, we defend its values and we're not going anywhere. Don't be afraid of us. Welcome us and give us the time we need.

**Julie Girling (PPE).** – Madam President, thank you to Mr Dance because I can follow very neatly on from what he said and I can drop some of what I was going to say. I want to appeal to Members of this Parliament directly, as fellow parliamentarians. We uniquely represent the people of Europe, the citizens of Europe and, as we stand at this moment, 60-odd million of them still reside in the UK. We are still members of the European Union. We have not left yet. We have not got an agreement to leave yet. Please, I ask you to remember that because for us it's really important that you give us the opportunity to redress the damage that has been done, and the only way that can happen is by giving us a long extension and us fighting the European elections. Yes, Mrs May is terrified of fighting the European elections and so is every other Westminster politician that you will see on the TV and so are my friends over here. They know that, unlike their rhetoric of dangling the bogeyman of Mr Farage coming back, actually, it's going to be quite tricky for them, and you're going to return, if we have the European elections, to a very strong pro-European contingent from the UK. Give us that opportunity. Don't jump off the cliff.

**Jean-Claude Juncker, Präsident der Kommission.** – Frau Präsidentin! Eigentlich habe ich keine Lust mehr, mich zu diesem Thema Brexit noch weiter zu äußern. Aber Herr Henkel hat einiges hier vorgebracht, dem ich strikt widersprechen muss. Denn das, was er sagt, stimmt nicht. Nicht Juncker oder die Kommission hat Großbritannien dazu gezwungen, ein Referendum abzuhalten. Das war Herr Cameron. Herr Cameron hat das getan, obwohl wir – Tusk und ich – uns mit ihm auf ein Austrittsabkommen geeinigt hatten. Wir haben dieses Austrittsabkommen verteidigt; Herr Cameron nicht, mit keinem Wort. Das, was wir nächtelang durchverhandelt haben, wurde von der britischen Regierung, von Herrn Cameron, während der Referendumskampagne mit keinem einzigen Wort erwähnt. Und in diesem Abkommen standen große Zugeständnisse, was die Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit anbelangt. Sie müssen lesen, was abgemacht wurde, und zuhören hier! Sie haben Herrn Farage zitiert – er hat heute überhaupt nicht geredet.

Also ich finde das unredlich, was Sie hier gemacht haben. Wieso können Sie die Kommission eigentlich beschuldigen, dass wir in Sachen Harmonisierung übertrieben hätten? Wir haben Hunderte Texte von der Tagesordnung genommen, nur 23 neue Initiativen vorgeschlagen – im Direktvergleich mit der Vorgängerkommission 100 Initiativen pro Jahr weniger.

Also, ich habe mir erlaubt, Ihnen zu antworten, weil Sie nicht mehr hier bleiben werden.

**Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Madam President, we have to remain confident and patient, even if there is some delay. The parliamentary process in the UK will lead to some clarity on the next steps in our future relationship with the UK, with or without a withdrawal agreement.

Depending on the outcome, we will have to address the implementation of the agreement on which we will have to exert a rigorous oversight so that it delivers in the interest of citizens and businesses, or to engage in negotiations for a future relationship with the UK, even in the case of a no-deal scenario, but with clear pre-conditions. We will therefore count on your cooperation at all the stages of these processes in the years to come.

**President.** – The debate is closed.

*(The sitting was suspended briefly)*

*Written statements (Rule 162)*

**Alfred Sant (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The crisis in coming to a ‘final’ settlement over Brexit weighs most heavily on Britain. The institutions there have not coped successfully with the challenge of addressing how Brexit, once endorsed by the British people, should be defined and then how negotiations about it should be conducted. However, it is illusory to believe that the current fiasco – and worse any diplomatic crash that could result – will impact mostly on the UK alone.

The fiasco, and potentially worse, could create deep fissures within the Union itself. These would reinforce existing levels of distrust, not least between east and west. Moreover, further ripple effects could ensue in the same direction, not least about issues of financing, cohesion and freedom of movement. Clearly, the framework provided by Article 50 for withdrawal from the Union is not fit for purpose, as I have argued right from the start of the Brexit talks. It seems to me that, with their emphasis on keeping a unified position, EU leaders may be misjudging the need to remain flexible in sticking to their red lines of border integrity, the sanctity of free movement rules and the implications of negotiating time-frames.

**Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Na decisão do povo britânico está presente um profundo sentimento de rejeição da União Europeia e das suas políticas que agridem os direitos e as aspirações dos trabalhadores e dos diferentes povos da Europa e aumentam as desigualdades e assimetrias, e que desrespeitam a soberania. Ao Governo português e à União Europeia pede-se que intervenham resolutamente, seja junto das autoridades do Reino Unido para assegurar a defesa dos direitos dos mais de 300 mil cidadãos portugueses a viver e trabalhar no país, como o direito de residência, igualdade de tratamento, acesso aos serviços públicos de cuidados de saúde e de educação, às prestações de segurança social, ao reagrupamento familiar, o reconhecimento mútuo das habilitações académicas e das qualificações profissionais.

## PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

*Presidente*

### 12. **Debata z premierem Szwecji Stefanem Löfvenem na temat przyszłości Europy (debata)**

**President.** – The next item is the debate with the Prime Minister of Sweden, Stefan Löfven, on the Future of Europe (2019/2672(RSP)).

I want to thank the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden. Thank you for coming to this debate with the European Parliament. We want to put the European Parliament at the centre of the dialogue on the future of the European Union with meetings with the leaders of the Member States. For us, it is important to know your position, your strategy for the future of the European Union. This is not a debate on the situation in Sweden. It is a debate on Europe.

As you know, Mr Prime Minister, for us it is important to achieve a good solution for Brexit. Today, this is one of the most important points for the European Parliament. It is important your work in the European Council on the Dublin reform is another very important point for the European Parliament. We are strongly engaged against climate change. We are strongly engaged against terrorism. We want to pave the way for a better future for our citizens. Youth unemployment is another problem for us. We want to work together to reduce youth unemployment.

In conclusion, on the budget. We want more money for the European budget. Our proposal needs to change from 1.1% of our GDP to 1.3% of our GDP, but not through more taxation coming from Member States. We want to work on our own resources. This is our proposal, our ideas.

Mr Prime Minister, thank you very much for coming. The floor is yours.

**Stefan Löfven**, *Prime Minister of Sweden*. – Mr President, Vice-President of the Commission, distinguished leaders of the political groups, Members of the Parliament, my fellow Europeans, firstly, let me express my appreciation for all the efforts and the work during this electoral period and the progress that you have achieved for Europe and us all. But of course, my focus today will not be on our past but on our future.

I believe that we must step up to defend our fundamental values in the European Union, and the most strategic way to fight the forces that challenge those values is to deliver results in the areas of employment, security, migration, climate change, and thus to create hope for the future. So that should be our core mission: the defence of our democratic values and our young people's dream.

There are people that say that idealism is the preserve of the young, and that when we enter into the world of adults, we learn that nothing is black and white and realise that self-interest and cynical trade-off rules the world. I believe that narrative is wrong.

My parents took me in as a foster child. They taught about shared responsibility, about respect for every human being, about solidarity, and during both my trade union and political life as an adult, I have had to compromise and make tough decisions in difficult situations such as economic downturns – but also terror attacks.

That has not made me forget my values. It has only deepened my belief in the importance of having a moral compass to guide you through these tough times, because if we didn't let our values steer our decisions, if we didn't feel that our choices were leading us towards the kind of society we believe in, what would be the point in making decisions at all?

The same applies to the European Union. Our Union is based on values. The whole idea of creating a common market and joint responsibility for coal and steel production was to tie our countries and the people closer together. We wanted to fulfil Friedrich Schiller's sentiments in the Ode to Joy that 'Alle Menschen werden Brüder', with equal rights, equal value and which, put to the music of Beethoven, became our common anthem.

And now that our Union has grown in size and has grown older as well, we, just like the individual, need to remember our most fundamental values. For what would be the ultimate point of our work, the ultimate point of our Union, if we did not promote the values that we believe in?

And this, my friends, may also be the best thing we can do for the world. We are living in a time when the multilateral system is being shaken to its core. The United Kingdom wants to leave our Union. The transatlantic link is being questioned. Meanwhile, China is on the rise, and several economies in South-East Asia and Africa are ready to follow in its footsteps and redraw the entire global economic map. And at the same time, Russia is acting in a revanchist manner, in flagrant contempt of international law. So, now more than ever, it is time to stand up for common principle-based solutions and a world order where might does not come before right.

But the EU can only be a strong voice for democracy in the world if all of us Member States stand up for the principles of democracy – also at home. We can only be a credible actor in the Middle East if we fight anti-Semitism and Islamophobia in our own countries. We can only be a force for free media and the rule of law in our neighbourhood if we have a free media and independent courts in our Union.

For every democratic principle that is weakened in the EU, the EU's voice in the world will be equally weakened.

*(Applause)*

Therefore the EU must stand up for our fundamental values, both externally in our world but also, of course, internally in our Union. And this is more than about our place in the world. This is about the whole future of our cooperation. If the principles contained in our most fundamental contracts are not adhered to, how are we then to trust other agreements on the single market, on free movement – everything that does so much for our prosperity?

If our promises to each other are to be trusted, if our cooperation and our economy are to continue to grow, then *pacta sunt servanda* must apply to the most fundamental contracts of all. And therefore, Sweden will work to defend the EU's core values in the budget negotiations, in our support of the Commission's work, and my government will propose to the Swedish Parliament that Sweden will join the European Public Prosecutor's Office to contribute in the fight against corruption and the embezzlement of EU funds.

(Applause)

We support also the Belgian proposal, or something similar, to establish an EU mechanism for the peer review of adherence to the rule of law. And I will devote my efforts in Europe to defending the values that I have borne since my childhood: of the equal value of all people and of solidarity. I will give my all, side by side with so many of you, to refute and fight the extremist forces who deny these values and those forces that are doing everything they can to tear apart the Union that defends them. And of course, EU is a compromise: probably one of the most successful compromises in world history.

But there can be no compromising on human dignity. There is no reasonable level of anti-Semitism, no acceptable level of racism, no tolerable level of misogyny or homophobia. Never will we compromise on these values.

(Applause)

The defence of democracy is also the defence of young people's dreams. Is there anything more dangerous to society than its young people ceasing to dream?

It is in societies that have lost hope that both political and religious extremism can grow the strongest, and this is not only crucial in the fight against extremism, but also in the work to uphold broad, popular support for our Union.

I believe it is crucial for all of us in the current Brexit negotiations, for example, that the UK and the EU have the ability to move on as friends and create a close, strong and long-term relationship.

But the only way for the EU to avoid similar exit ordeals in the future is to constantly prove its worth to people's everyday lives and to their dreams for the future. And that is why the EU should not only benefit the market but, preferably, benefit its people. It is also why the work for a larger market can also be the work for a stronger democracy – if that can create jobs and hope for our young people.

Over the past two years, South African President Cyril Ramaphosa and I have co-chaired a Global Commission on the future of work for the International Labour Organisation. And there is no doubt that in the future, work will be more advanced, more automatised, more digitised, and that demand for skilled workers will soar. This is good news for the EU. We benefit from a global competition that is based on knowledge rather than lower wages.

But we cannot rest on our laurels, because everyone wants to be in the same position. China has long been educating more engineers than the United States, Germany and Japan put together. So in this respect, our European cooperation will have an incredibly important role to play in the creation and sharing of world-leading knowledge and innovation. And there are always many competing interests in budget negotiations; you know that better than most.

But my country has learned the very hard way that it is only with strict priorities and a budget that is under control that democracy actually can deliver in the long-term and with stability. And that is why, given all the competing interests, we do not propose a larger budget, but rather the stronger prioritisation of innovation, new jobs and the digital, educational and physical infrastructure required to make them possible.

It is our responsibility, for our young people's dreams, to take advantage of this opportunity. Our solution can never be to lower wages or raise protectionist walls. We should not shut ourselves off from the world. We should lead it.

Therefore I am proud also that young people now in Tallinn or in Bratislava can listen to hip hop from Paris or Fado from Lisbon on Spotify from Stockholm. But I also know how hard Spotify had to work to get launched in Europe. Compare that to a start-up company in Silicon Valley. They can launch a product on the US market and reach more than 320 million people immediately. So our only chance of competing with this is to make it just as easy to reach all the citizens in the European Union at the same time. And believe me, anyone who has lived through a dark Nordic winter knows that we can not compete with California when it comes to weather.

For generations, people from our continent have travelled across the Atlantic in search of a better life. But the young geniuses and IT geniuses of today and the future should not have to go west, or east for that matter, to realise their dreams. They should be able to do so here in Europe, in a digital market open to everyone.

Friends, it is now almost a treat to visit the European Commission website and see that one priority policy area is the European pillar of social rights. Of course, my pride is not diminished when it also says that we launched this work in the Swedish city of Gothenburg.

I'm grateful to President Juncker, the Commission, to the European Parliament, to the Member States and the Council for all of our work to create a social pillar and establish 20 key principles that strengthen the social rights of all the citizens of Europe.

But no worker will or should thank us, unless these 20 principles also become reality across the EU: until we stand up for collective agreements and fair wages, until we put a stop to rule-breaking and tax fraud, until we secure gender equality and women's right to a full wage, a career without glass ceilings and the freedom to decide over their own lives.

For this very same reason, Sweden will actively promote new free trade agreements, because we know how many jobs these agreements can create. But all these agreements should also be favourable to people as well as to the market. The agreements must respect our environment, our health and the rights of workers. And there is an enormous potential for the European services market if it's opened up and shaped with concern for social rights.

The EU labour market must be defined by all of the positive freedoms: the freedom to study abroad, learn languages, work throughout Europe – but never the freedom to set workers against workers.

*(Applause)*

Our common labour market should not crush workers' dreams; it should fulfil them.

I know that, if you are to have hope in the future, you must also feel safe here and now. ISIS and terrorism are dreadful security threats that must be dealt with together, but unfortunately that's not the only challenge that we have.

I recently met the leadership of Europol at their headquarters in The Hague and their virtual command post. Europol has done an amazing job, not least breaking up and arresting paedophile networks. This type of crime – every nation and nation's police service can see their part, but we can only see the whole and crush it in cooperation with others.

A single nation would not – even if it really wanted to, even if it poured in resources – be able to solve that alone. So Europe is borderless for criminals as well. They read up the European laws looking for the weakest national legislation and for the new national markets to enter.

That is why Sweden wants to deepen European efforts to fight organised crime as well as cyber threats.

We want to strengthen our cooperation on security and defence, increase our ability to implement joint civilian and military crisis management operations, and have a European Union that cooperates with strategic partners and builds security together.

I also know that there is a broad agreement in this Parliament and on this continent that the EU must never again lose control in the way it did during the refugee crisis. Chaotic migration affects the confidence of the whole of society and the reception of refugees, but it affects the refugees themselves worst of all.

The only ones who benefit are right-wing extremists who are able to use the situation to inflame hatred of migrants.

The EU's free movement of people requires shared external borders and a shared responsibility for orderly, regulated migration, built on three pillars.

Firstly, strong cooperation with countries outside the EU, so that fewer people are displaced and more people can have better living conditions, so that new migration crises can be reduced or prevented entirely.

Secondly, the control of all external borders, which is now taking place through the strengthening of Frontex, creating greater security and saving lives.

Thirdly, the fair distribution of those who arrive and whose grounds for asylum are to be examined, with that work carried out as a shared responsibility by all Member States.

It should not be possible to benefit from all of the advantages of the Schengen cooperation and then refuse to share the responsibility for its maintenance. And we have, in this respect, a huge task ahead of us. Sweden will do its best to support the completion of that task, and I'm under no illusion that it will be simple. But if we fail to deliver, the Schengen Agreement will be weakened, and in the long run, so will the entire European Union.

So it's time now to step up for orderly and regulated migration in Europe. It is in the best interest of us all.

Dear friends, as Swedes, we're often asked: 'Do you know Abba? Do you know Zlatan Ibrahimović?' Now we're getting ready for a new question: 'Do you know Greta Thunberg?' We're proud of the demonstrations that she has inspired, which gathered over a million young people all over the world. But one thing we must never forget in their message is the following: it is not up to their generation to solve the climate crisis, it is up to us: all generations, here and now.

*(Applause)*

Sweden is ready to be in the lead of that work and show what is possible. We have a climate framework for our society which will lead our efforts to cut emissions quickly and powerfully and achieve net zero emissions by 2045.

But it's us together that must implement the Paris Agreement – without any ifs, without any buts, without maybes – in order to keep the global temperature rise below 1.5°, and as part of this work, the EU needs to adopt a goal of net zero emissions by 2050 at the very latest. This is also a great opportunity for European industry, as the whole world is crying out for new solutions. So this is not only the right thing to do morally, it is the smart thing to do economically, and it is crucial to our survival.

To conclude, Mr President, this is what I want to say to you today: idealism is not only the preserve of the young. Our common values have been the basis for the EU's fantastic history, and they must guide us now, so that we can have an even brighter future. And in these times, when people say that the EU must prove its worth, there is no better task for our Union than defending our democratic values and by delivering on jobs, security, migration and climate change, defending the dreams of our young people.

An EU that can deliver this not only gains greater legitimacy but also a stronger voice in our world. It is indeed a difficult task, but that is why it's so alluring, and that is why it's so perfect for us.

*(Applause)*

**President.** – Thank you very much Mr Prime Minister. Thank you for your speech, for your proposal on the future of the European Union and your engagement.

Now we need to close the electronic registration for catch-the-eye.

**Valdis Dombrovskis**, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it's a great pleasure to represent President Juncker in this debate on the future of our Union with Prime Minister Löfven.

At the start of next year, we will celebrate 25 years of Sweden taking its rightful place at the heart of our Union. In this time, Sweden has brought so much to the European Union, from its rich culture to its unique social model.

In many ways, a Swedish way of doing things has become both an example and a guide for our future. Sweden is a country that does more than simply talk about European values. It puts them right at the heart of its society through its strong social protection and high-quality education and health care for all, and it is a country that always looks forward. For instance, Sweden was one of the first countries to pass a Climate Act with the explicit goal of being carbon neutral by 2045. It is also well ahead of the rest when it comes to embracing a new digital world.

Stockholm is now home to more one billion plus companies, or so-called unicorns, per capita anywhere in the EU and is the most important tech hub of this kind outside Silicon Valley. We can learn from all of this. But, as we look forward, there is another Swedish concept that I believe should be central to the future of our Union.

For many Swedes, *lagom* is a lifestyle and a habit of mind. It is a Swedish philosophy of moderation and balance, of avoiding both excess and extreme. For many, it is the secret of a balanced, sustainable and happy life. As we look to our future, Europe should inspire itself from *lagom* to find the right balance for all of its Member States and all of its citizens. It means focusing on the things that matter most to Europeans and doing less elsewhere. It means tackling the big issues by being open to compromise and finding balanced solutions to common challenges.

In this spirit, I want to commend the Prime Minister and all of Sweden for the way they responded to the migration crisis in 2015. Ever since, it has been leading efforts on a long-term and comprehensive reform of our asylum system so that it offers protection for those who need it. The solution we need must balance solidarity and responsibility. The Commission has put the package of asylum reform on the table, and Europeans now expect their leaders to make real progress. We count on Sweden to continue leading those efforts.

Sweden has also been at the forefront of efforts to make our Union more socially fair for all, an issue which is second nature to your country. I want to thank the Prime Minister for his personal leadership on the European Pillar of Social Rights launched by President Juncker in Gothenburg in 2017. It is a shared and future-proof commitment to support a fairer and more equal society across Europe.

Once again, it's about finding the right balance. This is, of course, mainly a national competence, and the EU does not interfere with the crucial role played by the social partners. But there is a lot we can do together and, thanks to the Social Pillar, we already have. We have ensured equal pay for equal work in the same place. In recent months, we have agreed new rules to improve the work-life balance for parents and carers. We have agreed to set up a European Labour Authority to make the labour market fairer and support the 17 million Europeans who work in another Member State. And we are investing in skills to help people get on the job market or find new opportunities in today's rapidly-changing world of work.

When it comes to the future of our Union, there is no more important priority than the fight against climate change. Millions of young Europeans in Europe, and increasingly beyond Europe, are marching. Politicians – at least European politicians – are listening to the young people. They tell us that every year of their lives has been one of the warmest recorded. Indeed, 17 out of 18 of the hottest years on record all occurred in this century, and we see with our own eyes the damage that this is causing.

We saw devastating forest fires and hugely costly droughts in Sweden and elsewhere last summer and, just recently, we had another tragic reminder of this in Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe. Sadly, this is not a freak event or a one-off. By 2050, climate change could force more than 10% of the global population to flee their homes. The world needs to respond, and Europe needs to continue leading the way. We did that with the Paris Agreement, which we are implementing at home and helping others to do the same right across the world.

For example, the Commission has already proposed to devote a quarter of the EU's budget to climate-related action as of 2021. But public finance alone will not be enough to meet our ambitious climate and energy targets by 2030. The financial sector needs to play its part in the fight against climate change. This is why we put forward an Action Plan on Sustainable Finance to incentivise private capital to flow towards green projects. We immediately followed up with three legislative proposals, two of which have already been agreed at EU level.

But fighting climate change takes more than targets, and it will not stop in 2030. We must look further ahead. This is why the Commission has set a long-term strategy to be climate neutral by 2050. According to our estimates, this would lead to clean technology solutions, boost our GDP by up to two percent, and take off as much as EUR 3 trillion from our energy import bill while ensuring a just and socially-balanced transition for all. It is good for people and it's good for the economy, and, for me, that is what European leadership looks like in the 21st century. The world expects, and we must deliver.

This is why we have focused our proposals for the new Multiannual Financial Framework on areas where European action can have the biggest impact. To respond to the future challenges, the Commission has proposed a modest increase in our long-term budget to an equivalent of 1.11% of the EU 27's GNI. We hope that Member States will support this approach, which is a minimum to fund our joint European actions. As Sweden, for example, has long called for, we have put forward programmes that are modern, flexible and focused, and we are investing where there is the greatest potential for our future.

Funding for research and innovation will be increased by 50%, to reach EUR 100 billion. A new Digital Europe programme, worth EUR 9 billion, will support Europe's digital transformation and create new opportunities for Swedish tech companies like Spotify or Klarna to flourish, and, as I mentioned, we will ensure that 25% of the budget will support our climate and sustainable development targets. There is no greater return on investment than a clean planet for future generations.

Prime Minister, honourable Members, it is only by working together to make our Union stronger that we can collectively tackle the issues which individually we never could. The last 25 years of Swedish membership of the European Union should be our template. It shows that a stronger, more sovereign Europe means a stronger, more sovereign Sweden, and it shows the virtues of showing true responsibility and solidarity. As we look to our future, this should inspire us to help us to find the balance – the *lagom* – that we need in our Union.

(Applause)

**Manfred Weber**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank you, Prime Minister Löfven, for the inspiring speech, and thank you for the start of your speech. You spoke about the fundamental principles of Europe, about our values, democracy, rule of law, freedom probably as a title of Europe, which is the overwhelming value for us, and about the independence of the judiciary. You mentioned these issues and you know that you have the European Parliament on your side when we speak about defending these values for Europe.

The step which is ahead of us is that you have to consider strengthening the defence mechanism internally. In the European Parliament we have already spoken a lot about an upgraded rule of law mechanism in today's European Union – Article 7. It is not strong enough, it's not effective enough to protect the values of Europe, and that's why the upgraded rule of law mechanism should be one of the main activities for the next five years into the Europe of the future. You're right – it's not possible to defend our values to the outside when we don't implement them internally, so thank you for this.

Ich möchte heute zwei Sachen herausgreifen, die Sie angesprochen haben und die viele Menschen mit Schweden verbinden. Das erste ist, dass Schweden für viele Europäer das Land der Fairness und der Gerechtigkeit, das Land der Solidarität ist. Und es ist in Europa notwendiger als jemals zuvor, über diese Themen nachzudenken, sie anzuwenden.

Wir haben heute ein Europa, das von vielen Menschen als ein Europa der Banken, der Märkte, des Geldes wahrgenommen wird und zu wenig als ein Europa des Zusammenhaltes, der sozialen Marktwirtschaft. Deswegen möchte ich diesen Akzent aufgreifen: So wie es Valdis Dombrovskis beschrieben hat, hat die heutige Kommission, unter Führung von Jean-Claude Juncker gemeinsam mit Marianne Thyssen, schon viele Initiativen auf den Weg gebracht, die wir als EVP unterstützen, Initiativen, die zu einem starken Solidaritätsgefühl und zu einem starken sozialen Europa führen. Im Respekt gegenüber den nationalen Parlamenten – weil Sie ja auch zurecht angesprochen haben, dass viele Kompetenzen national verankert sind – müssen wir das miteinander anpacken.



Ich würde gern noch einen konkreten Vorschlag mit einbringen: Europa ist ja für Handelspolitik zuständig. Wir machen *trade agreements* auf europäischer Ebene – die wir dort aushandeln und für die Europa die Verantwortung trägt, vor allem eine schwedische Kommissarin – und ich glaube, dass Europa solidarisch gefordert ist, wenn negative Folgen aufgrund dieser Handelspolitik entstehen, wenn manche Märkte, manche Industrien unter Druck kommen wegen des internationalen Handels und der Öffnung der Märkte. Das heißt, wir werden uns in der nächsten Legislaturperiode überlegen müssen, den bestehenden Europäischen Globalisierungsfonds so aufzustocken, so auszustatten, dass er die negativen Wirkungen, die eben auch mit Globalisierung verbunden sind, noch besser abfedern kann, damit die Menschen spüren, Europa steht ihnen zur Seite, wenn Veränderungen anstehen.

Wofür ich dankbar bin, ist, dass Sie Mut gemacht haben, dass Sie nicht Angst gemacht haben, gerade bei Handelsfragen, beim Öffnen von Märkten, bei der internationalen Zusammenarbeit, dass wir das anpacken müssen und dass wir da Mut machen müssen.

Das zweite, was viele Menschen mit Schweden verbindet, hatten Sie auch angesprochen: Das ist Greta Thunberg, die wirklich vielen Menschen Motivation gibt. Über eine Million junger Menschen auf den Straßen, zweitausend Städte, in denen die Demonstrationen stattfanden. Umweltschutz – in Ihrem Anliegen jetzt Klimaschutz als Priorität, aber im weiteren Sinne Umweltschutz als das große Thema. Und ich möchte ein Thema herausgreifen, das neben dem Klimawandel sicher auch eine der Prioritäten der nächsten Zeit werden muss, nämlich die Frage, wie wir mit Plastik umgehen.

Wir haben letzte Woche im Europäischen Parlament das Verbot von Einwegplastik beschlossen. Wir dürfen uns jetzt aber nicht darauf ausruhen, dass wir als Europäer hier einen guten Beschluss gefasst haben. Wir müssen überlegen, ob wir, ähnlich wie beim Klimaschutz, jetzt auch internationale Initiativen starten. Warum sollte man für das Verbot von Einwegplastik nicht einen ähnlichen Weg gehen, wie wir es beim Übereinkommen von Paris gemacht haben, nämlich dass wir internationale Lösungen brauchen?

Wir alle wissen, dass der Ozean nicht geschützt werden kann, wenn nur Europa handelt. Wir brauchen dafür jetzt die Kraft, international Anstöße zu geben. Und so, wie wir beim Klimawandel stolz darauf sein können, dass Europa der führende Kontinent war, so können wir jetzt auch in Fragen Plastikverbot auf internationaler Ebene Initiativen starten, mit dem, was wir in Europa vorleben, jetzt auf internationaler Ebene arbeiten, zeigen, wozu Europa gemeinsam imstande ist.

Insofern danke für die schwedischen Beiträge, danke für die Anregungen! Ich glaube, dass Schweden wesentliche Anstöße für die Zukunft Europas geben kann.

**Presidente.** – Prima di dare la parola all'on. Bullmann, presidente del gruppo S&D, saluto il pubblico che segue sempre con grande attenzione i nostri dibattiti, i nostri visitatori che vengono a conoscere meglio il funzionamento delle Istituzioni comunitarie.

**Udo Bullmann, on behalf of the S&D Group.** – Mr President, I would like to thank Prime Minister Stefan Löfven for the great speech today; and many, many thanks for all the gifts that the Swedish nation, Swedish society, has given to Europe and to the world in the past. Yes, one of the strongest social welfare systems in the world. Yes, a huge tradition of social compromise, strong trade unions and, from the early days of your democracy, the capacity to strike alliances between different social groups in your society. What you have done during the last decades is also built on this early compromise encompassing both industrial workers, in metropolitan areas especially, and farmers and rural areas, for the value of nature, the value of natural resources, has always been acknowledged in the Swedish debate. That makes you prominent. That puts you in the front row when it comes to the answers today to the challenges to Europe and the challenges to the world – sustainability and also fairness, equality, especially with respect to gender, and acceptance – not only acceptance, but the idea – of the necessity of putting women on an equal footing and granting them full rights in civic life as well as in the labour market.

So you can find the Swedes in the lead in this modern world, and we can also see that from the very issues of our debates today. Greta Thunberg has rightly mentioned, and we have praised, the commitment of the young generation. But there is a direct line to Gothenburg and the summit in 2001, when we saw António Guterres, under the Portuguese Presidency in 2000, coming forward with this grand idea – I would still say grand idea – of the Lisbon Strategy to have a new modern, holistic approach to economic policy. And it was the Swedish Government which, a year later, added sustainability as a crucial element in this discussion. Gothenburg 2001, the Gothenburg of the social pillar and now Greta Thunberg, always leading the progressive discourse.

My neighbour to the right, Ms Maria João Rodrigues, had the pleasure – and we thank you very much for that – of contributing to both Gothenburgs, as an essential player. So this was well done and still makes us proud today.

Nachhaltigkeit, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ist das Thema, dem sich meine Fraktion verschrieben hat. Denn wir werden Europa nur dann weiter in einer führenden Position erleben, wenn wir unsere Wirtschaftspolitik auf die Erfordernisse der Umwelt einstellen und wenn wir unsere Umweltpolitik auf die Erfordernisse der Menschen, der Arbeit und des sozialen Zusammenhalts einstellen. Das ist die Politik meiner Fraktion. Von dieser Politik, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, möchten wir gerne haben, dass sie die dominante Politik der nächsten fünf Jahre der Europäischen Kommission wird. Deswegen kämpfen wir für das Szenario 1 der Nachhaltigkeit, wenn es darum geht, unsere wirtschaftspolitischen Instrumente zu renovieren, weil wir nur mit einer inklusiven Politik, nur mit einem ganzheitlichen Entwurf das leisten können, wozu Europa aufgerufen ist.

Ich danke dem Ministerpräsidenten von Schweden, weil er deutlich gemacht hat, dass Idealismus keine Altersfrage ist, sondern eine Frage des Herzens, unseres Verstandes, unseres Lebensgefühls. Ich habe nur eine Bitte, weil mir das gelegentlich Sorgen macht: Ich weiß um die Stärke unserer nordischen Mitgliedsländer, ich weiß um ihre Kraft, ich weiß um ihre historischen Errungenschaften. Ich habe nur eine Bitte an Stefan Löfven, wenn wir alles das sehen: Seid nicht ungeduldig! Seid nicht ungeduldig mit den anderen Mitgliedstaaten in der Europäischen Union – auch wir, auch alle anderen müssen sich auf eure Standards entwickeln –, und bleibt die großen Internationalisten, die ihr immer wart, weil Europa euch braucht. Europa braucht Schweden, Europa braucht diesen fortschrittlichen Geist aus den nordischen Ländern. Der darf uns nicht den Rücken kehren, auch wenn es manchmal Enttäuschungen gibt. Wir brauchen euren Impuls, wir brauchen eure Kraft. Bleibt die mutigen Internationalisten, bleibt die mutigen Europäer, die ihr immer wart! Und dann Glückauf für eure Auseinandersetzungen – wir führen sie zusammen!

**Peter Lundgren**, för ECR-gruppen. – Herr talman! Tack för ordet och jag får väl börja med att välkomna statsminister Löfven till Bryssel.

Det är andra gången jag ser statsministern i de här sammanhangen. Första var i Strasbourg, andra gången här. Jag vill börja med att beklaga igen att statsministern väljer att stå och prata engelska. Vi sitter i ett rum som är fullt av tolkar, som tolkar till alla slags språk och jag anser att svenskan är ett så pass litet språk att det förtjänar att få höras i det här huset. Jag vet att statsministern fick kritik för det här efter Strasbourg men har inte tagit till sig, märker jag, av den kritiken alls.

Som vanligt så efter en stund går diskussionen in på att det finns hemska människor i det här huset. Det finns hemska människor som vill riva ner. Det finns hemska människor som vill förstöra. Jag är ju en av dem då så klart. Eftersom jag har en annan syn på ett EU-samarbete eller ett Europa-samarbete än vad statsministern har. Det är precis som att har man en annorlunda syn på ett politiskt arbete här, då ska man stämplas. Då ska det klistras etiketter på en. Man ska målas ut som något man överhuvudtaget inte är och de enda godkända åsikterna är de som kommer från Socialdemokraterna och statsministern. För allt annat stämplas man som extremist och populist. Då blir hyckleriet totalt när partiets, faktiskt statsministerns egna företrädare i huset, står och demonstrerar utanför denna sal för en dömd mördare och terrorist. Det var inte så länge sedan.

Socialdemokraterna vill flytta förhandlingsrätten mellan arbetsmarknadens parter i Sverige till EU. Den sociala pelaren är ett stort hot mot svenskarna. Du är till och med en före detta fackman och nu vill du att utländska politiker ska bestämma över våra förhållanden i Sverige.

Glöm aldrig, Stefan, det var du som öppnade den dörren under toppmötet i Göteborg. Vi kommer att påminna alla om att det var du som kompromissade bort svensk jämställdhet, familjepolitik, arbetsmarknad, och valde att lägga det i händerna på utländska politiker.

När inte ens röran hemma i Sverige kan fixas av Socialdemokraterna, då ser jag inte någon större anledning att ha förhoppningar om att ni ska lyckas fixa röran i Europa. Det är dags för en ny tid i Europa. Det är dags för ett smalare och vassare samarbete än vad som finns i dag.

**Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group.** – Mr President, I would like to welcome you, Prime Minister Löfven, to the European Parliament. You will immediately see the difference between the European Parliament and the Swedish Parliament. In the Swedish Parliament you would never have somebody saying 'I don't like Sweden'. You have never had that in the Swedish Parliament. In the European Parliament we have that. Mr Lundgren is a typical example, explaining why he is so bored to be here in Europe and why he is against the European Union. The only thing is his salary: he doesn't complain about that.

But thank you for your leadership, certainly in the fight against climate change. I want to explore three examples that you have given, to examine with you what is not going well in the European Union. There has to be a reason why you're saying we want a European migration policy and we don't have a European migration policy or an agreement on Dublin. I have here the rapporteur, Ms Cecilia Wikström, the rapporteur for the European Parliament. We have an opinion. The Council doesn't have an opinion and therefore we cannot conclude this reform of this migration package, and especially of Dublin.

The same goes for the other issue. You say 'the values I will not compromise on', but the European Council is compromising on values every day. This is not an attack on you, it applies to you and your colleagues. The 28, tomorrow the 27, in the European Union are compromising all the time. We have two Article 7 procedures against two countries, one initiated by the Commission against Poland, the second initiated by the European Parliament against Hungary, but the European Council has never put that point on the agenda for the Council, whereas it is obliged to do so whenever the Commission or Parliament has taken such action. So it's not a criticism of you, but when you say you will not compromise – no. The European Council – and you are a member of the European Council too – compromises every day on this issue and is not capable of dealing with it; it is closing its eyes. And I'm talking about everybody, about all political families and all political parties .....

And the third example that you have given is Spotify. You know that it is Swedish, I know that it is Swedish, but most people outside think that it is American because a number of years ago the headquarters went from Stockholm to New York. And you have indicated why. It is because we don't have a digital single market. We have no one regulator, but 27 or 28 different regulators. What Spotify got was problems, obstacles, inside the Union. They had to make 130 agreements with 130 mobile operators before launching the fantastic idea of streaming music, which today is something very normal. In the end they had enough. They said OK, we'll move our headquarters from Stockholm to New York because there it is far easier. You have one regulator, the FCC. You have three big operators on mobile. They made an agreement and rolled out the fantastic model and there are a world company today. And then they came back to Europe and the other countries to make the same model, working in France, in Germany, in Italy, in Belgium, everywhere in the European Union. It's a good example: Spotify is the example of what is not going well in the European Union. We don't have a European Union in digital and the reason is very simple. The reason is that there is no one regulator. The reason is that we have 130 mobile operators. Why do we have 130 mobile mobile operators? It is because, yes, we have ministers of finance here in the European Union who want to keep the money for themselves: spectrum selling – 3G, 4G, tomorrow 5G. So if we really want – and this has to be the conclusion, I think, and Spotify is a good example – to change something, then we need to do a number of important things: stop unanimity; putting values back on the agenda of the European Union; creating and really completing the single market. I have enough of all the documents that are produced on Digital Single Market of the European Union, and the reality is that there is only one European in the 20 big internet platforms worldwide.

Let's take an example. When Ericsson – you remember that, Prime Minister? – was successful, together with Nokia, it was when there were European standards, GSM for mobile. Then we were successful, and that is what we need. OK, I agree with every priority that you have mentioned, but we also need to be courageous and say that more European cooperation, European strength, is the only way forward to be successful.

**Dennis de Jong**, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister of Sweden. I think many of the things you said took me also back to what you said as a reaction to the outcome of the British referendum on Brexit. You said in particular that we need a Europe that works and delivers and focuses on the issues where people expect us to deliver results. That includes, among other things, joint responsibility for refugees and, not least, to create jobs and do it with decent wages and conditions.

On behalf of my Group, I couldn't agree more with you. At the same time, if you look back over these past three years, Europe hasn't been very successful in these respects. Guy Verhofstadt already referred to the negotiations on the reform of the Dublin system for the responsibility of asylum applications, and it's not Parliament that's blocking them – it's in the Council that we see that no progress is being made. My question to you, Mr Prime Minister, is: what does Sweden do to unblock the situation? If I look at the national legislation in Sweden, I see that you have actually a Swedish act temporarily restricting the possibility to obtain residence permits in Sweden. Is that a helpful way forward to a joint responsibility system for asylum? Parliament is waiting: waiting for you, waiting for the Council.

As far as creating jobs with decent wages and conditions is concerned, I read in your statement of government policy of 21 January that the Swedish labour market must be characterised by security and flexibility. Well, we all know how the concept of flexicurity worked out in the EU. I dare say that the rise of the extreme right-wing populism in many EU Member States – unfortunately also in Sweden – can at least be partly attributed to this concept. People who are uncertain about their jobs or have to combine various precarious jobs to make a living are easy prey for populism. Unfortunately, the EU doesn't help very much in this respect.

Let's have a look at the internal market together. For years we have been asking, together with European trade unions, for a social progress protocol. Whenever there is a conflict between the rules of the internal market and social rights, the latter should prevail. And you could ask then: what are the social rights? You yourself mentioned the European social pillar; but in practice the Council made this into purely political commitments. Fortunately, we also have legally-binding instruments like the European Social Charter, the ILO conventions, and it shouldn't be too difficult to develop a framework to really put all EU legislation to the test. Is it advancing social rights? Is it really contributing to people feeling secure and protected? Such a social progress protocol is more urgent than ever before – also because, and you mentioned this, Mr Prime Minister, workers from various Member States are made to compete with each other. Look at the tedious discussions we are having and the votes we are probably having tomorrow on the so-called mobility package.

Mr Prime Minister, what is your detailed vision about creating jobs and doing it with decent wages and conditions at European level? Do you agree that a social progress protocol is indispensable, and what initiatives can we expect?

A few words on the militarisation of the European project. Sweden has indeed a longstanding tradition when it comes to the protection and promotion of human rights globally, and I would say Sweden's international diplomacy in this area used to be famous. These days, however, the Swedish Prime Minister is strongly encouraging the arms build-up in the EU. Does that mean that, instead of relying on multilateralism, instead of relying on your diplomats, also Sweden is now relying more on force and violence? Shouldn't the question be how we can avoid an endless arms race instead of participating in this project?

Finally, I think business and human rights is another area that Sweden could be very active on. I shall be short, because I am running out of time, but the UN is working on a binding instrument, and can we expect some initiatives also from Sweden, given its tradition, to unblock the situation? Because the EU hasn't done anything yet in that respect.

**Ska Keller**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for joining the debate on the future of Europe.

Prime Minister, I'm very glad that you talked about the need to have a more social Europe. Indeed, I agree with that. I think the next level that we need to put the European Union on is to have a social union, because one of the key promises of the European Foundation has been the promise of prosperity, and we haven't really been getting very far with that. While some countries and regions have been benefiting a lot from European integration, other countries and regions have benefited less, and we still have a lot of social inequality in Europe.

Almost every fourth person in Europe is at risk of poverty or social exclusion, and that includes 25 million children. That's really a situation that's not acceptable. The Social Pillar is fantastic, but the thing is we need to make it binding and not just have a nice declaration of things that we should do. We *have* to do them. We cannot, of course, talk about social justice without talking about climate justice and environmental justice, because it's always the poorest people who are hit the hardest by the climate crisis, no matter whether it's inside the European Union locally, or globally. It's them who are most affected by severe weather events that, for example, destroy their homes and their small businesses. It's the poor people who live in big cities that will face more and more heat, and this heat will also worsen the air pollution situation. Again, poorer people will be hit by this, while they actually contribute less to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than rich people do.

So climate justice needs to go hand in hand with social justice. Just one example and one area where this needs to be fulfilled is the area of mobility. We need to make sure that mobility is climate-friendly, available, affordable and existent. Europe is a rather small continent. You would think it's possible to have a train network, for example, that connects European cities. Right now, that's not really working yet. It shouldn't take more than 20 hours to go by train from Stockholm to Brussels. One of the things that needs to be done in order to have easily accessible and affordable trains, I think, is to make it easier to book cross-border trains. We very much hope that your government will back the proposal by us Greens, which was actually adopted by this plenary in November, to allow open data for train bookings that would allow you to book your train tickets across the border without much difficulty. And if you've tried booking your train ticket cross-border, it's crazily difficult. It shouldn't be more difficult than booking flights, as is currently the situation. Maybe a sort of Skyscanner for trains is the next European big start-up platform to make it possible to have train rides within Europe.

Another important issue, of course, is the Emissions Trading System (ETS) for climate action, and there it's very good that the Swedish Government, actually on the initiative of the Deputy Prime Minister, Isabella Lövin, has proposed in Council to cancel about three billion carbon emission allowances. That's about 50 times Sweden's yearly emissions. That has been adopted in Council, which is very good, because it finally contributed to the reform of the ETS and at least tried to bring the prices for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to a more reasonable level in order to really make polluters pay.

Talking about jobs, Europe could indeed be the frontrunner in climate-friendly jobs, but right now we're leaving the innovation to other regions and countries in the world. That is a problem when solar panels are being produced in China, as well as battery cells, and electric cars are being produced in South Korea. It should be Europe where this innovation is done. The climate crisis is real and it's happening. This is the one planet that we have, and there are also no jobs on a dead planet. So we need to act quickly and decisively. We can still decide how to make that economic transition, but we need to make it fast.

*(Applause)*

**Rolandas Paksas**, *EFDD frakcijos vardu*. – Pone pirmininke, pone premjere, sveiki atvykę į Europos Parlamentą. Tikrai puikus pasisakymas, sakyčiau, labai toliaregiškas. Manychiau, pone premjere, grįžęs į Stokholmą galėtumėte sau prisitaikyti garsiąją romėnų frazę: „Veni, vidi, vici“. Bet, pone premjere, aš jau dešimt metų šioje salėje turiu galimybę tiesiogiai girdėti bei matyti įvairių šalių prezidentų ir premjerų pasisakymus, Europos institucijų vadovų, Komisarų kalbas ir kuo daugiau aš jų išgirstu, tuo daugiau klausimų nei atsakymų. Kas gi iš tikrųjų šiandien vyksta Europos Sąjungoje? Kodėl Švedijoje registruotas ir ne vienoje Europos Sąjungos šalyje veikiantis bankas sėkmingai išplauna milijardus eurų ir jokios reakcijos? Kodėl visas Europos Sąjungos finansų sektorius nuo 2008 metų krizės laikų gavo daugiau pagalbos, nei bet kuris kitas ekonomikos sektorius? Kodėl Europos Sąjungai reikėjo net penkerių metų tam, kad jos valdantieji politikai suprastų, kad migrantų atžvilgiu atvira politika, kvotos dėl jų pasidalijimo ir gelbėjimo operacijos Viduržemio jūroje tik skatina nelegalią migraciją ir žmonių kontrabandistus. Tos politikos padariniai tarsi pleištas į daugelio valstybių

visuomenių gyvenimą ir pradėjo ardyti jų sanglaudą bei saugumą. Nusikalstamos ir neteisingos Europos Sąjungos migracijos politikos pasekmė – šiandieniniai teroro išpuoliai Europos miestų gatvėse. Tačiau prisiimti atsakomybės dėl tokios politikos padarinių jos autoriai kažkodėl neskuba. Pone premjere, kaip manote, ar visuomenė gali didžiulis tokia Europos Sąjunga, kurios šalyse veikia slapti kalėjimai, o juose buvo kankinami žmonės? Ar galima džiūgauti dėl tokios Europos Sąjungos, kurioje šiandien politikai yra teisiami už referendumo, vieno iš svarbiausių demokratijos atributų, organizavimą? Man nepatinka tokia Europos Sąjunga, kurioje tik kalbama apie lyderystę, tik džiaugiamasi dar vienu, nieko nenusprendusiu Vadovų Tarybos susitikimu, nes tikrasis tokios lyderystės kabutėse rezultatas – išaugusi socialinė atskirtis, skurdas ir nedarbas. Šiandieninė Europos Sąjungos politika tėra tuščia forma be visuomenės turtinančio ir jas apsaugančio turinio. Tai tik tezių rinkinys, pridengtas įmantriais žodžiais apie subsidiarumą, teisės viršenybę, pagalbą mažiau pažengusiems šalims, laisvą rinką. Tą pačią laisvą rinką, kurią, beje, iš tiesų, jei ne šiandien, tai ryt mažesniems valstybėms esate linkę suvaržyti taip vadinamuoju Mobilumo paktu, kad tik būtų mažiau konkurentų. Normalioje bendrijoje tokie veiksmai būtų nepriimtini. Kaip ir savanaudiška pagalba. Man nepatinka tokia Europos Sąjunga, kur Lietuvos žemdirbiams ir šiandien už žemės ūkio naudmenų hektarą tebemoka gerokai mažesnes išmokas nei kitoms šalims. Pone premjere, manau, kad Europos Sąjunga šiandien kuriama didiesiems ir stipriesiems, didžiosioms Europos valstybėms ir nacijoms, stambiausioms firmoms ir galingiausiems kapitalams, kad jie dar sustiprėtų ir turėtų ką numesti likusiems, tegu ir menkiausių išmokų laukiantiems, kad tik nereikėtų ko nors keisti globalizacinio kapitalo stichijos sukurtame prabangos ir skurdo pasaulyje, kad sustiprėtų patikimiausia imperijos atrama, biurokratija. Pone premjere, teigiama, kad Europos Sąjungai alternatyvų nėra. Netiesa. Europos Sąjungos alternatyva yra Europa be sąjungų. Dabartinės Europos Sąjungos alternatyva – tai grįžimas prie Europos Sąjungos kūrėjų ir jos tėvų esminių nuostatų – lygiateisių ir savarankiškų valstybių bendrijos.

**Harald Vilimsky, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Als ich dem schwedischen Premierminister zugehört habe und anschließend dem Herrn Weber und dann dem Herrn Bullmann, war da eine Gemeinsamkeit, die mir sofort auffiel: Es war die Frau Greta Thunberg, die als Klimaaktivistin, wie sie sich nennt, hier quer durch die europäische Berichterstattung geht. Und nur, um hier keine Missverständnisse zu produzieren: Ich bin für Klimaschutz, ich bin für Naturschutz, ich habe selbst auch, als ich jung war, in Österreich mitgeholfen, die Au zu schützen, aber durch dieses fast sakrale Erklären der Frau Thunberg hier können Sie sich nicht freikaufen von einem: Wir haben seit heute aktenkundig, über eine investigative Tätigkeit von Global 2000, dass in Mochovce ein neuer Reaktor in Betrieb genommen werden soll. Und genau hier brauche ich eine europäische Stimme, eine europäische Kooperation, um der Slowakei zu sagen: Nein, wir wollen nicht, dass im Herzen Europas ein Schrottreaktor in Betrieb geht und eine sehr kurzfristige und sehr akute Bedrohung stattfinden kann.

Und als zweiten Aspekt möchte ich, nachdem Herr Weber jetzt meinen Worten lauscht, auch eines direkt in Ihre Richtung sagen: Wissen Sie, Herr Weber, Sie kommen aus Bayern, Sie sind Vertreter der CSU, Sie haben Ihre eigene Meinungslage – die ist gut, die respektiere ich –, Sie sind auch Freund des österreichischen Bundeskanzlers Sebastian Kurz. Ich bin einer der Bündnispartner von Sebastian Kurz und vertrete die Freiheitliche Partei hier in einer Fraktion und möchte Ihnen eines ins Stammbuch schreiben: Ich respektiere jeden Standpunkt, der hier durch demokratische Wahlen legitimiert wird. Wenn Sie aber allen Ernstes sagen, dass Sie jenen politischen Gruppierungen, die nicht Ihre Meinung haben, die einen reformatorischen, einen anderen Ansatz haben, was europäische Kooperation betrifft, sämtliche Mittel streichen wollen und es damit auch unmöglich machen, dass wir Mitarbeiter heuern können, dass wir politische Kommunikation betreiben können, dann entsprechen Sie nicht den europäischen Werten von Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit, Fairness, auch Diskursqualität, die Sie heute hier beschworen haben.

Ich habe nichts dagegen, dass, wenn die Grünen und die Kommunisten hier im Haus sitzen, sie ihre Meinung vertreten. Der Wähler hat das legitimiert. Ich ersuche Sie um Respekt und demokratische Reife, dass jeder, der hier vertreten ist, auf Grund von freien Wahlen hier sitzt und Wähler zu vertreten hat, und wir uns nicht gegeneinander ausspielen sollten und sagen: Der hat eine andere Meinung, deswegen soll der weniger bekommen, der soll gar nichts bekommen, und der soll mehr bekommen. Das ist nicht der europäische Geist, den ich mir vorstelle.

Österreich – ich habe das angesprochen – hat seit 15 Monaten eine neue Regierung, und ein Teil der von Ihnen dämonisierten Parteienfamilie – diese bösen Populisten – ist hier ein ganz wesentlicher Gestaltungsfaktor. Und schauen Sie nach Österreich, wie viele Dinge hier ins Gute reformiert werden, wie sehr das Land Zug um Zug vorwärtskommt. Vielleicht reift in Ihnen auch die Erkenntnis, dass nicht der Weg, wie er hier mehrheitlich beschritten wird, sondern vielleicht ein anderer Weg, wo europäische Kooperation dadurch eine gute Zukunft finden kann, weniger zu kooperieren, dafür dort, wo kooperiert wird, besser und tiefer gehend, vielleicht ein guter ist.

Nicht Sie sind entscheidend, diesen Weg zu definieren, und auch nicht ich. Wissen Sie, wer es ist? Es ist der Wähler, und der spricht am 26. Mai, wohin die Reise gehen wird.

**Stefan Löfven**, *Prime Minister of Sweden*. –Mr President, first Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Dombrowski, yes, we like to use the word '*lagom*'. Sometimes I do not believe that we are so '*lagom*', but we do think the balance is important. I think that balance is also important in the European context, in which we meet and have different opinions, but we also need to recognise that no one has 'the' single answer: we have to balance and compromise. Compromise is not as bad as some people think. It's a good way forward, never forgetting values of course: these are, as I said in my statement, what should steer all that we're doing.

Several of you have mentioned social rights. I will touch upon that issue, which, yes, I think it very important to address. For many people today, not least the members that I used to work for when I was a trade union leader, the transition of the labour market, of the global economy, is scary, and that is because they feel insecure about what will happen. I know I strongly believe in a social market economy because we need a market economy that has the best incentives for raising productivity, giving us a greater possibility of prosperity, but that change, that transformation, also needs to be brought about in a socially just way, otherwise people will rise up and say no, we will not be in favour of change. And if we have a workforce that is not in favour of change, then we will slow down in our economic development.

So this is about a morally right thing, but is also economically smart. Those who totally reject the social perspective of the European Union or economic development are making a huge mistake.

Now we can combine that and we have a treaty to adhere to as well. So the pillar of social rights has not changed the treaty. Before and after the social pillar rights, the decision-making is exactly the same, but what we're saying is that we should cooperate on these 20 very important principles within three themes.

One is to make sure that people get a job in the first place, given that the unemployed would be the most desperate people: the longer the unemployment, the greater the desperation.

The second is what kind of job do we want? Do we want jobs in which workers are supposed to compete with one another with lower wages and bad working conditions? Is that the future labour market? No, it's not. So therefore it is in our mutual interest to make sure that things also move in the right direction with the national decision-making. Nothing has changed.

And the third is social security in a broader sense. Is that too much to ask? This European Union, in my opinion, is made for the people. The market is very important for us. Creating this huge market gives us a possibility to compete with China, with the United States, with India and all the big players. But that other purpose must be to improve people's daily lives.

*(Applause)*

Otherwise, we're on the wrong path. So I think that we can definitely work with social rights in a balanced way too.

Regarding the budget, Mr Commissioner, I guess that the discussion needs to continue; I see that we have certain differences here. But let me just explain the Swedish position. During 2015 we received 163 000 asylum-seekers. Not everybody gets to stay. Some need to go back because there are no grounds for their asylum.

But we have ahead of us now huge investments in our country: in schools, in eldercare, in our health sector. I'm telling the Swedish people, look, we can handle this. We've now reduced immigration. We can handle this. Those who can stay in our country will be integrated in our society as soon as possible, but they need somewhere to live. They need a job, eldercare, everything. We can handle that.

But when I say that, I cannot also tell them, look, at least 50% of the space we have for future reforms needs to go to Brussels in increased fees to the European Union. That is not possible. We are eager to work to develop the European Union and do our best; we will contribute as best we can. But what I have just said is impossible because it would mean that the legitimacy of the European Union would be ruined. I cannot even deliver that answer to the people.

So we will do our part, but that too needs to be in balance.

When it comes to Mr Weber and the values, yeah, let's look into how to strengthen that and make sure that the values are adhered to. I guess we agree upon that. We need to make sure that they are adhered to, otherwise we will weaken the European Union.

So I can't say in detail what it requires, but, yes, we are interested in looking into it.

Several have touched upon the climate and environment. I share most of the positions and the policies. Once again it's so crucial now for us to show young people that we have understood. We understand what is happening. Not only do we understand, but we will act to prevent a catastrophe. This is our duty, but it's also our opportunity, and that's a fine thing.

We need to turn the climate, the combat against climate change, from a burden into an opportunity, because this will provide the new jobs. The new technology is here and that is what we are going to develop. So we're going to create new jobs and more wealth and combat climate change, and that's why we also need to talk to people to show them that this is not a burden. We're going to do this together. We're not going to let you have the burden as an individual, we're going to do it together and we are going to be fine. We're going to show our children and our grandchildren that we understood what was happening and we did something about it.

Peter Lundgren. Nu ska jag prata svenska, Peter Lundgren. Jag pratar gärna engelska också. Men jag ska prata svenska.

Jag nämnde ingenting om hemska människor. Det var du som gjorde det. Jag respekterar alla människor. Alla människor ska respekteras. Men jag kommer att bekämpa åsikter som går tvärs emot mina värderingar.

Jag vet inte vad du refererar till med en retorik som jag då ska använda, men om det är när Sverigedemokraternas företrädare säger att judar och samer väl inte kan vara svenskar, då reagerar jag. Och det kommer att fortsätta göra. För jag tycker det är långt, långt... Det är inte i enlighet med våra värderingar och vi har dessutom en strid ström utav sverigedemokratiska företrädare som gång på gång på gång avslöjas med den här typen av uttalanden och statements. Sen är det dessvärre så att era rötter är i vitmaktrörelsen. Det är inte så länge sedan.

Så, så länge de här värderingarna inte respekteras så kommer jag att bekämpa de åsikterna. Men människor ska respekteras. Det är viktigt för mig.

Mr Verhofstadt, on migration. Yes, you're right: that is the problem right now – that we cannot reach a decision. We need to reach that decision. We've been pushing for it for a long, long time, for years now, ever since I started almost as a Prime Minister. So that is what we're struggling for. And the problem is not the Council. The problem is that we have a few of our colleagues that do not want to share that responsibility. That's the problem, and as long as we have that problem, we will be stuck. But we also need to find a solution. So, let's work on that solution. We talked to Mr Weber earlier, and we need to see what is a way forward, because we cannot have this being dragged along for another five years. That's impossible.

Regarding Spotify, just to clarify one thing. Spotify also has an office in Stockholm. It is already there. But there are a lot of Swedish unicorns that need to grow. And they grow globally, and some of the activities need to take part also on the other side of the Atlantic. But I guess we agree on the point that the services market as well as the digital market need to be much more efficient, and that is why we are pushing for that. In the last European Council that we had just a few weeks ago, we were at 17 countries that wrote to the Commission and said we need to speed up this now and implement what we already have decided. So, in general, I agree we need to do much, much more.



To Dennis de Jong on Swedish migration, the point is, as I said, we received 163 000 asylum-seekers in 2015. We needed to handle that situation. It was not sustainable. That's the simple truth. Therefore, we changed our legislation to the same level as the European Union in general. Now, we need to stick to that legislation and, at the same, time work with this common European legislation so that, if we have that in place, all the Member States can also change their national legislation, and then we will have sustainable legislation for all of us. But once again, I think we need to make sure that we also share the responsibility. So that's an issue for us.

You were also asking how we create jobs. On the one hand, that's why the market is so important – the huge market, because that will give our companies fast access to 500 million people. That's a good thing, and that is why we need to implement the services market, make sure that works, the digital and all these things, but then to invest together: invest in innovation, invest in training, invest in those things that actually create jobs so that we always, constantly can fill new jobs, new jobs, new jobs, because old jobs will go, so we need to keep the pace with creating the new jobs. I think we can do that, and not least during that transformation, to make sure that people can follow at that pace. We need training, we need education, and this is a really important mechanism for making sure that we can create jobs and, by that, trust in the future.

When it comes to arms build-up, there are two paths we need to follow. One is, as the Prime Minister of Sweden, I need to tell the people that we are doing what we can to make sure that we can handle any military threats in a good way. I cannot say: 'We'll see what happens'. So that's important. But on the other hand, perhaps the most important thing (I think in that sense, I think we can agree) we can do as leaders is to decrease tensions. So we need to work with diplomacy. We are active right now also in Sweden working for more peace, to make sure that we can reduce the number of nuclear arms, for example. We need to have the debate that we are having today because I cannot see the reason why the ultimate protection would be arms that can destroy the earth. Because that's what nuclear are all about, and that is not so smart. So we need to work on that together, but, until we're there, I need also to show the Swedish people that we're working with their security.

So, Ska Keller on social issues. We have the Treaty, as I said. We're moving this step by step, and that is why I work hard and, once again, I do also commend Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker and everybody else who has worked with it (I guess you also worked with it), so we have taken this step. But let's see what the next step is. But we need to make sure that social security is something that people in our Member State can say: yes, this is for me as well.

On mobility, you mentioned trains specifically. We are working on that right now, also in Sweden. How do we invest in such a way that our trains can move in a better way than they do now? But also the ticket situation, because you're right, it's too difficult now to travel, and it shouldn't be difficult. Going by train should be easy and accessible. So we need to work with that.

Lastly, ETS. You know what our government did? We actually cancelled allowances. The government before us sold them, made money on them. We cancelled, them and if you cancel those, the price will go up. So that's what we did, at the expense of the Swedish taxpayers, and that's what we think was right to do.

The moralists and the moral question: well, sometimes it's a complex world, but on migration I would like to say this: we need to stick to the three-pillar strategy that was chosen. First, work to improve conditions in our neighbourhood so that people don't have to make these very dangerous journeys in the first place. Second, make sure that our external border is functioning. And third, make sure that we have a shared responsibility between the Member States within our Union. If that works, if we get that in place, we will have a sustainable migration policy.

Mr Vilimsky, the climate: we need to be active, but the reactor in Slovakia, I cannot comment on the Slovak reactor. Every Member State needs to decide by themselves what kind of energy mix they will use. There is an important European perspective also given the Energy Union, but we not have any mandate – the different Member States decide on their own what kind of energy mix they want.

*Procedura «catch the eye»*

**Gunnar Hökmark (PPE).** – Herr talman! Herr statsminister! Välkommen hit.

Jag vill gärna säga att det var ett bra tal om vad Europa är till för och vad vi vill. Nu undrar statsministern kanske: Vad är haken i detta? Problemet är att det var väldigt lite konkret kring vilka vägval vi ska göra. Därför att det är där det stora problemet och utmaningen är. Hur möter vi hoten från Ryssland? Hur stärker vi den gemensamma utrikes- och säkerhetspolitiken?

Det är ingen som ifrågasätter att Europa ska ha en socialpolitik. Skillnaden är att du och din regering öppnade upp för att det ska beslutas i den här kammaren – inte i Sveriges riksdag och i andra nationella parlament. Då brukar ni ofta säga att det är bara en skröna när vi säger detta men du hör i debatten här, och jag kan här visa 150 sidor lagtext som direkt hänvisar till den sociala pelaren. Det är där som risken är, därför att det skapar motsättningar.

Men den stora frågan som jag vill ta upp med dig, det är hur vi värnar fri- och rättigheterna i unionen. Jag skulle vilja att du talade lika mycket om dina socialdemokratiska vänners övertramp när det gäller fri- och rättigheter och rättsstat, som när det gäller andra. Rumänien, Slovakien, Malta, därför att om du inte är beredd att tala om dem, då devalverar du dig till partipolitik och det gynnar Orban och det gynnar dem som får i tysthet göra övertrampen, som den rumänska regeringen. Du kommer ha tillfälle här i dag därför att de finns här i huset.

**Paul Brannen (S&D).** – Mr President, I was pleased that the Prime Minister mentioned climate change in his speech and the importance of the European Union delivering on the Paris climate agreement.

Prime Minister, in your home country, Sweden, you have a very large number of trees, you have big forests – in fact you do trees and forests exceedingly well. Those trees and forests are all soaking up carbon emissions, and increasingly you're using your wood to make products that go into the construction industry, which also continue to soak up the carbon. One of your biggest markets is the United Kingdom. Your neighbour, Norway, now has the tallest wooden building in the world, at 18 storeys, and the opportunities to build big and tall in wood are there for everyone to see now.

Recently in the United Kingdom we unfortunately had a horrific fire in London, in the Grenfell Tower, where over 70 people lost their lives. One of the consequences of that fire is that the British Government is looking at banning the use of wood in buildings over eight storeys tall. I think that would be an overreaction and a mistake. It would mean you would lose an important market for your cross-laminated timber and other products. I wondered if you'd be open to intervening with the British Government to point out that this is maybe the wrong road to take in response to Grenfell, because the need to tackle climate change means we need to build much more in wood in future?

**Marek Jurek (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pan Verhofstadt atakował mojego kolegę Petera Lundgrena, atakował rządy państw Unii Europejskiej, nawet całą Radę Europejską, powiedział swoje i wyszedł. No, ja z pewnością nie jestem tak gorliwym wyznawcą *our values*, naszych wartości, ale z reguły słucham tych, do których mówię, bo tak rozumiem pluralizm. No, niektórzy są zainteresowani tylko własnymi poglądami, choć pluralizm deklarują.

A teraz kilka słów do Pana, Panie Premierze. Mówił Pan o wartościach, o ich wadze w naszym życiu. Ja z ogromnym uznaniem patrzyłem na demonstrację zwierzchników szwedzkich wspólnot religijnych w styczniu w Sztokholmie, którzy upominali się o prawo, właściwie o obowiązek udzielania azylu chrześcijańskim konwertytom, którym niestety władze szwedzkie odmawiają schronienia. Wymieniał Pan różne patologie, które zagrażają wolności w Europie, nie mówił Pan ani słowa o pogardzie i nienawiści antychrześcijańskiej. A naprawdę, ile trzeba pogardy dla chrześcijaństwa, żeby odmawiać ludziom schronienia, którzy w swoim kraju za to, że przyjęli religijne dziedzictwo Europy, z zasady zagrożeni są śmiercią? Wierzę, że Pański rząd zapewni, że te zasady...

*(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)*

**Fredrick Federley (ALDE).** – Herr talman! Tack statsministern och välkommen till Europaparlamentet.

I Europaparlamentet har vi 20 svenska ledamöter som statsministern vet. Flera gör ett ganska stort avtryck. Cecilia Wikström leder den viktiga ordförandekonferensen och har levererat en stabil majoritet på migrationsområdet. Din partikamrat Marita Ulvskog leder förtjänstfullt väldigt ofta EMPL-utskottet. Det är inte alltid vi är överens i sak men vi är ofta glada över det arbete hon utför. Detsamma med kollegan Gunnar Hökmark som arbetar i ekonomiutskottet och industriutskottet. Själva har jag fokuserat på utsläppsrätter, jordbruk och djurskyddsfrågor under mandatperioden.

Svenskar har ofta kunnat skapa majoritet och jag tror att vi alla i våra partigrupper har ett större inflytande än vår numerär. Men därför blir jag något orolig när jag ser över statsministerns ministrars närvaro på rådssammanträdena. Sverige har en nyckelposition i Europasamarbetet för att få detta att fungera och att leverera de sakerna statsministern så förtjänstfullt lyfte. Men vad kan vi göra för att öka statsministerns ministrars närvaro på rådssammanträdena så att vi verkligen lever upp till vår fulla potential?

**Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Löfven, θέσατε σωστούς στόχους μιλώντας για τις θεμελιώδεις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά για να υπερασπιστούμε την κοινωνική ατζέντα του Γκέτεμποργκ δεν πρέπει αυτή να μείνει μια απλή ετικέτα, πρέπει να γίνει δεσμευτικές πολιτικές. Για να υπερασπιστούμε τους στόχους που έχει θέσει η Greta Thunberg, πρέπει να δώσουμε περισσότερους πόρους, ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, για να αντιμετωπίσει της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Για να αντιμετωπίσουμε τις παραβιάσεις της δημοκρατίας, πρέπει να βοηθήσετε και εσείς, στο Συμβούλιο, να ενεργοποιηθεί το άρθρο 7 της Συνθήκης εναντίον των κυβερνήσεων της Ουγγαρίας και της Πολωνίας, όπως ζητάει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και η Επιτροπή. Πρέπει να βοηθήσετε για να αναθεωρηθεί η ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική ασύλου, διότι η Επιτροπή και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχουν εγκρίνει τις μεταρρυθμίσεις αλλά σκαλώνουν στο Συμβούλιο. Με ανησυχεί πάρα πολύ ότι στη χώρα του Olof Palme ένας στους πέντε ψηφοφόρους ψηφίζει ακροδεξιούς αντισημιτιστές. Για αυτό, δεν αρκεί να λέμε ωραία πράγματα, πρέπει να κάνουμε και περισσότερα με μια μεγάλη προοδευτική φιλοευρωπαϊκή συμμαχία.

**Max Andersson (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Varje år förlorar svenska skattebetalare 40 miljarder kronor på storföretagens skatteflykt. Jag vill fråga statsministern varför din regering blockerar flera EU-lagar som ska komma åt skatteflykten?

Pengarna behövs i skolan och vården. Men ditt parti har ändå blockerat förslaget om offentlig land-för-land-rapportering i mer än två år. Jag har frågat finansministern i tre artiklar varför sossarna blockerar EU:s arbete mot skatteflykt. Hon har aldrig svarat. Undrar varför? Kan det vara för att Socialdemokraterna vill hjälpa svenska företag att undvika skatt i andra länder? I så fall, det är inte okej. Är det rimligt att en regering som blockerar EU:s arbete mot skatteflykt inte ens kan ge en tydlig förklaring varför?

Nu är du i EU-parlamentet, Stefan Löfven, så jag undrar om det här är min turdag. Kommer du svara på frågan om varför Socialdemokraterna blockerar EU:s arbete mot skatteflykt?

**Jeppe Kofod (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for a very inspiring speech. Coming from Denmark I, of course, know Sweden very well and I think what you mentioned, Prime Minister, that the young people are now asking the older people to act when it comes to climate, is so fundamental, and I think in Sweden and in the Nordic countries we have actually experience of how we can do things together to be more sustainable. In the energy area for example – electricity – we have now one Nordic market because we are starting to integrate. We are employing more renewables than ever and we should be a model for Europe.

But I want to ask you, in concrete ways, what do you think the European Union could do more to develop from a coal and steel Union, as you mentioned, to become a real, true climate Union? A Union where we put climate first in all of our policies.

And secondly, Prime Minister, this response needs to be just, responsible, where all people are included, so how do we ensure, in your view, that in the face of globalisation, we integrate people more? How do we spread the model of labour market participation, labour market organisations that take responsibility, unions and employers? It's very important to integrate them in our social policy.

**Paulo Rangel (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Primeiro-Ministro da Suécia, falou aqui muito sobre o respeito dos valores europeus, sobre o respeito do Estado de direito e julgo saber que o Partido Social Democrata sueco, dos Socialistas Europeus, pediu a suspensão do partido romeno no PSE. Se isto aconteceu, dou-lhe os parabéns, mas gostava que convencesse os socialistas europeus que aqui estão a condenar o partido romeno, o eslovaco e o maltês, três partidos que estão no governo de três Estados que hoje põem em causa o Estado de direito.

E já agora, como português, que dissesse ao primeiro-ministro Costa, do meu país, e ao seu candidato às europeias, Pedro Marques, que, se são a favor dos valores europeus, devem fazer uma condenação clara do partido romeno, do partido eslovaco e do partido maltês e dos três primeiros ministros que estão nestes governos. Defender os valores europeus não é fazer *double standard*, dois padrões, um para uns países como a Polónia e a Hungria e depois outro para os países em que o nosso partido governa.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-ministru, stimați colegi. Domnule prim-ministru, mi-a plăcut foarte mult tot ce ați spus. Ați vorbit de valori fundamentale, de faptul că trebuie să ne gândim când luăm orice decizie la nivel european sau local, să ne gândim la influențele asupra oamenilor, să ne gândim și la tribunale independente, să ne gândim la toate lucrurile care, de fapt, sunt scrise în Tratat și în Constituțiile statelor membre. Dar vă întreb, domnule prim-ministru, dacă domnul Weber ar fi venit la dumneavoastră și v-ar fi spus, ca prim-ministru, cum a făcut-o în țara mea, „Vă rog să opriți procesul de cercetare a unui procuror”. Ce ați fi făcut dacă prim-vicepreședintele Comisiei Europene ar fi spus, cum a spus astăzi despre țara mea și a dat ordine Guvernului să interzică anchetarea unui procuror, dar nu a spus nimic când un procuror-șef a fost anchetat pe nedrept și acum este, de fapt, nevinovat. Ce ați face, despre ce valori comune, cum putem să dăm un mesaj cetățenilor? Și, de fapt, asta este întrebarea: cum vedeți, în viziunea dumneavoastră, viitorul Uniunii Europene, dacă există atâta fragmentare în spațiul european și există atâta dublă măsură în aplicarea unor decizii?

**Joachim Starbatty (ECR).** – Herr Präsident! Herr Ministerpräsident! Sie haben die Ungleichheit innerhalb der Europäischen Union beklagt und viele Sprecher auch. Aber wir haben die Ursache nicht genannt: Der Euro hat beispielsweise dafür gesorgt, dass die Ungleichheit größer geworden ist. Die Kommission ist dafür ein Beispiel: Die Kommission hat festgestellt, dass die Spaltung Europas durch den Euro größer geworden ist.

Ich habe nur zwei konkrete Fragen. Die erste Frage richtet sich an Sie direkt: Der französische Staatspräsident Macron hat in seinem jüngsten Aufruf für einen Neubeginn in Europa gesagt: Wie können wir ohne den Euro, der die gesamte EU stark macht, den Krisen des Finanzkapitalismus widerstehen? Ja, wenn der Euro so positiv für alle Mitgliedstaaten ist, warum tritt Schweden nicht der Eurozone bei?

Meine zweite Frage richtet sich an die Kommission als die Hüterin der Verträge: Im Maastricht-Vertrag haben zwei Länder eine Opt-out-Klausel zur Währungsunion verankert: Großbritannien und Dänemark. Die Dänen haben sich in einer Volksabstimmung gegen den Beitritt zur Währungsunion entschieden. Die Schweden ebenfalls – das ist aber im Vertrag nicht vorgesehen. Das ist eine Vertragsverletzung, und ich frage die Kommission, wie sie mit dieser Vertragsverletzung durch Schweden umgeht.

**Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE).** – Herr talman! Statsministern, välkommen till Europaparlamentet, platsen där alla EU-skröner skapas. För visst var det så du svarade när vi varnade att du flyttade makten över svensk arbetsmarknad till Bryssel? Du sa att det var en skröna. Dina kamrater lovade att det inte skulle bli lagstiftning. Nu står du där med lagstiftningen som kommer på löpande band.

Du lovade att skydda svenska löntagare. Nu har du i praktiken flyttat makten över svensk arbetsmarknad till Bryssel, och det mest konstiga nu är att nu när lagstiftningen kommer så gör ni allt för att underminera den, minimera, undvika, försena, dina kamrater här röstar, lägger ner sina röster. De röstar nej. LO sitter i mitt rum och ber mig hjälpa dem att stoppa lagförslaget som du har drivit.

Det är helt konstigt och jag förstår inte om du förstår vilket intryck det lämnar. Jag har kamrater som frågar mig, varför beter sig Sverige så konstigt? Förstår du inte att du skämmer ut oss genom att bete dig så konstigt?

**Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor primer ministro, yo quiero, en primer lugar, decirle «gracias» porque, cuando yo era muy joven, nos llegaba dinero del Partido Socialdemócrata Sueco a los socialistas españoles que luchábamos contra el franquismo, contra la dictadura. Yo no olvidaré una foto de Olof Palme recogiendo o pidiendo dinero en las calles de Estocolmo para los demócratas españoles. Y por eso le quiero decir, en primer lugar, «gracias».

Y, como estamos hablando del futuro de Europa, tengo que preguntarle algo que sí es muy importante para nosotros. Porque, en los debates sobre el futuro de Europa, se habla con frecuencia —en esta Cámara hay una gran coincidencia al respecto— de que la unanimidad es una condición que impide avanzar a la Unión Europea. Por ejemplo, en política fiscal; por ejemplo, en política exterior. Y muchos piden, y muchos pedimos que la unanimidad sea superada por cláusulas pasarela o por otros mecanismos.

Mi pregunta, señor primer ministro, es si usted está a favor de que la Unión Europea pueda avanzar sin este obstáculo tan grave en su futuro.

**Anders Sellström (PPE).** – Herr talman! Statsminister Stefan Löfven! Välkommen till Bryssel. Välkommen till det parlament som från och med i morgon övertar beslutsmakten om föräldraförsäkringen från Sveriges riksdag och övriga nationella parlament. Välkommen till det parlament som i framtiden kan komma att fatta ytterligare beslut på föräldraförsäkringens område. Resultatet av beslutet i morgon, och kommande, är att Sveriges barnfamiljer nu riskerar möta ytterligare inskränkningar i sin frihet och flexibilitet.

I parlamentet sitter, som statsministern vet, en mängd olika nationaliteter med många gånger en annan syn på familjeliv och regelverk än den svenska. Eftersom parlamentet söker kompromisser innan beslut kommer därför andra länder få ett avgörande inflytande över svenska barnfamiljers vardag. När statsministern på det sociala toppmötet i Göteborg hösten 2017 tog initiativ till den sociala pelaren, så lovade statsministern på heder och samvete att det inte skulle följas av någon lagstiftning. Vi varnade dock för dessa konsekvenser av att föra upp de här frågorna på europeisk nivå. Dessa varningar ignorerade tyvärr statsministern.

I den här framtidsdebatten har jag därför en enkel men viktig fråga till statsministern: Är statsministern nöjd med att parlamentet i morgon genom ditt initiativ hösten 2017 i Göteborg fattar beslut på föräldraförsäkringens område?

**Babette Winter (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! Herr Ministerpräsident, herzlichen Dank für Ihre Rede. Aus Schweden kommen gute Signale in die Europäische Union: Der soziale Gipfel in Göteborg war so ein Signal, die junge Bürgerin Greta bringt gute Signale an die jungen Menschen, aber auch an die Politik, und – wie gesagt – Ihre Rede hier im Parlament gehört für mich auch eindeutig dazu. Ich möchte zuerst Ihnen herzlich danken dafür, dass Sie klargestellt haben, was bei allen Kompromissen in der EU nicht verhandelbar ist, nämlich der Kampf gegen Antisemitismus, Antiziganismus, Homophobie, dass das Werte sind, über die wir nicht verhandeln.

Ich möchte auf einen Punkt eben noch eingehen: Sie haben auch herausgehoben, dass die jungen Menschen, die für mehr Aktion im Klimaschutz und Umweltschutz demonstrieren, nicht diejenigen sind, die jetzt die Lösung finden und die Politik machen müssen, sondern dass wir das sind – wir im Parlament, wir in den Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten. Und da Sie als Ministerpräsident angekündigt haben, der erste kohlenstofffreie, fossilfreie Wohlfahrtsstaat in der Europäischen Union zu sein und auch den Verbrennungsmotor zu verbieten, bitte ich Sie zu erläutern – auch im Rat und uns hier –, wie die Transformation gelingen kann, für mehr Klimaschutz.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to thank Prime Minister Löfven for his inspiring pro-European speech, including mention of ABBA and Greta Thunberg – Swedish-made global leadership!

Prime Minister, thank you for reminding us of the European dream, but it is about time that the European dream came to terms with European binding law because solidarity, orderly migration and the social pillar are not just dream works. They are binding European laws, yet violated by some notorious Member States. Article 50 is also binding law on the duty of the European Union, the Brexit thing.

We heard a British MEP here calling the attention of the House of Commons to the clock which is ticking because it is about time that the House of Commons delivered on the deplorable referendum that took place in 2016. But, for the European Parliament, the consequence of it all is that we have to fight against populism by voting pro-European, as you have just advocated.

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** – Mr President, my congratulations to the Prime Minister, and my thanks for your reminding us of the need to keep a moral compass for integrity, for the fight against corruption, as a central question for credibility – even in our own political family, and starting with our political family. I thank you for your initiative on Romania.

But let me ask you, if we are indeed to fight organised crime and criminality that is taking advantage of the system, do we not need to indeed move away from unanimity on taxation? Because they are taking advantage of this blocking system to actually exploit offshores, inside and outside the European Union. Indeed they divert the money that is so needed for public services to our taxpayers. This is a crucial question and we want leadership from you on that.

**Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his intervention. I would like to hear a little bit more about how Sweden sees the future financing of the European Union. At the same time, Sweden represented an example on social security for other European Union countries. Unfortunately, nowadays, even when you have a minimum wage of EUR 8 per hour there are workers from Central and Eastern Europe working in Sweden who are paid EUR 5 per hour, or even illegally. Which measures are you going to take in order to respect equal rights for European Union citizens?

And last, but not least, do you see that more drugs are sold not only in Sweden, in Stockholm or in Malmö, but in Paris, in Brussels, in London? Don't you think that all of us should enforce a policy of the European Union to fight drugs trafficking and give a chance to the new generation in Europe?

**Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister and say, Prime Minister, that I welcome your friendship and words on Brexit. Unfortunately, I have Brexititis, so I apologise for the coughing from the back, but a lesson from Brexit is that the left-behind areas of our countries must be listened to and heard on the negative side of globalisation and the impact of rising precariousness, and I strongly agree with you that the social benefits of EU membership have to be tangible in people's lives and tangible in people's workplaces.

But the influence of our market goes way beyond our borders. No one will stay in love with globalisation unless there are stronger, fairer social and environmental rules internationally and Europe can lead the way, but is our trade policy really fit for purpose? Corporations have far more rights to justice than the workers and communities that they rely on. Shouldn't we be pushing for EU mandatory business and human rights rules to clean up labour exploitation in our supply chains at home and abroad?

Stefan, I like your vision of the future of Europe, and I hope that my country will take the opportunity and decide to stay so that we can build it together.

**Christofer Fjellner (PPE).** – Herr talman! Herr statsminister! Sveriges utrikesminister Margot Wallström brukar säga att man vet om man är svensk på ett möte i Bryssel för de inleder ofta med att säga "In Sweden we have a system".

Alltför ofta låter svenska, inte minst socialdemokrater, så här. Föga framgångsrikt kan jag säga. Men, när vi är som bäst kan vi inspirera. Det bygger dock på att vi lyckas. För *charity starts at home* och många av de frågor som är viktigast just nu, som du själv tar upp, är vi ju tyvärr inget föredöme på, inspirerar vi knappast någon.

Fungerande gränser, hur ska vi inspirera någon när kommissionen dömer ut vårt eget gränsskydd? Kampen mot terror, när andra länder är rädda för att IS-återvändare ska lämna Sverige och göra hemskheter i deras länder. Gränsöverskridande brottslighet, när det finns en oro för att organiserad kriminalitet från Malmö ska rinna över Öresund eller tillväxt, där Sverige har lägst tillväxt per capita i EU.

Ord är viktiga men handling är ännu viktigare och ska vi lyckas förändra och inspirera EU, då krävs det betydligt bättre än vad herr statsminister levererar i dag.

*(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)*

**Stefan Löfven**, Prime Minister of Sweden. – Mr President, first, once again, several raised the issue of the Social Pillar, and I have the same answer. It's not that we have the same opinion; that is not true. We have different opinions on these issues, because I believe strongly that social security is important – not least in the transition. This is something we have argued within Sweden for decades, for centuries, and all the improvements that have been made have also been fought against by the Conservatives. That's true.

That is why we also disagree at a European level. We need to have an ambition and make sure that the population, the people, in our Member States also see that, yes, we have a strong market, but we also have a strong social dimension that makes us – everybody – winners, because today that's not the case. That is not the case at the global level either. The case is that too many people feel they are the losers and that they don't have a place in the future product. Our task is to show that everybody has a place, and that also goes with social security and social responsibility. It is a common task. I guess we will have to debate this in the coming decades as well, but I do not give up. We need a social justice.

When it comes, Mr Brannen, to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and wood, we have another argument, and that is that wooden constructions and wooden buildings are not more dangerous in terms of fire. It could actually be the other way around, but that is up to the experts to continue to decide. I will not intervene in British decision-making, but I would say this: that we will continue in Sweden. We need to build more using wood rather than other materials for exactly the reason that that was mentioned: the climate. So we need to use more of our wood.

I do not think I cannot go through everybody.

Federley, när det gäller svenska statsråds närvaro, jag kan inte det i detalj. Jag kan bara säga att det är klart att man ska vara närvarande så mycket det går. Det är vi helt överens om.

Mr Papadimoulis, yes, we need to do more of that and that is why we believe it's very important that we have a goal.

There was also another question on the same issue – what more can we do for the climate – from Mr Kofod. We need to set goals and that is why I said in my speech here that in Sweden we decided that we should be zero neutral in 2045.

We think it's important that the European Union make a similar decision, and we have suggested 2050, at the latest, because that's the first goal. You need to decide that this is where we're going and then you can adapt the goals for 2030 or 2025, look at the transport sector, the construction sector, industry, and then you're starting. So you need the structure and the clear decision and then of course you need the tools as well so that we make it easier, also for individuals and organisations.

But I can also say this: we have a lot of businesses in Sweden and a lot of companies and enterprises that love to be in this project. They are in many ways ahead of us, telling us that we need to go faster and that they want to do more. So I think what it's all about is creating the 'people's movement' for combating climate change and making sure that we do our best for climate.

Max Andersson om skatteflykt. Nej, det är inte alls det det är frågan om, utan det finns ingen annan ambition än att här ska det betalas skatt. Naturligtvis efter förmåga och vad man har tjänat, utan vad det här handlar om är också att vi ser till att vi ska ta ut skatterna nationellt. Så det här är en fråga som är mycket mer komplex än så. Men ingen tvekan på att skattefusk ska bekämpas med alla tillgängliga, lagliga medel.

Several of you have been touching upon the subject of corruption and mentioned different countries like Malta, Slovakia and Romania. There is only one answer to that: corruption, wherever it takes place, is not acceptable. That means that, a Prime Minister of Sweden or as a party leader of the Social Democratic Party in Sweden, it doesn't matter who is guilty of what, we will combat that: nobody gets away with saying that they belong to a certain family. Corruption and misuse of financial resources are never, never accepted, and I can assure you that we are also dealing with that, being very clear on that issue because this is about the legitimacy of democracy and of our system. We cannot undermine that so it doesn't matter who is responsible. We will combat that.

Sällström om föräldraförsäkring. Det är ju precis det här vi säger hela tiden. Det är ju inte så att fördraget i EU har förändrats på en enda punkt med pelaren för sociala rättigheter. Inte ett enda mandat, för då krävs det en fördragsändring. Så de förslagen hade ju kunnat komma när som helst ändå och föräldraförsäkringsdirektivet har väl varit på plats, jag gissar nu, i väl över 20 år. Jag kan inte i detalj, men det har varit på plats väldigt, väldigt länge.

Det är en sak vi ska vara väldigt noga med här och det är att se till att hålla jämställdhetens flagga högt. Vi vet att om kvinnor skulle ha samma sysselsättningsgrad i EU som män så skulle vårt BNP kunna öka med 12 procent. Det är en massa resurser det faktiskt, och det är så vi skapar resurser och ser till att kvinnor får samma möjligheter på arbetsmarknaden, i livet, hemma. Det är det det här handlar om.

Det här är en jämställdhetsfråga och den är inte till bara för kvinnor. Den är till för dig och mig också som män. Den är till för hela våra samhällen. Men inget mandat har flyttats från den nationella nivån till EU-nivån så att vi ska fortsätta att slåss för jämställdhet och där hoppas jag att vi kan kroka arm.

We should not negotiate our values, I totally agree. I talked about the climate so we agree on that.

Mr López Aguilar, on the UK and Brexit we share the worry. We have to respect the referendum and what the UK will now decide and we try to be as pragmatic as possible, but there is also a line, of course. But let's see what happens now during this, and next, week.

Ms Gomes, on the moral compass, I agree.

There was also a question about future financing. As I said, if we put more people into work, we will have more finances. Sweden is a net payer right now and we're fine with that. That's okay. We are a relatively rich country so we can contribute more, and that's okay, but we cannot increase the fees so high that we cannot fulfil our obligations at home. That's not possible. So that is why I would say that we also need to think about how to relocate resources. We cannot just add new tasks and new missions and then increase the fee. That is not possible because there is a limit. But let's relocate.

I fully agree on drugs because we need to cooperate more to combat drugs, because that is something that will definitely – not will, is right now – poisoning our society. So the more strongly we combat drug dealing and drugs, the better for us. That is also why I went, for example, to Europol to see what we are doing together here. We're doing a lot, but I guess we need to do more.

Ms Kirton-Darling, about the trade agreements: we need to have trade agreements that also include these kind of rights and they are doing so. The agreements that we are negotiating right now also include, as far as I understand it, social rights.

Fjellner, inrikespolitisk fråga. Men okej, jag tar den också. Då är det så här, att sedan vi tillträdde så har polismyndigheten inte haft mer resurser. Vi ser till att de får bättre verktyg. Det sitter fler busar i häkten och i fängelserna nu än det har gjort på många, många, många år.

Problemet är att det fylls på i unga åldrar och då är vi tillbaka i det sociala ansvarstagandet så den ena sidan att vara stenhård mot brotten, det är viktigt och det kommer vi att vara. Men den andra sidan, det är att se till att det är sådan social utveckling för människor också i utsatta områden att de känner hopp för framtiden och att ungdomar inte dras in i brottslighet. De ska ha bättre skolor, bostadsområden, deras föräldrar ska in i arbete och det är det arbetet vi har påbörjat nu. Nu går det snabbare för människor som kommer till Sverige att komma in i arbete och då ser deras barn och ungdomar att det är den vägen vi ska gå.

Så det sociala, det mjuka, är väl så viktigt som det hårda. Det är de båda två spåren vi måste förbättra och därför var det inte bra att Moderaterna, Kristdemokraterna och Sverigedemokraterna röstade för en budget när just den satsningen togs bort. Inte bra.

**President.** – The debate is closed.

*Written statements (Rule 162)*



**Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Ich teile viele Positionen des Ministerpräsidenten, und ich freue mich, dass er ein starker Vertreter der Grundwerte der EU ist. Ich teile auch seine Ansicht, dass wir einen stärkeren Rechtsstaatsmechanismus innerhalb der EU brauchen. Denn nur, wenn wir diese Werte selbst leben und schützen, können wir sie nach außen verteidigen. Ich teile auch seinen Aufruf für einen stärkeren Kampf gegen den Klimawandel und für einen besseren Umweltschutz. Hier sollte die EU eine Vorreiterrolle in der Welt einnehmen.

## PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

*Vicepresidente*

### 13. Wspólne zasady rynku wewnętrznego gazu ziemnego (debata)

**El presidente.** – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Jerzy Buzek, en nombre de la Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/73/CE, sobre normas comunes para el mercado interior del gas natural (COM(2017)0660 – C8-0394/2017 – 2017/0294(COD)) (A8-0143/2018).

**Jerzy Buzek, Rapporteur.** – Panie Przewodniczący! Dla bezpieczeństwa energetycznego Europy dostawy gazu to sprawa najbardziej delikatna i trudna. Po pierwsze mamy naszego własnego gazu europejskiego coraz mniej a zużywamy go coraz więcej, a po drugie jeszcze niedawno trudno było sobie wyobrazić przejrzysty rynek gazu w Unii Europejskiej z konkurencyjnymi cenami. Kluczowe jest obowiązywanie na całym terenie Unii, włączając wody terytorialne państw członkowskich, które w tym przypadku są bardzo ważne, przepisów wewnętrznego unijnego rynku energii. Co mówią te przepisy? O rozdziale właścicielskim, dostępie do stron trzecich, do każdego gazociągu oraz stosowaniu niedyskryminacyjnych i uczciwych taryf. To wszystko gwarantuje nowa dyrektywa i to jest koniec ery monopolistów na europejskim rynku gazu, którzy albo grozili wysokimi cenami albo wręcz zakręceniem kurka z gazem.

Jesteśmy w zasadzie spóźnieni o 10 lat, bo dyrektywę, czyli trzeci pakiet energetyczny, wprowadziliśmy dokładnie 10 lat temu w czasie prezydencji czeskiej w 2009 roku. Tutaj szczególne słowa uznania dla pana komisarza Miguela Cañete za inicjatywę wprowadzenia tego rozwiązania, a także dla prezydencji rumuńskiej, która bardzo odważnie przystąpiła do negocjacji. Po tych negocjacjach uzupełniona dyrektywa gazowa dotyczy całej infrastruktury spoza Unii Europejskiej, czyli wszystkich rurociągów dostawczych z krajów trzecich do Unii Europejskiej, ale zwłaszcza dotyczyć to będzie tych nowo budowanych i jeszcze nieoddanych do użytku gazociągów.

Ta dyrektywa nie jest wobec tego przeciwko żadnemu krajowi ani przeciwko żadnemu dostawcy gazu do Unii Europejskiej. Jeśli jakiś dostawca ma problem z tą dyrektywą, to świadczy to raczej o jego intencjach, a nie o tym, co wprowadzamy, bo my wprowadzamy jedynie prawo europejskie na całym terytorium Unii.

I jeszcze jedna sprawa ważna. Jutro głosujemy i to jest koniec pierwszego etapu naszych działań po to, żebyśmy mieli rozwiązania prawne, ale teraz jest problem wdrażania. To będzie zależało w dużym stopniu od Komisji Europejskiej i Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej. Jeśli się okaże, że działania Komisji Europejskiej nie będą wystarczająco skuteczne, Parlament będzie kontrolował i przyglądał się jak jest realizowane prawo unijne. Nie ma i nie będzie naszej zgody w Parlamencie, by jakkolwiek gazociąg, który godzi w nasze bezpieczeństwo energetyczne albo jest niezgodny z celami unii energetycznej, a więc zasadami, wartościami, takimi na przykład jak dywersyfikacja źródeł czy tras dostaw gazu, aby taki gazociąg, a więc niezgodny z zasadami, które wprowadzamy w Unii Europejskiej, mógł liczyć na jakiekolwiek ułatwienia czy derogację spod prawa unijnego.

Jestem przekonany, że dopilnowanie tego to wielkie zadanie, także dla nowego Parlamentu Europejskiego i dla Komisji Europejskiej, bo zawsze jak mamy do czynienia z dobrym skutecznym prawem na terenie całej Unii Europejskiej, to kluczowe znaczenie ma to, żebyśmy je dobrze i we właściwy sposób wdrożyli.

**Miguel Arias Cañete**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start my intervention today by thanking the European Parliament for its strong and constructive support throughout the complex and difficult negotiations. It has allowed us to secure a political agreement in one single trilogue, on 12 February.

The European Parliament strengthened the robustness and European Union oversight of the new legal provisions of the Gas Directive. My special thanks reach out to the rapporteur, Jerzy Buzek, and to all the shadow rapporteurs involved.

With the amended Gas Directive, we will be in a position to ensure that European Union energy legislation will apply to all pipelines connecting the European Union market with third countries. No such pipeline should be operated in a legal void or only according to the rules of a third country. This is important for European energy security, for European sovereignty and for European solidarity.

In practical terms, it means that the key principles of European Union energy legislation, such as third-party access, tariff regulation, ownership unbundling and transparency will apply to gas pipelines with third countries. Let's recall: the European Union imports 77% of the gas it consumes, and the great majority of this gas, almost 90%, is reaching us via pipelines from third countries, onshore and offshore.

The provisions of the Gas Directive will from now on be applicable to all these gas transmission lines, both onshore and offshore, in the territory and the territorial sea of the Member States. This is a major step towards a well-functioning, transparent and competitive European Union internal gas market where all suppliers are acting under the same European Union rules.

Exemptions for new infrastructure are only possible under strict procedures and conditions. These procedures and conditions are already well established under the current Gas Directive. The European Commission plays a decisive role and has extensive case practice. Each exemption decision has to be approved by the European Commission via a binding decision. The European Commission may grant the exemption, reject it or grant with appropriate modifications. The text agreed by the co-legislators also ensures transparency and cooperation among competent national authorities, for instance by requiring consultations among regulators before granting exemptions for new infrastructure.

Existing interconnectors with third countries will be eligible for a time-limited derogation to be granted by the Member States, for a period of up to 20 years – based on objective criteria – and all derogations shall be notified to the European Commission.

The final text of the compromise preserves the possibility for Member States to conclude bilateral agreements with third countries on the operation of gas interconnectors, subject to authorisation by the European Commission – the so-called empowerment procedure. But such agreements must comply with European Union law and they cannot change the rules of the Gas Directive. Based on the European Parliament's amendment, an additional step was added requiring authorisation of the European Commission for the conclusion and signature of such agreements to ensure adequate oversight is in place.

Together with the previously agreed rules on security of gas supply and intergovernmental agreements in the energy field, the Union has given itself a strong set of tools to deal effectively and collectively with our external energy suppliers. This has always been one of the main objectives of the Energy Union. I am looking forward to the debate.

**Werner Langen**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte sagen, das war ein Schnellverfahren, in dem die Gasrichtlinie geändert wurde. Es ist auch nicht so – ich muss meinem hochgeschätzten Vorsitzenden Buzek widersprechen – dass der Gasmarkt nicht funktioniert. Er funktioniert seit 2009 hervorragend. Wir haben Gas in allen Formationen in Europa: Wir haben Gas aus Norwegen, den Niederlanden, Großbritannien, aus Russland, über Flüssigerdgas, aus allen Teilen der Welt. Er funktioniert!

Deshalb war die Frage: Warum wird die Gasrichtlinie geändert? Eine Frage, die mit einem einzigen Projekt zusammenhängt: Mit Nord Stream 2. Da brauchen wir uns nicht darüber hinwegzutäuschen. Und ich sage ganz klar: Der Kompromiss ist vertretbar, so wie er gefunden wurde. Dort heißt es nämlich, dass für den Anwendungsbereich das Territorialgewässer des Anlandestaates entscheidend ist, also der Anlandestaat. Das ist die Auslegung. Die Kommission hat vorher Rechte gehabt. Sie hat jetzt noch das Recht, dass sie eine Genehmigung – wenn man so will – unter strengen Bedingungen erteilen kann. Damit kann man leben. Aber eine Umdeutung des deutsch-französischen Kompromisses, der mehrheitsfähig war und von 27 Staaten abgesegnet wurde, kann ich nicht billigen. Und deshalb sage ich: Wir werden darauf achten, wie es umgesetzt wird.

Die Kommission hat mehrere Gutachten in Gang gesetzt – sie hatte keine Kompetenz. Dann hat sie die Richtlinie geändert. Und niemand kann sagen: Die Gaszufuhr aus den Nachbarstaaten ist unzuverlässig. Für Deutschland ist Norwegen der größte Gaslieferant, für die EU Russland. Und wenn wir heute sagen, das muss zur Sicherheit beitragen, dann kann man politische Gründe wie die Besetzung der Krim vorschieben. Aber wenn wir Kohle und Kernenergie ersetzen und erneuerbare Energien einsetzen, dann werden wir mehr Gas brauchen. Und die beiden einzigen Störungen in 40 Jahren der Gasversorgung zu Europa sind durch die Ukraine verursacht worden, nicht durch Russland. Das möchte ich hier klarstellen, damit wir eine sachgerechte Bewertung finden.

**Dan Nica**, *în numele grupului S&D*. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau să vă felicit pe dumneavoastră, pe domnul Buzek, pe ceilalți *shadow rapporteurs* și Președinția română pentru că au încheiat acest extrem de important dosar, foarte controversat, doar pentru o singură țară, e drept, într-un timp foarte scurt. Și vreau să spun aceste lucruri pentru că este și o lecție. Regulile Uniunii Europene trebuie aplicate pentru toate statele membre, în mod egal, și nu poți să favorizezi un stat membru pe cheltuiala și pe seama cetățenilor din celelalte țări membre, care erau expuși unor prețuri mari, unei lipse de securitate a aprovizionării, cu toate lucrurile negative care ar deriva de aici. Și mai cred ceva: că lecția de astăzi este că nu putem face un regim special pentru o companie, fie ea și Gazprom, pentru un singur stat membru, fie el și Germania, ci trebuie să facem aceleași reguli pentru toate statele membre în beneficiul cetățenilor europeni și mai ales să arătăm că regulile funcționează în Uniunea Europeană pentru toată lumea. Când toți se supun acestor reguli de competiție, de transparentă, atunci beneficiile vor fi pentru toți, și acest lucru a fost salutat de către toată lumea, și pentru acest lucru vreau să le mulțumesc tuturor pentru că au arătat cum trebuie procedat în Uniunea Europeană, și mai ales beneficiile pentru cetățenii europeni, pentru că ceea ce trebuie spus este că în absența acestei modificări a directivei, prețurile la gaze ar fi fost supuse unor jocuri care erau necontrolabile și acest lucru nu putea fi acceptat. Dacă vrem într-adevăr și constatăm că nu putem să ne lipsim de gazele naturale, trebuie să ne asigurăm că acestea vin la un preț corect, că fiecare cetățean european plătește prețul corect și că legea de bază în Uniunea Europeană este competiție și regim egal pentru toată lumea, state terțe și cei care vor să intre în relații comerciale cu Uniunea Europeană. Acesta este mesajul și vreau să-i felicit pe toți pentru această realizare.

**Zdzisław Krasnodębski**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja też podzielam zdanie, że ta nowelizacja dyrektywy gazowej była potrzebna i że przyjęcie tekstu zamyka ważną lukę prawną, i w tym sensie jest to sukces. Toteż gratuluję panu premierowi Buzkowi, bo czekaliśmy bardzo długo, aż Rada tę dyrektywę wyciągnie ze swej zamrażarki, w której przebywała właściwie przez cały rok. Tylko że potem zaczęliśmy się bardzo spieszyć i muszę przyznać, że z mojego punktu widzenia ostateczny rezultat jest nieco rozczarowujący.

Mianowicie stanowisko Rady spowodowało daleko idące rozmycie tekstu. I wymienię trzy kwestie, które wydają mi się wątpliwe. To przede wszystkim kwestia derogacji, ponieważ wątpliwości tu budzą zarówno tryb podejmowania decyzji wyłączeniowych, jak i bardzo mało precyzyjne przesłanki umożliwiające ich wydawanie.

Po drugie: fakt, że decyzję o derogacji podejmuje regulator tylko jednego państwa członkowskiego, na którego terytorium kończy się gazociąg biegnący z terytorium państwa trzeciego. A zdarzało się, że regulatorzy omijali prawo unijne.

No i wreszcie to, że myśmy chcieli, żeby cały podmorski odcinek gazociągu był objęty prawem Unii, natomiast będą to tylko wody terytorialne. No i to dotyczy oczywiście tej sprawy kontrowersyjnej, mianowicie Nordstreamu. Już się słyszy, że ma powstać odrębna spółka, która będzie właściwie operatorem wyłącznie tego odcinka na wodach terytorialnych. Dlatego tak bardzo ważna jest, po pierwsze, rola Komisji – monitorowanie i wdrażanie tej dyrektywy, a po drugie, chciałbym zaapelować do rządu niemieckiego i do pani kanclerz Merkel osobiście, żeby Pani zakończyła tę inwestycję, która jest sprzeczna z interesami Unii, sprzeczna z interesami Europy. Niech Pani pokaże, że Pani rzeczywiście jest taką *glühende Europäerin*, jak się to często mówi.

**Morten Helveg Petersen**, for ALDE-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Lad mig starte med at sige tak til ordfører Buzek for det store arbejde og det gode samarbejde omkring dette gasdirektiv. Tillykke med en vigtig aftale for Europas fremtid! Vigtig, fordi aftalen sikrer, at Gazprom og Putin skal følge helt centrale spilleregler for handel med gas i Europa. Uden direktivet, som kommissæren også anførte, ville Putin kunne udnytte et juridisk tomrum til at forstærke Europas afhængighed af russisk energi yderligere. Det hverken kan eller skal vi selvfølgelig acceptere.

Derfor er jeg ganske godt tilfreds med, at vi nu kan stille krav, så russisk gas skal følge de samme regler som europæiske selskaber. Det er på høje tid. For der er vitterlig ingen grund til at give særlige fordele til Putins Rusland, der gang på gang underminerer menneskerettigheder og demokrati og destabiliserer vores allierede, både militært og i cyberspace, og som tidligere viste sig klar til at bruge Europas afhængighed af russisk gas som et egentligt geopolitisk værktøj. Vi burde som reaktion herpå i Europa reducere vores import af russisk gas i stedet for at øge importen ved at bygge nye rørledninger. Vi er i det hele taget alt for afhængige af import af energi udefra, og vi burde satse meget mere på at blive reelt uafhængige. Hvordan det?, kunne man så spørge sig selv. Først og fremmest ved at blive bedre til at spare på energien, ved at investere i energieffektivitet – hvilket mange medlemslande i EU desværre har været for dårlige til historisk set – og ved at investere i vedvarende energi, der nu kan konkurrere på markedsvilkår, og som kun bliver billigere år for år. På den måde går bekæmpelsen af klimaforandringerne fint hånd i hånd med at blive mindre sårbar over for Putin og import af energi udefra. På den måde slår vi faktisk flere fluer med ét smæk.

De grønne investeringer skal ikke kun ses i lyset af Putins Rusland. Det gælder helt generelt klimakampen, som vi er godt på vej til at tabe, netop fordi vi har givet fossile brændsler for gode vilkår i for mange år. Hvis vi skal have en chance for at sikre, at EU bliver CO<sub>2</sub>-neutral i fremtiden, så nytter det ikke noget at fortsætte ned af det fossile spor. Tværtimod skal vi udfase den energi, der skaber farlige klimaforandringer og skadelig luftforurening, og i stedet satse på vedvarende alternativer og dermed sikre, at EU går forrest i klimakampen. Det har vi en klar interesse i.

**Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης**, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κατά την άποψη της Ομάδας GUE, η νέα οδηγία για το φυσικό αέριο ακυρώνει τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τη δημιουργία αγωγών με τρίτες χώρες και δεν λαμβάνει υπόψη τις ιδιαιτερότητες που υπάρχουν σε κάθε κράτος, οι οποίες καθιστούν αναπαραστάτο τον ρόλο των εθνικών πολιτικών στην ενέργεια. Είναι απαράδεκτο να πρέπει να ζητείται εξουσιοδότηση από την Επιτροπή πέντε μήνες πριν ώστε να μπορούν να γίνουν διαπραγματεύσεις με τρίτη χώρα για τη δημιουργία νέου αγωγού ή για τροποποίηση υφιστάμενης συμφωνίας για τους αγωγούς. Όπως, εξίσου, απαράδεκτο είναι να απαιτείται από το κράτος μέλος να περιμένει 90 μέρες την Επιτροπή για να αποφασίσει εάν θα δώσει ή όχι την έγκρισή της ώστε να μπορέσει το κράτος να υπογράψει τη συμφωνία στην οποία κατέληξε με την τρίτη χώρα. Ακυρώνεται εντελώς η εθνική ευελιξία στη διαμόρφωση αποδοτικών ενεργειακών σχέσεων, ιδιαίτερα, όταν ακόμα υπάρχουν ενεργειακά απομονωμένα κράτη και περιοχές. Αντί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να λύσει τα αδιέξοδα που αντιμετωπίζει στην ενεργειακή τροφοδοσία και ασφάλεια με την εν λόγω οδηγία, θα δημιουργήσει νέα προβλήματα τόσο στη λειτουργία των υφιστάμενων αγωγών όσο και εκεί που θα δημιουργηθούν νέοι αγωγοί, για παράδειγμα, στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο. Επίσης, δυστυχώς, δεν έγινε καμία προσπάθεια να ενισχυθεί η πρόταση όσον αφορά τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών σε σχέση με το φυσικό αέριο ούτε κατατέθηκε ολοκληρωμένο σχέδιο για ανάπτυξη και αξιοποίηση των εγχώριων πηγών φυσικού αερίου της Ένωσης, όπως, για παράδειγμα, των σημαντικών κοιτασμάτων στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο. Αντιθέτως, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τηρεί σιγή ιχθύος στις παραβιάσεις που κάνει η Τουρκία στα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα κράτους μέλους και αναφέρομαι στην κυπριακή ΑΟΖ.

**Rebecca Harms**, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Herr Buzek, auch von meiner Seite vielen Dank. Vielen Dank auch an die Kommission und an die rumänische Ratspräsidentschaft, dass dieses wichtige Dossier noch aus der Blockade herausgeholt werden konnte. Meine Fraktion begrüßt ausdrücklich, dass die gesamte Gasinfrastruktur – die alte und die neue –, die aus Drittländern in die EU führt, in Zukunft gemeinsamen europäischen Regeln unterworfen wird.

Um auf Herrn Krasnodębski einzugehen: Auch wir appellieren, wir fordern von der Bundesregierung, dass diese gemeinsamen Regeln auch eingehalten werden. Es ist ja bisher nicht möglich gewesen, ein unverantwortliches Projekt – Nord Stream 2 – zu stoppen. Das war auch nie die Absicht dieser Gesetzgebung; es wird allerdings erschwert.

Ich möchte an dieser Stelle sagen, dass es für mich erschreckend gewesen ist, wie schnell das russische Gas-Imperium zurückgeschlagen hat, nachdem wir uns geeinigt hatten. Nur Tage nach der Einigung hat der russische Energieminister erklärt: Von der Stunde an, zu der Gas durch die Nord-Stream-Pipeline fließt, wird der Transit durch die Ukraine eingestellt. Angela Merkel hat versprochen, sie hat es zur Bedingung für Nord Stream 2 gemacht, dass der Transit weitergeht. An dieses Versprechen muss man sie, glaube ich, nicht erinnern; das weiß sie noch. Und ich erwarte, dass sie da jetzt handelt.

Ich möchte – da dies meine letzte Rede nach vielen Reden zu unserem Verhältnis zu Russland sein wird – hier sagen, dass ich dringend – dringend – fordere, dass die Europäische Union ihre Abhängigkeit von Russland im Energiebereich überprüft. Denn es würde auf Dauer unserer Sicherheit schaden, wenn wir ein aggressiveres Russland durch wachsende Energieimporte stärken und eigentlich die Investitionen in den militärischen Komplex in Russland durch unser Geld stärken würden.

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

**Werner Langen (PPE)**, *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Kollegin Harms! Wie erklären Sie sich denn Ihre Aussage, dass durch eine Pipeline, die maximal 50 Millionen Kubikmeter fassen soll – Nord Stream 2 –, der gesamte momentane Transport durch die Ukraine mit einem Volumen von 115 Milliarden Kubikmeter erfolgen sollte? Wie erklären Sie sich dieses technische Wunder?

**Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Erstens habe ich den russischen Energieminister zitiert. Den sollten Sie dann vielleicht fragen – da gibt es ja Möglichkeiten.

Zweitens ist Nord Stream 1 bis heute nicht ausgelastet, und es werden auch weitere Infrastrukturmaßnahmen von russischer Seite geplant. Ich empfinde die Ansage aus Moskau und aus dem Gazprom-Imperium nicht nur als einen Angriff auf die Ukraine und ihre Interessen, sondern ganz eindeutig als eine Ansage, dass die europäischen Interessen auf der anderen Seite nicht ernst genommen werden, sondern dass Gazprom, dass Putin weiter Politik mit Erdgas machen will.

**Jonathan Bullock**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the EU common rules for the internal market for natural gas reiterate the principle according to which more EU interference is going to solve Europe's energy deficiencies and dependencies from external energy sources. New EU definitions and less derogations to Member States will, according to this report, lower energy prices and augment regulatory certainty. Well, it hasn't happened yet. Mr President, it seems quite remarkable in my opinion that EU institutions have not yet learnt their lesson. Euro-scepticism is rising all over Europe. People ask to be heard. Nevertheless, this House, just like the unelected EU Commission here in Brussels, seems to be living in a parallel reality, far from the poor householder that cannot afford their energy bills. You are willing to sacrifice the needs of ordinary people to achieve a greater, yet highly expensive and unreliable energy goal. I think it is time to put the EU project aside and admit that EU energy legislation has impoverished Europe and its industries and households. Member States should be focusing their agenda and finances on discovering local energy sources. It is time for Europe to become independent from its green-driven agenda. We know renewables are not reliable enough to make Europe free from energy imports. As for my country, Britain, I deeply hope that once outside the European Union, hopefully with a no deal Brexit, we will be able to scrap EU energy legislation altogether and invest in proper reliable and affordable energy sources.

**Christelle Lechevalier**, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, à l'heure où les réserves de gaz d'Europe du Nord diminuent tandis que la consommation européenne est en passe d'augmenter, le sujet de l'approvisionnement en gaz est une affaire capitale.

La Russie fournit 35 % du gaz consommé dans l'Union et ses exportations sont une source indispensable de revenus pour elle. Malgré cette interdépendance, la Commission évoque la nécessité de diversifier les fournisseurs et cherche à brider, pour des raisons géopolitiques, les échanges avec la Russie. Incapable d'imposer ses vues par la voie diplomatique, la Commission tente de parvenir à ses fins au moyen d'un règlement. Elle exige qu'en dehors de son territoire, les règles de l'Union en matière énergétique s'appliquent aux gazoducs d'approvisionnement.

L'objectif est de nuire au projet Nord Stream 2, qui permettrait de doubler l'approvisionnement en gaz russe via la Baltique. La manœuvre est grossière et les difficultés rencontrées avec plusieurs États lors des négociations interinstitutionnelles est la preuve que personne n'est dupe. Ce règlement cherche à nous couper du gaz russe par idéologie. Il favorisera un gaz de schiste américain nuisible écologiquement et coûteux économiquement. La Commission s'impose ici comme leader en matière énergétique et géopolitique au détriment des États, une nouvelle fois, ce qui sera le motif principal de notre opposition à ce texte.

**Gunnar Hökmark (PPE).** – Mr President, first of all, I think it's quite obvious that the Russian energy policy is a part of its powerful reaction against Europe. We have disinformation, we have money laundering. We have laundering of money coming from the business of oil and natural gas in Russia and we have the disinformation and we have the warfare in Ukraine.

Of course we need to face up to this challenge, but we don't even need to think about those challenges in order to see that it is quite natural that we shall have the same rules for the dominant actors on the internal market for energy as well as for the smaller actors. Gazprom will, with Nord Stream, be a main supplier with nearly 30% of their natural gas going to Europe. Why shouldn't we apply the same rules regarding competition? How to decouple production from distribution as for all other actors on the European energy market? I haven't heard anyone who sees any big problems with this. Why should we see it as some sort of diplomatic action?

We apply the same rules to everyone – to the big producers and the big distributors and the small producers and the small distributors. I can't understand why there should be any problems but I hear from the GUE Group, the genetic defence of Moscow is always there, and the extreme right, which is not at all right. They're all extreme. They are against it all the time. What I would like to say to the Commissioner is: see to it that you use this legislation. See to it that Germany does the negotiations, as it shall, and see to it that we can get an outcome which makes the European gas market transparent and full of competition.

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

**Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR), blue-card question.** – Some friends of Russia here in this room. Why do you ignore Mr Langen from your political group?

**Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), blue-card answer.** – I never ignore Mr Langen. He is a very wise man, and he can sometimes take arguments. The fact that he and I sometimes have different views, that is because you can have different views. But I'm quite convinced – and I'm willing to defend Mr Langen – when it is about standing up to Russia or standing up to anyone else. We might have our discussions, but we stand united towards the threats against Europe.

**Carlos Zorrinho (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, a criação do mercado integrado do gás é uma pedra angular do projeto da União Europeia que visa criar uma União da Energia e o presente relatório vem dar mais um passo neste processo tão importante, eliminando barreiras que dificultam o comércio transfronteiriço e aplicando às trocas exteriores à União Europeia as mesmas regras que são aplicadas internamente.

Mas sejamos claros. A independência energética no quadro de um mercado fluido é fundamental para a competitividade e para a segurança na União Europeia, mas a independência deve criar condições para uma interdependência e para a justa troca comercial propiciando a paz e a boa relação entre os povos.

Foi, aliás, com esse espírito que fiz, por exemplo, a proposta de instalação de uma central de abastecimento de navios transatlânticos com gás natural nos Açores, quando fui relator desse parecer, e que fiz também as propostas para o reforço das interconexões, como relator-sombra do parecer da *e-governance*.

Esta é a altura de «dar gás» a esta diretiva e a estas medidas para proporcionar a independência, a paz e o progresso.

**Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Porozumienie w sprawie rynku gazowego nie wróży niczego dobrego przyszłości solidarności energetycznej, która wraz z Nord Streamem zostaje po raz drugi zakopana na dnie Bałtyku. Z całkiem dobrego projektu Komisji tak naprawdę została wydmuszka. Wszystko teraz będzie zależeć od dobrej woli regulatora niemieckiego i Komisji Europejskiej. Znając siłę niemieckiego lobbingu, który w pełni ukazał się w pracach nad tym projektem, nie wróży to niczego dobrego.

Po raz kolejny interes Unii padł ofiarą zakulisowych uzgodnień. Podwójnie zły układ Niemiec z Francją, który z jednej strony pozbawił zębów projekt gazowy, z drugiej dał zielone światło na ograniczenie wolności w internecie, jest dowodem na lekceważenie unijnych standardów i dowodem na to, że partykularne interesy najsilniejszych państw członkowskich mają prymat nad wartościami europejskimi.

**Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE).** – Señor presidente, las multinacionales del gas no pueden estar por encima de la ley; tampoco las de países terceros. Nos alegramos, pues, de que por fin haya una directiva que, como pedíamos los Verdes, ponga límite a los privilegios de empresas como la rusa Gazprom, asegurando que el gasoducto Nord Stream 2 respete las reglas de nuestro mercado interior.

Pero no nos engañemos, las empresas de energía tampoco pueden estar por encima del clima y de nuestra salud. Si queremos cumplir el Acuerdo de París, las energías sucias, como el gas de origen fósil, vengán de donde venga, no tienen cabida en la combinación energética europea del futuro.

Frente a la emergencia climática, apelo a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros a no desperdiciar más tiempo y recursos en infraestructuras fósiles e inútiles como el Nord Stream 2.

Ahora más que nunca actuemos en favor de una ola de eficiencia energética y de energías renovables.

**Dariusz Rosati (PPE).** – Mr President, let me first of all express my satisfaction that we are in the process of adopting this important document. I would like to express my thanks to President Buzek for his work. I think this is a step in the right direction. This directive aims at extending the main principles of the energy union also to the gas infrastructure, gas pipelines that come to the Union from third countries; this is very important. These are the principles that ensure that competition is fair and free – unbundling of ownership of gas pipe pipelines and gas itself, free access of third parties to the infrastructure, regulatory oversight over tariffs, and also transparency of contracts. This is all good but, unfortunately, when I look at one very controversial project that has been already discussed here – the Nord Stream 2 – it is exactly an example of a project that breaks all these rules. We have at the same time the ownership of the gas pipeline by Gazprom, which is also the owner of the gas that is going to be transported through this pipeline. We don't see evidence of transparency of contract, and we see the most important thing: increasing dependence of the European Union on gas supplies from one supplier. This is not ideology. We don't want simply to be dependent on one country, on one source, be it Russia or the United States. This is the question of our security. And my question to the Commission is this: on what grounds will the Commission grant exemptions from this directive in the case of the Nord Stream 2, given the fact that we have spare capacity in the existing infrastructure to bring more gas from Russia, existing pipelines are not yet fully used, and at the same time we have this policy by Russia which is based on using gas as a foreign policy tool for the Kremlin. Can I have clarification on this point, Mr Commissioner?

**Patrizia Toia (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la crescente instabilità politica in molte aree del mondo, dalla Russia, all'Ucraina, al Nord Africa, al Medio Oriente, obbliga l'Europa ad agire per superare le criticità del sistema di approvvigionamento del nostro continente.

Una vera politica comune dell'energia ridurrà i costi per i cittadini e le imprese e, nel contempo, l'uso delle rinnovabili rappresenterà un input importante per garantire la competitività di interi settori ad alta intensità energetica. Dobbiamo continuare sulla strada iniziata con i pacchetti legislativi di riforma del mercato dell'energia e del gas e sostenere la necessaria realizzazione di infrastrutture di collegamento, anche alternative, che garantiscano la sicurezza degli approvvigionamenti. Gli sforzi europei dovrebbero concentrarsi nella riduzione delle barriere interne, come diceva il mio collega Zorrinho, affiancata alla costituzione di una capacità di stoccaggio sufficiente a gestire i momenti di crisi.

Questo accordo garantisce – ed è importante – che tutti i gasdotti, compresi quelli off-shore con paesi terzi, siano soggetti ai principi della normativa europea, e il regime di deroga previsto tutela gli investimenti in essere – penso al Sud dell'Europa – in vista della futura riforma del mercato interno del gas.

**Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE).** – Pone pirmininke, noriu pasveikinti Parlamento pranešėją poną Buzeką, Komisiją, Tarybai pirmininkaujančios Rumunijos vadovus su tikrai, manau, puikiu tarpinstitucinio darbo rezultatu. Nors ši direktyva nesustabdys kontroversiškiausio energetikos projekto Europoje, bet ji tikrai pažabos šio projekto neigiamas pasekmes Europos Sąjungos vidaus rinkai, energetiniam ir geopolitiniam saugumui. Be abejo, lieka neišspręstas tranzito per Ukrainą klausimas. Taip pat ir toliau privalėsime stebėti ir užtikrinti, kad „Nord Stream 2“ vystytojai laikytųsi teisės aktuose numatytų reikalavimų. Tačiau ši direktyva yra didžiulis Europos solidarumo pergalės pavyzdys.

**Maria Spyraiki (PPE).** – Mr President, the amendment of Directive 2009/73/EC on rules for the internal market in natural gas is a key element of the European Union's energy security strategy, but allow me to say that it's time to take some distance from Russia concerning the dominant role that it plays in the supplies in the EU. This Directive, among others, forms a firm and clear regulatory framework to ensure affordable and sustainable energy for all European consumers. This is achieved by ensuring a level playing field for those involved in the EU energy market, as well as security and predictability for the potential investors, and this is extremely important as well. But it is not enough just to have energy security and economic and sustainable energy. Investments that are compatible with the directive should be exploited and supported – supported in geopolitical terms, in geostrategic terms and in geostrategic balances. Such an investment is also the EastMed pipeline, which has major challenges to face. However, a firm political decision by the EU to support it will send a clear message of European determination to promote energy security in the southeast Mediterranean.

Beyond the ambitious plan, such as the EastMed pipeline, I should also mention the very positive development of the approval of the EUR 33 million funding of the Gas Interconnector Greece-Bulgaria (IGB) pipeline that will interconnect my country, Greece, and Bulgaria for the first time, diversifying the energy mix in the region and enhancing competition. The final beneficiaries will be European citizens. While it is worth noting that IGB will also be interconnecting with the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline (TAP), widening even further the European demand (*inaudible*).

This is the way in which energy security becomes a reality: with a robust legal framework and strong financial support, but also firm political will.

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

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, tato směrnice není jen technickou normou, která má za úkol posílit energetickou nezávislost EU, budovat její vnitřní trh, ale také zabránit vzniku monopolů i pro zahraniční dodavatele plynu a projektům typu Nord Stream.

Já osobně vnímám tento projekt jako velmi riskantní, protože svým způsobem oslabuje ekonomickou sílu Ukrajiny. Tento projekt ovšem není touto směrnicí nijak oslaben, nicméně do budoucna se domnívám, že by se mělo zabránit vzniku podobných riskantních projektů.

Chci věřit tomu, že nejde jen o příslib, že Ukrajina nepřijde o tranzit plynu, ale že bude touto směrnicí do budoucna vyloučeno další oslabování a politická rizika.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, of course it makes sense to have the same common rules for natural gas and internal market and whether they're big producers or small producers, big distributors or small distributors, of course we have to have the same rules. I compliment the efforts made by Jerzy Buzek and Commissioner Cañete and others to try and bring that about. One of the statistics that the Commissioner mentioned is worth repeating. He said 77% of the gas is imported, and 90% of it by pipelines. So, obviously common rules would have to apply here, otherwise you'd have a complete distortion. But that also brings into question our security of supply in the sense that we need to diversify. We should definitely have more LNG, which gives us greater variety and choice. As well as that, of course, I have been involved in the renewable energy file. Over the next few years we have to incentivise renewable gas within the European Union. I spoke about that earlier today at the Eurogas Conference at the Renaissance Hotel. Definitely over the period ahead, that is one way of ensuring that we will be more independent and won't have to worry as much about pipelines into the future.

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

**Miguel Arias Cañete, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank the House for this important debate.

Today's debate has shown again that, as the European Commission, we can count on this Parliament as a strong ally when it comes to defending the principle of solidarity in our energy policy. This has been a major strength in our cooperation over this entire mandate. It has been our longstanding objective that when it comes to our external energy relations, the European Union should speak with one voice. With the legislation we have passed during this mandate – the IGAs Decision, the Security of Gas Supply Directive, and the amended Gas Directive discussed today – we now have the tools in place to do just that.



As regards the Gas Directive, Members raised a number of important issues. I would like to respond to the most important points raised. Mr Langen raised the issue of whether this legislation is discrimination against Nord Stream 2. I have to say that the revised legislation concerns all gas pipelines to and from third countries, and Nord Stream 2 is only the latest example of such pipelines which all operate under different legal and regulatory regimes. The recent legal and public debate concerning Nord Stream 2 only underscores the value of providing legal clarity on this issue across the European Union. Project promoters, including those from Nord Stream 2, should welcome the legal certainty the amended legislation will create.

Mr Krasnodębski and Ms Wiśniewska raised the issue of the exemptions that can be given to Nord Stream 2 and who will decide on such exemptions. I would have to say that Nord Stream 2, like all new pipelines, could apply for an exemption under Article 36 of the Gas Directive. The conditions for such exemptions are clearly set out in the directive.

The national authority with jurisdiction over an exemption decision will be the authority of the Member State where the first interconnection point is located. In the case of Nord Stream 2 it will be Germany, but the draft decision by the national authority must be notified to the Commission, which takes a binding decision. It may grant, reject or impose changes for the exemption decision by the national authorities.

Finally, Mr Rosati raised the issue of what the criteria are for granting an exemption. If Nord Stream 2 files a request for an exemption with the national regulator, it will be subject to strict conditions. As I said before, the final decision as to whether to grant an exemption stays with the Commission.

The exemption conditions include the following criteria. First, the risk level is such that the investment will not take place without an exemption. So if the investment cannot take place without exemptions it will go that way. Second, the new infrastructure must enhance competition in the gas market, and also it has to enhance security of supply. These will be the criteria that will be applied objectively by the Commission when agreeing whether to grant an exemption.

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your excellent cooperation. The new rules ensure that European Union law will be applied to pipelines bringing gas to Europe and that everyone interested in selling gas to Europe must respect European energy law. I think that we have all made a major step forward in the creation of a truly integrated internal gas market, which is based on solidarity and trust, with full involvement and oversight of the European Commission. I trust that in your vote tomorrow you will maintain that spirit and adopt this very important piece of legislation with a broad majority, as has been shown in the debate this afternoon.

**Jerzy Buzek**, *Rapporteur*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja się zgadzam ze wszystkim, co powiedział przed chwilą pan komisarz. Jeszcze raz dziękuję, Panie Komisarzu, i gratuluję postawienia tej dyrektywy na porządku dziennym. Zwłaszcza chciałem podkreślić, że decyzje w sprawie np. derogacji zależą od Komisji Europejskiej, a nie od jednego państwa członkowskiego, bo ciągle słyszy się te dezinformacyjne informacje. Bardzo ważna będzie dywersyfikacja źródeł, tras dostaw gazu – bez tego nie można udzielić derogacji. To jest bardzo ważne.

Chciałem również podkreślić ważną rzecz: To było przyjęte w normalnej procedurze w Parlamencie Europejskim. Nie była ona w żaden sposób przyspieszona, co najwyżej można powiedzieć, że była sprawna. Ale i tak niemal rok ta dyrektywa czekała w Radzie, a więc wszystko odbywało się dość wolno.

Kolejna sprawa: Ta dyrektywa nie jest skierowana przeciwko żadnemu państwu. Warto to zawsze podkreślać. Na przykład dostawcy norwescy nie mają żadnego problemu z tą dyrektywą, więc jeśli poseł Langen ma tu jakieś wątpliwości, to przede wszystkim wątpliwości mamy wobec tych dostawców, którzy mają jakiś problem z tą dyrektywą, bo ona tylko wprowadza jednolite prawo europejskie na całym rynku gazu w Unii Europejskiej. I tego rodzaju wyjaśnienia powinniśmy się bardzo mocno trzymać. Jak w wielu innych sprawach Komisja stoi na straży traktatów i prawa unijnego, tak samo jest w tym przypadku. Nie jest to żadna nowość, nie jest to żadna słabość tej dyrektywy. Podkreślam to, bo rzeczywiście uzyskaliśmy w tej sprawie w zasadzie wszystko, co chcieliśmy uzyskać.

I jeszcze ostatnie słowo. Dotyczy Ukrainy. Rzeczywiście trzeba robić wszystko, żeby uchronić ten kraj, który jest z nami w specjalnych relacjach, przed zagrożeniem braku dostaw gazu. I to jest także jeden z elementów tej dyrektywy, bo ona mówi o przejrzystym i transparentnym, sprawiedliwym rynku w Unii Europejskiej, a także w krajach sąsiednich.

**El presidente.** – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana, jueves 4 de abril de 2019.

*Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento interno)*

**Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), în scris.** – În urma demarării primei etape a procedurii de infringement împotriva României din cauza plafonării prețurilor la gaze prin OUG 114, bine-cunoscutul deja guvern socialist exclude agenții economici din scopul deciziei, însă intenționează menținerea plafonării prețurilor în ceea ce privește gazul destinat consumului populației și a taxării cu 2 % din cifra de afaceri a companiilor energetice. Deși la prima vedere această măsură pare benefică românilor, ea nu reprezintă decât o manevră electorală populistă marca actualului grup de la guvernare, ce va genera de fapt atât o creștere excesivă a prețurilor gazelor, cât și falimentul multor companii locale din sectorul gazifer, punând astfel în real pericol securitatea aprovizionării cu gaz a mii de gospodării. Solicit pe această cale Comisiei Europene să își intensifice dialogul cu guvernul de la București, în vederea înlăturării acestor riscuri și asigurării securității și competitivității pieței gazelor atât în România, cât și în Uniunea Europeană.

**András Gyürk (PPE), írásban.** – Az energiauniós integráció egy sikertörténet. Átgondolt és versenypárti szabályozások sorozata megnyitotta az addig elszigetelt piacokat, növelte a diverzifikációt és sikeresen csökkentette a fogyasztói árakat. A 2006-os és 2009-es gázválságok bebizonyították, hogy Európának elemi szükséglete, hogy csökkenjen az egyoldalú függőségét, hiszen az Unió nem engedheti meg magának, hogy ilyen mértékben ki legyen téve egy beszállító politikai akaratának. Az ezt követő 10 évben felgyorsult az integráció és a harmadik energiacsomaggal kikristályosodott az a jogszályi környezet, amiben az európai vállalatok versenyezhetnek a piacon. Az Északi Áramlat II gázvezeték projekt nemcsak tökéletesen szembe megy ezekkel szabályokkal, de új problémákat is okoz. Kritikussá teszi az egy szolgáltató felé való kitétségünket és tovább destabilizál egy amúgy is sokat szenvedő régiót, Ukrajnát. Remélem az Európai Bizottság valóban a szerződések pártatlan őreként lép majd fel, és az Északi Áramlatra is azokat a szabályokat fogja alkalmazni, amelyeknek minden más európai projekt meg kell, hogy feleljen.

**Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie.** – Nowelizacja dyrektywy gazowej jest długo oczekiwanym przedsięwzięciem. Pozwoli bowiem zamknąć ważną lukę prawną w odniesieniu do gazociągów importowych.

Czekaliśmy na tę dyrektywę długo – prawie rok – Rada nie potrafiła sfinalizować pracy nad tekstem. Niestety wynik jest mało zadowalający. Mamy do czynienia z tekstem dobrych intencji, który zakłada, że regulatorzy państw członkowskich – nawet ci którzy już wcześniej omijali regulacje UE – będą bezstronni, a z kolei Komisja Europejska będzie pryncypialna w egzekwowaniu prawa unijnego. Wynegocjowany w trilogu tekst zawiera mało precyzyjne zapisy dotyczące derogacji i przesłanek na podstawie których te derogacje będą udzielane.

Obawiam się, że te luki prawne i nieścisłości umożliwią wyłączenia wobec szeregu projektów energetycznych. Tym samym budowa kontrowersyjnych gazociągów, zagrażających bezpieczeństwu energetycznemu Europy, nie tylko nie zostanie powstrzymana, ale wręcz odwrotnie, będzie realizowana ponieważ z „prawnym błogosławieństwem” Unii.

**Carolina Punset (ALDE)**, *por escrito*. – A pesar de la aprobación de las nuevas normas del mercado interior del gas natural, para evitar monopolios y separar la producción de la distribución, nada cambia respecto de la construcción del nuevo gasoducto Nord Stream 2, ya que Alemania seguirá negociando los detalles de esta polémica infraestructura que duplicará la dependencia del gas natural ruso y contribuirá a desincentivar las inversiones en renovables. La UE solo ha maquillado la Directiva para legitimar a Alemania en sus negociaciones con Nord Stream 2, inversión liderada por la antigua empresa estatal soviética hoy Gazprom, y dirigida por el antiguo canciller alemán Schroeder, para construir 1 200Km de nueva tubería a través del Báltico que permitirán introducir hasta 110 000 millones de metros cúbicos de gas natural en la UE. Se sigue de este modo menospreciando la diversificación y seguridad de suministro que proporcionan las energías renovables, y aunque se acuerden objetivos ambiciosos de reducción de emisiones, parece que el plan es cambiar la generación con carbón por generación con gas, es decir un combustible fósil por otro, que además en el caso del gas natural, es en sí mismo un gas de efecto invernadero hasta 86 veces más potente que el CO<sub>2</sub>.

**Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – This report is an overdue step in the right direction. Although it gives the Commission a supervisory role in the approval of process regarding all pipelines linking the EU and third countries, it is too little too late when it comes to Nord Stream<sup>2</sup>. By continuing with this project, Germany has unfortunately chosen to sacrifice Europe's security and long-term strategic goals over the potential short-term benefits of cheaper energy. However, once we are further locked into increasing Europe's dependency on Russian gas, we are at the mercy of the man at the other end of the pipeline. Since this project makes no commercial sense, as there is no lack of capacity in existing pipelines, there is a clear ulterior motive. For Putin, 11 billion is a relatively cheap price to pay for financially harming Ukraine and Poland, reducing Europe's energy security by increasing our dependence on Russian gas and dividing Western allies. Russia clearly demonstrated that it is ready to use energy as a political weapon when it restricted gas flow through Ukraine in 2006 and 2009. This alone should be reason enough to abandon this unreasonable project. Ceterum censeo, Nord Stream<sup>2</sup> needs to be cancelled.

## 14. Europejski Fundusz Morski i Rybacki (debata)

**El presidente**. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Gabriel Mato, en nombre de la Comisión de Pesca, sobre la propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativo al Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca y por el que se deroga el Reglamento (UE) n.º 508/2014 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo (COM(2018)0390 – C8-0270/2018 – 2018/0210(COD)) (A8-0176/2019).

**Gabriel Mato, ponente**. – Señor presidente, la financiación a través del FEMP es un elemento clave para la pesca sostenible y la conservación de los recursos biológicos marinos, para la seguridad alimentaria a través del suministro de productos del mar, para el crecimiento de una economía azul y para el desarrollo sostenible de unos mares y océanos saludables, seguros y limpios.

Me gustaría enfatizar la importancia del sector europeo marítimo pesquero y acuícola, que involucra a más de ochenta y cinco mil embarcaciones, emplea a más de trescientas cuarenta mil personas y produce más de seis millones de toneladas de pescado de alta calidad y nutricionalmente muy rico, además de mariscos procedentes de la pesca y de la acuicultura. El impacto socioeconómico de este sector es enorme en muchas regiones costeras que dependen de él y tienen fuertes vínculos con la cultura y las costumbres locales.

Sin embargo, hay muchos problemas derivados de la implementación de la política común de pesca, como la eliminación de los descartes o lograr el rendimiento máximo sostenible, además de los resultantes del *Brexit*. Por lo tanto, es importante salvaguardar el presupuesto necesario para hacer frente a estos problemas y desafíos que afectan al sector marítimo y pesquero, y hay que tener en cuenta la muy corta asignación presupuestaria de la Unión Europea para esta política. Y no debe ser usado en ningún caso como excusa el *Brexit* para reducir la financiación.

Por tanto, me alegro especialmente de que el Parlamento haya pedido un aumento del 10 % del presupuesto en comparación con la propuesta de la Comisión. Durante todo el proceso con los ponentes alternativos, cuya labor me gustaría agradecer públicamente, hemos trabajado arduamente para lograr el equilibrio adecuado entre la necesidad de seguir apoyando pesca y acuicultura y sectores de procesamiento, a la vez que preservamos los recursos pesqueros. Todos los compromisos se adoptaron al final en la Comisión de Pesca, y espero que se mantengan en la sesión plenaria.

De estos compromisos, me gustaría destacar alguno. No queremos que los mares y sus ecosistemas se deterioren, pero queremos que haya hombres y mujeres trabajando y teniendo un salario y condiciones de trabajo decentes. No queremos que los barcos pesqueros aumenten su capacidad para capturar peces, pero queremos inversiones a bordo que aumenten el espacio de un barco pesquero para mejorar la seguridad o las condiciones de trabajo de vida de la tripulación o la calidad del producto. No queremos el reemplazo de motores para tener más potencia, pero queremos que los motores viejos y contaminantes se recambien por otros modernos y ecológicos.

Hemos aceptado no dar dinero público para construir nuevos buques, pero nos gustaría, al menos, facilitar el acceso al crédito, a los seguros y a los instrumentos financieros, especialmente para las pequeñas empresas que carecen de capital para hacer inversiones significativas. Nos gusta prestar una atención especial a los operadores de pequeña escala, a los artesanales, y es por eso que les damos prioridad absoluta. No queremos apoyar a los operadores para que simplemente cumplan la ley, pero queremos que, cuando la ley genere costos insostenibles para los operadores, se les otorgue financiación pública. No queremos dar dinero a quienes no cumplen la ley, pero no queremos imponer dobles sanciones y condiciones que les impiden solicitar financiación.

No queremos financiar vacaciones para los pescadores, pero queremos compensarles por la pérdida de sus ingresos en caso de que la pesca se detenga temporalmente. No queremos dar dinero a los pescadores para que cesen su actividad y utilicen este dinero para comprar otra embarcación, pero queremos alentar a los pescadores a que cesen su actividad allí donde exista un exceso de capacidad. No queremos dar dinero a la acuicultura y al procesamiento no sostenible, pero sería absurdo no dar un impulso a nuestros sectores que proveen de pescado de alta calidad y seguir importando pescado de baja calidad y no sostenible.

Finalmente, no queremos que las regiones ultraperiféricas reciban ayuda operativa sin que esto esté justificado, pero deseamos apoyar a estas regiones, que están lejos y tienen limitaciones estructurales, para utilizar el dinero disponible y que se ajuste a sus necesidades reales. Me complace que hayamos optado finalmente por la flexibilidad y la simplificación de las actuales normas de elegibilidad detalladas y prescriptivas, y que nos hayamos alejado en parte de eso que algunos llaman «microgestión de Bruselas».

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, on behalf of my colleague, Commissioner Karmenu Vella, I would like to warmly thank the rapporteur, Mr Gabriel Mato, the shadow rapporteurs and all the members involved in this important file for all their valuable work. The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund should continue to support the objectives of the common fisheries policy and the implementation of the Union's maritime policy after 2020. Therefore, the Commission has proposed a budget of EUR 6.140 billion in current prices for the next programming period, which will allow us to tackle the challenges ahead and achieve our ambitious objectives. Support for the achievement of the objectives of the CFP remains a core priority. Such support should ensure that fishing activities are environmentally, economically and socially sustainable in the long term while they can contribute to the availability of food supplies. Hence the need for strong conditionalities for secession measures and leaving fleet renewal to private investment.

However, support from the EU budget is necessary to help achieve and maintain sustainable fishing, based on the maximum sustainable yield and to reduce the impact of fisheries on our maritime environment. This includes support for innovation and investment in low impact, climate resilient and low carbon fishing practices and techniques.

The EMFF is also a tool to support fisheries control and scientific knowledge. The Commission has proposed to ring fence amounts for these areas of support to ensure that sufficient funding is dedicated to this cornerstone of fisheries management. I would also like to insist on the importance of giving preferential treatment to small-scale fisheries. In particular, under the Commission's proposal, small-scale fishers would benefit from a 100% rate of public aid.

Food security and nutrition are also of the utmost importance. Fisheries and agriculture both contribute to this objective. An important challenge is therefore to encourage the consumption of fish protein produced in the Union, which meets high-quality standards and is available for consumers at affordable prices.

Therefore, the EMFF can support agriculture, including fresh water agriculture and the processing and marketing of fishery and agricultural products. The EMFF may also support the development of the sustainable blue economy by creating conditions for the development of the sector, removing bottlenecks to facilitate investment and market development.

Lastly, the EMFF will support the Union's international action to promote and improve the international governance of the oceans. This is essential to guarantee healthy, safe, secure, clean and sustainable management and specially manage seas and oceans worldwide, in line with the 2030 agenda for sustainable development, in particular Sustainable Development Goal 14.

Our proposal for the EMFF simplifies the delivery of the fund, compared with the rather complex architecture in the current period. This simplified architecture will not pre-define eligible measures at Union level, but will give flexibility to Member States in designing these measures.

Our proposal for a new EMFF represents an evolution rather than a revolution of the current regulation, with an important element of simplification.

**Eider Gardiazabal Rubial**, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Presupuestos*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, estamos hablando de uno de los Reglamentos que están bajo el paraguas del marco financiero plurianual 2021-2027 y, por lo tanto, que también está sujeto a los principios horizontales que adoptamos de cara a negociar los presupuestos a largo plazo. El Fondo Europeo Marítimo, de Pesca y de Acuicultura será clave para conseguir gran parte de los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Estamos hablando de seguridad alimentaria, de pesca sostenible, de protección de los hábitats marinos y de una actividad económica fundamental para muchas de nuestras regiones. Una actividad económica que, a su vez, tiene que asegurar empleos dignos y de calidad, que tiene que garantizar la formación y el acceso de los jóvenes a los oficios de la pesca y que tiene que apoyar, reconocer y hacer visible el trabajo de las miles de mujeres que están vinculadas al sector pesquero. Y todo esto solo se puede hacer con una financiación adecuada. Por eso, no solo rechazamos el recorte que ha presentado la Comisión Europea sino que, además, pedimos que la partida se aumente hasta los 6 867 millones de euros.

**Francesc Gambús**, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, déjeme empezar diciendo en esta intervención, que probablemente sea la última, que es un honor que sea bajo su presidencia, señor Valcárcel, y sabe que se lo digo de corazón.

En primer lugar, y entrando en materia, quiero agradecer al ponente competente para el fondo, el señor Gabriel Mato, la colaboración que ha mantenido para incorporar en la medida de lo posible las recomendaciones de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, así como dar las gracias a todos los ponentes alternativos con los que hemos trabajado en nuestro informe de opinión.

Quiero destacar, por un lado, el avance que este nuevo FEMP supone en materia de sostenibilidad: sostenibilidad económica, ambiental y social, que encontramos reflejada en la incorporación de la cogestión como un elemento fundamental. En mi tierra, en Cataluña, tenemos ya varias iniciativas en marcha en este ámbito que afectan desde la gamba de Palamós a la merluza de Roses, y ya estamos viendo los frutos de esta cogestión con un aumento de la población de juveniles de estas especies y su margen de reproducción. Debemos avanzar en esta cogestión, desde Bruselas hasta las cofradías, para garantizar el futuro del sector.

**El presidente**. – Muchas gracias, señor Gambús. Asimismo, esta será mi última intervención en la que podré agradecerle tanta cortesía. Gracias.

**Искра Михайлова**, *докладчик по становището на комисията по регионално развитие*. – г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, комисията по регионално развитие в своето становище подкрепя предоставените възможности за опростяване и по-голяма гъвкавост в предложението за Европейски фонд за морско дело и рибарство, както и за допълняемост и синергия с другите фондове и програми на Общността.

Подчертаваме, че е необходимо в бъдеще да се насърчава интегрираното управление на морските региони във връзка с трансграничното сътрудничество, макрорегионалните стратегии и възможностите за регионално развитие.

Приветстваме факта, че предложението засилва връзката на фонда с опазването на околната среда и екосистемите, и предлагаме 30% от бюджета да бъде насочен за смекчаване на последиците от изменението на климата. Не сме съгласни с редуциране на бюджета и предлагаме да бъде съхранен бюджетът от сегашния планов период.

Надяваме се, че ще бъдат включени и мерки за устойчив риболовен туризъм, които имат добавена стойност по отношение на създаване на заетост и диверсификация. Необходимо е и подкрепяме мерките за връзка с научните изследвания и насърчаване на партньорството в научните изследвания.

**Francisco José Millán Mon**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, el sector de la pesca europeo —ya se ha dicho— tiene ante sí numerosísimos retos: adaptarse a nuevas normas como la obligación de desembarque —una auténtica revolución— o el nuevo Reglamento de medidas técnicas; afrontar también el *Brexit* y la necesidad de alcanzar el rendimiento máximo sostenible para ya, para el año 2020. Quiero subrayar asimismo la importancia de asegurar el relevo generacional, un desafío de primera magnitud para el sector.

Dadas estas circunstancias tan especiales, necesitamos un Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca potente, no recortado; un fondo mejor dotado, más ágil para su uso, o sea, menos burocrático, menos complejo y restrictivo. La utilización del Fondo actual, como todos sabemos, está lastrada por muchos obstáculos administrativos y, al final, la implementación —lo sabemos— está siendo bastante pobre. Yo quiero agradecer ahora a Gabriel Mato, el ponente de este informe, su trabajo tan eficiente e inclusivo, y también su proximidad y contacto permanentes con los distintos sectores afectados.

El ponente ha sido plenamente consciente de las necesidades del sector y de las circunstancias del ahora. No solo del sector extractivo, sino también de la industria de la transformación y de la acuicultura. El ponente ha sido también consciente de que era necesario superar la rigidez en la propuesta originaria de la Comisión, que relegaba al sector transformador y a la acuicultura a la financiación únicamente mediante instrumentos financieros.

Esto podría haber sido especialmente problemático para las pequeñas empresas. Por ello, celebro que el informe de Gabriel Mato recoja la posibilidad de que haya también subvenciones directas para estos sectores transformadores y acuícolas, tan importantes en mi tierra, Galicia.

Yo me congratulo igualmente de que el informe que hoy debatimos aborde la cuestión clave del relevo generacional, destinando fondos a la formación, a la mejora de las condiciones de trabajo y a la de la calidad de vida a bordo. Asimismo, el FEMP apoya la compra de buques por parte de nuevas generaciones, que aspiran naturalmente a contar con una flota más moderna y segura. Confío en que no prosperen algunas enmiendas que se han presentado en contra de este importante punto.

Y termino. Quiero subrayar la importancia del dictamen sobre el FEMP aprobado hace unos meses en el Comité de las Regiones. Precisamente, el ponente fue el presidente de mi comunidad autónoma, Alberto Núñez Feijóo, y ha sido un informe muy útil —creo yo— para el trabajo realizado en este Parlamento para el informe del ponente, el señor Mato.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno)).*

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul»*. – O Senhor Millán Mon referiu, e muito bem, a importância de apoiarmos a renovação da frota bloqueada há quase duas décadas. Sucede que, desse ponto de vista, este relatório fica aquém daquilo que era possível e desejável.

Disse aqui, e estamos de acordo, que seria bom que não se limitasse ainda mais face àquilo que está no relatório, mas o que lhe queria perguntar é se há disponibilidade sua e do seu grupo para apoiar propostas que vão no sentido contrário, ou seja, de permitir de forma mais clara irmos além do que está previsto no plano da renovação da frota, eliminando um bloqueio que há quase duas décadas existe e que é extremamente pernicioso e mesmo absurdo.

**Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE)**, *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – El ponente ya lo ha dicho. Tenemos un claro compromiso —y lo he dicho yo— con la renovación de la flota. El problema es que tenemos el tope de las capacidades que tienen atribuidas los Estados. No se puede, por consiguiente, superar esos toques en cuanto a la capacidad.

Pero en todo lo que se refiere a la mejora de la habitabilidad, la mejora de los motores, por ejemplo, la mejora de las circunstancias de seguridad, desde luego estamos en esa línea. Y ya he hablado también de la necesidad, de la conveniencia, desde luego, para asegurar el relevo generacional, de que a los jóvenes que quieran incorporarse y adquirir nuevos barcos, pues se le den facilidades también con el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca.

**El presidente**. – Señora Rodust, perdone que la haya interrumpido antes. Le agradezco su comprensión. Pero es que la tarjeta azul se exhibió en el último segundo.

**Ulrike Rodust**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! „Zeit ist Geld“ – diese Aussage stammt von Benjamin Franklin, dem Erfinder des Blitzableiters. Ein Blitzableiter gibt Schutz bei Unwetter, bei Blitzeinschlägen. Diese treten nicht oft auf. Wenn sie auftreten, dann doch oft mit heftigen Folgen. Blitzableiter geben Schutz durch Erdung.

Auch wir sollten in dieser Debatte geerdet bleiben. Auf was spiele ich an? Wir können es den Fischern nicht erneut antun, dass wir eine Verabschiedung des EMFF, wie beim letzten Mal geschehen, nicht nahtlos hinbekommen. Zeit ist Geld! Wir können es aber auch nicht der so nötigen Datensammlung und den nötigen Umweltmaßnahmen antun, dass sie auf Unterstützung warten müssen. Zeit ist Geld! Und mit diesem Fonds kann keiner eine Stange Geld verdienen – weder der Fischer noch die Natur. Dafür sind die vorgesehenen Mittel viel zu klein.

Es wird uns vorgeworfen, wir werfen Geld zum Fenster raus und hauen Geld auf den Kopf, indem wir Überfischung und Überkapazitäten finanziell unterstützen. Manch einem scheinen unsere Anträge und der Bericht zu *fishy*, das heißt, die vorgesehenen Finanzmittel scheinen zu stinken. Es stimmt, mit einigen Änderungsanträgen und Kompromissen im Bericht des Fischereiausschusses bin auch ich nicht einverstanden. Zum Beispiel fand ich einen Höchstbetrag von 60 % der EMFF-Gelder eines Mitgliedstaats für Investitionen an Bord bereits während der Verhandlungen mehr als üppig. Nicht nur hierfür gibt es zum Glück die Möglichkeit von erneuten Änderungsanträgen, um einige Dinge nachhaltig zu korrigieren. Und solche haben wir eingereicht.

Die finanzielle Unterstützung der endgültigen Einstellung von Fangtätigkeiten führe zu Überfischung und Überkapazitäten – so eine weitere Meinung. Besagt der Bericht nicht auch, dass, sollte eine endgültige Einstellung durch den EMFF unterstützt werden, eine solche Einstellung zu einer permanenten Reduzierung der Fangkapazität führen muss und die Unterstützung nicht wieder in die Flotte investiert werden darf? Muss ein Fischer, sollte er innerhalb von zwei Jahren wieder Fischereiaktivitäten aufnehmen, die Unterstützung in diesem Fall nicht anteilig zurückzahlen?

Wie bereits erwähnt: Auch die Natur kann nicht auf Finanzmittel warten. Mittel, die gemäß unseren Änderungsanträgen mindestens 25 % der EMFF-Mittel eines Mitgliedstaats jeweils für Kontrolle, die Durchsetzung und die Datensammlung und mindestens weitere 25 % für den Schutz mariner Biodiversität und Ökosysteme ausmachen müssen.

Es ist selbsterklärend, dass zweieinhalb Minuten keinen Raum für eine Detailanalyse lassen. Zusammengefasst: Hier wird weder Geld zum Fenster hinausgeworfen noch Geld auf den Kopf gehauen. Deshalb: Bitte stimmen Sie unseren Änderungsanträgen zu und am Ende dem Bericht!

**Czesław Hoc**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Europejski Fundusz Morski i Rybacki z realizacji wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa ma zapewnić rozwój zrównoważonego rybołówstwa i akwakultury oraz przetwórstwa rybnego. Naczelnym priorytetem ma być łodziowe rybołówstwo przybrzeżne, które dotąd jest prowadzone przez statki rybackie o długości poniżej 12 m i które stanowi około 70% zatrudnienia w sektorze rybołówstwa w Europie.

Tymczasem w mojej ocenie, w obecnym procedowaniu owego funduszu, próbuje się dokonać wręcz zamachu na tradycyjne rodzinne łodziowe rybołówstwo przybrzeżne, forsując definicję rybackiego statku na małą skalę powyżej 12 m, a nawet do 24 m długości. Jeśli do tego dojdzie, to fundusz będzie grabarzem łodziowego rybołówstwa przybrzeżnego, a nie jego naczelnym priorytetem.

Inna ważna kwestia. Pochodzę z Polski i serce mnie boli gdy widzę jak powoli Bałtyk zamiera. Na Bałtyku larum grają, dorsz, król Bałtyku, powoli zanika. Głównie jest to wynik nieprawidłowego zarządzania zasobami przez Komisję Europejską, a nade wszystko cichego przyzwolenia na połowy przemysłowe, tzw. paszowe. Wielka szkoda, że dramat u wybrzeży Nowej Fundlandii niczego nie nauczył. Początkowo było tam mnóstwo dorszy, po czym w skutek przełowienia zniknęły. I pomimo 17 lat zakazu połowu stado dorsza nowofundlandzkiego do tej pory nie zregenerowało się.

Innym problemem jest dramatyczna sytuacja armatorów połowów rekreacyjnych. Widmo ich bankructwa staje się realne w krótkim czasie. Dorsz w Bałtyku zanika. Dodatkowo jest chudy, stąd apel, by uwzględnić w funduszu możliwości wsparcia finansowego, możliwości złomowania, bądź rekompensaty za zaprzestanie połowów rekreacyjnych.

**Nils Torvalds, för ALDE-gruppen.** –Herr talman! Bästa kommissionär Bulc! Kära Gabriel! Under årens lopp har vi ett antal gånger drabbat samman med Gabriel Mato. Ibland har vi kommit överens. Ibland har vi inte kommit överens och det har uppstått en egenartad vänskap mellan oss.

Problemen som vi ser framför oss kanske beskrivs alldeles bra av att av de sex första talarna kom fyra från Spanien. Det är inte en alldeles oriktig signal i det här sammanhanget eftersom vi vet att det där att överfiska är en del av verkligheten.

När vi genomförde den gemensamma fiskeripolitiken i det föregående mandatet så skapade vi egentligen förutsättningar för att också åstadkomma ett hållbart fiske. Men samtidigt konstaterar vi egentligen också att de strukturerna, de ekonomiska och sociala strukturerna, kring fisket egentligen inte var gjorda för att upprätthålla ett hållbart fiske och inför den frågan står vi idag på samma sätt som många gånger tidigare. Vi måste alltså klara av att förändra strukturerna och se till att de sociala strukturerna också håller för de förändringarna. Av den orsaken har vi en del problem framför oss på den här punkten.

Gabriel underströk i sitt tal att vi för tillfället importerar en hel del fisk också som vi borde klara på egen hand, och det här beror till stor del på att vi har överfiskat våra egna vatten. I morgon kommer vi dessutom att rösta om planen för Medelhavet där vi egentligen går under alla de principer som vi försökte slå fast i den gemensamma fiskeripolitiken. Vi har alltså ganska mycket att göra framför oss. Åldersstrukturerna inom fiske är inte särskilt fördelaktiga. Strukturen på fångsten är inte särskilt fördelaktig. Men vi måste på något sätt bli bättre när det gäller att förändra strukturerna, också de sociala.

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

**Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL), question "carton bleu".** – Ba mhaith liom a fháil amach, a Uasail Torvalds, cad a bhí i gceist agat nuair a thugais chun solais an leasú a bhí istigh (Uimhir 2, 6 agus 9) ag lorg maolú i gcomhair oileáin na hÉireann ach go háirithe.

Bhí sé seo mar pháirt de leasuithe eile agus ní thuigim cad ina thaobh go bhfuil tú ina choinne sin mar is é sin an t-eolas go bhfuilimse ag fáil. Bhí an bhliain ar fad againn chun é seo a réiteach sa choiste, bhí go leor cruinnithe agamsa agus agatsa agus ag an Uasal Mato agus ní thuigim cad ina thaobh nár thugais suas é ag na cruinnithe sin seachas é a thabhairt aníos aréir chomh déanach san. Is leasú an-mhaith atá ann agus maidir leis an tacaíocht sin – tá géarghá léi sna hoileáin.

**Nils Torvalds (ALDE), blue-card answer.** – We seem to be of a different opinion on what are excellent amendments. The amendment is actually throwing out money. There is an understanding of some remote islands, as if Ireland were a remote island, and in some comments from Ireland on behalf of the Irish fishers, they are asking why I didn't propose that the money should also go to the Finnish Åland islands. My opinion was not to give money to islands that are very well sustainable without that help and that money.



**Liadh Ní Riada**, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL*. – A Uachtarán, a Uasail Torvalds, caithfidh mé a rá nach n-aontaím leat agus is léir nach bhfuil aon tuiscint ná cur amach agat ar shaol phobal cósta na hÉireann, go háirithe na hoileáin bheaga sin ar a bhfuil tú ag caint, ná i gcomhthéacs Breatimeachta ach go háirithe. Tá sé níos tábhachtaí ná riamh go mbeadh tacaíocht againn anois, agus caithfidh mé a rá, níor fuair eadar riamh pingin ón tigh seo i dtaobh tacaíocht i gcomhair na n-oileán. Ní bheidh earnáil iascaireachta againn. Sin é atá chun tarlú mura mbeidh an tacaíocht sin ann. Mar sin, táim ag gaoch ar gach duine sa tigh seo tacú leis an leasú sin, 269.

Caithfidh mé a rá; mo bhuíochas leis an Uasal Mato agus an chuid eile de mo chomhghleacaithe i dtaobh na hoibre a chuireamar isteach insan tuarascáil seo. Tá rudaí maithe mar gheall uirthi. Gan dabht, táim criticiúil mar gheall ar roinnt rudaí, ach tá rudaí maithe mar gheall uirthi. Agus tugann sí aitheantas don tacaíocht don ghá atá ann lenár n-iascairí. Feicimid lenár bhfeirmeoirí, nuair a bhí géarchéim dhéiríochta ann, fuair eadar tacú. Mar sin, is iontach an rud é go bhfuil ár n-iascairí anois chun tacaíocht a fháil, mar shampla, nuair a bhíonn drochaimsir ann agus go mbíonn orthu dul i ngleic leis sin.

Tá neart rudaí eile maithe mar gheall uirthi seo – traenáil d'iascairí óga, ag caint ar bháid atá i ndroch-shlí – go mbeidh siadsan ag fáil breis airgid chun iad a fheabhsú ó thaobh na slándála agus cúrsaí sábhailteachta de, stocáil a dhéanamh ar éisc in uiscí áirithe chomh maith. Agus arís, ní féidir liom a chur in iúl cé chomh tábhachtach is atá sé dár n-earnáil. Mar is eol daoibh, le Breatimeacht ag teacht agus ag bagairt, táimid i gcruachás. Tá géarchéim uafásach againn in Éirinn maidir le hiascairí. Níl cuóta ceart againn. Níl mórán rudaí againn sa tír, ach ar a laghad, tá dóchas éigin ann, ós rud é go bhfuil airgead ag teacht ón gciste seo anois, go bhfeabhsóidh rudaí insan todhchaí. Mar sin, go raibh maith agaibh as tacú liom amárach.

**Marco Affronte**, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è in discussione il valore, diciamo così, sociale ed economico del settore della pesca. Credo che in tutte le lunghe discussioni che abbiamo avuto in questi mesi su questo *file*, questo non sia mai stato messo in discussione. La differenza sta in come noi garantiamo il valore economico e sociale di questo settore. Secondo noi il modo per garantirlo e per renderlo sicuro, per mantenerlo nel tempo, è fare in modo che la risorsa che garantisce che questo settore stia in piedi venga mantenuta sana, e quindi ovviamente mantenere sani gli ecosistemi e gli stock ittici che stanno alla base del settore della pesca.

Per questo, secondo noi, il FEAMP dovrebbe come prima cosa aiutare verso il raggiungimento degli obiettivi della politica comune della pesca. Politica comune della pesca che abbiamo in piedi ormai da sei anni e che, in gran parte, non ha raggiunto e non sta raggiungendo i suoi obiettivi.

Nel testo rimangono anche degli elementi, a mio avviso, a nostro avviso, che fanno pensare che si possa comunque aumentare la capacità di pesca in tempi in cui, come sappiamo, nel nord dei nostri mari abbiamo oltre il 40 % degli stock ittici sovrasfruttati e nel Mediterraneo, purtroppo – ne parleremo dopo –, ben oltre l'80 %. Siamo riusciti a circoscrivere un bilancio per la ricerca, per la raccolta dei dati, per la protezione degli ecosistemi, per la protezione della biodiversità, ma abbiamo chiesto e chiedevamo, almeno noi Verdi, qualcosa di molto più significativo e importante come il 25 %. Abbiamo ottenuto un 10 % che è bene, ma non è benissimo, sicuramente.

Altri punti sono stati inseriti che a noi non piacciono, e l'impianto in cui è stato costruito questo FEAMP non ci piace, e per questo motivo noi voteremo contro.

**Rosa D'Amato**, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fino ad ora, fra restrizioni e burocrazia, la maggioranza dei piccoli pescatori non ha beccato un centesimo dal FEAMP. Oggi il regolamento accoglie le nostre proposte basate su semplificazione e aumento del *budget* fino a 7,7 miliardi.

Semplificare significa tenere a mente che il FEAMP deve essere prima di tutto un fondo per i pescatori. Ciò vuol dire dare importanza, sì, alle priorità ambientali, ma quando vi è una riduzione dello sforzo di pesca, è lì che i fondi devono agire. Quindi sono giuste la reintroduzione del sostegno all'arresto temporaneo, la possibilità di ammodernamento delle navi, indipendentemente dall'età del beneficiario, e soprattutto una norma chiara che specifichi nel dettaglio le condizioni e la durata del periodo di inelleggibilità in base alle tipologie di infrazioni, perché è assurdo punire i pescatori per infrazioni ridicole.

Finalmente finanzieremo la tutela della sicurezza in mare e la salute dei lavoratori. I pescatori potranno, con procedure agevolate e anticipi, accedere a strumenti finanziari e assicurativi, in caso di incidenti in mare e di disastri naturali, e a compensazione per i danni causati da uccelli e mammiferi marini protetti.

**John Stuart Agnew**, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, when I saw the title of this debate, my heart lifted – I thought ‘oh a fisheries fund, I wonder what they’re going to use that for? Maybe they’re going to use it to pay some rent to the British Government for the use of their fishing grounds, or maybe they’re going to use this fund to compensate Spanish fishermen and other fishermen who are no longer going to be able to fish in British fishing grounds’. But I don’t get that impression here at all; it’s just going to be business as usual – post-Brexit, you continue to plunder our fishing grounds, just as you have done for the last 40 years. I live on the east coast of England near two big fishing ports – they were big fishing ports when I was a child, of course, but they’ve just gone. A whole society, an industry, has been wrecked by this European Union, and we really did hope when this referendum came up that there would be a change. At last, we would be able to get our fishing grounds back. The fishermen were so uplifted. They campaigned so hard – they had flotillas going down the east coast, up the Thames – and when the referendum result came in, they cheered and cheered and cheered. But those cheers are absolutely in vain. You have no intention, do you, of getting out of our waters? Short of us putting warships in there, I really don’t know what we’re going to do.

Now I’ve finished my time, and my colleague Mike Hookem will continue.

#### PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODEBSKI

*Wiceprzewodniczący*

**Mike Hookem (NI)**. – Mr President, the real shame in the government betraying the British fishing industry is the lost potential. I’m not talking about the lost income, despite there being plenty of that as the UK continues to hand the EU a business worth an estimated GBP 6.3 billion a year. No, what I’m talking about is the lost potential to coastal communities, the lost opportunities for future generations, and the continued decline rather than renewed growth through our reclaimed fishing industry. Fishing is changing rapidly. It is becoming an industry of even greater skill than ever before as ships are computerised and mechanised. Yet, because of Theresa May’s determined betrayal of Brexit, there are generations of young people who will be denied the highly skilled opportunities their French, Danish, Norwegian or Icelandic contemporaries enjoy, and instead of enjoying renewed investment, the wealth of coastal towns will continue to ebb away as it has done since we joined the European bloc. Communities that have survived over hundreds of years due to the brotherhood of fishing will slowly cease to exist.

So please, EU, do the UK a favour and tell Theresa May no, *non*, *nein*, when she comes begging for an extension.

**Norbert Erdős (PPE)**. – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Először is szeretnék gratulálni Gabriel Mato jelentéstevőnek, hogy hozzám hasonlóan kulcságazatként tekint az akvakultúrára, amely az Unió halászati politikájának az egyik pillére. Szeretném megköszönni neki és a Halászati Bizottság minden tagjának, hogy felvették a pénzalap elnevezésébe az „akvakultúra” szót, sőt egy külön fejezetet szentelnek az ágazatnak a rendeleten belül. Ez óriási győzelem, hiszen a haltenyésztés jelentősen ki tudja segíteni a halászatot, s erre a tenger nélküli országokban – mint például Magyarországon – is komoly lehetőség van. A magyar édesvízi haltenyésztők már hosszú évek óta várnak erre az áttörésre, főleg annak elismerésére, hogy magas minőségű, egészséges halászati élelmiszereket állítanak elő, továbbá a változatos élővilágot eltartó halastavaik révén komoly környezeti és természetvédelmi szolgáltatásokat nyújtanak.

Az Európai Unió végre hangsúlyosan támogatja a tevékenységüket. Ezért küzdöttem folyamatosan, mióta az Európai Parlament Halászati Bizottsága egyetlen magyar tagja lettem. Az uniós akvakultúra ágazat ettől a lépéstől jelentős lendületet kaphat, hiszen egy friss uniós tanulmány szerint, globális szinten 2016-ra a bevételek megduplázódtak, s a foglalkoztatás is növekedett a 2014-es évhez képest az akvakultúra ágazatban. A haltenyésztésnek tehát komoly munkahelyteremtő képessége van a vidéken élő polgárok számára, és ez a legfontosabb. Ezért is kell ide helyoznunk a hangsúlyt. Kérem a képviselőtársakat, hogy a Halászati Bizottságnak a javaslatát támogassák.

**Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, quero começar por agradecer o empenho e dedicação de todos os relatores envolvidos neste documento. Tem sido uma tarefa árdua, mas espero que amanhã obtenhamos um mandato equilibrado para as negociações com o Conselho.

Muita informação cruzada e posições aguerridas têm sido veiculadas nos últimos dias sobre aquilo que será o resultado da votação em plenário e quais são as prioridades deste Parlamento para o Fundo. Discussão que tem sido ainda mais empolgada pelo período pré-eleitoral europeu em que nos encontramos.

Não nos podemos esquecer de que o FEAMP visa apoiar a realização dos objetivos ambientais, mas também económicos, sociais e de emprego da Política Comum de Pescas, promover a implementação da política marítima da União e apoiar os compromissos internacionais da União no domínio da governação dos oceanos. Ou seja, há que olhar para este Fundo por todas as vertentes e com um apoio equilibrado para que todos os objetivos sejam atingidos.

Os Fundos como o FEAMP são importantes para a economia azul, mas têm que reverter para quem necessita deles e apoiar o desenvolvimento sustentável do ambiente, da sociedade, da economia e das comunidades. Não podemos subsidiar por subsidiar, mas há situações em que os apoios são fulcrais para as que as atividades sejam competitivas e consigam ultrapassar condicionalismos específicos, em particular, entre outros, em áreas com dificuldades acrescidas como são as regiões ultraperiféricas da Europa.

Na votação de amanhã temos que ter em conta que este Fundo permitirá não só aos pescadores continuarem a adaptar-se às medidas estabelecidas na Política Comum de Pescas e contribuir para os seus objetivos, mas também melhorar o conhecimento, a gestão do mar, sem esquecer a proteção da natureza ou o impulso de atividades emergentes da economia azul.

Há que equilibrar e ponderar a distribuição das verbas sem pensar neste Fundo como destinado apenas a um pilar em detrimento dos outros. A sustentabilidade é um todo, não apenas uma parte, e um dos pilares são os pescadores, o mais importante.

*(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta formulada ao abrigo do procedimento «cartão azul» (artigo 162.º, n.º 8, do Regimento))*

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul».** – Eu queria perguntar ao Deputado Serrão Santos se tem alguma ideia do impacto que podem ter sobre a frota do cerco portuguesa, por exemplo, as dificuldades acrescidas, as restrições acrescidas à mobilização de apoios às paragens temporárias, por exemplo, as chamadas paragens biológicas, e se está disponível para, apoiando as nossas propostas de alteração, poder eliminar algumas dessas restrições, permitindo que, como aconteceu nos últimos anos, pelo menos em moldes idênticos, esse apoio possa continuar a ser concedido.

**Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D), resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul».** – Sim, tenho, caro João Ferreira, tenho perfeita consciência dessas dificuldades e que há que encontrar e manter de facto apoios no âmbito do Fundo Europeu para as Pescas e de Assuntos Marítimos para apoiar os constrangimentos que hoje se vivem nalguns setores das pescas e que não têm só a ver, de facto, com os impactos das próprias pescarias, mas com as questões de mudança de clima, de migração de stocks e problemas de recrutamento que afetam, de facto, as comunidades piscatórias, e elas têm de ser tidas neste contexto.

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, o atual Regulamento do Fundo dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas está completamente desfasado da realidade e das necessidades do setor. É isso que explica as suas muito baixas taxas de execução e o número de projetos financiados também muito baixo.

Esta proposta de regulamento deveria contribuir para alterar esta realidade. Infelizmente, tememos que tal não venha a suceder.

Passam quase duas décadas desde que está em vigor o bloqueio absurdo, incompreensível, à renovação e à requalificação da frota. Por quantos anos mais vamos manter este bloqueio? Sublinhamos que este apoio à renovação não é incompatível com a boa conservação dos recursos. Pelo contrário, pode ajudar a essa boa conservação. Em vez de resolver problemas, parece que esta proposta está mais apostada em criar novos problemas. É o caso, que já referi, das dificuldades acrescidas à mobilização de apoios em caso de paragem temporária, por exemplo, as paragens biológicas. Apresentamos alterações que esperamos possam contribuir para resolver estes problemas. Deixamo-las à vossa consideração e esperamos poder recolher o vosso apoio.

Estamos convictos de que é possível ainda melhorar a proposta que saiu da Comissão das Pescas, por exemplo, olhando também ao problema dos rendimentos e à forma como se faz a comercialização no setor, com medidas que ajudem a melhorar o preço de primeira venda, que beneficiem os pescadores, melhorem a retribuição pelo seu trabalho e promovam uma mais justa distribuição do valor acrescentado ao longo da cadeia. É também esse o objetivo de algumas das propostas que apresentámos e espero possamos receber amanhã o vosso apoio.

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, I represent the fishing nation of Scotland. The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund in its current term is worth about GBP 150 million to Scotland's fishing communities, contributing to port facilities, health and safety on vessels and many projects in the all-important processing sector. But Scotland's experience in the common fisheries policy (CFP) has not been entirely positive in every aspect. The CFP has been grossly over-centralised and inflexible over most of its existence, to the detriment of many parts of our catching sector. Indeed, the CFP has often been used as a justification for Brexit.

But we should never forget that the CFP has been constructed over the years with the full agreement of UK governments, and if Brexit goes ahead the UK Government has decided to retain fisheries powers at Westminster. The record of UK Governments in betraying Scotland's coastal communities does not give me much confidence for the future. We're expected to believe now that, all of a sudden, UK governments will prioritise Scotland's coastal and island communities. I don't believe it, and I think independence for Scotland is the answer.

**Jacques Colombier (ENF).** – Monsieur le Président, les pêcheurs européens en général et les pêcheurs français en particulier sont aujourd'hui confrontés à de graves difficultés. La Commission européenne, dans le contexte du prochain cadre financier pluriannuel, s'apprête à baisser de 5 % les montants versés au Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche, comme – j'en suis témoin – elle souhaite le faire pour la politique agricole commune. Ce n'est pas admissible. Pêcheurs comme agriculteurs sont – si vous me passez l'expression – dans la nasse des visées mondialistes de la Commission.

Cependant, la commission de la pêche a adopté des amendements demandant la conservation du budget initial du Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche, ce que nous soutenons bien évidemment.

Nous prenons également note de la demande du rapporteur en vue d'une plus grande simplification administrative. Cette simplification est absolument nécessaire, comme me le disent régulièrement les pêcheurs, qu'ils soient du bassin d'Arcachon, du Pays basque, de Perpignan, de Sète ou d'ailleurs. Nous serons également particulièrement attentifs aux possibilités d'amélioration des flottes artisanales. C'est pourquoi nous soutiendrons ce texte.

**Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, desejo cumprimentar os colegas, mas permita-me em primeiro lugar cumprimentar o Gabriel Mato pelo esforço que fez em desenvolver todo o trabalho junto com outros colegas relativamente ao FEAMP e dizer-lhe também que é com muita satisfação, com enorme satisfação, que vemos aqui reconhecida a importância que têm as regiões ultraperiféricas, estando aqui incluído um capítulo específico para as regiões ultraperiféricas.

Todos nós sabemos os constrangimentos que tivemos durante todo o processo, mas julgo que chegámos a uma proposta cujo resultado é um compromisso bastante positivo. Cumpre, portanto, também destacar a possibilidade da renovação das frotas artesanais que vai permitir a modernização do setor e vai permitir aquilo que queremos: adaptá-lo a um setor rentável, mas também olhando para a sustentabilidade, mais seguro e mais apelativo aos jovens. Queremos trazer mais jovens para este setor, as regiões ultraperiféricas querem também ter e dar essa oportunidade aos mais jovens para serem incluídos neste setor com novas oportunidades.

Mas não basta apenas exigir políticas europeias, exigir melhores financiamentos e financiamentos mais justos, precisamos depois de não os desperdiçar. E é com algum constrangimento que assisto no meu país, em Portugal, ao Governo da República, que neste setor em particular pouco fez, tem tido um desinvestimento na área do mar e não tem apoiado aquele que deve ser o desenvolvimento de um setor tão importante para o nosso país.

Também não podia deixar de criticar, para terminar, a pouca ambição da Comissão em relação ao POSEI pescas. Gostaríamos de voltar a falar do POSEI pescas de uma forma mais estruturada e cuja aplicabilidade fosse mais efetiva. Se queremos estar mais próximos dos cidadãos, temos nestes fundos em concreto áreas específicas para poder demonstrar a solidariedade da União para com os nossos Estados-Membros e regiões ultraperiféricas.

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D).** – Señor presidente, quiero agradecer el trabajo del ponente, Gabriel Mato, y de los ponentes alternativos en lo que yo considero una buena propuesta para el próximo fondo de la pesca.

Lo primero que quiero decir es que me alegro de oír de todos que demandamos un presupuesto más justo. Por lo tanto, que no se haga ningún recorte a este presupuesto, que es el Fondo europeo más pequeño. Y se pretende recortar. Por lo tanto, negarnos al recorte.

Quiero decir también que es muy importante, sobre todo, resolver algunas cuestiones. Pedía un diputado anteriormente que no se derroche el dinero público. Aquí no se va a derrochar el FEMP actual. ¿Saben por qué? Porque no se puede utilizar. Porque es inútil el FEMP actual. Y, por tanto, necesitamos hacer grandes cambios. Y esa propuesta trae algunos de ellos, muy importantes e interesantes.

Por tanto, se devolverá dinero en este Fondo. Y dirán que no han sido capaces de gastarlo. Hay que poner instrumentos útiles y hay que apostar por la innovación, las organizaciones de productores pesqueros, los grupos y también, por supuesto, por la acuicultura.

Y termino diciendo que, además del nombre, le demos apoyos que no sean recursos financieros, sino que sea dinero, como al resto del sector pesquero.

**Sofia Ribeiro (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, uma primeira palavra de agradecimento ao colega Mato que fez um extraordinário trabalho na defesa do setor das pescas em geral e dos interesses das regiões ultraperiféricas em particular.

Nós defendemos que a sustentabilidade das pescas tem de aliar a proteção das espécies com a proteção social dos agentes do setor, não sendo admissível que os pescadores tragam para casa apenas 5 euros após o seu dia de faina. Isso implica trabalhar a cadeia de valor, tornando-a mais equilibrada, com uma justa remuneração dos pescadores, o que só se consegue se conseguirmos potenciar o valor acrescentado do pescado numa lógica de qualidade e não através do aumento da quantidade daquilo que é pescado. E aqui o FEAMP desempenha um papel crucial, sendo que é importante a possibilidade de investimentos em embarcações, não com o objetivo de aumentarmos o esforço de pesca, mas de proporcionarmos aos pescadores e aos armadores condições de modernização, melhorias tecnológicas e inovação para que contribuam para a valorização do que pescam, bem como para melhores condições de segurança.

Quero reforçar o seguinte: a pesca artesanal e sustentável não pode ser a pesca dos pobres, bem pelo contrário, tem que ser valorizada pelos consumidores e adequadamente remunerada. É por isso que a proposta de investimento que apresentamos é ainda mais importante para as regiões ultraperiféricas, que se destacam pela sustentabilidade ambiental da sua pesca, o que, aliado aos problemas de afastamento, clima difícil, dificuldade de acesso aos mercados identificados no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, justifica, tal como o seu artigo 349.º dispõe, medidas específicas para estas regiões, o que neste caso se traduz no restabelecimento do POSEI pescas, por mim insistentemente defendido durante esta legislatura e cuja perda do seu carácter autónomo se revelou catastrófica no início do presente Quadro Financeiro Plurianual.

Apelo à Comissão para que reveja este ponto fundamental para os pescadores das regiões ultraperiféricas, como é o caso dos Açores, região de onde venho.

**Michela Giuffrida (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la pesca, al di là di tutte le nostre buone intenzioni, è purtroppo uno degli argomenti che più spesso vedono l'Unione europea sul banco degli imputati. Certo, molte volte a torto, ma spesso anche a ragione, se ci mettiamo nei panni dei nostri pescatori.

La poderosa relazione del collega Mato bene affronta le molteplicità del settore, ma molto bisogna ancora fare, e soprattutto sul fronte del Mediterraneo, della piccola pesca, della semplificazione di norme che sono complesse e che sempre più spesso si trasformano in muri insormontabili per chi vive di pesca. Una problematica che, assieme a quella della sostenibilità, deve vederci impegnati al massimo è quella dell'accesso al credito, requisito indispensabile per chi deve adeguarsi a standard che per molti dei nostri pescatori sono inarrivabili.

Su questo fronte il sostegno finanziario dell'Unione europea deve essere intensificato, altrimenti favoriremo solo i cartelli, cancelleremo la pesca artigianale e accresceremo il senso di ostilità che più che mai in questo tempo c'è nei confronti dell'Unione.

*Zgłoszenia z sali*

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** – Señor presidente, quiero agradecer a Gabriel Mato y al resto de los ponentes el gran trabajo realizado. Y quiero decir que el principal objetivo de este Fondo es promover el desarrollo de la economía azul, impulsando prácticas sostenibles, diversificando las fuentes de renta que propicien un desarrollo armónico y próspero de las comunidades costeras, y fortalecer una gestión y gobernanza sostenible en los océanos.

Creo que un buen paso en esa dirección es que haya presupuestos suficientes para primar las actividades de la flota con prácticas artesanales, apoyar los etiquetados que informen a los consumidores del origen sostenible de las capturas o respaldar a los profesionales que sufren paradas de actividad imprevistas o derivadas de medidas de recuperación de las poblaciones. También me parece imprescindible contemplar la especial situación del sector que trabaja en regiones ultraperiféricas como Canarias y reforzar los derechos y la posición de las mujeres de la mar.

Finalmente, apoyo la renovación de la flota siempre que se cumplan las condiciones de no incrementar la capacidad de pesca, facilitar el relevo generacional y descarbonizarla. Buques más modernos, menos contaminantes, más seguros y cómodos para sus tripulantes y dotados de innovaciones que ayuden a reducir al mínimo los descartes, que hagan más sostenible y rentable y controlable la actividad.

Estos principios apoyan también una industria costera, la construcción naval.

**Gesine Meissner (ALDE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist, glaube ich, kein Zufall, dass wir heute ganz viele Spanier und Portugiesen haben reden hören, denn in Spanien und Portugal wird zum Beispiel viermal soviel Fisch gegessen wie in Deutschland, wo ich herkomme. Und deshalb ist natürlich die Fischerei dort auch besonders im Fokus.

Es ist so, dass einige Sprecher auch heute die Fischerei erwähnt haben und gar nicht das M, das Maritime. Seit acht Jahren ist es inzwischen ein Europäischer Meeres- und Fischereifonds, das M ist dazugekommen. Und ich halte das für sehr wichtig.

Wir haben in Europa eine sehr gute, integrierte Meerespolitik, die besagt, wir wollen das Meer nutzen, wir müssen es aber auch schützen. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass es Schutzzonen gibt, dass eben auch auf die Umweltaspekte geachtet wird. Und dafür brauchen wir auch Geld. Ich möchte das besonders betonen: Es ist schwierig, mit sechs Millionen so viele verschiedene Wünsche zu erfüllen.

Äußerste Randlage wurde gesagt, Azoren, Madeira haben wir gehört. Genauso ist es aber auch wichtig zu sehen, wie wir das Meer gesund halten können, denn das ist eine große Voraussetzung, um wirklich Fischerei machen zu können.

Ich würde mir eigentlich wünschen, dass wir in Zukunft einen Ausschuss hätten, der für Fischerei und Meer zuständig ist. Ich glaube, das wäre das Beste für die Zukunft.

*(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)*

**Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their interventions. I have taken due note of the various points raised during this debate which will be shared, of course, with my dear colleague Commissioner Vella.

The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) should be a tool for implementing our policy commitments under the common fisheries policy and maritime policy. Therefore, public support needs to be targeted at the challenges of these policies, in particular delivering healthy fish stocks and reducing fish waste through the implementation of the landing obligation and key topics for which EMFF investments are available.

I would like to insist on the very serious risk of introducing support for vessel construction and capacity-enhancing investments. This would be detrimental in terms of fisheries conservation and our maximum sustainable yield target. This would not only contradict the CFP, but also our international commitments under the sustainable development agenda under the WTO. It would crowd out investment into more important areas such as improvements to selectivity.

It is therefore important to spend taxpayers' money in line with our policy objectives and commitments. As Commissioner for Transport I can assure you that in the maritime sector we will take all the necessary steps to support sustainable development in the future as well.

**Gabriel Mato, ponente.** – Señor presidente, yo creo que la Comisión es un poco inconsecuente cuando nos insta a cumplir los objetivos y a afrontar los nuevos retos que tenemos y, sin embargo, plantea una reducción del presupuesto. Habla de evolución y no revolución, pero, desde luego, no puede haber evolución sin ingresos y sin presupuestos.

Tengo que decir, además, que siento una cierta tristeza al ver las enmiendas que legítimamente han presentado algunos grupos políticos. Durante las negociaciones todos somos capaces de ceder, de abandonar algunas de nuestras pretensiones en aras a la consecución de un acuerdo. De ahí salieron unos compromisos que fueron aprobados por amplísima mayoría. De verdad, no me parece leal que una vez que se aprueban esos compromisos mantengamos en el Pleno enmiendas que van en contra de los propios compromisos. En todo caso, reitero, es legítimo.

Y aquí se ha hablado de tener los pies en la tierra. Y yo digo que sí, que ojalá hubiéramos tenido siempre los pies en la tierra. También cuando adoptamos decisiones como la obligación de desembarco con unos plazos que eran absolutamente imposibles y que nos están creando tantos problemas. Y también hay que tener los pies en la tierra cuando estamos planteando aumentar un tanto por ciento, hasta el 25 % o hasta el 30 % en algunos casos, cuestiones como el control o temas que son tan etéreos que lo que hacen es perjudicar a los propios pescadores. Yo creo que cuando la propuesta estaba estableciendo un mínimo y un máximo, ya estaba controlando perfectamente eso.

En todo caso, yo quiero contestar en general. Muchos de los que han intervenido no están ahora ya aquí, pero decía el diputado Hoc que estamos atacando la pesca artesanal. En absoluto. Todo lo contrario. Yo creo que cuando hablaba de veinticuatro metros y algunas otras cuestiones es que no ha leído el texto final. Es un compromiso clarísimo el apoyo a la pesca costera. Y, de hecho, yo estuve en Polonia la semana pasada, el viernes, y los pescadores entendían perfectamente lo que habíamos hecho.

Y es verdad cuando se dice que hay muchos españoles hablando. Sinceramente, es lógico. ¿Por qué? Porque, por lo que respecta a la pesca, España no tiene parangón con ningún otro país de Europa.

Señora Ní Riada, la enmienda 289 la vamos a apoyar. Y es verdad que hay que eliminar la burocracia, porque no se pueden seguir utilizando fondos cuando no hay. Posibilidades de utilizar fondos siempre sobran.

Nada más. Terminó. Acuicultura, apuesta total y absoluta. Y, en cuanto a las RUP, el tema de las ayudas y el fondo son una cuestión de supervivencia.

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 4 kwietnia 2019 r.

*Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)*

**Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR), na piśmie.** – Europejski Fundusz Morski i Rybacki ma zapewniać rozwój zrównoważonego rybołówstwa i akwakultury oraz przetwórstwa rybnego, przyczynić się do odbudowania stad ryb, wspierać rybołówstwo małej skali, młodych rybaków i innowacyjne inwestycje. Niestety nie we wszystkich tych obszarach możemy mówić o sukcesach. Największe obawy budzi odejście od priorytetu wspierania łodziowego rybołówstwa przybrzeżnego, które stanowi około 70% zatrudnienia w sektorze rybołówstwa w Europie.

Dyskutowana nowa definicja statku rybackiego, zwiększająca jego skalę nawet do 24 m długości, budzi poważne wątpliwości i musi zostać jeszcze raz przemyślana. Priorytetem powinna stać się odbudowa populacji dorsza, której stan jest wręcz alarmujący. Zamiast tego mamy do czynienia z przyzwoleniem na połowy paszowe o charakterze przemysłowym. Racjonalne wykorzystywanie zasobów rybnych oraz ochrona ekosystemu powinny pozostać priorytetem UE, z jasną strategią przeciwdziałania naturalnym i antropogenicznym czynnikom powodującym obecny alarmowy stan zasobów oraz jeszcze bardziej katastroficzne prognozy.

## 15. Ustanowienie planu wieloletniego dotyczącego połowów eksploatujących stada denne w zachodniej części Morza Śródziemnego (debata)

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Clarę Eugenię Aguilere Garcíę w imieniu Komisji Rybołówstwa w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego plan wieloletni dotyczący połowów eksploatujących stada denne w zachodniej części Morza Śródziemnego (COM(2018)0115 - C8-0104/2018 - 2018/0050(COD)) (A8-0005/2019).

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, ponente.** – Señor presidente, quiero, en primer lugar, mostrar mi agradecimiento a todos los que han colaborado en que traigamos ya, finalmente, el acuerdo del diálogo tripartito para este plan de gestión para los demersales en el Mediterráneo occidental. Estamos hablando del cuarto plan de gestión que abordamos para unas pesquerías que son importantes en el entorno de la Unión Europea y que es el primero del Mediterráneo.

Quería agradecer a los ponentes alternativos, a todo el personal técnico y al personal de la Secretaría de Pesca el trabajo que se ha realizado, y, por supuesto, a la Comisión Europea, cuyo personal también nos ha ayudado mucho a entender muchos parámetros en muchas cuestiones que son a veces demasiado técnicas y que se nos hacían incomprensibles. Quiero agradecerse, por supuesto, y también a la Presidencia rumana, que ha hecho un trabajo ímprobo durante su presidencia. Y, finalmente, hemos conseguido este acuerdo.

Creo sinceramente que este acuerdo que traemos hoy aquí a debate y mañana a votación es el mejor acuerdo posible. ¿Es el que nos gustaría a todos y cada uno de nosotros particularmente? Seguramente no, pero, si eso fuera así, no sería un acuerdo. Y, como es un acuerdo de muchas partes y muchos intereses, yo creo que es un gran acuerdo.

Las poblaciones de peces y crustáceos, las especies demersales, que son las que se regulan y se gestionan en la pesca de arrastre del Mediterráneo, han estado —unas más que otras, hay que decirlo— sobreexplotadas. Este plan multianual tiene como objetivo revertir esta tendencia y asegurar que, a largo plazo, estas especies se gestionen de forma más sostenible medioambiental, social y económicamente.

Este plan afecta a tres países —mi país, España, Francia e Italia— y a una flota de más de diez mil buques. Algunos están planteando que es un plan en el que los objetivos de sostenibilidad no se han conseguido todos. Otros dicen que es demasiado medioambientalista. Yo creo que no: si unos dicen que estamos en un extremo, y otros en el otro, al final el punto medio es el acuerdo.

Quisiera destacar algunos aspectos. Por primera vez, un plan multianual a escala del Mediterráneo. Es un hecho importante. Y yo creo que servirá para los siguientes acuerdos y va a sentar los precedentes para los mismos. Hemos aprobado cuestiones tan importantes —que a mí me gusta destacar— como la cogestión por primera vez en un plan de gestión. Los Estados miembros podrán promover esta gestión participativa a nivel local.



Las vedas, una cuestión también importante y relevante para proteger zonas de reproducción de juveniles y hábitats sensibles hasta una profundidad de cien metros o a seis millas náuticas de la costa cuando una plataforma sea demasiado extensa, durante tres meses al año, que a cada país le corresponderá decidir.

También hemos determinado que el rendimiento máximo sostenible —que es un objetivo que debemos cumplir todos, y que la PPC nos obliga a alcanzar en 2020— no es posible en este plan y, por lo tanto, haremos todos los esfuerzos por llevarlo a cabo de aquí a 2025. Se ha aprovechado también para abrir la limitación que teníamos en el FEMP del cese permanente.

Quiero terminar mi primera intervención diciendo que, como es un acuerdo y es importante un gran esfuerzo, les pido a todos que mañana mayoritariamente demos un gran mensaje con una gran aprobación.

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to warmly thank the rapporteur, Ms Aguilera García, and all the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent work and all their efforts to conclude this important file in a successful and timely manner.

The agreement reached between both co-legislators on 4 February is a historic achievement for the Mediterranean. It is the first EU multiannual management plan in the region. Based on the common fisheries policy, this plan provides a balance between environmental and socioeconomic aspects. It will introduce a limitation on fishing time per day and provide for a progressive reduction of up to 40% during the first five years. This should bring us closer to sustainable fishing by 2025, from which point in time fishing limits will have to fully respect maximum sustainable yield.

For the first time, control measures for the fishing effort regime will fully apply as from next year, 2020. With this new plan, closure areas will also get an even more prominent role in the Mediterranean Sea. From the entry into force, we will have a three-month closure for all trawl vessels and more closures are to follow in the coming years. This will ensure protection of nursery and spawning grounds for demersal stocks such as hake. Another step forward is the integration of recreational fisheries and co-management into the plan, the latter being very popular for managing fisheries at the local level in the Mediterranean.

When I look back to 2016, when we embarked on the path towards sustainable fisheries in the Mediterranean with our MedFish4Ever Declaration in Catania, I realise the long road travelled to get the multiannual plan adopted and the tangible increase of ownership and awareness generated. I'm very grateful to see such great progress and that the final result, the multiannual plan, forms a comprehensive package of measures that will contribute to restoring demersal stock and ensuring that fishers have the necessary tools to address the transition towards better profitability, as in other sea basins.

A new era in the western Mediterranean Sea will start with this plan, one in which concrete measures will be progressively implemented to reduce fishing mortality until we reach sustainable limits. I am confident that this new plan is the right way to go. It will ensure that fisheries have a prosperous future in this sea and that fishermen and fisherwomen will be the first ones to benefit from that.

The plan serves as an important testimony of the possibility to progress in the Mediterranean when there is a political will to do so. It should therefore pave the way for other ambitious plans to advance from both the side of the EU and multilaterally in the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean. During the trilogue, the Commission committed to making three statements relating to the best available scientific advice, the inclusion of depth intervals as a criteria for the segmentation of the fishing effort, and regional cooperation. These statements are part of the final compromise and the Commission will submit these statements for the minutes.

**Carlos Iturgaiz**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, este acuerdo es presentado por algunos como un paso decisivo hacia la sostenibilidad en el mar Mediterráneo, donde, aparentemente, la mayoría de las poblaciones de peces están sobreexplotadas. Pero, una vez más, las presiones de varios actores, los sospechosos habituales, llevaron a un acuerdo donde el enfoque principal y casi único es la sostenibilidad ambiental.

Solo puedo compartir las preocupaciones del sector de los pescadores de que los recortes drásticos en el esfuerzo de pesca —40 % de reducción en los próximos cinco años— tendrán consecuencias irreparables. Porque durante los últimos diez años, en mi país, España, el número de arrastreros ya ha disminuido de 900 a 600. No estoy seguro de que otros países hayan hecho el mismo esfuerzo. Pero esto no es lo peor. Lo peor es que las medidas propuestas, y me refiero aquí principalmente a la prohibición del arrastre, no tienen base científica. Son arbitrarias y rígidas.

Las prohibiciones directas nunca son constructivas. Son simplistas, unidimensionales, desproporcionadas e injustas. Una provisión brusca y arbitraria de la pesca de arrastre es un precedente muy malo, que podría llevar a restricciones absurdas en el futuro. La prueba es que hasta ahora había una prohibición de pescar dentro de una isobara de cincuenta metros a tres millas de la costa. Ahora los arrastreros tendrán que abandonar la zona donde siempre han pescado y moverse más lejos durante tres meses, a cien metros de isobara o a seis millas de la costa.

Esto significa en la práctica una prohibición total de la pesca de arrastre en la mayor parte del Mediterráneo, ya que esta flota opera principalmente en la plataforma continental, que en su mayoría coincide con el límite de profundidad propuesto. Además, la plataforma continental termina abruptamente en muchas áreas, alcanzando una gran profundidad en unas pocas millas, lo que hace imposible que los barcos arrastreros puedan pescar más allá de esa área.

No hace falta decir que los arrastreros de fondo son los principales proveedores de alimentos a los puertos mediterráneos, las subastas y las industrias auxiliares. Por lo tanto, si los arrastreros deben detener las actividades de pesca durante tres meses cada año, estos sectores también se verán profundamente afectados.

El arrastre, como cualquier otro arte, no debe ser demonizado. Debemos evitar los conflictos entre marchas diferentes, entre pescadores en pequeña escala y gran escala. Todos nuestros pescadores contribuyen al suministro de pescado nutritivo y, por eso, nuestra posición será votar «no» en la votación de mañana.

**Ricardo Serrão Santos**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, tenho que começar por elogiar o trabalho de todos os envolvidos nas negociações e em particular quero agradecer e enaltecer o empenho da colega e amiga Clara Aguilera. Acompanhei de perto o esforço que fez, enquanto relatora, para chegar a um documento final equilibrado que inclusive diversos setores interessados defendem que seja aprovado.

O resultado final deste plano plurianual demonstra que é possível dar passos positivos para um objetivo comum, mesmo quando há visões afastadas entre os interessados. Para tal, é necessário não só o empenho de todos os envolvidos, mas também encontrar soluções para ultrapassar posições de negociação mais difíceis – basicamente, pensar fora da caixa.

Fico satisfeito por ver que se conseguiu terminar a quase totalidade dos planos plurianuais previstos com a última revisão da Política Comum de Pescas. Agora há que, regionalmente, entre os Estados-Membros e entre os conselhos consultivo regionais, trabalhar para apresentarem medidas específicas de gestão e conservação que ajudem a cumprir os objetivos da Política Comum de Pescas.

Apelo a que amanhã votem de forma positiva e que desta forma contribuam para mais este passo no sentido de caminhar para que a sustentabilidade dos recursos pesqueiros demersais e das comunidades de pescadores desta região do Mediterrâneo seja um sucesso.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica**, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, quiero empezar agradeciendo a la ponente, Clara Aguilera, el trabajo realizado, y por eso voy a defender el voto a favor de este plan plurianual para la gestión de la pesca del Mediterráneo. No es el mío, no es el que me gustaría, no es el que propuse ni el que defendí, pero es la única respuesta posible para acabar con un sistema de control, Estado a Estado, completamente ineficaz. Los informes científicos más solventes acreditan que ha provocado que el 80 % de las poblaciones en estas aguas sufran sobrepesca y tengan un alto riesgo de colapso.

Un mal político es el que tiene miedo de decirle a la gente la verdad aunque haya decisiones que no se puedan aplazar, y esa tentación se combate con el realismo constructivo. Tenemos que reducir las capturas, pero nos hemos dotado de programas para afrontar el impacto social que provoca esta medida. Tenemos que reforzar la cogestión trabajando con los afectados para diversificar la renta de las comunidades costeras, para mejorar su posición en la cadena de valor de la industria de la pesca y es obligatorio hacerlo cuando hay posibilidades de recuperar las poblaciones y garantizar la actividad para el futuro.

A los que quisieran más restricciones, como yo, les informo de que no hay ninguna oportunidad de que prospere una propuesta más ambiciosa. Sin embargo, hay muchas de que se rechace este acuerdo, que mejora lo que tenemos hoy porque nos proporciona un marco plurianual que al menos obliga cada año al Consejo a aprobar reducciones del esfuerzo pesquero de acuerdo con los informes científicos y porque incorpora claras y muy necesarias restricciones para la actividad de los arrastreros en zonas y periodos concretos. Nuestra primera obligación es aprobar esta mejora y extremar el control para que los Estados cumplan con sus términos.

Finalmente, un mensaje para los que van a rechazar este informe porque creen que se puede seguir como hasta ahora. El pan que venden hoy a sectores muy concretos como un logro, justo antes de unas elecciones europeas, creo sinceramente que es el hambre de mañana: una catástrofe ambiental y social irreversible. Una amenaza que acecha a mucho más que al sector pesquero y de la que serán los posibles y futuros responsables.

**Marco Affronte**, a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non sono d'accordo quando la relatrice ha detto che, visto che questo è il primo piano del Mediterraneo, più o meno va bene qualunque piano. Anzi, proprio perché il Mediterraneo è nella situazione che conosciamo e che tutti abbiamo sottolineato, avremmo avuto bisogno di un piano molto ma molto più forte.

Ricordo che fra le specie che vengono coperte da questo piano, ce ne sono alcune che, secondo i ricercatori, secondo la scienza, sono pescate quattro o cinque volte oltre il livello del massimo rendimento sostenibile. Questo MSY non è una definizione, non è una parola. Significa quello che gli stock ci possono dare, anno per anno, perché si possano mantenere nel tempo. Proprio sull'MSY qui abbiamo l'ammissione di un grande fallimento: arrivare a un anno di distanza da quello che doveva essere il limite per raggiungere questo obiettivo e dire che non ce lo facciamo, non ce la possiamo fare e lo spostiamo in là di altri cinque anni. Un grave e chiaro fallimento.

Ciononostante, sono d'accordo con quello che hanno detto molti colleghi e che ha detto anche la Commissione: meglio questo piano così debole, così poco efficace, che lo status quo attuale. Meglio partire da qualcosa, meglio creare almeno un livello di partenza e sperare che questo possa in qualche modo servire da stimolo nel futuro per cercare di fare molto ma molto meglio.

Per questo motivo, pur avendo provato in tutti i modi a ridiscutere questo lavoro e anche a rimandarlo in commissione prima di farlo passare al trilatero, comunque per come è uscito non siamo soddisfatti, ma proprio per questo motivo voteremo a favore, perché ci accontentiamo in qualche modo e speriamo che sia un primo gradino verso qualcosa di molto più importante in futuro.

**Rosa D'Amato**, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo piano pluriennale ha misure per la protezione delle specie di interesse biologico e commerciale, ma bilanciate con gli aspetti economici e sociali per la sopravvivenza delle migliaia di compagnie di pesca.

Il regolamento accoglie molti nostri emendamenti: abbiamo eliminato l'introduzione delle quote di pesca, il regime di gestione dello sforzo avrà una riduzione al massimo del 40 % su un periodo di cinque anni. Sull'uso delle reti a strascico ci saranno deroghe in base alla specificità delle nostre coste e delle nostre tecniche di pesca. Una regola uguale per tutti ci avrebbe fortemente svantaggiati. I nostri fondali sono diversi, e il nostro tipo di pesca si è sempre adattato alle caratteristiche geografiche, senza intaccare la biodiversità.

Fino ad ora l'Unione europea non aveva tenuto conto delle caratteristiche delle flotte in termini di navigazione e attrezzature tecniche. Oggi invece i mesi di chiusura saranno scelti dagli Stati in base alla regionalizzazione. Questo è il primo piano che, in deroga, permette di usare il FEAMP per finanziare i pescatori che optano per l'arresto definitivo. I negoziati sono stati lunghi, combattuti, non siamo pienamente soddisfatti, ma abbiamo migliorato tantissimo il testo e dato voce alle principali richieste della piccola pesca.

**Nicola Caputo (S&D)**. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, complimenti alla collega Clara Aguilera García per il lavoro fatto e per aver adeguatamente considerato le specificità del Mediterraneo occidentale nella proposta di piano di gestione pluriennale.

La proposta comprende misure volte a migliorare la conservazione delle risorse e la sostenibilità ambientale degli *stock*. Tuttavia, al fine di conseguire la sostenibilità sociale ed economica, parallelamente a quella ambientale, è necessario approvare le modifiche proposte per raggiungere un equilibrio e ridurre l'impatto sui territori.

Oltre alle misure di arresto temporaneo, andrebbe consentito agli Stati membri di istituire misure compensatorie all'arresto definitivo delle navi da pesca interessate dalle misure di riduzione dello sforzo di pesca proposte dal piano. Occorre la giusta flessibilità nel divieto della pesca da traino. Le flotte locali si sono adattate alle caratteristiche dei rispettivi luoghi di pesca. Una riduzione eccessiva di tali zone basata unicamente sui criteri geografici o topografici potrebbe quindi causare danni socioeconomici irreversibili per il settore.

Va sviluppata, nel quadro della Commissione generale per la pesca nel Mediterraneo, la collaborazione con i paesi terzi con i quali si condividono gli *stock*, per garantire una gestione efficiente delle attività di pesca ed assicurare l'efficacia dei piani di gestione regionale.

#### *Zgłoszenia z sali*

**Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE).** – Señor presidente, este plan de pesca para el Mediterráneo occidental es un paso hacia adelante para reducir la sobreexplotación que sufre este mar. La recuperación de las poblaciones de peces dentro de un plazo realista puede y debe ser compatible con la continuación de una actividad pesquera bien administrada.

Ello requiere un régimen racional de gestión del esfuerzo pesquero, incluidas las medidas de gestión espacial, pero también requiere una estrategia integral para compensar económicamente a los pescadores por la necesaria reducción del esfuerzo pesquero, incluyendo estrategias de comercialización, diversificación de actividades, reducción de costes, etcétera. El aplazamiento de la aprobación del plan solo contribuiría a un mayor deterioro de las poblaciones de peces y a medidas más estrictas en un futuro próximo.

Finalmente, considero muy importante defender la cogestión como un instrumento útil de toma de decisiones y de su implementación, en la que todos los agentes implicados participan y se responsabilizan de una gestión sostenible de la pesca.

En Cataluña tenemos experiencias muy interesantes en este sentido.

#### *(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)*

**Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, thank you for your interventions and valuable views. I have taken note of the points raised during this debate. This plan is tailored to the specificities of the Western Mediterranean fisheries, notably with the choice of an effort regime as opposed to catch limitations. This type of management system fits well the mixed fishery prevalent in the sea basin and is easier to control and monitor. With this plan we have struck a good and realistic balance between the conservation and socio-economic dimensions through a progressive reduction of the fishing effort to achieve maximum sustainable yield. This balance is also a factor of the additional measures provided for in the plan, chiefly the closure areas that contribute to reducing fishing mortality and improving selectivity of fishing.

Going forward, the Commission services will work closely with the Member States towards the implementation of the plan. In parallel, Member States will have the opportunity to review the operational programmes under the Fisheries Fund and introduce measures to facilitate this implementation.

Allow me to say that, at a time when the Commission mandate is coming to an end, we are very proud to be part of the adoption of the first EU multiannual plan in the Mediterranean Sea. We are confident that this will contribute to more sustainable fisheries and pave the way for a better management of Mediterranean fisheries.

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, ponente.** – Señor presidente, comisaria Bulc, en nombre de la Comisión y del comisario Vella, que hoy ya me dijo que no nos podía acompañar. Además de los agradecimientos, quisiera hacer algunas precisiones.

Este plan de gestión, insisto, no es el que yo habría hecho si hubiese decidido solo yo, ni nadie de nosotros aquí. Pero sin duda ha dado lugar a un gran acuerdo. Un plan de gestión basado en el esfuerzo pesquero, donde no se contempla la posibilidad de introducir el sistema de TAC y de cuotas, sino otros elementos, como es el esfuerzo pesquero, la veda o la inclusión, por primera vez en un Reglamento, de la gestión.

Por cierto, señor Solé, quiero felicitarle, porque en su comunidad autónoma, en Cataluña, hay grandes experiencias en cogestión que nos van a servir mucho para desarrollarla en el resto de Europa. Por lo tanto, yo creo que es el mejor acuerdo posible.

Me he quedado muy sorprendida con mi ponente alternativo del Grupo PPE, el señor Iturgaiz, cuando he visto su intervención. Porque el Grupo PPE ha apoyado, en todos y cada uno de los momentos, este acuerdo hasta el final. Por tanto, cuando le he oído hoy aquí me ha causado mucha sorpresa, pero, en fin. Se ha transformado, porque todos los votos hasta ahora habían contado con el Grupo PPE y con su ponente, el señor Iturgaiz, al que, en cualquier caso -a él y a su equipo-, agradezco su trabajo, aunque él quiera tirarlo por la borda.

A los demás grupos políticos quiero agradecerles el esfuerzo. No es fácil para ninguno, y sé que todos han hecho un gran esfuerzo, conjuntamente con la Comisión. Veamos lo que es útil para el futuro y no miremos el paso corto ni la estrategia electoral política.

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 4 kwietnia 2019 r.

## 16. Wzmocnienie zabezpieczeń dowodów tożsamości oraz dokumentów pobytowych wydawanych obywatelom Unii (debata)

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Gérarda Depreza w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie zwiększenia bezpieczeństwa dokumentów tożsamości obywateli Unii i dokumentów pobytowych wydawanych obywatelom Unii i członkom ich rodzin korzystającym z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się (COM(2018)0212 - C8-0153/2018 - 2018/0104(COD)) (A8-0436/2018).

**Gérard Deprez, rapporteur.** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, la liberté de circulation des citoyens dans un espace européen sécurisé est une des valeurs essentielles de l'Union européenne. Nous devons cependant reconnaître que la situation actuelle n'est pas totalement satisfaisante.

Il existe aujourd'hui plus de 250 versions différentes de cartes d'identité et de permis de séjour en circulation dans l'Union, ce qui rend leur reconnaissance difficile dans certains pays et entraîne des tracasseries administratives pénibles, en particulier pour les citoyens qui voyagent ou qui s'établissent dans un autre État membre que le leur. En outre, beaucoup de ces documents sont très peu sécurisés. Certains n'ont même pas de puce, ce qui facilite les fraudes à l'identité fréquemment constatées dans le chef des terroristes et des criminels.

Nous avons donc d'abord souhaité favoriser la lisibilité et la reconnaissance des cartes d'identité. C'est ainsi qu'à l'avenir, il y aura un format unique pour toutes les cartes. Les mêmes données d'identité y figureront dans un ordre spécifique. La mention du genre deviendra optionnelle et prévoira, si elle est retenue, trois catégories: M, F et X. Est également prévue la présence d'un symbole européen sur la carte et la mention «EU Citizen» sur les titres de séjour des plus de 15 millions de citoyens de l'Union qui résident dans un autre État membre.

Le règlement précise que toutes les cartes d'identité doivent être reconnues comme telles par tous les États membres et qu'une meilleure reconnaissance des documents d'identité provisoires délivrés en cas de destruction, de perte ou de vol doit être mise en chantier.

La lisibilité ne suffit toutefois pas à garantir totalement l'exercice de la libre circulation. Il faut aussi pouvoir s'assurer que le détenteur de la carte est bel et bien son titulaire légitime. La détection des fraudes à l'identité est un impératif en matière de sécurité. C'est pourquoi il est prévu de renforcer les éléments de sécurité figurant sur les cartes d'identité par l'inclusion obligatoire de l'image faciale et de deux empreintes digitales intégrées dans une puce hautement sécurisée, comme c'est déjà le cas, d'ailleurs, pour les passeports.

Je veux aussi rappeler, et j'insiste, qu'il n'est pas question de remplacer les cartes nationales d'identité par une carte européenne. Il n'est pas question d'obliger les États membres qui n'en délivrent pas à délivrer des cartes d'identité. Il n'est pas question de créer une banque de données européenne des empreintes digitales. Le règlement dont nous parlons ne constitue en aucun cas une base juridique pour créer une banque de données des empreintes digitales au niveau national, comme se plaisent à le proclamer certains, au mépris de la vérité.

Par ailleurs, nous avons mis un soin particulier à renforcer les dispositions relatives aux droits fondamentaux, à la protection des données personnelles et à la responsabilité des États membres. C'est ainsi que l'utilisation des données biométriques est strictement limitée au personnel dûment habilité. Il est aussi très clairement stipulé que, sauf si la législation nationale l'autorise, les données biométriques ne sont conservées, en dehors de la puce, que jusqu'à la délivrance de la carte, ou au maximum pendant trois mois, avant d'être détruites. De plus, une disposition prévoit clairement que les États membres sont responsables de l'intégrité, de l'authenticité et de la confidentialité des données, même lorsqu'ils font appel à une société privée.

Enfin, je veux rassurer les citoyens: ils ne vont pas devoir remplacer immédiatement leur carte d'identité actuelle, ni supporter des coûts supplémentaires. En effet, les nouvelles cartes d'identité commenceront à être délivrées dans les deux ans après l'entrée en vigueur de ce règlement, et ce n'est qu'au bout de 10 ans encore que les cartes actuellement en circulation devront toutes être remplacées.

Je veux, pour conclure, remercier tous ceux qui nous ont aidés dans ce rapport: les collaborateurs, le personnel du secrétariat et en particulier mes collègues et les rapporteurs fictifs, pour toutes les discussions constructives que nous avons eues dans un climat empreint de respect mutuel, et même de convivialité.

**Angelika Mlinar**, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the rapporteur, Mr Gérard Deprez, my colleague, for taking into consideration the opinion provided by the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality. Biometric data must be collected in a manner that respects human dignity. National authorities responsible for issuing ID cards must undertake fingerprints and facial images, as far as possible, in a gender-sensitive manner. Fingerprinting persons in a vulnerable situation, including those who have experienced gender-based violence, requires particular attention.

There is a difference between sex and gender. The disparity between the sex on someone's official document and the gender presented in person can lead to discrimination and harassment. Therefore, I am pleased that, in the future, the ID card format of national identity cards will include the category of gender with the options of female, male or gender neutral, described as X.

**Věra Jourová**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, our right as European citizens to move freely within the Union is one of the most important achievements of European integration. It requires that the documents we use when exercising this right are secure and reliable. A number of Member States still issue ID cards that do not meet international standards. Some even issue paper ID cards and many such ID cards remain in circulation. Weak ID cards represent a serious security gap. They can easily be falsified and could be used by terrorists and other criminals to enter the EU. That is why the Commission proposed a regulation to strengthen security features for ID and residence documents in April 2018 as part of a wider package of security measures.

I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Gérard Deprez, for his excellent cooperation on this initiative. His efforts to find acceptable and workable solutions were tireless and, in the end, successful. Let me also thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their hard work and commitment. Last but not least, let me thank the Romanian and Austrian presidencies for their efforts.

I would like to stress that the regulation does not oblige Member States to introduce ID cards if they do not already issue such cards, nor does it make ID cards mandatory in those cases where they are optional. In these situations citizens will continue to use a passport instead. Also, the new rules on ID cards cannot serve as a legal basis to introduce national databases containing citizens' biometric data.

Regarding biometrics, I know there have been intensive discussions on whether ID cards should contain a chip with the fingerprints of the holder and whether this should be compulsory for all Member States that issue ID cards. We have consistently argued that fingerprints are a necessary security feature. The inclusion of biometric identifiers, and particularly the inclusion of fingerprints, renders documents more reliable and secure, and having secure and reliable ID cards is in the interest of citizens.

Fingerprints on ID cards is also consistent with the approach for passports. Many Member States already include fingerprints in their ID cards or may be planning to do so, but only an obligation at EU level can make sure there is no weak link in our area of free movement without internal border controls.

At the same time, we agree with Parliament that robust data protection and fundamental rights safeguards are essential. Thanks to Parliament's efforts, the text makes clear that Member States are fully responsible for the safe handling of citizens' data. Changes introduced by Parliament will also make sure that the keys necessary to verify biometric data stored on the chip are exchanged between the Member States.

To summarise, the new common minimum standards will make sure that EU citizens can rely on secure and reliable documents. We fully support the compromise found by Parliament and the Council and look forward to tomorrow's vote.

**Carlos Coelho**, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, Schengen e a liberdade de circulação são a expressão concreta da Europa dos cidadãos, o sucesso do projeto europeu mais valorizado pelos nossos cidadãos.

Sabemos que há dificuldades e obstáculos e este regulamento (que – espero – iremos aprovar amanhã), contribui para os reduzir e melhorar a mobilidade e a liberdade de circulação. Venho de um país de emigrantes, Portugal, e sei bem como é importante que o Cartão de Cidadão seja reconhecido noutros países europeus. A verdade é que, ainda hoje, muitos portugueses enfrentam obstáculos no acesso a serviços elementares noutros Estados-Membros, devido ao formato não conforme do nosso Cartão de Cidadão.

Com este regulamento devemos tornar a vida mais fácil a todos os europeus, removendo obstáculos desnecessários ao exercício dos seus direitos. Um Cartão de Cidadão português será válido e reconhecido em qualquer parte da União Europeia.

Mas vamos também aproximar o aspeto visual dos cartões de identidade, nomeadamente através da inclusão da bandeira da União Europeia junto da referência ao país. Damos expressão à complementaridade da cidadania europeia.

Por fim, e não menos importante, reforçamos as características de segurança. Entre muitas outras, todos os cartões terão as impressões digitais do seu titular. Alguns, em clima pré-eleitoral, vão ceder à tentação de instrumentalizar esta questão inventando problemas e receios. Mas não podemos brincar com a segurança de todos.

Ao incluirmos impressões digitais damos um passo sem precedentes na luta contra o roubo de identidade, na luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos, na proteção das nossas crianças. E não digam que o problema é a criação de uma base de dados com informação biométrica de todos os europeus. O regulamento proíbe expressamente a criação de uma base de dados com estes elementos.

Senhor Presidente, aprovar este regulamento significa aprofundar a livre circulação, proteger melhor todos e reforçar a cidadania europeia. É isto mesmo que os europeus esperam de nós!

Também por isso devemos agradecer e felicitar o deputado Gérard Deprez pelo trabalho excepcional que realizou e o acordo que alcançou. *Merci*, Gérard.

**Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Gemeinsame und verbesserte Sicherheitsmerkmale für alle Personalausweise sind sinnvoll, denn sie erhöhen die Fälschungssicherheit und sie verhindern Missbrauch. Ich möchte Kollegen Deprez für seine geleistete Arbeit sehr herzlich danken. Er hat viele Positionen des Parlaments im Trilog erfolgreich vertreten. Die Verordnung enthält eine ganze Reihe von Punkten, mit denen ich inhaltlich übereinstimme.

Leider gibt es jedoch eine fundamentale Frage, die ich, die meine Fraktion am Trilog-Ergebnis nicht unterstützen kann – das ist die verpflichtende Abnahme von Fingerabdrücken aller Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Biometrische Daten sind bekanntlich sensibel; jede Speicherung dieser Daten stellt einen Eingriff in die Grundrechte dar. Von dieser Verordnung werden bis zu 370 Millionen Bürgerinnen und Bürger neu betroffen. Daher muss gut begründet werden, warum dieser Eingriff verhältnismäßig und notwendig ist. Ich sage: Nein, die verpflichtende Speicherung der Fingerabdrücke zusätzlich zum biometrischen Foto ist weder verhältnismäßig noch notwendig. Auch die Agentur für Grundrechte und der Europäische Datenschutzbeauftragte sagen das.

Deshalb sollte jeder Mitgliedstaat selbst entscheiden können, ob er die Fingerabdrücke seiner Bürger auf dem Ausweis speichert oder nicht. Dies war und ist die Position unserer Fraktion. Dies war ebenso die Position des Parlaments, und leider ist sie im Trilog aufgegeben worden.

Die Mitgliedstaaten, die bereits jetzt die Fingerabdrücke ihrer Bürger speichern, sollen es auch weiter tun können. Ja, aber wir sollten es den Innenministern nicht zu einfach machen, derart weitreichende Grundrechtseingriffe, die die große Mehrheit unserer Mitgliedstaaten betreffen, einfach mal so „über Brüssel“ vorzunehmen. Wenn die Innenminister dies wollen, dann sollten sie es doch zu Hause erklären und vertreten.

Ich bitte die Kolleginnen und Kollegen daher, morgen für die optionale Lösung zu stimmen. Wir sollten uns von den Innenministern auch keinen Handlungsdruck einreden lassen, denn sie selbst haben im Trilog darauf gedrängt, dass es eine lange Übergangsfrist gibt, in der alte Ausweise weiter ihre Gültigkeit behalten, sodass noch nach 2030 Ausweise ohne die neuesten Sicherheitsmerkmale in Umlauf sein werden.

**Anders Primdahl Vistisen, for ECR-Gruppen.** – Hr. formand! Denne sag handler først og fremmest om borgernes og europæernes sikkerhed. Den handler om, at når vi i Schengenzone har ret til at rejse på et ID-kort udstedt af nationalstaterne, så skal sikkerheden også være i orden. Derfor har ECR-Gruppens holdning fra først til sidst været at kæmpe for, at sikkerheden i de nationale ID-kort bliver på et niveau, der er sammenligneligt med det andet tilladte rejседokument, nemlig et almindeligt europæisk pas. Derfor er vi også tilfredse med udkommet af forhandlingerne i trilog, hvor vi har fået to biometriske markører ind som et krav til de nationale ID-kort. Vi er desuden yderst tilfredse med, at der nu også skal være fingeraftryk på kortene.

Samtidig må vi sige, at der generelt er gjort et seriøst stykke arbejde med disse regler for de nye europæiske ID-kort, og vi er særligt tilfredse med, at vi bevarer frivilligheden i forhold til nationalstaternes ret til at fravælge eller tilvælge muligheden for at have nationale ID-kort. For os handler denne sag om sikkerhed. Den handler om fælles standarder for dem, der ønsker at have kortene, og en høj standard for alle de lande, der skal acceptere kortene som lovligt rejsehjemmel. Overordnet set vil vi gerne takke Rådet, ordføreren og Kommissionen for det fine resultat, der er kommet ud af forhandlingerne. Den eneste større udfordring, vi ser, er at Parlamentet fik gennemtvunget et EU-flag på kortet. Det havde vi gerne undgået! Men alt i alt er det et fornuftigt kompromis, som ECR-Gruppen kan støtte.

**Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident! Diese Verordnung gehört mit Ausnahme der Gender-Regelung, die ich auch ausdrücklich begrüße, tatsächlich zu den Instrumenten mit dem Label „Was die Menschheit nicht braucht“. Um Terroristen und anderen Kriminellen beim Fälschen von Pässen und Identitäten beizukommen, sollen nun biometrische Fingerabdrücke verpflichtend auf die Personalausweise; in einem Fall schon von Kindern ab sechs, in allen anderen von Kindern ab zwölf Jahren. Nur für die älteren Semester ab sechzig ist es so, dass sie mildernde Umstände bekommen, indem deren *ID cards* länger gelten sollen nach dem Prinzip „Vertrau deinen Kindern nicht, aber den Alten schon“.

Und nun zu den Fingerabdrücken. Die Folgenabschätzung der Kommission hat keinerlei zwingende Notwendigkeit für das generelle Nehmen von Fingerabdrücken aufgezeigt. Das Zweite ist: Fingerabdrücke können gehackt und nachgebildet werden, wie der Chaos Computer Club schon 2008 nachgewiesen hat. Passwörter für den PC – um mal ein anderes Beispiel zu nehmen – kann man ändern, Fingerabdrücke ab einem bestimmten Alter eben nicht. Sind sie einmal geklaut, dann ist das nicht korrigierbar.



Und das Dritte: Fingerabdrücke ab zwölf lehnen wir ab, schon weil diese Kinder nicht mal strafmündig sind. Wenn nun die ID cards und die Fingerabdrücke auf den ID cards auch für andere Zwecke unter EU- oder mitgliederschaftlichem Recht genutzt werden können, dann wird irgendwann der Weg natürlich frei für biometrische Datenbanken auf den verschiedenen Ebenen.

Fazit: Bei dieser Verordnung gibt es wirklich nur einen Gewinner, einen echten Gewinner, das ist die Gilde der ID-Fälscher; die werden jetzt aufleben. Dazu herzlichen Glückwunsch!

**Sven Giegold**, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, diese Verordnung soll jetzt mehr Sicherheit bringen bei den Personalausweisen, aber gleichzeitig führt sie leider zu einem unverhältnismäßigen Eingriff in die Grundrechte, nämlich der verpflichtenden Aufnahme von Fingerabdrücken für alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger in der EU. Damit wird ein Problem gelöst, das eigentlich schon auf dem Rückgang ist, denn wir wissen, dass die Zahl der gefälschten Personalausweise seit Jahren zurückgeht.

Die verbindliche Aufnahme von Fingerabdrücken in allen Mitgliedstaaten – wie es eben die Grundrechteagentur und der Europäische Datenschutzbeauftragte festgestellt haben – ist unverhältnismäßig. Die Folge dieser Vorgabe ist, dass die Datensammelwut der Innenminister wieder auf dem Rücken Europas ausgetragen wird; dann sollen sie es auch national beschließen und nicht über den Umweg der Europäischen Union unpopuläre Politik verbindlich machen, die dann hinterher der Europäischen Union wieder Reputation kostet. Deshalb hoffe ich, dass dieser Fehler morgen in der Verordnung korrigiert wird.

**Емил Радев (PPE)**. – г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, по данни на Европейската комисия в момента в Европейския съюз съществуват над 86 различни вида лични карти и 181 различни вида документи, удостоверяващи правото на престой в Съюза. Освен това над 17 милиона европейски граждани живеят в държава членка, различна от родната им страна.

Съществуващата в момента фрагментация на това как трябва да изглеждат личните карти и какви данни да съдържат поставя под съмнение тяхната сигурност. В контекста на миграционната криза и терористичната заплаха, които доведоха до увеличаване на случаите на намиране на фалшиви и фалшифицирани европейски документи за самоличност, постигнатото споразумение, което обсъждаме днес, е изключително важно.

С промените европейските лични карти и разрешителни за престой ще станат по-сигурни. Общият формат и мерки за сигурност, въвеждането на пръстови отпечатъци в картите, въвеждането на общи правила за валидност ще ги направи много трудни за фалшифициране. В същото време европейските граждани ще бъдат улеснени, тъй като личните карти ще могат да се използват за преминаване на електронните, по-бързи изходи по летищата.

Дами и господа, сигурността на Европейския съюз зависи от сигурността, гарантирана от всяка една държава членка. Новите документи за самоличност ще направят изключително трудно използването на друга идентичност и ще улеснят засичането на фалшиви документи. По този начин те ще бъдат още един ефективен инструмент в борбата с тероризма и престъпността.

**Helga Stevens (ECR)**. – Voorzitter, morgen stemmen we over een uiterst belangrijk dossier: een verordening ter harmonisering van de veiligheidsaspecten van al onze nationale identiteitskaarten. Cijfers tonen aan dat dit broodnodig is. Zo onderschepte Frontex, de Europese grens- en kustwacht, vier jaar lang al steekproefsgewijs zo'n 38 870 vervalste identiteitskaarten. Het werkelijke getal ligt veel hoger. We maken het criminel en ook gewoon bijzonder gemakkelijk. Ze zoeken naar de minst beveiligde identiteitskaart en vervalsen die.

Deze verordening beëindigt dat. Elke nationale identiteitskaart zal even goed beveiligd zijn met foto én vingerafdrukken. En ja, die vingerafdrukken zijn absoluut nodig. Een foto is gemakkelijk te vervalsen, maar vingerafdrukken zijn uniek voor elke persoon. Bovendien wordt in deze verordening vastgelegd dat vingerafdrukken alleen geraadpleegd mogen worden wanneer het echt noodzakelijk is en dat er geen grote Europese databank komt.

Als N-VA'er voelt dit als een erkenning voor wat mijn partij op nationaal niveau reeds bereikte. België geeft nu al identiteitskaarten met vingerafdrukken uit. Ik hoop dat we in de toekomst deze voortrekkersrol mogen blijven spelen.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señora comisaria Jourová, este Reglamento tiene sentido. Esta iniciativa tiene sentido. El trabajo que se ha conducido desde este Parlamento Europeo para obtener un resultado está cargado de sentido. Asegurar la identificación a través de un documento europeo de al menos once millones de ciudadanos europeos que residen en algún país distinto de aquel país en el que han nacido, o de mil millones de ciudadanos extranjeros que acceden a la Unión Europea y a su espacio de libre circulación a través de sus fronteras exteriores, tiene sentido.

Y tiene sentido que se propenda, con un calendario razonable, con todas las garantías, a la mejor identificación, con todos los instrumentos disponibles por las nuevas técnicas de identificación biométrica y de transmisión de esa información, para prevenir la criminalidad grave transnacional y las amenazas que penden sobre la ciudadanía europea y sobre la Unión Europea en su conjunto.

Y, por tanto, creo que el equilibrio que se ha conseguido al final del camino merece ser saludado con un voto favorable.

*(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)*

**Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their interventions and again, many thanks to the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs. I'd like to make a very short comment related to the mandatory fingerprints. They were included in the preferred option as it was decided to give more importance to the criterion aimed at improving security. At the same time, there are several very important safeguards introduced in the proposal.

The safeguards in the text ensure the protection of citizens' personal data. In response to the requests by Parliament's representatives, many recommendations by the Fundamental Rights Agency have been included in the text. As suggested by the Fundamental Rights Agency and the European Data Protection Supervisor, the text makes it absolutely clear that it does not provide a legal basis for databases for the storage of biometric data.

We fear that the opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor might have been based on some kind of misunderstanding of the encryption used for fingerprints on the chip of ID cards. Contrary to what is stated in the opinion, the fingerprints on the chip can only be accessed by authorities with the necessary certificates. We believe that the safeguards introduced in the text ensure the protection of citizens' personal data, and we welcome Parliament's effort in this regard.

I am convinced that this piece of legislation is a very important contribution to our overall efforts to strengthen the security of our citizens. Therefore, I would like to encourage you to vote in favour of the compromise text. It will make the lives of the EU's citizens easier when exercising their free movement rights and it will increase the level of security in our Union.

**Gérard Deprez, rapporteur.** – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais remercier les collègues qui ont participé à ce débat.

Nous avons recommencé en plénière les débats que nous avons eus lors de nos réunions précédentes et je voudrais simplement dire que j'ai défendu avec une énergie passionnée la position initiale du Parlement européen. Je n'ai pas pu obtenir satisfaction et j'ai estimé de mon devoir de passer un accord avec le Conseil, qui était sur une autre ligne que la nôtre, parce qu'il y va de la sécurité de nos concitoyens.

Aujourd'hui, je voudrais rappeler deux arguments. Je ne comprends pas pourquoi certains de nos collègues ont des objections, maintenant, à l'incorporation obligatoire des empreintes digitales, alors que nous l'avons acceptée et que cela ne pose aucun problème pour les passeports: ces empreintes sont une réalité dans les passeports depuis plusieurs années. J'en profite pour dire à notre collègue Cornelia Ernst (*s'adressant à elle*: non, non, écoutez, je ne vous agresse pas, je vais donner un fait) que nous n'avons aucun exemple de piratage de puces ces dernières années et que le niveau de sécurisation des puces augmente en permanence.

Je voudrais ajouter un autre élément. J'ai sous les yeux un *tweet* de Statewatch, organisation avec laquelle vous avez correspondu, qui dit que le texte qui va être proposé pourrait être utilisé comme base juridique pour la création de banques de données nationales d'empreintes digitales. Ce n'est pas exact! C'est faux! Au contraire, le texte prévoit expressément que ce règlement ne peut pas servir de base juridique pour justifier la création de banques de données d'empreintes digitales au niveau national. Je demande donc que dans notre débat aujourd'hui et lors du vote que nous émettrons demain, nous parlions de la réalité de ce qui a été décidé, de ce qu'elle signifie et de son intérêt.

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 4 kwietnia 2019 r.

*Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)*

**Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban.** – Az uniós polgárok egyre mobilabbak. Jelenleg több mint 15 millió uniós polgár tartózkodik és több mint 11 millió uniós polgár dolgozik az állampolgárságtól eltérő tagállamban. Évente több mint egymilliárdan utaznak az EU-n belül vagy lépik át annak külső határait. A közelmúltban elkövetett európai terroristámadások viszont rámutattak arra, hogy a személyazonosító okmányok biztonságának garantálása kulcsfontosságú Európa biztonságának visszaállítása és megőrzése érdekében. Az úti és személyazonosító okmányok biztonságának erősítése a szervezett bűnözés elleni küzdelem terén is fontos szereppel bír. Az okmányok biztonságának növelésére irányuló javaslat tehát időszzerű, ugyanis az okmányok fokozott biztonsága fontos szerepet játszik az EU-n belüli biztonság javításában. Az okmányok a biometrikus azonosítók, és különösen az ujjnyomatok alkalmazásával megbízhatóbbakká és biztonságosabbakká válnak, csökkentik a hamisítás és az okmányokkal való visszaélés kockázatát.

**Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen.** – Tällä hetkellä EU:n jäsenmaissa on käytössä noin 250 erilaista henkilötodistusta tai oleskelulupa-asiakirjaa. Näiden turvallisuustaso vaihtelee merkittävästi, mikä lisää väärennysten ja asiakirjapetosten riskiä. Erilaisten asiakirjojen laaja kirjo voi myös vaikeuttaa kansalaisten liikkumista unionissa, jos rajaviranomaiset estävät maahanpääsyn asiakirjoihin liittyvien epäselvyyksien takia.

Käsittlemämme asetuksen tarkoitus on yhtenäistää henkilökortti- ja oleskeluasiakirjojen ulkoasua ja parantaa niiden turvallisuusominaisuuksia. Korteissa on jatkossa oltava passien kaltaiset biometriset tunnisteet, eli valokuvan lisäksi sormenjälkitunnisteet. Asetus tekee asiakirjaväärennyksistä ja identiteettivarkauksista vaikeampaa. Se vaikeuttaa myös terroristien ja muiden rikollisten toimintaa, minkä johdosta minun on helppo kannattaa asetusta.

## PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

*Wiceprzewodniczący*

### 17. Stosunki UE–Chiny (debata)

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie stosunków UE–Chiny (2019/2677(RSP)).

**Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, China is currently very high up on the European political agenda. This is reflected in the recent dynamics of high-level EU-China meetings. In March, the European Council discussed overall EU relations with China in the global context and gave guidance on the future strategic priorities for the EU.

The key task for relations with China is to have a coordinated European approach toward China as a strategic partner, but also as a competitor and a rival. The essence of the relationship should be reciprocity in all areas so as to underpin our common economic interests. The upcoming EU-China summit on 9 April will be a good opportunity for the EU to push for its core priorities, notably in terms of trade and investment, human rights, global challenges and foreign policy.

Indeed, EU-China trade relations, on which I will concentrate today, are part of a wider political and economic relationship with China, touching upon issues relating to competition, industrial policy and internal market rules. China's model of state capitalism has led to a number of imbalances. These imbalances in the level playing field are not unique to EU-China relations, as observed in the current US-China standoff on trade. The situation will inevitably have an impact on the EU and we will need to remain vigilant.

Parliament, in its resolution of 12 September 2018 regarding EU-China relations already touched upon the various aspects of our trade and investment relationship. The European Council also discussed this issue at its meeting in March. Clearly, we cannot ignore that China is – and will remain – a very important strategic market for EU exports of both goods and services, as well as for EU investment. China is the EU's second biggest trading partner after the US, and the EU is China's biggest trading partner. Generally, both economies are closely interlinked, including a fast evolving presence of Chinese companies in Europe. It is therefore important for us to reflect on how the EU can seize the opportunities that China provides, while at the same time addressing the numerous challenges in the relationship.

We also need to remember that China is indispensable as a partner if we are to deal with global challenges, which can only be addressed together. Climate change is an obvious example. We need close trade and investment links for our own economic growth and prosperity. At the same time, our economic relationship needs to be more balanced. Here we come to the heart of the matter.

A decade ago, our main focus was on how to improve access to the Chinese market and deal with the different barriers that exist. Today, the challenge of China's state capitalist economic model is far greater as it creates systemic competition with liberal market economies. This had led to a lack of reciprocity and the absence of a level playing field in our economic relationship with China, which is pursuing its ambition to become the world leader in a number of key sectors, including key technologies. It has achieved this through massive market distorting subsidies, resulting in a dominant position of state-owned firms through forced technology transfer, industrial policies and non-tariff measures that discriminate against foreign companies, through poor protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights, and through strategic investment in key sectors in the EU or other third countries.

In addition, the EU is being kept out of the Chinese market in sectors where the Union is strong, while China has wide-ranging access to the EU market, such as in the area of foreign direct investment or public procurement. Unfortunately, in aiming at realising its global ambition, China has no intention or constraints to play by the same rules as other players. We therefore urgently need to look at the EU toolbox to address Chinese behaviour in the area of trade and investment. Trade defence instruments or the new regulation on foreign direct investment screening are important here, but we also need to look at competition rules, state aid control, industrial policy and internal market rules more widely, while keeping the interests of consumers in mind. We also need to see how best to navigate between US-China rivalries and steer the dynamics of the triangular EU-US-China relationship. The US has been clear in its view that China has benefited massively from its WTO accession and thus it now needs to meet its commitments.

The upcoming EU-China summit on 9 April will be a good opportunity to urge China to address existing asymmetries and the lack of reciprocity, as well as to encourage China to live up to its responsibility to pursue policies that support an open, balanced and inclusive global economy which is beneficial to all. This includes assuming its responsibility in the WTO to contribute to a comprehensive collective effort to WTO reform, in line with its economic weight. China's engagement to reform the WTO in certain key areas is therefore to be welcomed.

For the EU, market distorting industrial subsidies should be dealt with as a priority. Such subsidies are often channelled through state-owned enterprises and are currently not adequately captured under international trade rules. Forced technology transfer policies are another aspect that we would like to see effectively eradicated. We should continue with our efforts to convince China to address these irritants. In this regard, I hope that the EU-China Working Group devoted to WTO reform will start delivering quickly.

Bilaterally, the EU is currently negotiating a comprehensive investment agreement with China. This agreement is meant to be ambitious and comprehensive. It will be a crucial tool to level the playing field, rebalance our investment relations and secure equal treatment for EU companies operating in China. Provided the substance is there, we would like to see the negotiations on this agreement concluded next year. The negotiations also come at a crucial moment when China is revising its domestic laws on foreign investment. These negotiations have therefore become an important tool to help push regulatory changes in China.

The negotiations on a bilateral geographical indication agreement with China are now in their final stages. The conclusion of these negotiations will help ensure mutual recognition of geographical indications in each other's markets. It is disappointing that progress has stalled, despite the commitments made by China at the last EU-China summit to conclude the negotiations by the end of October 2018. China has raised new issues and has backtracked on others. We therefore expect the upcoming summit to provide additional momentum with respect to both the comprehensive agreement on investment and the geographical indication agreement. This will be important if we want to maintain the credibility and ambition of these negotiations.

**Jyrki Katainen**, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, our relationship with China currently combines positive engagement with actions to contain the distorted effects of China's state capitalist economy. Lately, there's been increasing awareness in the EU that China is unlikely to change its economic model where the state and party have a strong influence in the economy. If China doesn't change, then the question arises as to what we in the EU can do to change our approach towards China.

To answer this question, in a recent joint communication the Commission and the High Representative have therefore reviewed the EU's relations with China in five broad areas and proposed 10 concrete actions to better respond to the opportunities and challenges we have with this partner. Firstly, we should engage more strongly with China to promote an effective rules-based multilateral order to fight climate change and to improve the governance of the oceans. The EU and China can be effective partners in doing so. We both realise the importance of upholding multilateralism as the best way of finding solutions to global problems.

We also both agree on the negative impact that emissions, pollution and unsustainable use of resources has on our planet, both on land and in the oceans. We have therefore decided to act resolutely on these fronts, but can and should, do more.

Secondly, we want to deepen our action in support of international peace, security and sustainable development. Building on the positive cooperation with China on the Iran nuclear agreement, we want to work with it, for instance, on the denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula, the peace process in Afghanistan, or in addressing the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar. China should, however, accept binding arbitration rulings issued under the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea relating to its maritime claims in the South China Sea.

We also want to cooperate with China and promote high governance standards, sustainability and a level playing field in respect to investment and economic cooperation with third countries in Asia, the Western Balkans or Africa, in particular in the fields of infrastructure.

Thirdly, we need to achieve a more balanced and reciprocal trade and investment relationship with China. With more than one billion euro of trade in goods every day, the EU and China are strategic markets for one another. However, distortions in the Chinese economy, where the state retains a strong influence, have negative spillover effects in the EU, notably when overcapacity leads to dumping. China's state-driven industrial policy and ambition to develop domestic champions is also problematic when it leads to non-reciprocal market openness and an uneven playing field for EU companies.

We therefore want China to deliver on its commitment to reform WTO rules and accept stronger discipline on industrial subsidies and forced technology transfer. We also have a shared interest to conclude our bilateral agreement with China on investment by 2020, and aviation safety or geographical indications in the near future. Finally, we call on the Council and the European Parliament to adopt as quickly as possible the international procurement instrument, which will help to ensure more reciprocity with their countries in the field of access to the public procurement market.

Fourthly, the EU must strengthen its competitiveness and ensure a level playing field in Europe. Let me be clear that this is homework the EU needs to do regardless of China and is not directed against China. What we want to avoid is having global competition on state subsidies. In order to ensure fair competition, EU state-aid rules limit strictly subsidies that Member States can grant to private companies. However, they do not apply to foreign subsidies and WTO rules on subsidies are less stringent than EU state-aid rules. This is why we want to reform and strengthen WTO rules on subsidies. But we also need to be able to act on our domestic market. The Commission will therefore identify before the end of 2019 how to address more effectively the distortive effects of foreign state ownership and state financing in Europe and fill the gap in EU law.

In order to promote high standards of quality, security, sustainability and social responsibility, the Commission will also publish guidance on the participation of foreign bidders in the EU's procurement market and conduct an overview of the EU's procurement framework. Based on renewed EU industrial policy strategy, the EU will encourage the development of strategic value chains and key technologies in Europe, such as we do with the Action Plan on Artificial Intelligence. Finally, we encourage co-legislators swiftly to agree on the Horizon Europe programme which will support innovation in Europe, while also including clear rules on exploitation of results and reciprocal access to research and development funding when we cooperate with third countries.

Fifthly, we must strengthen the security of the EU's critical infrastructure and technology. 5G networks will provide the future backbone of our societies and economies, connecting billions of objects and systems, including sensitive information. The Commission therefore adopted on 26 March a recommendation for a common EU approach to 5G security networks.

We have called on Member States to start preparing for the implementation of the new EU foreign investment screening system that will enter into force in April 2019 — this year — and will allow detecting and addressing this year the security that may be posed by foreign takeovers of critical assets, technologies and infrastructures.

Finally, we called on the Council to adopt swiftly the EU modernised rules on export control of dual-use goods. All these steps will reinforce EU resilience and security regarding potential risk in critical sectors.

Let me conclude by saying that the upcoming EU-China Summit on 9 April provides a good opportunity to take stock of the progress achieved since the summit of last July and to insist on China's more substantive engagement on all issues of EU interest. Until now, China has continued to downplay concerns raised by the EU and sought to keep the focus on areas of common ground. Its interest is in a feel-good summit with the EU to display EU-China cooperation to the world. However, a feel-good summit is only possible if China is able to deliver concrete results. We are doing our utmost to prepare well for this event.

**Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Auch wenn ein nicht enden wollender Brexit-Prozess die Aufmerksamkeit der Öffentlichkeit auf sich zieht, dreht sich die Welt natürlich weiter. Dies kann man auch ganz besonders gut an den Veränderungen Chinas in den letzten zehn Jahren erkennen.

Deshalb begrüße ich es, dass die Europäische Union darauf besonnen und klug reagiert und nun einen vorsichtigen, aber richtigen Wandel in ihrer Außenpolitik mit der Volksrepublik China vollzieht. Nicht zuletzt das Projekt der Neuen Seidenstraße zeigt, dass Chinas autoritäre Regierung zunehmend über ihre wirtschaftliche Expansion auch global geopolitischen Einfluss gewinnen möchte. Diese Erkenntnis sollte keinen überraschen, denn Staaten verfolgen seit Menschengedenken ihre Interessen. Die entscheidende Frage ist daher lediglich, wie wir mit einer solchen Expansion umgehen. China ist und bleibt eine unermesslich große Chance für die europäische Wirtschaft.

Demnach sollte es selbstverständlich sein, dass wir in unsere Beziehungen auch entsprechend viel Zeit und Kraft investieren. Dabei sollten wir aber nicht nur den kurzfristigen Gewinn im Kopf haben, sondern vor allem auf die langfristigen Auswirkungen unseres heutigen Handelns achten. Chinas Unternehmen haben mehr oder weniger einen freien Zugang zur EU, und deswegen sollten wir ebenso freien Zugang zum Markt in China haben. Es geht im Endeffekt ganz einfach darum, zwischen der EU und China möglichst gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen herzustellen – zum Vorteil beider Seiten.

**Alessia Maria Mosca**, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la chiave strategica per relazionarci con il colosso cinese è il mantenimento della nostra unità. Il dialogo con Pechino è imprescindibile, ma affinché esso sia efficace dobbiamo parlare con una voce sola.

Il mercato europeo è la principale piazza commerciale a livello globale, la capacità negoziale che ne discende è formidabile. Gli Stati membri non devono cadere in tentazione e cedere alle lusinghe cinesi in cambio di qualche investimento poco trasparente. Come possiamo pensare di fronteggiare la crescente aggressività economica cinese da soli? Il presidente Xi ha capito, prima di noi, che uniti siamo più forti. Dobbiamo far fronte comune per garantire maggiore giustizia sociale e ambientale contro ogni forma di competizione sleale.

In gioco non ci sono solo milioni di posti di lavoro, la nostra rilevanza sullo scacchiere globale e la salvaguardia dell'ambiente. Stiamo parlando della sopravvivenza del nostro modello sociale, del nostro welfare e del nostro sistema liberaldemocratico fondato su democrazia, mercato e rispetto dei diritti umani. Accogliamo quindi con favore la presentazione della nuova strategia europea, una buona sintesi fra le grandi opportunità e le altrettante distorsioni create da un'economia statale.

La Cina ha beneficiato ampiamente dell'apertura dei mercati e di un commercio libero. La partecipazione agli scambi globali ha permesso a circa un milione di cinesi di uscire dalla soglia di povertà. Questo dato è straordinario e ci dimostra quanto il commercio possa sostenere crescita e occupazione. Ma il passaggio da economia in via di sviluppo ad attore preminente del commercio globale comporta l'assunzione di responsabilità: non si gode dei privilegi dell'appartenenza a una comunità senza rispettarne le regole.

È chiaro che in questo clima di apertura indiscriminata la Cina non abbia interesse a cambiare lo status quo, ma la situazione non è sostenibile per le nostre aziende e soprattutto per i nostri lavoratori, costretti a una competizione basata su un *dumping* sociale e ambientale. Il nostro obiettivo deve essere uno: maggiore reciprocità. È quindi necessario un cambio di paradigma. Per ottenerlo dovremo parlare con una voce sola, quella europea.

**Bas Belder**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de tijd dringt dat de Europese Unie en haar lidstaten afscheid nemen van naïviteit tegenover strategische partner China, [...] die in werkelijkheid al vele jaren een problematische partner blijkt te zijn.

Hoe problematisch bleek begin deze week weer eens. Toen publiceerde de *Frankfurter Allgemeine am Sonntag* een bijdrage onder de veelzeggende titel "Tatort China". Duitse managers slaan alarm over de toename van steeds driestere bedrijfspionage. Berlijn schat de schade op 100 miljard euro per jaar. En dan hebben we het alleen over Duitsland.

Voor betere belangenbehartiging in de handelsrelaties met China dienen de EU en de lidstaten het externe beleid van Peking van binnenuit nauwlettend en diepgaand te volgen. En dan komt een kwetsbaar [...] naar voren, waar experts zelfs lange crisisjaren voorzien. Dan klinkt ook een discussie over de toekomst van de private sector in China. En daar moeten we voor opletten en bij dit binnenlandse discours aansluiten. Alleen op basis van solide kennis van de drijfveren van China valt een passend solide Europees antwoord op Pekings staatsverminking van [...] te formuleren.

**Elsi Katainen**, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, Kiinan vaikutusvalta ja taloudellinen voima ovat todellakin kasvaneet laaja-alaisesti, ja komissio on oikeassa siinä, että Kiinaa ei voi pitää enää alikehittyneenä maana ja siihen pitääkin suhtautua tasavertaisena toimijana.

Joka tapauksessa Kiinalta on vaadittava sopeutumista sääntöihin, joiden kulmakiviä ovat YK ja WTO. EU:n on myös edellytettävä Kiinalta vastavuoroisuutta. Eurooppalaisten yritysten toimintaedellytykset Kiinassa eivät ole samat kuin heidän yrityksillään EU:ssa. Meidän on pidettävä huoli nykyistä paremmin siitä, että esimerkiksi lelujen ja tekniikan tuonnissa noudatetaan EU:n turvallisuusstandardeja.

Teollisuuden kilpailukyvyyn suhteen EU:n ei pidä käyttää samoja keinoja kuin Kiina tekee. Esimerkiksi kilpailu- ja valtiontukisääntöjä kiertämällä emme voittaisi mitään. Yritysten kasvattamiseen on todellakin löydettävä ihan muut keinot. Sen sijaan meidän täytyy tehdä Euroopasta mahdollisimman houkutteleva ja kilpailukykyinen, niin että huippuyritykset tänne sitten sijoittavat ja myöskin jäävät.

Tarvitsemme sisämarkkinan, jossa kaikilla on samat säännöt, on investoitava tutkimukseen ja innovaatioihin, on vahvaa kauppapolitiikkaa ja EU:n yhtenäisyyttä. Näillä pärjäämme kyllä myös Kiinan kanssa.

Selvää on, että EU ja Kiina ovat kilpailijoita ja kilpailua on yhä enemmän myös kolmansissa maissa. Meidän on tehtävä nykyistä enemmän yhteistyötä myöskin Afrikan kanssa, missä Kiina jo vahvasti on läsnä. Samalla on pyrittävä yhteistyöhön, jossa on valtavasti mahdollisuuksia muun muassa ilmastonmuutoksen vastaisessa taistelussa, jossa sekä Kiina että EU ovat globaaleja johtajia, kun Pariisin sopimusta toimeenpannaan. EU:n ja Kiinan on harkittava yhteistyötä myös päästökaupassa, jossa molemmat maat ovat todellakin edelläkävijöitä.

**Helmut Scholz**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich erkenne an, dass die Kommission mit der Neuorientierung strategische Partnerschaft, Wettbewerber und strategische Rivalität das eigentliche Problem endlich mal auf den Tisch gelegt hat. Dass China eine Marktwirtschaft chinesischer Prägung ist, ist nun wirklich kein Novum. Seit 40 Jahren geht dieser Weg voran. Und deshalb möchte ich klar feststellen: China ist keine Gefahr und auch nicht unser Gegner. Kolonialismus und Imperialismus wurden nicht von China in die Welt getragen. Ich meine, wir müssen alle gemeinsam lernen, in dieser veränderten globalen Situation miteinander auszukommen. Das schließt Konkurrenz und Wettbewerb nicht aus. Die Regeln dafür müssen wir aber gemeinsam festlegen. Die Zeit der Diktate von einer Seite ist vorbei.

China stellte in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten sein Wirtschaftssystem komplett um. Dabei sind die Menschen nicht in Massen verhungert, sondern 600 Millionen Menschen müssen nicht mehr in Armut leben. Das Rezept heißt inklusives Wachstum. Die Marktöffnung musste dafür wohl dosiert erfolgen. Haben wir bessere Rezepte anzubieten für die Transition von 1,3 Milliarden Menschen?

Der bevorstehende Gipfel ist durchaus eine Chance, uns gemeinsam mit China zu verständigen, wie wir uns auf den Weg machen, um die Weltwirtschaft zu stärken, neue Strukturen, Standards und einen regelbasierten multilateralen Handel zu entwickeln, den Klimawandel zu verhindern, die Technologiesprünge und ihre Folgen zu bewältigen und die Nachhaltigkeitsziele der Vereinten Nationen zu erreichen. Dafür bleiben uns nur noch elf Jahre. Und mit unseren Konzepten von Partizipation, Menschenrechten und Mut zur Vielfalt haben wir in eine Kooperation mit China die Basis des hohen kreativen Potenzials einzubringen.

**Reinhard Bütikofer**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ein neuer Wind beginnt zu wehen in den EU-China-Beziehungen. Über die letzten 40 Jahre ist der Ostwind immer massiver geworden und über die letzten sieben Jahre immer unangenehmer. Es ist ein Wind des radikalierenden Autoritarismus, des Staatskapitalismus und des nationalen Hegemoniestrebens. Neu ist die Entschlossenheit, jetzt den Westwind zu verstärken, und das wird ein Wind des Realismus und des europäischen Selbstbewusstseins. Dabei will ich klar sagen: Basis ist nach wie vor unsere Kooperationsbereitschaft, aber es muss eine Kooperation sein mit klaren Kanten. Und dabei wollen wir, dass China eine Ein-Europa-Politik verfolgt, und wir werden das auch durchsetzen.

Es ist richtig, dass das Verhältnis auf den Begriff der systemischen Rivalität gebracht worden ist. Dazu gehört, dass wir Dinge klar benennen, etwa wenn in Xinjiang der schlimmste Polizeistaat geschaffen wird, den es auf der Welt gibt, etwa wenn China Versprechungen macht beim letzten EU-China-Gipfel, die es dann nicht einhält, oder wenn China Multilateralismus sagt, aber nur eine Politik im Auge hat, die dem eigenen Nutzen dient.

Wir müssen auch entsprechend handeln. Und deswegen bin ich klar dagegen, dass wir zulassen, dass hier ein Wohlfühlgipfel inszeniert wird. Es muss ein Gipfel werden, wie es Kommission und Rat gesagt haben: mit klaren Ergebnissen.

**Tiziana Beghin**, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è naturale che si debba parlare alla Cina con un'unica voce nel prossimo summit, ma è altrettanto naturale che quella voce non possa essere solo quella dell'ipocrisia.



Molti governi europei, la Commissione, i popolari e i socialisti hanno tutti pesantemente criticato il governo italiano per aver firmato un memorandum con la Cina. Io non ho niente contro il diritto di critica, peccato però che, come spesso accade in Europa, si guardi la pagliuzza negli occhi del vicino senza guardare la trave nei propri. Non è solo il governo italiano ad aver firmato questa intesa. Ben altri quattordici paesi europei – da ultimo il Lussemburgo di Juncker – lo hanno fatto.

E anche quelli che non hanno firmato alcun accordo non possono certo far finta di nulla. La Germania, per esempio, ospita un colossale terminal ferroviario per le merci cinesi, dove ogni settimana arrivano da Pechino 30 treni. Il Belgio ha venduto alla Cina il terminal per il gas naturale nel suo porto di Zeebrugge, la Spagna la gestione dei container nei porti di Bilbao e Valencia, per non parlare della Grecia dove è arrivato un miliardo di euro di investimenti cinesi per il Pireo, dell'Ungheria dove ne sono arrivati 200 milioni per una ferrovia, o Croazia, Portogallo e molti altri.

Germania e Francia esportano in Cina rispettivamente 9 e 2 volte più di quanto non facciamo noi italiani, ma ovviamente, colleghi, il problema è l'intesa firmata dal mio governo. Per anni avete raccontato che i populisti destabilizzavano gli equilibri internazionali, che erano pericolosi per la pace e la democrazia. Peccato però che oggi quelli che voi chiamate populisti firmano intese per la cooperazione, gli investimenti e la cultura, intese che incitano la Cina a rispettare le regole europee, mentre il Presidente Juncker continua a definirla un *competitor* e un rivale sistemico, come se non fosse già un dato di fatto che la Cina è uno dei principali partner commerciali di tutti i nostri paesi.

Nessun problema, possiamo continuare a diffondere falsità, seminare odio, oppure possiamo continuare a lavorare per un mondo più unito, giusto e coeso come noi stiamo facendo.

**France Jamet, au nom du groupe ENF.** – Monsieur le Président, «puisque ces mystères nous dépassent, feignons d'en être les organisateurs», disait le poète. Nous nous retrouvons aujourd'hui à débattre de la Chine, qui nous pose un véritable problème, effectivement, car elle refuse un certain ordre géopolitique dont l'Union européenne et les États-Unis ont longtemps tenu tous les leviers – et cet ordre prend fin sous nos yeux.

Les pays d'Europe doivent dialoguer avec la Chine, qui est l'un des multiples partenaires du monde de demain, un monde multipolaire. Et je ne vois pas pourquoi l'Union voudrait empêcher certains pays de défendre leurs intérêts dans le cadre d'une coopération approfondie. Mon pays, la France, a toujours eu des relations équilibrées avec la Chine. Il en est ainsi depuis que le général de Gaulle a été le premier à reconnaître la Chine populaire.

On n'ignore pas 1,4 milliard de personnes. Si concurrence déloyale il y a, le protectionnisme et le localisme sont les seules réponses appropriées. Nier cela, c'est basculer dans une logique pernicieuse de choc des civilisations et à ce jeu-là, personne ne sortira gagnant.

**Cristian Dan Preda (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, je suis content de voir que la thématique de ce débat a été élargie, comme je l'avais demandé en début de séance. Il aurait été absurde de discuter seulement de commerce.

Je veux saluer et soutenir l'importance de cette nouvelle stratégie adoptée par l'Union européenne concernant nos relations avec la Chine. Tout d'abord parce qu'on a rompu avec la langue de bois et qu'on dit clairement, qu'on admet que la Chine est en concurrence avec nous, non seulement sur les questions commerciales, mais également pour la promotion d'un modèle de gouvernance à l'opposé de nos valeurs.

En effet, alors que l'Union européenne fait de la défense des droits de l'homme, Madame, des libertés, Madame, et de l'état de droit, Madame, l'un des piliers de sa diplomatie, la Chine promeut l'autoritarisme, Madame, et la loi du plus fort, Madame, c'est ce qui vous plaît, Madame? Mais allez en Chine, alors, Madame! Si vous n'aimez plus la liberté, emmenez votre amie italienne et allez bénéficier de la magnifique atmosphère de la Chine populaire, Madame!

Les droits de l'homme doivent être au centre de notre stratégie. Il ne faut pas craindre de porter atteinte à nos intérêts commerciaux tout simplement parce que chaque fois que nous parlons des valeurs démocratiques, Xi Jinping est mal à l'aise. Notre objectif, ce n'est pas le bien-être de Xi Jinping, c'est le droit des individus et ce sont les intérêts commerciaux de l'Europe tout entière, et non pas ceux des nations individuelles. Ce n'est pas le gouvernement de Salvini qui va sauver nos relations et qui va améliorer le sort des citoyens européens. Travaillons ensemble et ne pensons plus selon cette logique autarcique qui est en fait une vraie preuve de malhonnêteté, une trahison de l'Europe.

**Bernd Lange (S&D).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Ministerin, Herr Kommissar! Ja, wir haben unterschiedliche Auffassungen mit China. Wir haben Investitionsbegrenzungen von europäischen Unternehmen in China. Ja, wir haben den Diebstahl von geistigem Eigentum in China. Wir haben keinen Zugang zu öffentlicher Beschaffung in China. Wir haben eine Ungleichbehandlung von privaten Unternehmen zu staatlichen Unternehmen. Und wir haben auch keine Respektierung der ILO-Kernarbeitsnormen, und die Stärkung der Arbeitnehmerrechte – das ist übrigens heute noch gar nicht gesagt worden –, ist für mich sehr wichtig. Das ist der Fakt, und das sollten wir auch klar so benennen.

Aber wir müssen auch sehen, dass China natürlich einen Wandel durchgemacht hat: Millionen von Menschen sind aus der Armut herausgekommen, China ist Mitglied des Pariser Klimaschutzabkommens, und der CO<sub>2</sub>-Abdruck in China pro Kopf ist noch etwa ein Zehntel des Abdrucks hier bei uns. Also insofern gibt es eine gemeinsame Verantwortung.

Und wir müssen überlegen, wie wir strategisch vorgehen. Und da ist natürlich die Priorität die WTO, dass wir alle in einem Zelt halten und gemeinsam die WTO reformieren und versuchen, genau diese Punkte, bei denen wir mit China über Kreuz liegen, über die WTO auch zu lösen – also neue Regeln im WTO-Bereich über geistiges Eigentum, über Staatsunternehmen und so weiter.

Und zum Zweiten, bilateral: Ja, wir müssen mehr Energie reinbringen, um das Investitionsabkommen durchzubringen und auch das Abkommen über die geografischen Herkunftsbezeichnungen.

Und ein Drittes müssen wir machen: Wir können nicht nur defensiv sein und sagen: „die bösen Chinesen“, sondern wir müssen auch mehr proaktiv sein, unsere eigene Industriepolitik nach vorne bringen – Reinhard Bütikofer und ich haben lange dafür gekämpft – oder auch das Wettbewerbsrecht überprüfen, damit wir industriell wieder nach vorne kommen.

Also insofern heißt das für den Gipfel: Klarheit, ja, aber auch Kooperation statt Konfrontation und nicht im Fahrwasser von anderen weltweit uns bewegen.

**Emmanuel Maurel (GUE/NGL).** – Monsieur le Président, oui, la Chine mène une politique offensive en matière commerciale, en matière diplomatique, et même en matière militaire. Et oui, l'Union européenne a trop longtemps été naïve à l'égard de la Chine, et je vois dans ce document une sorte de réveil tardif. Je le salue, mais c'est un réveil qui est à la fois incomplet et parfois un peu hypocrite.

Incomplet, parce que ce document ne parle pas de la contrefaçon: ce sont près de 250 milliards de dollars de perdus pour des pays comme l'Allemagne, l'Italie ou encore la France. Incomplet sur le développement durable: on ne peut pas se contenter de vaines admonestations face à un pays qui est l'un des plus gros pollueurs de la planète. Hypocrite, enfin, parce qu'il faut poser clairement la question de la réciprocité commerciale et dire clairement que l'Europe ne peut pas se laisser faire.

Les marchés publics européens sont grands ouverts; les marchés chinois ne le sont pas. Les entreprises chinoises réalisent des investissements stratégiques en Europe dans des secteurs aussi divers que l'aéroportuaire, les nouvelles technologies, et même le secteur des canalisations – comme en France, aujourd'hui, avec Saint-Gobain. Par contre, les entreprises européennes ne peuvent pas le faire. Il ne faut pas être hypocrite. Il faut imposer la réciprocité, ou alors il faut tout simplement nous protéger, protéger nos territoires et protéger nos salariés et nos entreprises.

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD).** – Mr President, let's start with the context. In 2017 China's exports of goods to the EU were EUR 375 billion. This gigantic figure is roughly equivalent to the entire economy of Nigeria. And now some more key facts. China is not in the EU's single market. There is No Customs Union between China and the EU. There is no regulatory convergence beyond those goods that China actually sells in the EU. There is no free movement of people between China and the EU. China does not have a trade agreement with the EU. Nevertheless, China has access to the EU's single market. Indeed, access enough to sell these goods in this massive volume. How come? Perhaps this is permitted because the EU has a trade surplus with China? Far from it. The EU's trade deficit with China in 2017, including services, was EUR 160 billion. This deficit was roughly equivalent to the entire economy of Romania, if you would pay attention.

So there you have it. China has full access to the EU's single market. By comparison, the EU demands of the UK, for example, payments of GBP 39 billion that the UK does not even owe, the supremacy of the European Court of Justice, which should really be called the European Court of injustice and, worse still, the effective regulatory annexation of the province of Northern Ireland. Well may the representative of the Commission snigger away. And this is in return for access. It is as if the EU was asking of China the same regulatory annexation of the province of Sinkiang.

From this debate, it seems that the EU would like good trade relations with China. A great idea, but one question: does the EU want, let alone seek, the same good trade relations with the UK? It certainly does not seem that way.

**Mario Borghesio (ENF).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la trasformazione strutturale dell'economia avviata negli ultimi anni, ma anche le pressioni da parte di paesi terzi e dell'Europa per una maggiore reciprocità negli scambi commerciali, mettono indubbiamente la leadership cinese di fronte alla necessità di trovare un nuovo equilibrio fra competitività e liberalizzazione.

Consideriamo la cautela con la quale il governo cinese ha stilato il suo rapporto annuale. Questa ha risentito indubbiamente della disputa in corso con gli Stati Uniti per la guerra commerciale e delle pressioni esercitate sull'economia cinese, che indubbiamente hanno avuto effetti molto pesanti, soprattutto sul sistema delle piccole e medie imprese cinesi, a seguito della politica sui dazi dell'amministrazione Trump.

Ora, tutto questo però non ci deve far perdere di vista un'esigenza fondamentale. Nel mio paese, l'Italia, tutte le settimane arriva dalla Cina, nei pressi di Milano, a Rho, un treno che arriva pieno di merci e riparte vuoto. Voi volete un'Europa che si faccia ancora danneggiare dalla concorrenza cinese o volete un'Europa competitiva, come sostenete? E per competere bisogna collaborare, bisogna lavorare, certo con la prudenza indicata da Salvini, che dice che non vogliamo diventare noi, Italia, una colonia della Cina, e vogliamo tutelare il nostro paese dai rischi nei settori più delicati e difendere quindi gli interessi nazionali.

**Iuliu Winkler (PPE).** – Mr President, it was high time that the EU narrative in relation to China changed. This converges to the EPP Group's position, which I have recently expressed in the Committee on International Trade (INTA). Our calls to see concrete changes on the ground will intensify and I am glad to observe that the Commission also addresses much attention to trade-related aspects in this recently retitled communication. A robust trade policy is key to the future relationship with China.

The three main priorities of the EPP Group are already very well-known, but let me just reiterate them. We want improved conditions for European companies to better market access, we want concrete action to level the playing field on the Chinese market, especially concerning state-owned enterprises, and we highlight the importance of reciprocity in our trade and investment relations.

Concerning the upcoming EU-China summit, we urge the Commission to maintain its assertive position. Indeed, also at last year's summit the joint declaration included some clear promises which have yet to be met by our Chinese partners. So, our message to them is very clear: the time to act is now. China needs to start delivering on the promises it has made numerous times, especially on advancing the investment treaty negotiations while addressing the issues related to state-subsidised industries and technology transfers. We want to see a concrete change on the ground to benefit European businesses, European investors and all the citizens of the European Union.

**Nicola Danti (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Cina è sicuramente un partner strategico ma anche un grande *competitor*, ma troppo spesso non giochiamo ad armi pari. Il prossimo vertice Unione europea-Cina rappresenta una buona occasione per far fronte comune e dimostrare di avere una strategia che tuteli il tessuto produttivo europeo e miri a più reciprocità nell'accesso ai rispettivi mercati. Negli ultimi anni l'Unione europea si è dotata di meccanismi di difesa più efficaci, dall'*antidumping* allo *screening* sugli investimenti esteri, che aiutano le aziende europee ad operare in condizioni più eque.

Ma questo non basta. Questo è uno dei casi in cui è necessaria più Europa. Non possiamo tollerare che alcuni paesi europei siano conniventi con gli interessi cinesi non effettuando controlli doganali adeguati alle frontiere, spianando la strada all'ingresso di prodotti non sicuri nel nostro mercato. Né possiamo limitarci a concludere accordi nazionali, come ha fatto recentemente l'Italia, con un accordo che mette il cappio al collo al sistema manifatturiero italiano, o lasciare che l'interlocutore di Pechino sia il direttorio franco-tedesco.

*(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))*

**Tiziana Beghin (EFDD)**, domanda «cartellino blu». – Onorevole Danti, lei parla di approccio europeo. Le consiglio di dirlo al Lussemburgo del Presidente Juncker, che ci ha criticato duramente per aver siglato un memorandum, fatto salvo fare la stessa cosa esattamente il giorno successivo. E le direi di dirlo anche al Presidente Macron, che nasconde dietro al suo finto europeismo, in realtà, interessi nazionali, visto che negli stessi giorni in cui criticava l'Italia strappava trenta miliardi di affari con la Cina. Lo dica alla Cancelliera Merkel, che si reca in Germania più di tutti i leader europei, ma soprattutto lo dica al suo partito, visto che Gentiloni nel 2017 dichiarava a Pechino che l'Italia doveva essere leader nella Via della Seta.

**Nicola Danti (S&D)**, risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Grazie, onorevole Beghin. Io non so davvero come ringraziarla per questa domanda perché, vede, non ha ascoltato il mio intervento. Ho detto che ci vuole più Europa e non va bene nemmeno il direttorio franco-tedesco, ma quello che voi avete fatto, svendendo i porti italiani, svendendo la manifattura italiana e lasciando che chi tirerà il cappio al collo a questa saranno i cinesi, decideranno loro quando tirare il cappio al collo alla manifattura italiana. Voi avete aperto i nostri porti, noi abbiamo lavorato per avere una sorveglianza dei mercati più forte, per avere dogane più forti. Dov'è l'onorevole Beghin che faceva la battaglia contro la Cina dai nostri banchi? Vi siete venduti alla Cina, onorevole Beghin.

**Michał Marusik (ENF)**. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jeszcze kilka pokoleń wstecz wszystkie najbogatsze i najpotężniejsze państwa świata znajdowały się tutaj w Europie, bo kierowały się elementarnym rozsądkiem gospodarczym. Bardzo chętnie przyjmowały produkty z rejonów, gdzie produkcja i surowce były tanie. Europa była potężna i bogata.

Teraz Europa zdaje się chronić przed napływem taniej produkcji i wręcz popiera zwiększanie kosztów produkcji u nas. Wobec czego Unia Europejska jest tym kawałkiem świata, który rozwija się najwolniej, a Chiny należą do tych części świata, które rozwijają się najszybciej. I co ciekawe, Chińczykom wcale Europa do niczego potrzebna nie jest. Oni sobie bez nas poradzą. Naszym problemem w relacjach gospodarczych z Chinami nie jest zachowanie Chin tylko zachowanie Unii Europejskiej, która swoimi rozporządzeniami paraliżuje gospodarkę i zwiększa koszty produkcji w Europie. I to jest największe nieszczęście.

**Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D)**. – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, valoro positivamente la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre las relaciones entre la Unión Europea y China. No así las descafeinadas conclusiones del Consejo. Porque la Unión Europea necesita aumentar su influencia global y eso, sin duda alguna, requiere nuestra determinación y unidad de acción.

China ejerce su competencia desleal porque se le permite y se le ha permitido. Somos socios estratégicos, pero también competidores. Y competimos en el mismo tablero internacional con diferentes reglas. La Unión Europea no es proteccionista, pero tampoco puede ser ingenua.

Nuestras relaciones comerciales y de inversión tienen que basarse en la reciprocidad y debemos proteger nuestra economía de las distorsiones que ocasiona la política industrial china y de las restricciones que impone a nuestras empresas europeas. El nuevo Reglamento sobre el control de las inversiones tiene que implementarse con diligencia, y el nuevo instrumento de contratación pública internacional, ver la luz cuanto antes.

Pero también debemos profundizar nuestras relaciones con China, basadas en el diálogo y en la confianza mutua, y trabajar conjuntamente para combatir el cambio climático, la defensa del multilateralismo y la reforma de la OMC.

**Gilles Lebreton (ENF).** – Monsieur le Président, depuis vingt ans, la Chine s'est ouverte au commerce international. Son entrée à l'OMC en 2001 en témoigne: elle souhaite aujourd'hui renforcer ses relations commerciales avec l'Europe à travers la création d'une nouvelle route de la soie.

Il faut certes commercer avec la Chine, mais en restant prudent. Il faut s'assurer que cette route de la soie favorisera les flux dans les deux sens, et pas seulement de la Chine vers l'Europe. Il faut aussi résister à la stratégie chinoise qui consiste à nous imposer des transferts de technologie en échange de notre accès à son marché. Dans les négociations en cours menées par l'Union, nous devons enfin obtenir de la Chine qu'elle respecte nos indications géographiques protégées.

Mais, plus profondément, nous devons toujours nous souvenir que la Chine n'est pas un partenaire comme un autre. C'est un État totalitaire qui vient d'inscrire dans sa constitution un étrange hommage à la pensée du président Xi Jinping. C'est aussi un État communiste qui subventionne massivement ses sociétés nationales et qui rend ainsi quasi impossible la libre concurrence loyale que voudrait instituer l'Union.

**Aleksander Gabelic (S&D).** – Herr talman! Det är bra att vi sätter i gång en ordentlig diskussion om EU:s relationer med Kina och ökar pressen för en schysst handelsrelation. Det finns många utmaningar att ta tag i. Det är hög tid att EU och Kina kommer längre i samtalen om handel och investeringar. Vi måste inse vilken viktig aktör Kina är i omställningen till en grön ekonomi. Här måste EU finnas med och trycka på. Här måste våra företag på ett mycket bättre sätt få vara med och erbjuda smarta gröna lösningar. Vi ska inte besvara oschysst protektionism med mer protektionism.

Samtidigt ska vi inte vara naiva när det gäller investeringar som kan påverka vår egen säkerhet. Vi måste fortsätta trycka på i världshandelsorganisationen WTO för att Kina ska börja spela enligt reglerna och inse värdet av ett fungerande internationellt handelssystem. Det gynnar Kina och det gynnar oss alla. Vi måste få med oss Kina i strävan för FN:s globala mål. Vi måste samtidigt vara extremt tydliga med Kina när det gäller respekten för mänskliga rättigheter. Utmaningar är många och det är viktigt att EU-länderna i de här sammanhangen, när det gäller relationen mellan EU och Kina, talar med en samlad röst.

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Mr President ... *(the speaker spoke Chinese)* ... which in English means that the EU and China should be friends, should have cooperation.

With the recent signing by Italy of the One Belt, One Road Initiative, we've now got 11 EU Member States who have formal business relations with China outside the EU trade framework.

The One Belt and Road Initiative is China's reaction to the Bretton Woods system and in their quest for a historical relaunch Chinese are now winning strategic structures in the EU, but sincerely we cannot blame China for promoting its economic interests if we do not even have a truly European trade strategy towards it. Instead, we call it an economic competitor and a systemic rival, giving away our playing cards into the hands of Trump. As a result, EU countries will pay the bill of trade wars between China and the United States. Paradoxically, in order to resist the Chinese economic offensive on the EU, we must ease the tariff tensions we have with the United States of America. In the meantime, we also need to build a solid strategy towards China, especially in relations to subsidies and, of course, technology transfers.

#### Zgłoszenia z sali

**Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D).** – Mr President, trade and investment are one of the key pillars in EU-China relations. China is the EU's biggest source of imports and the second biggest export market. A healthy and balanced trade relation and fair access to Chinese markets are key interests of the Union. Although the EU currently has a trade deficit with China, we should see there are huge potentials and increasing opportunities in the Chinese market which could be further explored when China loosens its restrictions on market access for foreign companies, particularly in the financial services sector. We are pleased that the Chinese Government has made several commitments since 2018. I am much expecting its implementation.

The last point I want to mention is that the EU and China are both committed to multilateralism and free trade, even if we have different political and economic systems. EU-China collaboration on World Trade Organisation reform would be a good chance to put China on a level playing field and to promote its fair practices.

**Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL).** – Pane předsedající, německý ministr průmyslu Altmeier se nedávno dal slyšet, že hlavní konkurenti Německa a potažmo tedy i celé EU jsou USA a Čína.

Osobně se domnívám, že to má primárně dva důvody. Prvním je, že v těchto zemích výrazně působí jakožto investor stát. Např. v USA, se kterými chce většina EP uzavírat dohody o volném obchodu, se tak děje přes ministerstvo obrany a také politiku *America first*, která vedla k obchodní válce s EU. Druhým důvodem je, že nám v EU ujel kvůli politice škrťů vlak. Teď je již pozdě, bojíme se o naši technologickou a průmyslovou suverenitu.

Jak nedávno napsala česká ekonomka Ilona Švihlíková: „Ne, proškrtat se k prosperitě opravdu nejde.“ K prosperitě se jde jen chytře proinvestovat. To ovšem bez podpory státu a potažmo celé EU nejde a pravice politikou škrťů umožnila konkurenčním státům růst a teď se prostě díví. Jedinou cestou je nyní investování do reálného hospodářství a vytváření důstojných a bezpečných pracovních míst.

(Koniec zğłoszeń z sali)

**Jyrki Katainen, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, thank you very much for the very good debate. Even though there have been some differences in views, I would say that that we have a relatively unified position which is attitude-free. By saying this, I mean that it's not wise to have any particular negative attitude in our relationship with China; what is needed is an honest assessment of the current state of play. That's why our communication is based on the assumption that our future relationship with China must be based on fairness, multilateralism and reciprocity.

It's supposed to be very easy to defend by everyone. As I said before, and as everybody should know, China and the EU are strategic partners. We have cooperated, and will cooperate, and want to cooperate with China very closely on various foreign policy-related issues – and also in security-related issues – upholding and enhancing multilateralism on trade.

It's also worth acknowledging that Chinese companies are sometimes better than our companies. They can compete with our companies even without state subsidies. But it's equally important to acknowledge that this is not always the case. We have to make sure that Europe can improve its competitiveness, as China will be a major player in the global economy in the coming years, and we have to make sure that our economies can develop so that we can compete on an equal footing when there is a level playing field. Even without China, we have to improve our competitiveness when it comes to innovations and other dimensions of competitiveness.

China wants to be seen as a developing country. To a certain extent, it is a developing country. When looking at the number of poor people or at democracy or other dimensions of the society, there are features which we can acknowledge as features of a developing country. But, at the same time, it's fair to say – and honest to say – that China is a military superpower, it's a political superpower, it's a technology leader, and it's a market leader in some areas. That's why we have to treat China as a normal competitor and strategic partner and cooperating partner. There's nothing bad and unfair about expecting reciprocity. Strategic partners are supposed to provide and base their cooperation on a reciprocal way to cooperate.

Multilateralism and rules-based systems are very often mentioned by Chinese leaders, and when I have had a chance to cooperate with many Chinese authorities and leaders, I generally believe that they believe that multilateralism is a good basis for international cooperation. Having said this, it's also honest to acknowledge that sometimes China is using multilateralism and a rules-based world order rather selectively. Again, we as strategic cooperating partners must agree that multilateralism means multilateralism, a rules-based system means a rules-based system, and we have to make sure that reciprocity is respected.

Our relationship with China is very active, and we are willing to deepen this relationship in various fields. But, at the same time, whilst technology, the market and China have developed positively, there are new challenges in our relationship and we want to solve those challenges. We have not chosen the same way as the United States to deal with China. We want to be constructive but fair, and expect reciprocity.

**Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, this has been a useful debate and I would like to thank you for the Parliament's continuous engagement and interest in this topic.

To conclude, China brings immense opportunities but also important challenges for the EU. Addressing this, we require a long-term engagement, both bilaterally and multilaterally. Without losing sight of the areas of positive cooperation, it is clear that we need to reflect on how to engage China to undertake market reforms, how to ensure a level playing field, and how to tackle systemic challenges linked to the WTO reform process. Also, it is of utmost importance that our cooperation with China is based on agreed principles and that it fully respects EU values. This is why human rights are one of the issues to be addressed in our forthcoming summit with China. Finally, maintaining EU unity both the within the EU institutions and among the Member States is of crucial importance. Speaking with one voice is the only way that we can respond successfully to the challenges that trade relations with China present while seizing the opportunities that China provides.

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

*Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)*

**Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit.** – Après des années de déficit commercial record, de stratégies prédatrices et de dumping massif, l'Union européenne feint d'avoir pris conscience que les relations économiques avec l'Empire du Milieu n'étaient pas «gagnant-gagnant.» Du reste, le déséquilibre semble être leur marque de fabrique. Dans bien des secteurs, par exemple dans celui du bois, l'Empire du Milieu se montre souvent avide de matières premières pour déverser ensuite sur nos marchés ouverts aux quatre vents des produits finis bon marché. Las, les mauvaises nouvelles se succèdent. En l'espace de quelques jours, ma terre natale de Lorraine a ainsi reçu deux coups de massue — l'arrêt de la production de Smart à Hambach et la probable prise de participation de 60 % du Chinois XinXing dans l'entreprise historique de canalisation, Saint-Gobain PAM. Cette dernière affaire souligne avec acuité les implications du commerce avec la Chine, que le Président américain avait eu le courage de dénoncer, en ce qui concerne les transferts de technologies, de propriété intellectuelle et de savoir-faire. Alors que la France est d'ores et déjà l'État membre le plus désindustrialisé, le dépeçage d'un autre de nos fleurons s'accompagnera inmanquablement d'une perte de souveraineté industrielle.

**Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto.** – Per l'Unione europea la partnership con la Cina è di fondamentale importanza, ma va chiarito in modo netto, che il gigante asiatico è anche un avversario economico. Ogni forma di collaborazione deve essere portata avanti collettivamente. Non capisco, ad esempio, la scelta che ha fatto l'Italia di distanziarsi dai partner europei lo scorso mese, astenendosi sulla proposta di introdurre uno strumento di controllo degli investimenti esteri diretti (IED). Il governo italiano è stato l'unico a non votare a favore di questa proposta chiave, in particolare considerando il fatto che gli investimenti dalla Cina sono aumentati di sei volte negli ultimi 20 anni e sono rivolti, ultimamente, ai settori ad alta tecnologia e spesso attraverso società di proprietà dello Stato. Gli Stati membri stanno cercando di intrattenere rapporti più equi con la Cina tramite l'UE, ma Pechino, da parte sua, vuole trattare individualmente con ogni singolo paese per accrescere più facilmente la propria influenza. Basti pensare all'iniziativa cinese denominata 16+1, che conta solo 11 Stati membri, divisiva per l'UE. Serve più Europa nelle relazioni internazionali e tutti gli Stati membri devono assumersi la responsabilità di agire uniti nei confronti di Pechino.

## **18. Ustanowienie programu „Cła” na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie ceł – Ustanowienie instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej (debata)**

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku obrad jest wspólna debata nad:

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Marię Grapini w imieniu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego program „Cła” na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie ceł (COM(2018)0442 - C8-0261/2018 - 2018/0232(COD)) (A8-0464/2018)

oraz

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Jiříego Pospíšila w imieniu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego, w ramach Funduszu Zintegrowanego Zarządzania Granicami, instrument wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej (COM(2018)0474 - C8-0273/2018 - 2018/0258(COD)) (A8-0460/2018).

**Maria Grapini**, *Rapporteur*. – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, doamnă ministru, uniunea vamală este un factor semnificativ de integrare, și nu de un an, doi – de zeci de ani. Acesta este printre puținele domenii care țin de competența exclusivă a Uniunii Europene, fără de care eliminarea frontierelor interne nu ar fi posibilă. Uniunea Europeană este cea mai mare piață comercială din lume și deține o cotă de 15 % din totalul schimburilor comerciale din lume. Iată de ce este important să avem o uniune vamală și să avem acest regulament. Competența exclusivă a Uniunii Europene atrage și responsabilitate, în aceeași măsură. De aceea, consider că regulamentul privind instituirea programului „Vamă” pentru cooperare în domeniul vamal este foarte important. În calitate de raportor, împreună cu raportorii din umbră, am încercat să îmbunătățesc propunerea Comisiei. Doresc să mulțumesc și Comisiei pentru disponibilitatea de a discuta această propunere de regulament și vreau să reamintesc că acest regulament a pornit de la ideea că autoritățile vamale au un rol deosebit pentru că contribuie la protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii și ale statelor membre, la existența unei competiții loiale, corecte, în piața internă, în raport cu competitorii din țările terțe. De asemenea, asigură protecția consumatorilor, protejează populația împotriva amenințărilor teroriste, sanitare. De aceea, autoritățile vamale joacă un rol deosebit în asigurarea integrității lanțurilor de aprovizionare. Viitorul sistem de control al importurilor ICS2 pentru gestionarea riscurilor vamale va contribui în mod decisiv la securitatea Uniunii și a cetățenilor, dar și a întreprinderilor. Avem din 2016 un Cod vamal nou, dar din păcate știm că nu a reușit să elimine total procedurile pe suport de hârtie în toate statele membre. De aceea, este nevoie să avem un buget suficient pentru programul „Vamă” și să nu mai amânăm implementarea. Regret că nu a avut loc dialogul în acest mandat, deși s-ar fi putut desfășura, din punctul meu de vedere, și regret că rămâne incertitudinea bugetului, nefiind încă adoptat noul Cadru financiar 2021-2027. Doresc să mulțumesc colegilor raportori din umbră și membrilor Comisiei IMCO pentru sprijin și vreau să atrag atenția Comisiei, Consiliului, că Regulamentul „Vamă” nu trebuie subfinanțat, deoarece, așa cum am arătat la începutul intervenției mele, autoritățile vamale au un rol multiplu, cu impact major asupra funcționării pieței interne. Pentru a se asigura o eficiență maximă, Comisia ar trebui să coordoneze punerea în practică a programului „Vamă” cu alte programe ale Uniunii, așa cum ar fi programul Fiscalis, programul Uniunii Europene de luptă anti-fraudă, programul privind piața unică, programul de securitate internă și fondul de gestiune integrată a frontierelor. Ar trebui să ne asigurăm că posibilul Brexit, încă nu știm dacă va fi, nu afectează aplicarea prezentului regulament. Ar trebui, de asemenea, să ne asigurăm că prin acest regulament controalele stricte de la frontieră, prin utilizarea de către toate statele membre a unor programe informatice, pot să îmbunătățească situația actuală. Reamintesc Comisiei că, la 4 octombrie 2018, Parlamentul European a adoptat o rezoluție referitoare la combaterea fraudei vamale și protejarea resurselor proprii. Consider că este necesar să se țină seama de concluziile acestei rezoluții în punerea în practică a programului „Vamă”. Până la urmă, funcționarea pieței interne depinde foarte mult de funcționarea uniunii vamale, de funcționarea programului „Vamă”. Sper, doamnă Comisar, că veți ține cont de recomandări și sper ca programul „Vamă” să fie totuși votat în acest mandat.

**Jiří Pospíšil**, *zpravodaj*. – Pane předsedající, já navází na to, co říkala ctěná kolegyně Grapiniová. Ano, opravdu dnes projednáváme mimořádně důležitou zprávu, která se vztahuje k vytvoření nového finančního nástroje, skrze který by bylo možno financovat vybavení jednotlivých celních úřadů, a tím posílit reálné základy celní unie. Zkrátka a dobře dnes na vnějších hranicích EU funguje přes 2 000 celních úřadů, přičemž jejich vybavenost je velmi rozdílná, a od toho se také odvíjí potom kvalita kontroly, které tyto úřady vykonávají.

Tento finanční nástroj, který by se vztahoval, jak bylo řečeno, na další finanční období 2021 až 2027, tedy má v úmyslu přispět k tomu, že by do budoucna došlo ke standardizaci vybavení celních úřadů a tak také k tomu, že kontrola, která se provádí na různých místech vnější hranice, bude stejná, bude jaksí stejně podrobná a zaručí také rychlou kontrolu, která nebude narušovat přechod zboží přes hranici. Tedy nebude narušovat mezinárodní obchod, který na vnější hranici probíhá.



Tento nástroj, který vypadá zcela logicky ve chvíli, kdy máme celní unii, že to tedy je otázka evropská, nikoli pouze otázka národních států, tak je třeba říci, že tento návrh vzešel přímo z iniciativy členských států, a to členských států, které právě kontrolují vnější hranici. Je však třeba uvést, že samotný návrh nařízení počítá s tím, že finanční prostředky by čerpaly nejen státy na vnější hranici, ale i všechny státy, které zkrátka realizují kontrolu zboží, které vstupuje do EU.

Já to tedy jako zpravodaj, musím říci, velmi vítám. Pokud by tento nástroj přišel a byl schválen a byl prosazen, pak jsem přesvědčen, že odstraníme nerovnováhu, která dnes v jednotlivých celních kontrolách probíhá, a jedinou šancí právě je ono podobné vybavení a metodologie kontrol, které na celních úřadech probíhají.

Je třeba říci, že Komise v návrhu pro vybavení celnic zamýšlí částku 1,3 miliardy EUR, což je na první pohled částka vysoká, ale když si uvědomíme, že třeba takový scanner stojí kolem 4 milionů EUR, jedno takovéto zařízení, a když si uvědomíme, že se jedná o víceletý finanční rámec, pak ta částka samotná tak vysoká není. My jsme o tomto vedli podrobnou debatu na výboru IMCO a naše poselství je tuto částku nesnižovat a naopak se v budoucnu snažit tuto částku navýšit.

Jak již bylo řečeno kolegyní Grapiniovou, tak neproběhl v rámci prvního čtení klasický dialog a nedošlo k politické dohodě, a to hlavně z toho důvodu, že současné předsednictví není oprávněno vyjednávat konkrétní podobu finančního rámce na roky 2021 až 2027. Marná sláva, základem politické dohody nad tímto finančním nástrojem je vědět, jak velká částka se tedy bude přerozdělovat. Pokud toto nevíme, pak nejsme schopni uzavřít politickou dohodu v rámci prvního čtení.

To bylo stanovisko většiny zástupců politických frakcí ve výboru IMCO, já jsem se nakonec také přiklonil k tomuto stanovisku a tím pádem zde není uzavřena politická dohoda v rámci dialogu. Ve chvíli, kdy na podzim bude jasné, jaká částka je určena na tento program, bude možné dokončit projednávání celého nařízení a pokročit ke konečnému stádiu. Prospěšnost je jasná, ale je třeba vědět, jaké peníze na tento program budou určeny.

**Ivan Štefanec**, *Spravodajca Výboru pre rozpočet požiadaného o stanovisko*. – Ďakujem pekne pán predsedajúci, návrh nariadenia, ktorým sa ustanovuje program pre spoluprácu v colnej oblasti, nahrádza súčasnú colnú stratégiu 2020.

Cieľom tohto návrhu je poskytnúť finančné prostriedky na podporu projektov s cieľom modernizovať a zlepšiť fungovanie colnej únie. Okrem toho sa zlepši aj spolupráca medzi colnými orgánmi zúčastnených krajín, konkrétne pri podpore prípravy a jednotného vykonávania colných právnych predpisov a politiky, ako aj podpora colnej spolupráce a budovania administratívnych kapacít vrátane vzdelávania a rozvoja ľudského kapitálu, ako i fungovanie európskych elektronických systémov. Colná spolupráca bude fungovať na základe budovania kapacít v týchto dvoch oblastiach: po prvé, networking a projekty zamerané na budovanie kompetencie vrátane výmeny osvedčených postupov a poznatkov, a po druhé, projekty na budovanie kapacít v oblasti informačných technológií budú financovať novú infraštruktúru a systémy.

Teší ma, že Európsky parlament dokázal vo výbore dosiahnuť dohodu, pretože modernizované colné predpisy prispievajú k posilneniu hospodárskej činnosti a rastu prostredníctvom posilnenia konkurencieschopnosti nášho priemyslu, ako aj zabezpečením vyššej ochrany pre spotrebiteľov.

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am pleased to participate in this debate today on the two customs proposals: the customs programme and the new customs control equipment instrument. I am replacing Commissioner Moscovici, who was not able to join us for the debate, so please accept his apologies. On his behalf, I would like to thank the two rapporteurs, Ms Grapini and Mr Pospíšil, for their outstanding work on these files.

The Customs Union celebrated its 50th anniversary last year. It is the foundation of our single market in which goods can circulate freely. Customs help to safeguard the financial interests of the Union and its Member States while protecting them against terrorism, health, environmental and other threats. This can only be achieved through a deep and operational cooperation between the national customs authorities. These authorities are constantly faced with new challenges arising from rapidly changing technologies, increasing volumes of trade, and persistent transnational crime and security threats.

We are here today to discuss the two Commission customs proposals that will support customs authorities to answer these challenges. These programmes represent the main EU instruments to achieve the objectives of the Customs Union. The proposed customs programme is indispensable for the work of the customs authorities. It supports their cooperation, capacity-building, networking and modernisation via information technology development.

The programme is the natural continuation of the existing Customs 2020 programme and its predecessors which have proven their added value and have been highly appreciated by Member States. The proposal for a customs control equipment instrument is a brand new initiative. It addresses the long-standing calls of the Member States for support to finance adequate and modern soft detection equipment to control goods crossing the EU's external borders. It also aims to improve and harmonise the quality of customs controls throughout the EU and contributes as such to the different customs services functioning as one entity.

We should not forget that the Customs Union is as strong as its weakest entry point. The Commission therefore welcomes the support of Parliament for the two proposals and is grateful for the quality of the reports that offer numerous constructive and valuable adaptations to its text.

We are pleased that Parliament quickly took action following the adoption of the negotiation mandate of the two co-legislators at the beginning of the year and that intensive and constructive work between the three institutions took place.

We regret that these efforts were not able to materialise in an agreement despite the significant progress made and, while an agreement was within reach, the negotiations could not be finalised. Today's joint debate gives us an opportunity to have further discussion and hopefully ensure that we will equip the European Union with the programmes of the highest quality. I'm looking forward to the debate.

**Arndt Kohn**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich freue mich, dass die Kommission einen Fonds zur Finanzierung von Zollkontrollausrüstung vorgeschlagen hat, und bedanke mich beim Berichterstatter und den anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen für die gute Zusammenarbeit.

Wieso brauchen wir das Geld für Zollkontrollausrüstung? Wir leben in Zeiten ansteigenden weltweiten Warenhandels. Immer neue Handelsabkommen mit Drittländern erhöhen das Warenaufkommen an den EU-Außengrenzen, unseren See- und Flughäfen sowie Postverteilzentren. Dazu kommen zum Beispiel in Deutschland immer neue fiskalische Aufgaben. Kurz: Die Arbeit der Zollbeamtinnen und -beamten wird nicht weniger.

Zurzeit sind jedoch die Zollstellen nicht gut ausgestattet, weder mit ausreichendem Personal noch mit Scannern und anderem technischen Gerät, um wirkungsvolle Zollkontrollen auszuführen. Das wissen auch viele Kriminelle innerhalb und außerhalb Europas, die sich immer wieder erfolgreich auf die Suche nach Schlupflöchern machen. Hierdurch kommen illegale Waren in die EU, den öffentlichen Haushalten entgehen eine Menge Einnahmen, Produktpiraterie blüht an vielen Orten, und dem Drogenhandel werden viel zu viele Möglichkeiten geboten. Dabei kann es doch nicht sein, dass wir gut funktionierende Ausrüstung für Zollbeamte nicht in die Realität umsetzen und das in Europa immer noch Mangelware ist.

In der Parlamentsposition legen wir heute in der ersten Lesung fest, dass das langfristige Ziel sein sollte, alle Zollkontrollen in der EU zu standardisieren, um genau diese Schlupflöcher zu stopfen. Der Rat hat sich leider sehr zurückhaltend verhalten. Dabei muss den Mitgliedstaaten doch klar sein, dass die Zollunion nur effektiv funktionieren kann, wenn alle mit standardisierten Zollkontrollen ihre jeweiligen Ressourcen effektiver nutzen.

Ein weiteres wichtiges Thema ist Cybersicherheit. Auf Initiative des Parlaments wird nun auch bei den anderen Institutionen die Dringlichkeit dieses Themas erkannt. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen sicherstellen, dass es vollste Kontrolle über die generierten Daten der gekauften Geräte gibt und mögliche Hackerangriffe auf diese hochsensiblen Prozesse um jeden Preis vermieden werden. Wir dürfen nicht zulassen, dass durch preisgünstige Geräte zweifelhafter Herkunft unberechtigte Personen, Firmen oder Staaten Zugang zu sensiblen Daten bekommen. Daher legen wir als Parlament fest, dass die Ausrüstung Standards für Cybersicherheit unbedingt einhalten muss.

Ich bin mir sicher, dass in der nächsten Wahlperiode an unserem Text sehr gut weitergearbeitet werden kann. Und ich hoffe, dass es zügig zu einem Ergebnis kommt, damit der Zoll so schnell wie möglich davon profitieren kann.

**Jasenko Selimovic**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the importance of a seamless and problem-free Customs Union cannot be overestimated. To achieve it, we need to strengthen and deepen cross-border cooperation in the countries. As the volumes of customs are increasing the burden, it is necessary to have cooperation and the burden of that cooperation has to be eased and eradicated. Without it, we will never achieve our ambition of a Customs Union free from both physical and practical obstacles.

Therefore, I welcome these efforts to improve cooperation, both in terms of money and equipment. By modernising custom procedures, we will make sure that goods can flow more freely and efficiently, achieving more efficient trading with the rest of the world and throughout the Union, and bringing benefits to our citizens and consumers through cheaper and safer goods.

Given the importance of this file, it is regrettable that the Council did not manage to bring this file to the end. This forced us to seek to conclude the first reading and secure our position in a future negotiation. But, despite this setback, I believe that the progress we made set us on a good path to achieve our aim of a seamless Customs Union that brings benefits to European citizens, businesses and consumers. It is great step forward, ensuring that European goods continue to circulate even more freely and, through that, increase growth and enrich our societies.

**Mylène Troszczynski**, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, sécuriser les frontières extérieures afin de sauvegarder les intérêts financiers et économiques de l'Union européenne, voilà qui devrait mettre tout le monde d'accord. Malheureusement, le ver est dans le fruit: le logiciel idéologique de la machine compromet une protection efficace des citoyens.

Premièrement, l'union douanière ne garantit pas les protections élémentaires en son sein même. Les disparités économiques et sociales sont tellement importantes dans le marché unique qu'il est inutile de protéger l'union douanière d'une distorsion de concurrence venant de l'extérieur, alors qu'elle existe déjà à l'intérieur.

Deuxièmement, cet objectif est l'objectif intrinsèque de l'union douanière depuis sa création: nous en connaissons les résultats et le bilan, largement insuffisants.

Une volonté politique sincère, ainsi qu'un évident pragmatisme économique, font largement défaut pour conduire les destinées des nations européennes livrées aux quatre vents de la mondialisation. Je soutiendrai ce texte avec mon groupe mais, à l'heure de la signature d'accords de libre-échange avec la terre entière, je demeure sans illusion aucune quant à la capacité de l'Union européenne à protéger ses administrés.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI)**. – Panie Przewodniczący! Przyznam, że nie bardzo potrafię zrozumieć logikę, jaką się Państwo kierujecie, bo albo cła są czymś dobrym, w takim razie należałoby je stosować również między naszymi krajami, a nawet wewnątrz krajów (no co by to szkodziło, nigdy za wiele dobrego), albo cła są czymś złym i szkodliwym, ale w takim razie są tak samo szkodliwe między Polską i Niemcami, jak między Polską a Ukrainą na przykład. Jeśli te zaostrzone kontrole będą bardziej skuteczne, no po prostu obywatele zapłacą drożej za towary, będziemy mieli mniejszą wymianę handlową, mniejszą konkurencję i wyższe ceny. I to wszystko po to, żebyście Wy mieli więcej pieniędzy na zmarnowanie w kolejnych, najczęściej bezsensownych niestety, projektach. Zresztą część tych pieniędzy wydamy od razu właśnie na ten sprzęt do kontroli celnej, o którym tutaj dyskutujemy. Jedna skuteczna kontrola celna, która wykryje jakieś nieprawidłowości – o tym nie możemy zapominać – oznacza wiele jałowych kontroli, podczas których niczego się nie wykrywa, tylko obywatele tracą czas w bezsensownych kolejkach, tylko dlatego że rząd w bagażnikach samochodów poszukuje dodatkowych paczek papierosów, które może opodatkować.

**PREȘEDINȚIA: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU***Vicepreședinte*

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to congratulate again the two rapporteurs on these two files and thank all the Members of the European Parliament for their participation in this debate.

The Commission greatly appreciates the excellent work of the European Parliament and both rapporteurs, who have been very constructive in the discussion so far. The Commission fully shares the view of the European Parliament and its calls aimed at further integrating the work of the different customs authorities, allowing them to function as one entity. The proposals for more convergence of controls can only support an increased overall performance of EU customs. Based on the debate, I do not see major blocking points. I am sure that our experts will easily find common ground and that solutions will be found with the appropriate wording.

Let me conclude by expressing my firm belief that the progress achieved in the negotiations so far and the exchanges in plenary today will be used as a platform to reach an agreement for the benefit of European citizens, businesses and customs administrations. The Commission is very positive about the vote in plenary tomorrow and we remain convinced that, together, we will manage to address the limited number of outstanding issues once negotiations resume.

**Maria Grapini**, *Rapporteur*. – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, în încheiere aș vrea să spun doar atât: spre deosebire de alte regulamente, aici, așa cum am spus în introducerea mea, responsabilitatea este foarte mare, și a Uniunii Europene, și a Comisiei. De aceea, în dispozițiile specifice din acest regulament prevedem atribuții pentru Comisie, în ceea ce privește dezvoltarea și operarea componentelor comune, coordonarea la nivelul Uniunii. Vreau să subliniez că este important, mai ales că, referitor la ce spunea colega mea, la modul în care protejează cetățenii, evident că, dacă avem un control vamal, avem o protecție a cetățenilor din punct de vedere al siguranței alimentare, al siguranței produselor, al traficului de droguri, al traficului de persoane, al terorismului și așa mai departe. Iar, pentru colegul care nu înțelegea cum funcționează, nu vorbim de frontiere interne. Tocmai spuneam că, de cincizeci de ani, de când funcționează uniunea vamală, am putut să desființăm frontierele. Vorbim aici de control la frontierele Uniunii Europene în raport cu țări terțe. Despre asta este vorba și sper să reușim, chiar dacă nu am putut să facem trilogul, sper să reușim să ducem la bun sfârșit procesul, pentru că, așa cum spuneam, funcționarea pieței interne și toate celelalte lucruri sunt foarte importante și dependente de modul de funcționare al uniunii vamale, al acestor rapoarte și e important să avem informația la timp, să avem proceduri comune de control, să avem informatizare, evident, pentru că și debirocratizarea și timpul în care se efectuează controlul sunt foarte importante. Mulțumesc și să sperăm că vom avea două regulamente foarte bune.

**Jiří Pospíšil**, *zpravodaj*. – Pane předsedající, já navází na to, co říkala ctěná zpravodajka, co říkala i paní komisařka. Ta debata, která zde proběhla, jasně ukázala, že je všeobecná shoda klíčových politických frakcí zastoupených zde v - Parlamentu, abychom určili finanční prostředky na nákup zařízení a lepší vybavenost celních úřadů na vnějších hranicích. To je základní věc. To, že neproběhl samotný dialog a není konečný závěr, mě také mrzí, na druhou stranu jedná se o finanční rámec od roku 2021 a není žádný problém, aby na podzim nový Parlament dokončil vyjednávání, které jsme takto připravili, a víceméně od roku 2021 zde byla částka určena pro vybavení celních úřadů.

Opakuji to, co je důležité, nejen rychlost, ale i to, aby na konci byla smysluplná částka, aby se částka určená pro technické vybavení zařízením, která je nyní předpokládána ve výši 1,3 miliardy EUR, nesnižovala, protože je už teď zjevné, že ten zájem jednotlivých členských států bude asi vyšší, než je určená částka, a pokud bychom tuto částku výrazně snižovali, pak by se jednalo spíše o symbolickou podporu, nikoliv o reálnou snahu zajistit jednotnou efektivní kontrolu zboží, které vstupuje ze třetích zemí na území EU.

Opět opakují, my budujeme celní unii uvnitř EU, budujeme Schengen, ale to nás nemůže vést k tomu, abychom nebyli ostražiti při kontrole vnější hranice, abychom nebyli ostražiti, jaké zboží vstupuje na území EU, protože to není pouze o clech, jak zde hovořil kolega, ale je to právě i o ochraně zdraví, života a práv občanů EU, práv spotřebitelů, kteří mají vědět, jaké zboží ze třetích zemí je na našem trhu prodáváno, jaké zboží sem vstupuje, a měli bychom my zajistit, aby to zboží bylo bezpečné a kvalitní. Tedy i ten návrh je jasně o zájmech Evropanů.

**Președintele.** – Dezbateră a fost încheiată.

Votul va avea loc în următoarea perioadă de sesiune.

*Declarații scrise (articolul 162)*

**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), na písmie.** – Aby skutecznie realizować priorytety Unii Europejskiej, wieloletnie ramy finansowe (WRF) muszą zarówno tworzyć nowe instrumenty, jak i modernizować istniejące już mechanizmy. Mając to na uwadze, Komisja Europejska zaproponowała utworzenie nowych programów w oparciu o wcześniejsze wnioski państw członkowskich bazujące na ich potrzebach w zakresie lepszego zarządzania granicami zewnętrznymi i wewnętrznymi.

W maju 2018 r. Komisja Europejska przyjęła pakiet dotyczący WRF na lata 2021-2027, w którym zaproponowała nowy Fundusz Zintegrowanego Zarządzania Granicami (FZZG), składający się z instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz zarządzania granicami i wiz oraz instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej. Instrument wsparcia na rzecz sprzętu kontroli celnej ma na celu wzmocnienie kontroli towarów wwożonych i wywożonych z UE dzięki zapewnieniu środków finansowych na zakup, utrzymanie i modernizację sprzętu do kontroli celnej (skanery, systemy automatycznej identyfikacji numerów rejestracyjnych, laboratoria przenośne do analizy próbek).

Zgadzam się z opinią sprawozdawcy, że istnieje konieczność wyjaśnienia kwestii wykorzystywania sprzętu służącego do kontroli celnej przez inne podmioty, do dodatkowych celów, tak aby nie było nadużyć, utrudniających realizację celów instrumentu.

## 19. Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem infrastruktury drogowej (deбата)

**Președintele.** – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul Danielei Aiuto, în numele Comisiei pentru transport și turism, referitor la propunerea de directivă a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului de modificare a Directivei 2008/96/CE privind gestionarea siguranței infrastructurii rutiere (COM(2018)0274 – C8-0196/2018— 2018/0129(COD)) (A8-0008/2019).

**Daniela Aiuto, relatrice.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, come tutti sapete, nel febbraio di quest'anno la Commissione europea ha proposto una revisione della direttiva 2008/96/CE sulla gestione della sicurezza delle infrastrutture stradali, relativamente alla quale ho assunto il felice ruolo di relatrice, specialmente considerando il fatto che questo *file* mi sta particolarmente a cuore, come deputato e come madre. Ed è proprio da questo punto di vista che intendo partire.

Secondo un'inchiesta effettuata da ANSA Europa, negli ultimi dieci anni sono deceduti oltre 8 000 bambini in incidenti stradali gravi. Una cifra enorme che mi rattrista immensamente e che si colloca all'interno di un insieme molto più ampio, composto da oltre 25 000 decessi annui all'interno dell'Unione.

Questa direttiva prevede tutta una serie di obiettivi specifici per cercare di ridurre il più possibile queste importanti cifre, nello spirito di voler migliorare la sicurezza delle infrastrutture stradali nell'Unione, anche attraverso una migliore gestione da parte degli Stati membri, rendendo più efficace l'applicazione della legislazione per raggiungere l'obiettivo di zero vittime nell'Unione europea entro il 2050, la cosiddetta «*Vision Zero*», come appunto proposto dalla Commissione. Tale revisione è concepita come uno dei punti focali che permetteranno il raggiungimento di tale obiettivo, unitamente ad altri elementi, quali il miglioramento dell'interazione delle principali infrastrutture europee con i mezzi tecnologicamente interconnessi e la protezione degli utenti vulnerabili.

In sostanza, stiamo parlando di una proposta legislativa di estrema importanza che si articola in diversi elementi, tutti essenziali, su cui sono molto orgogliosa di aver potuto lavorare con il Consiglio, che vorrei ringraziare nuovamente per lo spirito di collaborazione dimostrato durante le negoziazioni. L'elemento principale da ricordare e da tenere sempre a mente è il fatto che la precedente direttiva si applicava solamente alle strade che fanno parte della rete TEN-T, siano esse in fase di pianificazione, di progettazione, in costruzione o già aperte al traffico. Al contrario, la nuova revisione prende in considerazione tutte le autostrade e le strade primarie, non solo quelle facenti parte della rete TEN-T, e questo porterà ad un drastico calo degli incidenti stradali mortali o con feriti gravi.

Molte delle iniziative proposte da questa direttiva rimandano al progresso tecnologico relativo alla mobilità che siamo in procinto di vivere proprio in questo momento storico, specialmente per quanto riguarda le vetture di nuova generazione equipaggiate con sistemi di assistenza alla guida sempre più avanzati. Quindi ricordiamoci che, per supportare questo aspetto e favorire la prevenzione necessaria alla riduzione drastica degli incidenti, è necessario lavorare per avere strade sempre più intelligenti e interconnesse con tali veicoli. Infatti, per esempio, gli Stati membri dovranno prestare particolare attenzione alla leggibilità e riconoscibilità della segnaletica, sia per i guidatori che per i sistemi automatici di assistenza alla guida. Tutto ciò sulla base di specifiche comuni a livello europeo.

Poiché in questo Parlamento è nostro dovere tutelare tutti i cittadini, ci siamo assicurati anche che negli Stati membri si debbano prendere in considerazione le necessità degli utenti vulnerabili della strada – quindi parlo di pedoni, ciclisti e motociclisti – durante l'implementazione delle procedure indicate all'interno della direttiva. Sempre nello stesso spirito, abbiamo ottenuto la possibilità per i cittadini di presentare una reportistica volontaria delle problematiche che identificano a livello stradale, favorendo così l'interazione fra l'infrastruttura stessa e chi ne usufruisce.

Finalmente possiamo affermare che è stato compiuto un altro fondamentale passo in favore di una migliore sicurezza degli utenti della strada, anche se resto sempre cosciente del fatto che questa direttiva non sia nient'altro che un tassello, parte di un disegno più ampio, che include la prevenzione e una diversa cultura della sicurezza. Sono sicura che questo percorso porterà ai risultati previsti nei tempi designati, evitando che singole persone o famiglie soffrano perdite dei propri cari dovute a incidenti stradali, eventi tanto tragici quanto evitabili se affrontati preventivamente e nel modo più corretto.

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, we are all concerned by road safety, as road users, parents, friends. There are way too many people losing their lives on our roads. That's a fact. It is of little comfort to know that we are by far the safest area in the world, because none of us want to be part of the statistics.

The safety and quality of road infrastructure contribute significantly to accidents and fatalities, and its contributing factor is over 30%. This is why I am very glad that we are, together, taking concrete measures to address the road safety situation in Europe. I can say that we are finally walking the talk in a very systemic way.

With a preliminary agreement reached on 21 February on the revised directive on road infrastructure safety, we have made a very substantial step forward to improve safety on European roads. Safe infrastructure is one of the three key pillars of our safe system approach, in addition to safe vehicles and safe road use, our behaviour. I would therefore like to use this opportunity to thank you all for the excellent cooperation and your continued support throughout this process. I thank in particular the rapporteur, Ms Aiuto, and all the shadow rapporteurs. They were very constructive in this process and strived for an ambitious result. I am proud of the result and I think you can all be as well. With the text as it stands now, we will deliver concrete measures that will, without any doubt, be a major improvement compared to the current road safety situation and, what really counts at the end, we will save lives.

How? First, thanks to the wider scope of the application, more roads will be covered, as already mentioned by the rapporteur. So far our rules covered only Ten-T motorways, which are, by definition, the safest roads accounting for only 8% of fatalities. With the new text we agreed to target specifically primary roads where we are recording 39% of fatalities. Here I have in mind, especially national roads with really heavy traffic.

Second, we are also moving towards a more proactive approach to road safety with a network-wide assessment. What does this mean? It means that the European road network should be assessed proactively and the stress is on proactive activities to identify potential risk sections, for example, black spots on our roads, and ensure appropriate follow-up. We don't want to wait for accidents to happen. This will help us to detect potential danger and act before people become part of statistics. Network-wide safety assessment will also bring transparency and will focus investment on where the returns are the greatest. In other words, this will be used as a criteria for investment.

Last, but not least, special attention will be paid to vulnerable road users like motorcyclists and cyclists, for example, by focusing on visible markings, dedicated bike lanes and similar.

We have laid the basis for making our road infrastructure fit for purpose, for accommodating new driver assisted technologies and, later on, for autonomous mobility. There, the Commission will work with Member States' experts to prepare common specifications for road markings and signs.

That brings me to the point where I want to make a link with the General Safety Regulation, the second important proposal from the Third Mobility Package. I am glad that our negotiations managed to reach a preliminary agreement last week, on which I want to congratulate you as well – 15 new features in vehicles of all price ranges in order to improve the safety of our citizens. This is something very concrete and deliverable for our citizens and ourselves as well.

Indeed, the Infrastructure Directive and the General Safety Regulation are two sides of the same coin, as the latter can only unfold its full potential and its benefits if the road infrastructure is ready to accommodate those new technologies that vehicles will have on board in the future. Altogether, we expect these two sets of rules to save about 10 500 lives in the period between 2020 to 2030 and also around 60 000 serious injuries. This is what we're here for, and this is why it's worth cooperating in order to deliver on this very clear result.

It will therefore be of the essence that the new provisions of the Road Infrastructure Safety Management Directive can be implemented as swiftly as possible so that the revised legislation delivers its benefits quickly. This is why I am counting on you to ensure the adoption of the text as previously agreed at the trilogue on 21 February. I understand that any changes resulting from the linguistic review that will be carried out over the summer will need to be formally endorsed by the European Parliament, hopefully as early as September. In this way, we expect the directive to be published and to enter into force by October of this year. This would be great news for our citizens and the Commission will do its part in the follow-up. We will establish the working and expert groups very quickly, some already in May this year, as we promised, and drive the process forward with clear determination.

**Karoline Graswander-Hainz**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, werte Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auf Europas Straßen sterben jährlich mehr als 25 000 Menschen. Unser Ziel ist: Bis 2050 soll es keinen einzigen Verkehrstoten mehr auf Europas Straßen geben.

Mit der Überarbeitung dieser Richtlinie werden wir die Sicherheit auf Europas Straßen verbessern und die Anzahl der Verkehrstoten reduzieren. Denn wir nehmen vor allem jene in den Blick, die zu Fuß, mit dem Rad oder mit dem Motorrad unterwegs sind. Sie sind die schwächsten Verkehrsteilnehmerinnen und Verkehrsteilnehmer, und Unfälle enden für sie besonders oft mit dem Tod oder mit schweren Verletzungen.

Ebenfalls konnten wir den Anwendungsbereich der Richtlinie ausweiten. Das bedeutet, dass die hohen Standards nun auch dort gelten, wo am häufigsten schwere Unfälle passieren, nämlich auf Landes- und Bundesstraßen und nicht nur auf Autobahnen. Außerdem müssen wir fit für die Herausforderungen von Digitalisierung und Automatisierung werden. Selbstfahrende Autos müssen Verkehrsschilder und Bodenmarkierungen in ganz Europa erkennen und lesen können. Eine europaweite Harmonisierung und Minimumstandards in diesem Bereich sind sinnvoll und notwendig, um mit den technischen Fortschritten mithalten zu können. Die richtige Infrastruktur und die richtige Verkehrsplanung sind zentrale Voraussetzungen für die Sicherheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger im Straßenverkehr.

An dieser Stelle möchte ich auch ein großes Dankeschön an alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen aussprechen, die hart daran gearbeitet haben, die neuen EU-Vorgaben für die Infrastruktur zu verabschieden. Die Richtlinie trägt auf jeden Fall zu mehr Verkehrssicherheit auf Europas Straßen bei. Dadurch können Menschenleben gerettet werden.

**Mark Demesmaeker**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, 47 % van alle verkeersdoden in de Europese Unie zijn zwakke weggebruikers. Harde cijfers die in de eerste plaats een bekommernis zijn van lokale en regionale overheden, maar met deze richtlijn kan en zal ook de Europese Unie bijdragen aan meer veiligheid. Zoals door het ontwikkelen van kwaliteitseisen voor infrastructuur voor voetgangers, fietsers en andere kwetsbare weggebruikers en door in verkeersveiligheidsprocedures systematisch met hen rekening te houden.

Deze integrale aanpak is de enige manier om de veiligheid van kwetsbare weggebruikers structureel en blijvend te verbeteren. Een kwaliteitsvolle weginfrastructuur kan de kans op verkeersongevallen beperken. In maar liefst 92 % van de ongevallen spelen menselijke fouten een rol. Nieuwe technologische ontwikkelingen, en met name digitale ontwikkelingen, kunnen bestuurders beter assisteren en helpen om het verkeer voor iedereen veiliger te maken. Die systemen werken optimaal met goed aangelegde, onderhouden, goed detecteerbare wegmarkeringen en verkeerssignalisatie. Daarom zijn gemeenschappelijke specificaties voor wegmarkeringen en verkeersborden nodig. Ze moeten de basis leggen voor de uitrol van slimmere en zelfrijdende wagens op onze Europese wegen.

De Europese aanpak is hier nodig en ik ben verheugd over de stappen die deze richtlijn neemt. Er zijn geen wondermiddelen die alle verkeersrisico's kunnen uitsluiten, maar het is wel onze plicht om op alle beleidsniveaus te doen wat mogelijk is om verkeersslachtoffers te vermijden. Veiligheid eerst, in alle fasen van de planning, het ontwerp en het gebruik van verkeersinfrastructuur.

**Matthijs van Miltenburg**, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de verkeersveiligheid in Europa moet verbeterd worden. Jaarlijks sterven er ruim 25 000 mensen op Europese wegen door verkeersongevallen en helaas stagneert de daling van het aantal verkeersdoden.

Deze ontwikkeling kunnen we keren door auto's en wegen veiliger te maken. En met deze richtlijn doen we het laatste. Ten eerste zorgen we ervoor dat we strengere eisen stellen aan de veiligheid van meer Europese wegen. Voortaan vallen niet alleen wegen van het trans-Europese vervoersnet onder de richtlijn – we hebben het zojuist gehoord – maar ook andere wegen waar veel ongevallen gebeuren. En dat is hard nodig!

De meeste verkeersongevallen gebeuren op wegen die geen onderdeel zijn van het TEN-T-netwerk, zoals provinciale, regionale wegen. Als ik kijk naar mijn eigen land, dan is slechts 6 % van de Nederlandse wegen als provinciaal aan te merken. Maar toch vinden ongeveer 20 % van de verkeersdoden helaas te betreuren op dat soort wegen.

Het tweede punt. We gaan ook Europese wegen beoordelen op veiligheidsrisico's. We richten het beleid meer op wegen waar de meeste ongelukken gebeuren en brengen risico's proactief in kaart. Op deze manier zorgen we ook voor een betere bescherming van kwetsbare verkeersdeelnemers.

Ten derde verbeteren we de kwaliteit van weginfrastructuur voor wat betreft wegmarkeringen en verkeersborden. Zo bevorderen we dat deze herkenbaar en zichtbaar zijn voor alle weggebruikers. Deze kwaliteitsimpuls is ook nodig met het oog op de opkomst van zelfrijdende voertuigen en voertuigen met rijhulpsystemen, zoals de intelligente snelheidsassistentie.

Concluderend: met deze richtlijn zetten we belangrijke stappen voor de verkeersveiligheid in Europa. We verbeteren de kwaliteit en veiligheid van weginfrastructuur. We bereiden ons voor op de toekomst met zelfrijdende voertuigen en we voorkomen zoveel mogelijk verkeersongevallen met als streven nul verkeersdoden. Want elk verkeersslachtoffer in Europa is er één te veel.

**Kateřina Konečná**, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, jsem velmi ráda, že se otázku řízení bezpečnosti silniční infrastruktury podařilo vyřešit ještě před volbami do Evropského parlamentu.

Během posledních pěti let snižování počtu úmrtí na silnicích stagnuje. V roce 2017 na evropských silnicích došlo k úmrtím více než 25 000 lidí. Kromě toho je každý rok nejméně 135 000 osob vážně zraněno. Například na českých silnicích v roce 2018 zemřelo 565 lidí, to je o 63 více než v roce předchozím.

Snaha o záchranu byt' jen jednoho lidského života není ztrátou času a tak jsem ráda, že se této problematice EU věnuje. Stejně tak jsem ráda, že Evropská komise vypracuje své návrhy na základě zkušeností všech členských států.



Dobrou zprávou pro řidiče jistě je, že by mělo dojít ke zlepšení zajištění dostatku parkovacích a odpočinkových míst pro řidiče, zejména profesionální. To zaručí vhodný prostor pro parkování zejména v horských a okrajových oblastech. Všichni se totiž jistě shodneme, že odpočatý řidič dělá méně chyb, a proto mu je třeba zajistit místo k zaslouženému a nutnému odpočinku.

Doufám tedy, že dojde ke snížení počtu smrtelných a vážných silničních nehod na silničních sítích EU pomocí zlepšení úrovně bezpečnosti silniční infrastruktury. Máme příležitost to stihnout ještě předtím, než se rozjedeme do svých měst a států proto, abychom si řekli o další mandát.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Doamnă președinte, doamnă comisar, vreau de la bun început să felicit raportorii, raportoarea, este un raport foarte ambițios, mă bucur că a mers bine și negocierea cu Consiliul, și felicit Comisia pentru că propune simultan cu lansarea modificării directivei și un cadru general de siguranță rutieră pentru perioada 2020-2030, bineînțeles un cadru adaptat la noua situație, pentru că, sigur, s-a schimbat structura transportului, avem mai mulți bicicliști, avem persoane vulnerabile, și pentru tot ce s-a discutat aici, în toate propunerile, legat de această directivă, se ține cont de factorii din fiecare zonă. Ce aș dori eu să spun însă, doamnă comisar, este că ar trebui să vedem cum am putea ca, în țările în care infrastructura rutieră este mai puțin dezvoltată, să ajungem acolo și cu dezvoltarea infrastructurii, evident, și cu sistemul de supraveghere, pentru că degeaba avem un sistem de supraveghere dacă nu avem o infrastructură de calitate, și mă bucur foarte mult că directiva revizuită vizează atingerea unor obiective importante, între care acelea de înjumătăți până în 2030 numărul de accidente.

#### *Intervenții la cerere*

**Nicola Caputo (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sulle strade europee nel 2017 sono morte oltre 25 000 persone, e il tasso di mortalità resta fermo da qualche anno, nonostante alcuni Stati membri continuino a compiere progressi in materia di sicurezza. Paradossalmente in autostrada si verifica meno del 10 % degli incidenti stradali fatali a fronte del 37 % in zone urbane e del 55 % su strade di provincia.

Il vantaggio di una direttiva sulla gestione della sicurezza delle infrastrutture stradali risiede nella convergenza verso standard più elevati di sicurezza delle infrastrutture in tutta l'Unione. Va estesa l'applicazione delle regole comunitarie per la sicurezza delle infrastrutture a tutte le maggiori strade d'Europa. Le regole più stringenti, che si applicano solamente alle autostrade principali e alla rete stradale transeuropea, vanno rispettate anche nelle aree urbane e di provincia.

L'obiettivo della Commissione di zero morti entro il 2050 però, non potrà essere raggiunto senza l'aiuto della tecnologia, rendendo obbligatori i sistemi di assistenza alla guida e di sicurezza, e un aiuto diretto agli Stati membri per individuare con precisione le strade più pericolose e renderle più sicure. Complimenti alla relatrice.

#### *(Încheierea intervențiilor la cerere)*

**Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for your very positive debate.

With these files, I think that we showed very concretely that our common commitment to road safety is more than just words. We are walking the path towards Vision Zero with a very concrete agenda in our hands.

I'm so proud of all of us, sincerely, because we were able to show EU citizens that we can be very ambitious, bold and very concrete when we work together, and that is a very strong message.

So I would like to thank again the rapporteur – she was great in motivating everyone – and all of you because I think we all work together with a very passionate and very sincere approach to save the lives of Europeans, and what can be more motivating than that?

So, thank you very much again and I'm really looking forward to a constructive deployment of our legislation.

**Daniela Aiuto, relatrice.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io non l'ho fatto prima e me ne scuso. Ringrazio veramente tutti i relatori ombra, che hanno seguito in maniera non solo costante, ma anche apportando dei suggerimenti e dei supporti, a volte anche emotivi, perché ci sono stati dei momenti dove la nostra unione, il nostro fare sistema per raggiungere l'obiettivo comune, ha fatto la differenza.

Il raggiungimento di questo risultato è la prova che quando il Parlamento e le altre istituzioni riescono a dialogare, riescono a trovare un accordo per il bene comune dei cittadini, si possono veramente ottenere dei grandi risultati. Quindi questo mi rende molto orgogliosa, però non è una vittoria solo di alcuni, è una vittoria di tutto il Parlamento ed è un grande risultato per tutti i cittadini europei.

**Președintele.** – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc joi, 4 aprilie 2019.

*Declarații scrise (articolul 162)*

**Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), per iscritto.** – Al fine di raggiungere l'obiettivo «zero vittime» entro il 2050, accolgo con favore, la richiesta da parte della Commissione, di modifica della direttiva 2008/96/CE, in materia di gestione della sicurezza e delle infrastrutture stradali. Con l'approvazione del testo si estenderà l'applicazione della disposizione a tutte le autostrade, incluse le strade primarie e quelle al fuori la rete TEN-T. La principale novità consiste nella possibilità di operare una valutazione concreta in merito alle condizioni della viabilità, al livello di rete, che tenga conto sia delle misure di sicurezza presenti, ovvero rilevabili visivamente, sia di un insieme di altri dati, desumibili dalla casistica di incidenti ivi verificatisi, dalla gravità degli stessi, dalla necessità di ispezioni finalizzate a risolvere situazioni delicate e pericolose.

Altra importante novità è la previsione di disposizioni specifiche comuni per la segnaletica verticale e orizzontale, che consentano una leggibilità ed un riconoscimento facilitato, in connessione con dispositivi di assistenza alla guida, installati sui veicoli. Finalmente avremo dei dati utili e certi che consentiranno l'identificazione delle cosiddette «strade della morte». Attraverso un costante monitoraggio della viabilità, si potranno migliorare con precisione quelle strade e autostrade non sicure.

**Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), în scris.** – Propunerea Comisiei privind gestionarea siguranței infrastructurii rutiere face parte din cel de-al treilea pachet de mobilitate și vizează reducerea atât a mortalității rutiere, cât și a vătămărilor grave, prin îmbunătățirea performanței în materie de siguranță a infrastructurii rutiere. Prezenta directivă prevede stabilirea și punerea în aplicare a procedurilor referitoare la evaluările de impact și la operațiunile de audit în domeniul siguranței rutiere, la inspecțiile în materie de siguranță rutieră și la evaluările siguranței rutiere la nivelul întregii rețele efectuate de către statele membre. Siguranța rutieră din UE s-a îmbunătățit semnificativ în ultimele decenii datorită măsurilor adoptate la nivelul UE, precum și la nivel național, regional și local. Cu toate că unele state membre continuă să înregistreze progrese considerabile în fiecare an, la nivelul întregii UE rata mortalității rutiere a stagnat în ultimii ani. În acest context, suntem de acord cu faptul că sunt încă necesare măsuri pentru încetinirea ratelor mortalității rutiere astfel încât să fie atinse obiectivele de reducere la jumătate a numărului deceselor rutiere până în 2020 comparativ cu anul 2010 și apropierea de obiectivul „zero decese” până în 2050. Printre măsurile preconizate s-ar include extinderea domeniului de aplicare al Directivei, introducerea evaluărilor rutiere la nivel de rețea și specificațiile comune pentru marcajele rutiere.

## 20. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

**Președintele.** – Următorul punct pe ordinea de zi este o intervenție de un minut privind chestiuni politice importante (articolul 163 din Regulamentul de procedură).

**Daniel Buda (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, mulțumesc. Dragi români din diaspora, vă așteptăm acasă! Este o realitate faptul că avem peste 4,5 milioane de români care muncesc și trăiesc în afara granițelor țării. Depopularea spațiului rural, lipsa forței de muncă în agricultură și în alte sectoare sunt evidente în România. Astfel, salut introducerea în noua Politică Agricolă Comună adoptată ieri de Comisia AGRI a conceptului de nou fermier care se aplică persoanelor cu vârsta de peste 40 de ani. Acestea vor putea obține o finanțare europeană în cuantum de până la 100 000 de euro pentru dezvoltarea unei afaceri în agricultură. Tinerii fermieri sub 40 de ani beneficiază de o creștere de la 70 000 de euro la 100 000 de euro pe o perioadă extinsă de la cinci până la șapte ani. Fermierii europeni trebuie să fie plătiți

atunci când decid să practice o agricultură ecologică de natură să asigure un mediu curat și oxigen de calitate pentru întreaga Europă. În același timp, convergența externă sau egalizarea subvențiilor între fermierii din Vest și cei din Est trebuie să devină un obiectiv pentru Parlamentul următor, dat fiind faptul că toți fermierii sunt actori pe aceeași piață unică.

**Alex Mayer (S&D).** – Mr President, I want to say thank you to my amazing staff, Peter Roberts and Chris Jones, and thank you to the Labour Party and the people of the East of England for giving me the opportunity to serve. And to everyone in this Chamber: I'm sorry. I'm sorry that my country has chosen a path that will make my nation and yours weaker, poorer and more isolated.

Brexit Britain means fewer opportunities to collaborate and for businesses to thrive, reduced capacity to tackle the big issues like climate change, and power ebbing away. It is a tragedy. And I say: not in my name. For what we have here is precious. Cooperation. Consensus. Unity in diversity. Prosperity. The greatest peace project ever.

I will always be proud to be British, and European too. And to be a socialist, and because I am a socialist I am an optimist. So, to every Brit at home who knows in their heart that this Brexit is wrong, my message is simple: do not despair. Organise.

**Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL).** – A Uachtaráin, “Dlúthpháirtíocht lenár gcairde in Éirinn” a deir ár rialtas mar aon le hUachtarán an Choimisiúin, an Coimisinéir Jean-Claude Juncker, ach diabhal dlúthpháirtíochta a bhí le feiceáil nuair a rinneadh bulaíocht orainn chun gach aon sealbhóir bannaí i ngach aon bhanc sa tír a aisíoc. An Banc Angla-Éireannach, an ceann ba lofa díobh ar fad, ba chuma lena cheannairí nó go leor de na custaiméirí faoi dhlí na tíre nó faoi mhuintir na tíre.

Táimid go léir fós ag íoc as an €34 bhiliún a chosain sé. Tharla an tubaiste sin thart ar 10 mbliana ó shin ach tá rialtas an lae inniu in Éirinn fós toilteanach orduithe Uachtaráin eile de chuid an ECB, Mario Draghi, a leanúint agus iad ag déanamh scrios ar an bhfiachas €31 bhiliún a bhaineann le nótaí gealltanais Anglo. Sa bhliain 2017, scriosamar €4 bhiliún, anuraidh €3.5 billiún agus €1 bhiliún go n-uige seo i mbliana. “Dlúthpháirtíocht”?

**Gilles Lebreton (ENF).** – Monsieur le Président, Laura Pignataro était un haut fonctionnaire du Service juridique de la Commission de Bruxelles. Elle était aussi une lanceuse d'alerte.

En 2018, elle a révélé à la médiatrice européenne des courriels qui prouvaient l'illégalité de la nomination de l'Allemand Martin Selmayr au poste de Secrétaire général de la Commission. Victime de pressions à la suite de ses révélations, elle s'est suicidée le 17 décembre. Un journal français vient de dévoiler l'affaire.

J'accuse M<sup>me</sup> Merkel d'être à l'origine de cet affreux malheur, en ayant imposé la nomination illégale de Martin Selmayr. J'accuse Jean-Claude Juncker et l'ensemble de la Commission d'avoir cédé à ces manœuvres. J'accuse le Parlement européen d'avoir fait preuve de lâcheté en s'abstenant de voter une motion de censure contre la Commission et en se contentant de voter une protestation platonique. J'accuse l'Union européenne d'avoir poussé Laura Pignataro au suicide et je demande justice pour cette femme. Ressaisissez-vous!

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já bych se chtěl ve své jedné minutě věnovat nejen těm velkým výzvám, které stojí před námi, ať je to klimatická změna nebo vytvoření energetické unie či bezpečnostní otázky.

Myslím si, že je důležité také řešit setrvalé výzvy, které pomáhají zvyšovat kvalitu života Evropanů. Neměli bychom na ně zapomínat, především na investice do občanské vybavenosti, do dostupnosti služeb, např. zdravotně-sociálních, do základní infrastruktury, jako je např. i vysokorychlostní internet a samozřejmě i dostupnost sídel nebo propojenost vodárenských soustav. Toto jsou všechno výzvy, které pomohou zlepšit kvalitu života občanů, a před těmito výzvami stojí celá Evropa. Jsem rád, že jsme schválili legislativu ke kohézní politice, která právě na tyto výzvy reaguje a pomáhá členským státům řešit palčivé problémy, s nimiž se potýkají nejen ony, ale i jejich občané.

**Inés Ayala Sender (S&D).** – Señor presidente, le agradezco muchísimo su generosidad por darme la oportunidad de excusarme ante la Cámara y, sobre todo, ante la señora comisaria y ante la señora Aiuto, la ponente, por no haber podido participar. Por desgracia, tenía la idea —es lo que se me había dicho— de que empezaba el debate a partir de las once. Creía que llegaba a tiempo y he llegado tarde.

Quería excusarme, sobre todo porque era un tema muy importante, que el Parlamento apoya absolutamente, en relación con la mejora de la seguridad de las infraestructuras viarias. Así que lo siento mucho y quería solamente poder excusarme ante la señora comisaria, esta Cámara y la ponente. Perdón.

*(Intervención sobre el debate anterior)*

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Mr President, recently it has become fashionable to fight so-called ‘social dumping’ and all legislation relating to posted workers in various fields is subject to revision.

It establishes requirements and imposes restrictions that supposedly protect workers from eastern Europe. However, protectionism is often hidden behind this. Unfortunately, the main advantage of workers from eastern Europe is that they work for a lower wage than workers in western countries. Temporary work in another EU country for these people is an opportunity to earn money for their families. Introducing restrictions supposedly for their protection means a significant amount of them will no longer be invited to work in a rich country. This means that they will have to stay in their country and they will receive much less pay for the same jobs than their colleagues from western countries.

We don't need protectionism disguised as social protection. We need a real, common, EU social policy.

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Senhor Presidente, a droga dos bairros da classe trabalhadora: assim podemos chamar ao aumento das casas de apostas que vemos nas nossas cidades, como já denunciei na pergunta que dirigi à Comissão Europeia no passado mês de janeiro.

Incremento da ludomania e risco de jogo compulsivo, sobretudo entre os jovens, por serem o coletivo mais vulnerável, são alguns dos prejuízos das casas de apostas na nossa sociedade.

Não esqueçamos que 30% dos rapazes e raparigas entre 14 e 17 anos admitem ter apostado alguma vez. Estes perigos fazemos com que no meu partido defendamos a necessidade de regular a nível europeu a limitação da sua abertura e que se desenvolvam atividades destinadas a informar e sensibilizar sobre os seus riscos.

Que tenciona fazer a Comissão para que os Estados-Membros implementem medidas preventivas e informativas?

**Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL).** – Mr President, we warned you about the disaster that Brexit would cause to the north of Ireland. We warned you that the British Government would take negotiations right to the wire. We warned you that the British Government would destroy our EU rights. We have done everything in our power to protect the rights of people in the north of Ireland, because no one knows perfidious Albion like we do.

When the British Government legislated to remove the Charter of Fundamental Rights, we sought legal advice which demonstrated that the British have an international obligation under the Good Friday Agreement to uphold the rights of people. Yet the British establishment, along with the Democratic Unionist Party, are riding a horse and cart through the Good Friday Agreement.

People in the EU talk about the rights of the three million EU citizens in Britain. What about the 1.8 million in the north? #WearIrishtoo. People like Emma DeSouza and other Irish citizens have already had their rights stripped away. Brexit is about more than just preventing physical infrastructure on the border partition in Ireland. It's about protecting people's rights too.

**Anna Záborská (PPE).** – Ďakujem pán predseda, pani komisárka, zajtra budeme hlasovať o návrhu, aby Európsky parlament požiadal Súdny dvor Európskej únie o stanovisko k ratifikácii Istanbulskeho dohovoru. Liberálna ľavicová strana chce obrátiť na súd, pretože vo férovom politickom procese nedokázala presadiť svoju agendu. Touto agendou však nie je ochrana žien pred násilím, je ňou snaha vnútiť členským štátom nové chápanie muža a ženy aj v tak citlivých oblastiach, ako je výchova detí a sloboda náboženstva a viery. Práve z obavy pred podobnými tlakmi slovenský parlament minulý piatok ústavnou väčšinou odmietol ratifikáciu Istanbulskeho dohovoru. Ak chceme zachrániť európsky projekt, musíme odmietnuť každý extrémizmus vrátane toho ľavicového.

**Nicola Caputo (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa è la settimana della consapevolezza sull'autismo, settimana che serve per riportare l'attenzione sul tema dei diritti delle persone affette da autismo.

In questi cinque anni mi sono occupato molto spesso di autismo, con varie iniziative parlamentari ed extraparlamentari, ma soprattutto con una dichiarazione scritta approvata nel settembre 2015 dal Parlamento europeo. Un mio emendamento sul «dopo di noi» è stato introdotto nella relazione sull'attuazione della strategia europea sulla disabilità, peraltro non ancora rivista dalla Commissione.

C'è tanto da fare. Non esiste ad esempio un registro di patologie su base clinica per l'autismo, una lacuna notevole che richiede determinazione ma anche collaborazione con le associazioni che si occupano di autismo e che molto spesso sono più avanti delle istituzioni. Sono cinque milioni i cittadini europei che attendono risposte concrete. È necessaria e non più procrastinabile una risposta strategica specifica da parte dell'Unione europea, con l'obiettivo di raggiungere il pieno riconoscimento dei diritti delle persone speciali di aumentare la ricerca e lo scambio delle migliori pratiche in materia e creare le condizioni per aiutare le famiglie delle persone con autismo.

**Președintele.** – Acest punct de pe ordinea de zi a fost închis.

## **21. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół**

## **22. Zamknięcie posiedzenia**

*(Ședința a fost închisă la ora 22.44)*

---

*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